1994

Combining service and learning: A comparison study of the relationship between a classroom sponsored service learning initiative and the moral, civic and intellectual lives of college students

Timothy Patrick Leary
University of Maryland - College Park

Order Number 9511845

Combining service and learning: A comparative study of the relationship between a classroom sponsored service-learning initiative and the moral, civic and intellectual lives of college students

Leary, Timothy Patrick, Ph.D.
University of Maryland College Park, 1994

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: COMBINING SERVICE AND LEARNING: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN A CLASSROOM SPONSORED SERVICE-LEARNING INITIATIVE AND THE MORAL, CIVIC AND INTELLECTUAL LIVES OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

Timothy P. Leary, Doctor of Philosophy, 1994

Dissertation directed by: Dr. Monique Clague
Professor of Education
Department of Education Policy, Planning, and Administration

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of a classroom sponsored community service initiative on students' moral judgment, commitment to civic and social responsibility, and mastery of academic course content. A multi-method approach was utilized to examine developmental and learning outcomes of students participating in two sections of a Philosophical Anthropology II course, both taught by the same instructor, offered at a small liberal arts college. Students in one section of the course participated in a structured service-learning experience of approximately 25 hours in length, while students in the other section were asked to complete a library assignment of approximately 25 hours in lieu of the service-learning component. All other aspects of the course remained the same.

The primary instrument utilized to measure changes in students' moral judgment was the Defining Issues Test (Rest, 1986a) and the main

instrument employed to measure changes in students' commitment to civic and social responsibility was the Social and Personal Responsibility Scale (Conrad & Hedin, 1981a). Students' mastery of academic course content was determined in large part by the results on a final essay examination.

Based on an analysis of the results of the three primary instruments utilized in this study, little or no evidence was found to suggest that students participating in the service section of the course demonstrated greater gains in their levels of moral judgment, commitment to civic and social responsibility, and mastery of academic course content than did students in the non-service section of the course.

However, analysis of the findings of the more secondary, qualitative aspects of this study tended to differ and to somewhat contradict the quantitative findings. Data generated from student interviews, an interview with the course instructor, student reflection papers, and the results of standardized course evaluations and community service questionnaires suggest that some modest, subtle differences did exist between the overall quality of the educational experience for students in the service section and for students in the non-service section of the course. These differences related primarily to pedagogy, to levels of student involvement in the learning process, and to the degree to which students were able to make meaningful connections to social issues and concerns.

COMBINING SERVICE AND LEARNING: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN A CLASSROOM SPONSORED SERVICE-LEARNING INITIATIVE AND THE MORAL, CIVIC AND INTELLECTUAL LIVES OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

by

Timothy Patrick Leary

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of The University of Maryland in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
1994

Advisory Committee:

Dr. Monique Clague, Chairperson
Dr. Richard Chait
Dr. Marylu McEwen
Dr. Leo Fenzel
Dr. Greig Stewart

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere thanks to all those people who supported me in this endeavor. Those individuals include:

My friends and colleagues at Loyola College. Particularly, Rick Boothby for his willingness to participate and to provide access to the students who participated in this study.

Members of my doctoral support group: Bob Birnbaum, Dick Chait, Monique Clague, Marylu McEwen, Mickey Fenzel and Greig Stewart.

My wife, Erin, for her patience, love and constant companionship.

My parents, Bon and Tom, who taught me the value of service to others.

My son, Patrick, whose presence in my life represents hope for a more just, loving world.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

School cannot be a preparation for social life
except as it reproduces, within itself, typical
conditions of social life. (Dewey, 1909, p.14)

An Overview of the Area of Concern

Many national leaders believe that the United States of America now faces a variety of complex, deeply ingrained economic, social, political, and environmental problems which threaten the stability of the country and the world beyond its borders. Timothy Stanton (1990) and others have observed that as the problems facing our society have increased in severity and complexity, the interest of most college students in these problems and in acting to solve them appears to be diminishing.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching concluded in the book College: The Undergraduate Experience in America (Boyer, 1987) that "a dangerous parochialism pervades many higher learning institutions" (p. 281). The Commission found that the vast majority of students, although vaguely concerned, were inadequately informed about the interdependent world in which we live. The report concluded that "the quality of the undergraduate experience must be measured by the degree to which it makes a difference in the intellectual and personal lives of its graduates, in the social and civic responsibilities

they are willing to assume, and ultimately in their world perspective" (p. 281).

Newman (1985) has argued that neither the structure nor the content of our educational system is providing students with a means to link classroom study with social problems and issues and, consequently, he contended that students lack an understanding of their responsibilities of democratic citizenship. In Higher Education and the American Resurgence (1985) Newman wrote, "if there is a crisis in our system of education today, it is less that test scores have declined than it is that we have failed to provide the education for citizenship that is still the most significant responsibility of the nation's schools and colleges" (p. 31).

In an effort to combat this perceived lack of understanding and commitment to issues relating to civic and social responsibility, leaders in both the public and private sectors have begun to explore more effective ways to educate students for their role as responsible citizens in an increasingly diverse democracy. While the motives of these groups have been quite diverse, it is clear that their efforts have focused much attention on the social, economic, political and environmental problems of our time and on the need for a renewed interest in and commitment to active citizenship to help address and ultimately resolve these concerns.

Colleges and universities in this country have responded to this call for a renewed commitment to responsible citizenship by encouraging

students to become actively involved in their local, state and global communities. Many institutions have promoted this call to service by establishing formal centers for community and public service (e.g., Stanford University, Georgetown University), while others have attempted to involve students utilizing more informal, decentralized initiatives. Although the methods and level of commitment to community service may vary from one institution to another, the majority of these programs have as their mission to develop in students an awareness of public issues and community needs, to foster the development of ethical leadership, and to encourage students to assume a lifelong commitment to social responsibility (Kendall, 1990).

This commitment to promote the value of community service in the college environment and to better understand the connections between community service and student learning, has also given rise to a number of national organizations. Organizations such as the Campus Compact (a coalition of 280 college and university presidents), the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE), and the Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) have all worked intensively to increase the number of students involved in public and community service and the variety of service activities and initiatives on campuses across the country. The Partnership for Service-Learning has focused specifically on providing

opportunities for students to link community service to academic study in the international community.

With increased interest and participation in service related activities in higher education has come a variety of claims regarding its merits. Many educators and service providers have asserted that participation in community service experiences, when coupled with structured, critical reflection and analysis: (a) increases self-esteem and levels of empathy (student shifts from a primary focus on self to an increased focus on others), (b) further develops a sense of reciprocity (mutual gains to both server and those being served), (c) enhances problem solving and critical thinking skills, (d) develops knowledge of and sensitivity to cultural differences, (e) enhances moral and ethical development, and (f) fosters more responsible citizenship and community leadership. While many of these claims may be true, there is, however, little empirical evidence to support such assertions.

Although a number of researchers in recent years have begun to examine the relationship between student participation in community service and student learning, most of this research has focused on the impact of service on student growth and development in the co-curricular, out-of-classroom environment, with little attention given to the student learning and development which takes place when service is linked to the more formal academic environment. While the co-curricular research is clearly important, service-learning advocates such as Howard Berry (1990)

and Jane Kendall (1990) have contended that the future of community and public service programs on college campuses is directly linked to educators' ability to integrate service into the academic curriculum, and to understand the connections between community service and more formal academic learning.

Berry (1990) asserted that "service-learning provides opportunities for faculty members to look at their disciplines in a new way and to discover a profound learning resource, stimulating to themselves as well as to their students" (p.327). Stanton (1990) has stated that "by integrating efforts to increase student involvement in public service with liberal arts curricular reforms which promote active learning and critical thinking, we may establish a model of undergraduate education that promotes the development of responsible and intelligent citizens" (p. 184).

However, Campus Compact (1989-90) has found that "despite the successful efforts of many colleges and universities to rekindle student interests in public service and the apparent benefits of integrating service and academic learning, the development of campus-based community and public service programs assumes only peripheral significance and lacks much needed faculty support and participation" (p.2).

Kendall (1990) has suggested that in order for service learning to be integrated into the curriculum in an ongoing, meaningful level, it must be academically valid and acceptable to the faculty and administration. She

believes that many faculty are often hesitant to integrate service into their classrooms because, among other things, they "lack an understanding of how service learning can help students test the concepts of an academic discipline, and they lack familiarity with techniques for assessing student learning" (p. 142).

To this end, the Campus Compact has begun working with college and university faculty and administrators to help them think more systematically and pedagogically about how to link service-learning to classroom theory and knowledge. Brown University and Campus Compact have established "The Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study" as a way to stimulate member campuses to search for innovative ways to tie students' public and community service to the academic curriculum and to strengthen the faculty role in students' service experiences. To date, approximately 25 institutions of higher education have participated in this innovative project.

Statement of the Problem

The Rutgers University report on the Status of Civic Education and Community Service (1991) aptly stated:

> While there is widespread and growing concern among our nation's leaders about the disaffection of young people, about their alienation from the democratic notions of civic responsibility and their perceived lack of commitment to issues related to the common good, there is also an emerging consensus that institutions of higher

> education have a responsibility to help equip their students for their role as responsible citizens in an increasingly diverse democracy. (p.1)

In response to this situation, many institutions have managed to involve successfully large numbers of students in community service programs. While many educators and service providers have made significant claims about how participation in community service positively affects student growth and development, there is minimal empirical evidence to support such claims. Even more scarce is research to support the claim that participation in community service enhances students' learning in a classroom setting.

In response to this situation, a group of 40 educators, researchers and service-learning practitioners meeting at The Johnson Foundation's Wingspread Conference Center in March of 1991, concluded that one of the principal research questions for service-learning educators in the 1990's is: "What is the effect of service-learning on the moral, intellectual, and citizenship development of participants?" (Giles, Honnet & Migliore, 1991, p. 9). It is postulated that answers to this question could provide faculty and academic administrators with a basis for judging the value of integrating service into the curriculum, and more specifically, into the classroom environment.

The major purposes of this study are threefold: (a) to examine the degree to which classroom sponsored community service affects students'

moral judgment, (b) to examine the degree to which classroom sponsored community service affects students' commitment to civic and social responsibility, and (c) to examine the degree to which classroom sponsored community service affects students' academic learning or mastery of course content.

Research Design

Two sections of a semester-long Philosophical Anthropology II course (PL 202), both taught by the same instructor at Loyola College, were used in this quasi-experimental design. Students in one section of the course were asked to participate in an ongoing service-reflection experience of approximately 25 hours. This included participation in a minimum of 15 hours of ongoing service, keeping a reflection journal about the service experience, and writing a four-page paper at the end of the semester integrating the experience with the course readings and class discussion. Students submitted a one-page paper at the end of the second week, outlining their proposed service experience and describing how it relates to and would help them understand the content and themes of the course.

Students in the non-service section of the course were asked to read two additional texts on reserve in the library and to write a five page research paper on both readings in lieu of the service-reflection experience. It was estimated by the course instructor that this assignment would take

approximately 25 hours to complete. All other elements of the two sections of the course were the same.

Students in the service section selected their service experience from a list of possible placements previously identified by the course instructor, working in conjunction with the director of Community Service at Loyola College. Criteria for site selection included the agencies' commitment to working with people somehow marginalized or disenfranchised in society, the providers' willingness to offer students an opportunity to have direct contact with those being served, and their willingness to provide ongoing support and supervision to the students.

Research Methodology

Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used to compare participants' changes in moral judgment, changes in their commitment to civic and social responsibility, and the degree to which students demonstrated a mastery of course content. The Defining Issues Test (DIT) (Rest, 1986a) was the primary instrument employed (pre and post) to measure students' changes in moral judgment, and the Social and Personal Responsibility Scale (SPRS) (Conrad & Hedin, 1981b) was the principal instrument used (pre and post) to measure changes in students' commitment to civic and social responsibility. Students' grades on a final essay examination were utilized to determine similarities and differences in students' mastery of academic course content.

Secondarily, other measures were employed in this study to obtain a more complete picture of differences in students' gains in each of the three main research areas. These methods included semi-structured interviews with a random subsample of students from both sections, an interview with the course instructor, and the results of the College's standardized course evaluations. To better understand the impact of the community service experience on students in the service section, participants' final reflection papers and responses to a community service questionnaire were also reviewed.

Primary Research Questions

The primary research questions posed in this study were the following:

1. **Do students participating in a course which requires community service demonstrate a greater increase in moral judgment than students participating in a non-service section of the same course?**
2. **Do students participating in a course which requires community service demonstrate greater gains in their commitment to civic and social responsibility than students participating in a non-service section of the same course?**
3. **Do students participating in a course which requires community service demonstrate a greater mastery of academic course content than students participating in a non-service section of the same course?**

A fourth exploratory question was also posed in this study.

4. **Do differences emerge in students' changes in moral judgment, changes in civic and social responsibility, and in their demonstrated mastery of academic course content based on gender?**

Definition of Important Terms

Moral Judgment

The works of Piaget (1952), Kohlberg (1972), Rest (1979), and Gilligan (1982) served as the theoretical and conceptual foundation for the research in this area. Rest (1979) argued that there are four major component processes involved in morality: (a) moral judgment, (b) moral sensitivity, (c) moral motivation, and (d) execution and follow-through. This study deals primarily with issues related to moral judgment, or a person's underlying thinking about the balancing of individual interests and the benefits of cooperation.

The above mentioned authors agreed that students develop moral judgment through a definite succession of transformations, and that some types of moral judgments are more advanced than others. There is, however, disagreement among the authors as to the content and the sequence of position or stage development in this area. Kohlberg (1972) viewed development of moral judgment and reasoning through a sequence of six distinct stages, each with its own formal structures of reasoning. Rest (1979), while in basic agreement with Kohlberg, argued that moral

development tends to occur more in patterns and shifts than in distinct stages. Gilligan (1982) suggested women may conceptualize the world differently from men and that the sequence of stage development is somewhat different for women than it is for men.

There is also disagreement as to what characterizes the highest levels of moral judgment, with Kohlberg (1972) and Rest (1979) focusing on notions of justice and fairness, and Gilligan (1982) asserting that caring for others and self represent the essential elements of the most advanced moral judgment.

Civic and Social Responsibility

Civic and social responsibility refers to the extent to which individuals express responsible attitudes toward social welfare and personal duty, demonstrate a sense of competence to take responsibility, exhibit a sense of efficacy regarding their ability to fulfill social responsibilities, and hold the perception that they do perform responsible tasks in their service experience (adapted from Conrad & Hedin, 1981a).

This area also focuses on students' capacity to recognize and to understand contemporary issues such as cultural diversity (i.e., racial, ethnic, and economic), and their capacity to understand and articulate their role in an increasingly complex, interdependent world. This includes the capacity to see how one's actions affect others and how one's actions may benefit and/or violate the collective good of all citizens (Morse, 1989).

Mastery of Course Content

Mastery of course content refers to the degree to which students are able to comprehend the discipline based theory and knowledge presented in course readings, lectures, discussions, papers, and other course activities, and the extent to which students are capable of connecting this theory and knowledge to broader social issues and concerns.

Service - Learning

While service-learning has been defined in various ways over the past twenty years as both a program type and a philosophy of experiential education, for the purpose of this study service-learning is referred to as the process by which students integrate theory and knowledge gained from classroom instruction with their community service. This process is considered a dynamic and interactive approach which suggests mutuality in learning between the student and the community with whom she or he is actively engaged, hence, the intentional use of the hyphen between the words service and learning.

Service-learning is viewed as a collaborative effort whereby students apply their classroom learning to inform and understand an individual or community being served. In turn, students are informed by the individual or community about their needs, concerns, history, and culture. Reciprocal learning results when the server (the student) is educated and develops a

deeper sense of civic responsibility and the served (individual or community) is empowered (Stanton, 1990).

Critical Reflection

Critical reflection refers to the structured time set aside to translate experience into learning, the time taken to "step back" and contemplate one's service experience, to abstract from it meaning or knowledge related to other experience. Most experiential educators believe that service does little to promote learning if it is not connected to ongoing, developmentally constructed reflection. The critical reflection component in the service section of the course included: (a) a limited number of class discussions about the linkages between students' service experience and the course material, (b) journal writing to record ongoing reflections about students' service experience (suggested, not mandated), and (c) a final reflection paper designed to help students' connect their service experience to the course material, and to make sense of the course experience within a much broader social context.

Service Providers

The service providers are those people working in the social service agencies who supervised the students involved in the service experiences. Students participating in the service component completed a contract with the service providers detailing their commitment to the experience. Service providers met with the students occasionally throughout the semester to

help process their experience. In addition, service providers submitted summary comments to the course instructor to assist in the evaluation process.

Rationale and Significance of the Study

There is wide-spread consensus in higher education that students are ill-equipped to deal effectively with the complex, deeply ingrained problems of our increasingly interdependent world. There is also much agreement in higher education that colleges and universities have a vital role to play in helping students to develop a deeper understanding of the critical issues, the skills, abilities, and most importantly, the commitment to address and to, ultimately, resolve these problems.

In response to this situation, many colleges and universities have begun to develop community service programs as a vehicle through which students can serve others while simultaneously developing a greater understanding of and commitment to responsible citizenship. Although many educators believe intrinsically that structured service-reflection experiences can enhance greatly students' growth and development in this area, there is little empirical evidence to support these claims.

Therefore, the results of this research may provide some evidence to support claims that community and public service positively impact students' moral development, their commitment to responsible citizenship, and their ability to master academic course content. This study may be of

particular interest because it examines the role of service in the more formal academic environment. To date, few studies have attempted to examine the link between service and academic learning in the classroom. If service can enhance students' academic learning, it [service] may become a more integral part of the academic curriculum, having implications for both epistemological and pedagogical changes.

If service can in fact enhance academic learning, faculty members may be more willing to reexamine and restructure their courses in ways that could assist students in better connecting course content to broader social issues. Courses offering students opportunities to get more experientially involved in their learning might also provide insights into how to reach students operating at less advanced levels of moral and cognitive development. Knefelkamp (1974) suggested that students at lower levels of cognitive development tend to need such experiences in order to cement their learning.

If, however, the results of this study show service to be insignificant in terms of its impact on students' development and learning, academic administrators may have added reason to suggest that service-learning initiatives be developed primarily in the co-curricular, out-of-classroom environment.

In addition, this study may help to underscore the importance of establishing much needed dialogue between service providers in the

community and members of the college faculty and administration. This discussion may help faculty to make their courses more relevant to real-life issues and enable those responsible for developing service projects on campus to more effectively meet the needs of service providers, and ultimately, the needs of those most disenfranchised in our society. This dialogue may also lead to an improvement in the relations between campus and local communities.

Finally, the integration of service into the classroom may also enable both teacher and student to be seen as partners in the learning process. Through participation in the service experience, students may feel as if they have something significant to contribute to the learning process as well as to gain from it.

It is important not to over-estimate the significance of this study. However, the study may prove to be valuable if it serves only to raise new questions for further research and to stimulate much needed dialogue about the role of service in the teaching-learning process. It is also important to note that while this study may help to illuminate some aspects of the link between service and learning, it deals primarily with attitudes and ways of thinking, and does not address the critical link between reasoning and behavior.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature considered relevant to this study is reviewed in four sections. The first section examines a number of issues and concepts central to combining the notions of service and learning. This includes a brief history of the service-learning movement, a review of the key constructs and theoretical frameworks essential to understanding the interrelatedness of community service and student learning and development, and a brief overview of the research which has been and is currently being conducted in the area of service-learning.

Section two examines the concepts of civic and social responsibility, focusing on the relationship between these concepts and participation in community service. A summary of the relevant research in this area is presented. The third section of the literature review examines the theoretical constructs underlying moral development and the ways in which researchers have attempted to investigate the impact of community service on students' moral judgment. The final section examines the literature related to experience-based learning, with a review of innovative learning constructs, classroom strategies and techniques, as well as issues related to learning assessment. It is important to note that many of the concepts and constructs presented in this review are interrelated and, therefore, information presented may tend to overlap in places.

An Overview of Service-Learning

Essential Principles for Combining Service and Learning

Service-learning has been defined as both a program type and a philosophy of education. The Research Agenda for Combining Service and Learning in the 1990s (Giles, Honnet, & Migliore, 1991) stated that:

> as a program type, service-learning includes myriad ways that students can perform meaningful service to their communities and to society while engaging in some form of reflection or study that is related to the service. As a philosophy of education, service-learning reflects the belief that education must be linked to social responsibility and that the most effective learning is active and connected to experience in some meaningful way" (p. 1).

Although service-learning has some special characteristics, Jane Kendall et al. (1986) suggested that service-learning draws on many of the same basic tenets as does experiential education. Based on the work of Dewey, Lewin, and Piaget, experiential education is viewed as a pedagogy which engages the learner directly in the phenomenon being studied. While all service-learning programs can be viewed as experiential learning, not all experiential learning qualifies as service learning. Stanton (1990) contended that service-learning focuses on service to others, community empowerment, and reciprocal learning while other forms of experiential education accentuate career development, academic knowledge, skill development, or some combination of these objectives.

The "Principles of Good Practice in Combining Service and Learning" (Honnet & Poulsen, 1989), developed in consultation with more than 70 organizations to serve as guidelines for establishing and sustaining campus and community-based, service-learning programs, stated that these initiatives must:

1. Engage people in responsible and appropriately challenging actions for the common good.
2. Provide structured opportunities for people to reflect critically on their service experience.
3. Acknowledge that those with needs define their needs.
4. Have genuine, active, and sustained organizational commitment.
5. Articulate clear service and learning goals for all parties involved.
6. Clarify the responsibilities of each person and organization involved.
7. Incorporate an ongoing process for matching resources and needs for the mutual benefit of all concerned.
8. Insure that the time commitment for service and learning is flexible, appropriate, and in the best interests of all involved.
9. Include training, supervision, monitoring, support, and evaluation to meet service and learning goals.
10. Be committed to program participation by and with diverse populations.

Robert Sigmon (1979) contended that there are three principles which qualify a program as service-learning:

1. Those being served control the service(s) provided,

2. Those being served become better able to serve and be served by their own actions,
3. Those who serve also are learners and have significant control over what is expected to be learned.

The Wingspread Conference (Giles, Honnet, & Migliore, 1991) concluded that one of the characteristics of service-learning that distinguishes it from volunteerism is "its balance between the act of community service by participants and reflection on that act, in order to provide both better service and to enhance the participants' own learning" (p. 7).

The concept of reflection, while inclusive of a wide variety of thoughtful processes, is crucial to linking the notions of service and learning (Hutchings & Wutzdorf, 1988). Although those working in the service-learning field tend to agree that the time set aside by participants to reflect on and to make sense of the service experience within a broader context is essential, there appears to be little agreement on how to structure the reflection process to best facilitate student learning from service experiences.

Jane Kendall (1990) stated that "at its best, service-learning is a philosophy of reciprocal learning, a dynamic and interactive approach which suggests mutuality in learning between the student and the community with whom he or she is actively engaged" (p. 23).

The History of Service in Higher Education

Boyer (1994) has stated that "higher education and the larger purposes of American society have been - from the very first - inextricably intertwined" (p. A48). Laurence Veysey (1965) suggested that after 1865 almost every visible change in the pattern of American higher education lay in the direction of "concessions to the utilitarian type of demand for reform" (p. 60). President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard stated in 1874 that "the throbbing life of today demands from our colleges something besides learning and culture. ...It calls for true men, who are earnest, and practical, who know something of the problems of real life and are fitted to grapple with them" (cited in Veysey, 1965). While it is clear that academic leaders have wrestled for some time with questions about how to make college educated men and women more aware of and sensitive to the needs of their communities, serious attempts to formally link community service to higher education first began in the 1960s.

Todd Gitlin in his book The Sixties: Days of Hope, Days of Rage (1987) emphasized a complex matrix of explosive cultural events and contending political forces which led to the student movements of the sixties. He contended that the civil rights movement was the significant index of change in that decade which gave inspiration to the free speech, feminist, and counter-cultural movements. Gitlin argued that the hopes and dreams of many students of that era to bring about nonviolent social and political

change were destroyed by our country's continued involvement in the war in Southeast Asia. Arthur Levine (1980) asserted that the turbulence of the 1960s and the profoundly negative impact exerted by the Vietnam War brought about much cynicism, distrust, apathy and alienation among college students of the late 60s and early 70s.

In an effort to combat students' negative perceptions about social and political issues, and to develop, establish and/or repair relationships between colleges and local communities, many institutions established volunteer and social action programs which coincided with the formation of national service initiatives such as the Peace Corps and its domestic partner, Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) (Kendall, 1990). Most noted of the campus programs was the University Year for ACTION which sent more than 10,000 American college students to live and to work in both rural and urban communities throughout the country. Many of these programs flourished into the mid-1980s at which time they succumbed to what some educators (e.g., Kendall, 1990) perceived as the rise in self-interest among college students and social and political changes in American society, not the least of which was the changing role of women in our society (Strand, 1993).

Janet Kendall (1990) asserted that although self-interest and changes in society played a role in the decline of the community service movement in the mid-1980s, a combination of factors related to deeply rooted

misperceptions about service and ineffective attempts to connect service to the academic community played a significant role in the demise of the movement. More specifically, she argued that a sense of paternalism, the unequal relationships between the parties involved, the lack of emphasis of integrating learning with the service experience, the lack of attention to long-term institutional support, and the emphasis on charity over social justice all contributed to the movement's decline in the mid-1980s.

In 1984 John Gardner wrote:

> An education at any of the great universities, followed by a graduate degree, followed by a plunge into the world of young professionals moves students steadily from the bedrock of everyday American experience.
>
> (Stanford University Campus Report, p. 16)

This wide-spread perception of malaise and apathy among young people, particularly those in American colleges and universities, gave rise to a number of service-related national organizations in the mid-1980s. The Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) was established as a student response to the need for more active involvement in college-sponsored community-centered service. In addition, more established organizations such as the Partnerships for Service-Learning, the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) and the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL) all experienced a surge in membership and a renewed commitment to the promotion of service-learning initiatives. In 1985, a

coalition of university presidents, under the leadership of Stanford University's president Donald Kennedy and Harvard University's president Derek Bok, established Campus Compact: The Project for Public and Community Service to set policy and to encourage the revival of the academy's commitment to public service.

In the past five years, colleges and universities have reported a tremendous increase in the number of students participating in service-learning activities. Conservative estimates indicate that 142,000 college and university students are currently engaged in part-time community service activities (Waller, 1993). To keep pace with this renewed enthusiasm and commitment to service, college officials have established hundreds of community service programs on American college campuses. It is estimated that about 21% of all higher educational institutions now have a college-based service office or department (Waller, 1993).

This surge in student interest in community service has also challenged college officials to create meaningful service-related activities that promote both co-curricular and curricular learning. In response to this concern, organizations such as Campus Compact and the National Society for Experiential Education have committed significant resources in an effort to more fully integrate community service into both the social and the academic life of campus. While colleges and universities have experienced some success in connecting service to the co-curricular life of the college,

few have managed to fully integrate community service activities into the more formal, academic sector of campus. This link to the academic sector is perceived by many to be the most critical task currently facing the service-learning movement.

A number of educators (e.g., Stanton at Stanford University) have suggested that by formally linking service to the curriculum a new "pedagogy of experience" may emerge on college campuses. Stanton (1990) contended that "when effectively structured, facilitated, related to discipline-based theories and knowledge, and assessed ... service-based learning is the means to link the initiative to develop [students'] social responsibility ... with the efforts to improve undergraduate education" (p. 14).

President Bush refocused attention on community service at the national level when he signed the National and Community Service Act of 1990, providing funding for programs and services which promoted community service. Under President Clinton, service has received even greater attention. His national service initiative (National and Community Service Trust Act) may earmark up to $98 million in the next four years for programs related to community service. It is estimated that President Clinton's youth service agenda could triple the number of students engaged in school and college sponsored community service by the year 1997. In 1992, seven separate pieces of legislation related to national service were

introduced into the Congress of the United States (Senate Labor and Human Relations Committee, 1992).

Officials at the state and local levels have also been active in the past two years in their efforts to formalize students' involvement in community service. Since 1993, all Maryland students must complete 75 hours of service during their high school years, and in Atlanta and Detroit, the schools systems now require 200 hours of community service for high school graduation.

While there is much enthusiasm in the service-learning community about the recent attention to service at both the state and national levels, many believe that the Clinton administration has little understanding of the learning part of the equation. Harkavy (1993) and others have suggested that in order for the national service agenda to succeed, policy and program developers must comprehend the interrelatedness between the service performed and the learning process.

Theoretical and Developmental Models of Service-Learning

The Service Learning Model

In an effort to identify and articulate the impact of service on participants' growth and development, Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990) designed the Service Learning Model. The model, the first and most comprehensive attempt to link participation in community service and student growth and development, is based on the developmental research

of Perry, Kohlberg, Gilligan and, to some extent, Kolb's work with learning styles. The model includes five progressively more advanced phases of development (Exploration, Clarification, Realization, Activation, and Internalization) which result from students' participation in service related activities. Each phase is examined by using four key variables: Intervention, Commitment, Behavior, and Balance. The first variable, **Intervention,** deals with both the mode and setting of the service experience. The mode refers to whether the student engages in a service-learning activity alone or as a group member, and the setting focuses on the student's relationship to the client population (i.e., indirect, non-direct or direct).

The second variable, **Commitment,** examines the frequency and duration of the service learning activity, while the **Behavior** variable refers to the needs or motivations students have for engaging in service and the possible developmental outcomes students may experience from participating in service. The final variable, **Balance,** relates to Nevitt Sanford's (1966) work with the variables of challenge and support. Sanford suggested that students' growth and development is maximized when an optimal amount of these two variables is present in the environment.

Phase One, Exploration, is characterized by infrequent (possibly one-time) service experiences in which students have little or no direct contact with a site population. Activities are usually perceived to be non-threatening and students remain generally naive about the problems facing

others. In Phase Two, Clarification, students participate in a group sponsored service activity which involves more direct and sustained contact with site population. In this phase, students begin to channel their energies towards a particular service activity and become aware of internal dynamics and conflicts within the group. The security of the group provides for ongoing elements of support.

Phase Three, Realization, is characterized by students making more consistent, long-term commitments to a given site, often individually, independent of their peers. In this phase students often have transforming or "Aha!" experiences as their awareness and understanding of the service site is enhanced. They begin to examine connections between their service experience and their own lives. Challenges in this particular phase are diverse and can lead to burnout if support is not provided by campus service coordinators (i.e., opportunities for structured critical reflection). In Phase Four, Activation, students are engaged in direct, prolonged service in which they participate in resolving group issues and concerns. In this phase students begin to view their experience within a much broader social context, examining critical questions related to racism, classism, and issues of economic and social injustice. Typically, students begin to recognize the "reciprocity" between service and learning and they begin to change their lifestyle to reflect their increased commitment to social justice. Students in

this phase connect intellectual concepts discussed in class to their own thinking and are willing to challenge people with alternative perspectives.

The authors (Delve et al.,1990) contended that few students fully integrate their service experiences into their lives as characterized in Phase Five, Internalization. In this phase, students pledge a life-long commitment to making their behavior consistent with their professed values related to fairness and justice.

Delve, et al. (1990) argued that participation in structured service-learning activities encourages responsible citizenry and community leadership. More specifically, they asserted that as students become involved in direct, prolonged, and increasingly more complex service experiences, they move from an egocentric to a more allocentric viewpoint, thereby being able to accept greater responsibility for their immediate community and the larger society. While there has been little empirical evidence to affirm this contention, there is no question that the Service Learning Model has served as the theoretical framework from which numerous colleges and universities have designed, implemented, and evaluated service-learning programs and policies.

The Two Feet of Christian Service

Another closely related service model referred to as "The Two Feet of Christian Service," was developed by James McGinnis (1984). One foot, or the first step of the model, focuses on students' experiences in serving

directly those in need in our society, while the second step deals with issues of advocacy or social change. Advocacy in this case means working with citizens and community leaders to craft relevant and creative solutions to pressing public problems.

McGinnis believes that the first step is not enough. He suggested that students who participate in service, in conjunction with structured reflection activities, will be motivated to create changes in their lives and in the lives of others that will promote social justice and transform society to better meet the expressed needs of all citizens, particularly those most disenfranchised in our communities. Referring to the critical link between service and advocacy Sondra Hausner (1993) stated "direct service and advocacy are inextricably linked: to promote service without concurrently encouraging advocacy is to do a great disservice to both communities in need and providers of service" (p. 31).

Nolan's Model of Spiritual Growth Through Service

Albert Nolan, (1984) created a four stage model which attempts to describe the spiritual development individuals pass through as they become increasingly more connected to those disenfranchised and marginalized in society. The first is characterized by compassion, a stage in which individuals working with the poor are deeply moved by their experiences. In stage two, service participants begin to view poverty as a structural problem, a direct result of political and economic policies. Individuals at

this stage express much indignation and anger about the state of affairs of those disenfranchised. In stage three, participants come to realize that the poor must and will save themselves, and that they don't necessarily need their help. There is, however, often a tendency to romanticize the poor at this level. In the final stage, participants come to see themselves in solidarity with the poor. "We" and "they" are no longer relevant terms at this level. Faults and weaknesses in all people are acknowledged in this fourth stage.

The Servant Leadership Model

As college faculty and administrators have begun to consider more seriously issues related to the study of student leadership and service-learning, a theoretical model has emerged that seeks to integrate many of the concepts inherent in these two areas. Based on the work of Robert Greenleaf, the Servant Leadership Model (1977) assumes that the student leader is servant first, as opposed to leader first, which is then followed by a conscious choice to aspire to lead. Greenleaf suggested that the servant first leader is more likely to make choices based on how a given decision might affect others, particularly those least privileged in society. The model suggests that the best test of successful servant leadership, although difficult to administer, is to ask questions not only about what the servant leader gained from a given experience, but how did those served grow as persons;

did they while being served become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, and more likely themselves to become servant leaders?

Greenleaf's model has provided a theoretical framework and guiding principles for numerous leadership development programs on college campuses throughout the country (University of Maryland, 1992). Ethical and moral development is at the very heart of these programs, and community service is perceived to be a major vehicle by which students develop morally and ethically.

Criticism of Current Service-Learning Models

There are those, however, who argue that the current models for understanding and promoting service-learning on college and university campuses are incomplete, ineffective, and often distort reality. Kerry Strand (1993) has contended that most service-learning models and programs: (a) fail to challenge conventional thinking about philanthropy, (b) promote individualistic approaches to solving systemic problems, (c) encourage reliance on experience as the main mode of knowing, and (d) perpetuate traditional gender-learning among female students. She argued that most programs are not based on a theoretical model which helps students to develop the sort of critical consciousness needed to make sense of social problems and to ultimately help resolve them. Nadine Cruz (1990) has argued further that in their good intentioned efforts to promote reciprocal

learning, service-learning programs often perpetuate long-standing racist and sexist stereotypes.

Efforts to Integrate Service into the Curriculum

In 1992, Campus Compact found that despite the tremendous interest in student volunteerism and growth of community service programs on college campuses in this country, the development of these programs assumed only slight significance and lacked faculty support and participation. Kennedy and Warren (1992) indicated that "these efforts have had minimal impact on faculty or on the curriculum as a whole, and with few exceptions, most institutions have yet to involve faculty on a broad scale in ensuring that students both serve well and learn effectively from their service" (p. 1).

In 1988, Campus Compact executive committee members Donald Kennedy and David Warren (1990) commissioned a study to examine how faculty might play a stronger role in promoting service. The results of these efforts led to the following conclusions:

1. Out of respect for the community and individuals that the students serve, institutions should include in service programs opportunities for critical reflection which enables students to serve more effectively.

2. The commitment to integrate public service into the academic life of an institution should be matched with a commitment to include issues in the curriculum such as relationship of

individual achievement and the common good, or whether knowledge can be extracted through social exchange and participation.

3. Institutions should establish a sequential service-learning curriculum which prepares students for service-based learning, supports and facilitates student learning while "in the field," and provides for post-experience reflection and analysis.

4. Institutions should provide strong incentives for faculty involvement in public service. Faculty recognition, rewards and incentives, such as including public service activity in promotion and tenure reviews, are viewed as critical to successful development of civic participation and social responsibility within higher education.

Jane Kendall (1990) argued that service-learning has not received wide-spread support from the faculty for a number of reasons related to their lack of understanding about service, their unfamiliarity with the pedagogy of experiential learning, their limited knowledge about how service connects to academic disciplines, as well as their logistical concerns about how to include service in an already full course schedule. Howard Seeman (1990) contended that faculty have been reluctant to integrate service into the curriculum because they are being asked to do nothing less than to redefine knowledge and how it is best acquired. He suggested that

the debate is among those who believe that knowledge is acquired through abstract concepts and cognitions apart from the real world, and others who contend that knowledge is best gained through interaction and reflection in real world settings.

Those who have studied organizational change in higher education may better understand the difficulties educators have experienced in integrating service into the curriculum. Cohen and March (1974) described colleges and universities as loosely coupled, open systems with multiple and poorly defined goals, and unclear links between means and ends, with highly political decision making processes. They contended that relatively autonomous, professionally staffed subunits or departments often cannot or will not carry-out activities suggested or even mandated by administrators. Benevista (1989) suggested that faculty tend to operate with their own best interest in mind and tend to favor the status quo unless incentives are created that entice and persuade them to change.

A number of educators such as Jon Wagner (1986) believe that community service and academic excellence are not competitive demands to be balanced through discipline and personal sacrifice [by students], but rather are interdependent dimensions of good intellectual work. Acting on this assumption, educators (e.g., Stanton at Stanford University) have sought to improve undergraduate education by infusing campus efforts to improve liberal arts education with efforts to introduce experience-based,

service-learning into the curriculum. Stanton contended that educators have an opportunity to assist students in reflecting critically about their public service experiences and in relating them both to broader social issues and to liberal arts disciplines, to develop what Bruce Payne (1987) refers to as "academics of human reality."

In 1991 Campus Compact created the Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study to stimulate campuses to search for innovative ways to tie students' public and community service to the academic curriculum and strengthen the faculty role in students' service experiences. A grant from the Ford Foundation enabled Campus Compact to establish a series of three summer institutes to bring teams from member schools to week-long workshops on combining service with academics. Each team (three faculty, a senior administrator, and a community service program advisor) developed an action plan to address the issues on their own campus. While it may be too soon to determine the effectiveness of this initiative, it is clear that the project has done much to promote discussion about the theoretical and practical aspects of linking service with academic study.

Although only a few colleges and universities report that they have been successful in fully integrating service into the academic curriculum, as in the cases of Berea College and Alverno College, there are many institutions that have begun to make some inroads into this process. A number of institutions such as Stanford University, Georgetown University

and Loyola College in Maryland have committed significant campus resources to develop centers for public and community service. These centers were developed not only to provide opportunities for students to serve their communities (local, state, national and international), but for the purpose of linking service to the more formal academic environment. These institutions have sought ways to integrate service into the curriculum, as well as to promote faculty and administrative research related to service-learning.

Other attempts to more fully integrate service into the academic sector of college life include the following:

- **Service as a graduation requirement.** A number of institutions such as Seattle University and Rutgers University require all undergraduate students to participate in 30 hours of community service.

- **Service-learning or community service courses taken for credit.** These courses, such as Project Community, Sociology 389 offered at The University of Michigan, and Teaching Literacy ED 461 at Loyola College in Maryland, are heavy on the service with a somewhat lighter emphasis on the academic material. The service goals are often intended to provide immediate, tangible service to the community as well as to contribute to the student's development of long-term commitment to service and the public good. The learning goals often relate to sharpening the student's critical observation and analysis skills and to learn the academic material as it is related to field placement. On-campus classes are usually quite small (10 - 20

students) and utilize a seminar-discussion format. The students' commitment to service in these courses may be as much as 60 hours per semester.

- **Academic courses which require community service.** In 1992 Campus Compact published the Index to Campus Service-Learning Course and Policies. The publication lists approximately 100 courses from colleges and universities throughout the country that have included community service as part of their course requirements. The vast majority of these courses were offered in the humanities (Philosophy, Theology, Sociology. Political Science, & English), with a few courses tied to Education, Business and the physical & natural sciences. The amount of time committed to service averaged 15-20 hours per semester.

- **Service as a fourth credit option.** A number of institutions offer one extra credit in a three credit class to students interested in adding a community service component to a select number of elective core, major and minor courses. The service component allows students, individually or in groups, to apply the theory learned in the course to practical real-life situations. Students participating in the fourth credit option must complete up to 60 hours of service work a semester.

- **Summer Institutes.** Schools such as Wheaton College and Georgetown University have sponsored faculty development institutes for the purpose of promoting faculty interest and involvement in making service-learning an integral part of the

academic curriculum. The Georgetown program has as its far-reaching goal "to develop students' abilities to articulate and thus make sense of their service-learning as they are asked to connect 'hands-on' experience with theoretical or methodological concepts presented in the classroom" (Donahue et al. 1992, p. 1).

- **Connecting writing and service.** The Community Service Writing is a joint project of Stanford University's Freshman English Program and the Hass Center for Public Service. Students involved in the project are assigned, as part of their work for a Freshman English class, to write for a community service agency. The aim of the project is to give students a chance to write outside the academic setting, where their work will reach an audience beyond the teacher and will serve a purpose for its readers as well as for the students.

The University of Pennsylvania (The West Philadelphia Improvement Corps) and Santa Clara University (The East Side Project) are two institutions that have committed significant financial and human resources to try to address not only the concerns of the institution, but the needs of the outside community as well. These two universities have formed comprehensive, long-term partnerships with the leaders of local schools, businesses, and nonprofit organizations for the purpose of helping to solve deeply entrenched, complex economic, social, and educational problems. It is their expressed goal to address such daunting problems with

hopes of empowering civic leaders and thus reinvigorating whole sections of city communities.

In an effort to promote a more coordinated approach to service-learning and community development, particularly as it relates to improved student achievement, the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) allocated a $1.5-million grant from The Pew Charitable Trusts to fund up to 15 comprehensive school and college-community partnership programs.

The Status of Service-Learning Research

Lee Levison (1990) stated that "among school administrators, faculty, and parents, community service is now perceived as "a panacea for the current generations unhealthy preoccupation with self" (p. 73). President Clinton himself in a speech at Rutgers University on March 1, 1993 declared that his community service initiative "will change the country forever, for the better" (Friedman, 1993). A commentary appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer entitled "Youth Service can rebuild the Cities" (Waller, 1993), contended that wide-spread participation in community service could help solve many of the daunting problems which have plagued American nation's cities.

Such claims have prompted a number of researchers to more actively seek answers to questions related to the impact of community service on the individual and on the broader community. To this end, a select number of

educators, researchers, service-learning practitioners, foundation representatives, government officials, students and staff members from national organizations gathered at The Johnson Foundation's Wingspread Conference Center in Racine, Wisconsin in March, 1991 to set a research agenda for combining service and learning in the 1990s.

This group found that despite the claims of many practitioners, there was a "scarcity of replicable qualitative and quantitative research on the effects of service-learning on student learning and development, the communities in which students serve, on educational institutions and on society" (Giles, Honnet, & Migliore, 1991, p. 5). The conference participants concluded that the lack of standardized instruments to measure program effects, the difficulty in identifying and defining control and comparison groups, the idiosyncratic nature of the service experience, as well as the absence of longitudinal studies to measure participant growth and development, have resulted in a relatively weak theoretical base for service-learning.

Hamilton & Fenzel (1988) contended that there are many plausible explanations for the difficulty in attempting to verify empirically the predictions of theory and common sense. They suggested that this is due in part to

> ...real and important benefits from participation vary so much from one participant to another that any measure that averages gains across the entire group misses what happened to different individuals, and

> that if one grants that important idiosyncratic effects cannot be assessed by measures of specific gains and looks instead for more general changes, the phenomena of interest (e.g., self-esteem, social responsibility) are not likely to change easily or quickly precisely because they are so general. (p.67)

A review of the literature suggested that much of the research considered relevant to measuring and assessing the impact of service-learning on participants has been conducted in high schools under the more general rubric of experiential education. This research has tended to focus on issues related to employment and training, career development and personal life skills for the purpose of program evaluation, with very little work having been conducted on the effects of service on the participants' themselves.

The research conducted by the Center for Youth Development and Research under the title The Evaluation of Experiential Education Learning Project (EELP) (Conrad & Hedin, 1981a) is considered by many to be the most extensive work on the impact of experiential learning programs on the social, psychological, and intellectual development of student participants. This study evaluated 30 exemplary experiential learning programs in independent, public, and parochial schools around the country. Approximately 4,000 students ranging in age from 12 to 19 participated in the study. The research sought answers to the research questions: To what

extent do experiential programs have a positive impact on students' (a) level of personal and social responsibility, (b) attitudes toward others, both adults and the person with whom they were in primary contact during their service experience, (c) attitudes toward active participation in the community, and (d) involvement in career planning and exploration?

The Social and Personal Responsibility Scale (Conrad & Hedin, 1981b) was administered (pre and post) to examine students' commitment to social and personal responsibility, the Defining Issues Test (Rest, 1986a) (pre and post) to measure levels of moral judgment, and levels of academic learning were investigated through self-reports of the participants. Because the programs varied widely regarding academic objectives, it was considered impractical to measure academic learning using any general test of facts or concepts.

The pre-post data in the EELP study clearly showed that experiential education programs can have a positive impact on students' social, psychological, and intellectual development. The study indicated that students participating in experiential programs (1-9 months in duration) tended to score significantly higher on instruments designed to measure psychological and intellectual development, both in absolute terms and in comparison with students in regular classroom settings. More specifically, in regard to social and personal responsibility, experiential groups indicated positive movement, a mean increase of two full points ($p<.0001$), while

comparison groups showed no change or decline on the SPRS. The results of the DIT showed that experiential groups attained significant gains in moral reasoning, while the comparison group indicated no gain. In regard to academic learning, 73% of the students reported learning more (41%) or much more (32%) in their experiential programs.

According to the EELP study, the most significant increases in student development were found in those programs where students were in a helping role that related closely to the dilemmas to be solved and were engaged in regular seminars in which they were encouraged to reflect and analyze their experiences. The research also indicated that the most effective programs gave students substantial autonomy, lasted at least one semester, and involved students in the community 4 or 5 days a week.

In regard to research, it is generally acknowledged throughout the service-learning movement that: (a) most of the research has focused on the personal, career, and social outcomes of service on the server, (b) much of the data collected has been anecdotal and self reported, (c) a great deal of the research has emphasized out-of-class learning with little attempt to measure academic and cognitive goals related to classroom learning, (d) little or no attention has been focused on the effects of community service on the community providers or on development in the community itself, and (e) funding agencies are most interested in supporting research which attempts to examine the relationship between participation in community service

and the development of citizenship and civic and social responsibility (Eyler & Giles, 1993).

Service-learning educators such as Sigmon (1979), Kendall (1990), Delve et al. (1990) and Berry (1990) all claim that a key component of service-learning is reciprocity, the notion that those being served somehow become empowered by the service experience and are, therefore, better able to serve and be served by their actions. While reciprocity is frequently discussed in the literature as an essential element of service-learning, there appears to be little research to substantiate the reciprocal effects of community service.

It is anticipated, however, that the recent surge in student interest, the academy's concern for students' lack of commitment to civic and social responsibility, coupled with President Clinton's emphasis on the subject, will combine to serve as the impetus for more rigorous research in the area of service-learning. The Kellogg, Lilly, and Ford Foundations have all initiated programs and research efforts recently to examine the impact of service-learning initiatives on participants and on the communities in which they serve. In addition, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (F.I.P.S.E.) plans to sponsor grants for service-learning research in the near future.

Civic and Social Responsibility

> Learning democracy can not be accomplished through a sterile civics and citizenship course. Democracy is a lived process, and it invariably involves people attempting to change some aspect of their personal, occupational and social worlds.
>
> (Brookfield, 1987, p. 174)

Reports written for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching such as Boyer and Hechinger's "Higher Learning in the Nation's Service" (1981) and Newman's "Higher Education and the American Resurgence" (1985) have concluded that: (a) the present educational structures in this country promote passivity in students, rather than encouraging active involvement in the learning process, (b) that current educational practices reinforce tendencies within the larger culture towards a narrow pursuit of individual interests, to the exclusion of community involvement and awareness, and (c) that education focuses increasingly on the means for doing things without examining the ends to which our actions are directed (Schultz, 1990). The result, Schultz contended, is "a growing ignorance of our common cultural heritage and a loss of any sense of shared normative values that govern our common life" (p. 211).

While the motives, program goals, services offered, and resources committed to service-learning programs vary widely from one institution to another, most appear to be in agreement that service-learning programs can and should educate students first and foremost for democratic citizenship.

There also appears to be a general consensus among educators, community service providers, and politicians that little has been done to prepare the youth of this country to assume their role as democratic citizens. Farland and Henry (1992) have stated that "in so far as students acquire a civic education in their college years it is generally incidentally, through casual contacts with other students or sporadically, through individual classes that make a difference in the way they think about the world" (p. 3).

Key Variables in Civic and Social Responsibility

Richard Morrill (1982) suggested that to be literate as a citizen requires more than knowledge and information, it includes the exercise of personal responsibility, active participation, and personal commitment to a set of values. Similarly, Suzanne Morse (1989) has identified a number of skills (the ability to talk, think, judge, imagine, and act) she believes to be critical to the development of civic and social responsibility. Morse argued that these skills are active, not passive, and that "they require, even in thinking, that individuals interact and be in 'conversation' with each other" (p. 104). Talk refers not only to speech, but to the whole range of communicative skills: listening, cognition, setting agendas, and mutual inquiry. Thinking includes three elements: an attitude to thoughtfully consider problems and issues, knowledge of logical and reasoning inquiry, and the ability to apply those methods. Judgment refers to the capacity to think with others about collective lives and actions. It goes beyond individual needs toward

consideration of common goals, requiring the ability to view particular situations from multiple perspectives.

Imagination refers to the power to envision a state of affairs that does not yet exist: a way of inserting oneself into the existence through the future (Murchland, 1988). The courage to act comes from the interaction of the previously mentioned skills. Talking, thinking, judging, and imagining are all called for when taking the courage to act. Denneny (1979) contended that "the courage to act is the political virtue, because other skills become worthless without it" (p. 274).

Morse (1989) argued that thinking, talking, and acting like a citizen are different from thinking, talking, and acting like an individual. She suggested that the challenge is to get individuals to realize that their actions affect others and that their individual actions may violate the collective good of all citizens. She suggested further that the process of taking others' viewpoints and perspectives into account moves people from the individual or private good to the collective or public good.

In addition, Morse (1989) asserted that moral and civic attitudes are framed not only by observations and interactions but also by the environment in which people live. She argued that the way people practice citizenship is a reflection of how they define politics and their relationship to it. Coles (1993) argued similarly that people develop their perspectives about the public world and their relationship to others from their parents,

peers, teachers, the media and history. Hence, he suggested that one's vision and imagination of what could be is often determined (restricted or enhanced) by his or her experience and understanding of life in a democracy.

There is much discussion in the literature as to whether or not community service should be mandated. Benjamin Barber (1991) suggested that if the aim of student community service is the encouragement of volunteerism and a spirit of altruism, then clearly it should not be required. However, he argued, that if service is understood as a dimension of citizenship education and civic responsibility in which individuals learn the meaning of social interdependence and become empowered in the democratic arts, then mandating that students participate in classroom-based community service is essential.

Four Frames or Models of Democracy

Keith Morton (1993) has observed that there are four distinct sets of core assumptions or different frames for viewing democracy which serve to inform practice. The first, Liberal Democracy, emphasizes the relationship between the individual and the state. The assumption in this view of democracy is that the political and the economic systems in this country are theoretically sound and will work well if individuals are informed and active in traditional ways such as voting. The Participatory Democracy model is based on the belief that citizens have control over their own lives,

that private and public aspects of life are intertwined and that human potential is achieved only through active, direct participation in the political process. It is this model of democracy upon which much of the civic and social responsibility literature is based. A third model referred to as Service as Citizenship views service as the defining act of citizenship and focuses on the relationship between the individual nd the community. The emphasis is on caring, interdependence, and the "authenticity" which results from integrated values and action (Morton, 1993).

In addition to the above mentioned models of democracy, a fourth, more radical frame, frequently referred to as the Social Justice model, has emerged as a fundamental tenet in a number of service-learning programs throughout the country, particularly among those programs deeply rooted in religious and/or theological principles and traditions. The model, often framed in terms of "distributive justice," assumes that human beings have certain rights based solely on their existence such as food, clothing, shelter, health care, access to employment. Based on the work of Freire (1970), this model assumes that society is marked by fundamental structural conflict which produces deep suffering to those not part of the dominant Western, patriarchal culture such as people of color, women, gays and lesbians, and those trapped in lower socio-economic classes. The model calls for empowering those most disenfranchised in our society to transform or alter the basic arrangements and structures and thereby alleviate their suffering

(Fay, 1987). Freire (1970) suggested that in order for this empowerment to take place, students must first develop a "critical consciousness" through active exploration of the personal, experiential meaning of abstract concepts in dialogue among equals.

Morton (1993) believes that the above models are not antithetical and that in practice, some combination of the four is usually present. He suggested that having a working knowledge of the concepts inherent in a variety of models enables educators to complicate their thinking about citizenship and to design programs and activities that engage students in community service and critical reflection about key social issues and concerns which will ultimately lead them to a life-long commitment to active citizenship.

Morton argued that the ideal service-learning program should: (a) teach how to articulate one's "self" in a public context, (b) lower the perceived and real barriers to participation in public life, and (c) develop in students the capacity to think strategically. He contended that educators should teach from the experiences of the students, rather than from the theories of citizenship, drawing attention to the insights offered by each student as they attempt to make sense of democratic practice.

Measuring Civic and Social Responsibility

The Social and Personal Responsibility Scale

Relatively little is known empirically about how civic and social responsibility develops and few instruments exist for measuring growth in this area. However, the Social and Personal Responsibility Scale (SPRS), developed by Conrad and Hedin (1981b) and based on the Social Responsibility Scale (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1964), is the best known and most widely-used of the instruments. The Social and Personal Responsibility Scale (1981b) is built on the assumption that a person will act in a responsible manner when the following conditions are met. First, one must feel a sense of responsibility or have a responsible attitude toward others in society. Second, one must have competence to act upon this feeling of concern for others. Finally, one must have a sense of efficacy, which allows one to believe that taking action and feeling concern can make a difference.

Relevant Studies

Hamilton and Fenzel (1988) used both the Social and Personal Responsibility Scale (SPRS) and open-ended questionnaires to study the effects of service on 84 students, ranging in age from 11 to 17 years, participating in 12 different types of eight week service projects. Pre and posttest results of the SPRS showed a statistically significant gain on the Social Responsibility Subscale (assessing attitudes toward society's obligation to meet the needs of others) ($p = .037$), and no gains on the full scale or the

Personal Responsibility Subscale (assessing perception of personal responsibility, competence, efficacy, and performance ability towards those in need). However, on the full SPRS scale ($F(1, 35 = 4.678, .037)$ and the Social Responsibility subscale ($F(1, 35) = 7.720$) girls recorded more significant gains than did boys.

The researchers concluded that the modest impact revealed by participants' scores on the SPRS, limited to the Social Responsibility subscale, can be attributed to the relatively short period of service (eight weeks), and to the ineffectiveness of quantitative instruments in measuring the impact of service experiences on participants. Hamilton & Fenzel (1988) stated that "real and important benefits from participation vary so much from one participant to another that any measure that averages gains across the entire group misses what may happen to different individuals" (p. 64).

Other researchers have developed their own instruments in an attempt to measure students' commitment to civic and social responsibility. Under the auspices of a grant from the Kellogg Foundation, the University of Michigan (Markus, Howard, & King, 1993) has been conducting research which, among other things, attempts to measure the relationship between participation in service-learning and one's commitment to social responsibility. Their instrument has been designed based on a conceptualization of social responsibility which includes the following five variables:

1. serving others
2. donating money to charity
3. orientation towards others
4. commitment to social justice
5. recognition that citizenship includes a responsibility for others.

The University of Michigan's current study of the effects of service-learning may be the most comprehensive to date. In this study, Michigan is attempting to examine how the integration of community service into the classroom affects students' personal values, orientation toward their community, and their academic learning. Eighty-nine undergraduates, predominantly sophomores and juniors, enrolled in eight sections of a "Contemporary Political Issues" class offered in the fall of 1992 participated in the study. Two of the eight sections were designated as "community service" sections, in which students were assigned to engage in 20 hours of service at one of a number of designated community agencies, while students in the other six sections were assigned research papers requiring an equivalent amount of work over the course of a 13-week semester. All eight sections were required to attend the same 50-minute lectures (twice weekly), and to participate in small group discussion sections two times a week. Time in the service sections was regularly devoted to discussing the connections between students' community service experiences and class

readings and lectures, while the "control group" discussion sections simply discussed the readings and lectures.

All students were administered (pre and post) a brief questionnaire inquiring about their social and political beliefs and values, an end of the semester standard evaluation questionnaire, and both a mid-term and a final exam. Results indicated that students participating in the service sections of the course were significantly more likely than students in the control sections to report they had performed up to their potential, had learned to apply principles for the course to new situations, and had developed a greater awareness of societal problems. In addition, University of Michigan researchers found that course grades were significantly higher in the two service sections (mean grade 7.47 or B+ to A-) of the course than in the control sections (mean grade 6.42 or B to B+).

While one of the stated goals of most service-learning programs is to enhance students' commitment to civic and social responsibility, the results of a study performed by Rutter and Newmann (1990) suggested that the actual service experiences connected with these programs are often operationalized and interpreted in terms of individual rather than public experience. Their comprehensive study of eight exemplary high school service-learning programs tried to assess the effects of participation in community service programs in three areas: personal development, developmental opportunities (i.e, experiences that promote development),

and civic responsibility. Through the use of student interview data and observations of students in classroom and service settings, the researchers found that participation in community service positively affected students' personal development, yet appeared to have only meager, if any, program effects on students' sense of civic responsibility. The researchers emphasized the key to enhancing students' commitment to civic and social responsibility is to systematically integrate opportunities for critical reflection and analysis into the service experience.

A study conducted at the University of Virginia suggests that participation in service-learning programs may have long-range effects on participants' commitment to social and civic responsibility. Gansneder and Kingston (1990) interviewed 65 individuals who had served as interns in UVA's University Year of ACTION (UYA) program between 1973 and 1976 and compared them with UVA students who did not participate in the program. The researchers found that over half of all the students who participated in the UYA were in human services careers, and that UYA participants devoted twice as many volunteer hours to community activities than graduates who did not participate in the program. While the authors of the study admitted that their findings cannot be causally linked to the UYA experience, it does present strong evidence to support some of the optimistic claims of proponents of service-learning.

Educators in Rutgers University's Civic Education and Community Service Program are currently in the process of developing an instrument which will attempt to measure more accurately students' attitudes about and commitment to civic and social responsibility.

Moral Development

> The moral contradictions and inconsistencies in our personal lives more than resonate with those in our social order, our nation's politics, our culture. ...Our colleges have not been all that successful in figuring out for themselves what their obligations are with respect to the moral questions that many students put to themselves. (Coles, 1989, p. 203)

Relevant Student Development Theory

There appears to be a general consensus in the field of moral development that young people learn about morality through their own experiences, observing and interacting with other young people and adults, and that morality develops over time, as young people move through a series of increasingly more complex ways of thinking about the nature of cooperation, fairness and sharing (Winkler, 1988). However, there remains much disagreement over the universality of patterns of moral development, particularly as they relate to the effects of culture and gender.

While John Dewey (1916, 1938) is often cited as having been influential to the development of many of the basic concepts of moral development, it is Jean Piaget's research in the 1930s that has provided

much of the foundation for the current study of moral and cognitive development. Piaget's four-stage theory of moral development (1952) suggested that a person's perception of reality is cognitively constructed and that these cognitive structures evolve -- that there is a developmental progression along a hierarchical continuum which is divided into a sequence of stages, with each stage representing a qualitatively different way of thinking (King, 1978).

Piaget was the first to recognize that movement from one stage to the next higher stage is often irregular and involves an individual's ability to employ the set of behaviors consistent with that next stage. In describing cognitive disequilibrium, Piaget asserted that as new experiences cannot be assimilated into existing categories of experience, humans attempt to revise their categories and expectations so that experience once again makes sense and is predictable (Rest, 1986b).

Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development

Building on the ideas of Dewey (1938) and Piaget (1965), Kohlberg developed his theoretical model of moral development. His six-stage scheme of development (1972) is constructed around the concepts of fairness and justice, and is based on three fundamental assumptions: (a) a majority of an individual's spontaneous reasoning can be classified at a single stage (or at the most 2 adjacent stages), (b) movement in time is always from the individual's major stage to the next stage in the sequence, with each new

stage a reconstruction or transformation of the prior stage, and (c) each stage is described in terms of formal structures of reasoning, not in terms of the context of judgments and values such structures generate (Rest, 1979). Kohlberg suggested that stage structure can be disassociated from the content of issues and is, therefore, concerned about how and why judgments are made.

Kohlberg contended that the concepts of fairness and justice are essentially notions about the balancing of individual interests and the benefits of cooperation. He asserted that each stage has a distinctive concept of fairness and justice and that as an individual's understanding of these two concepts increases in sophistication and complexity, this results in more independent thinking and autonomy in making moral judgments. In other words, Kohlberg's model attempted to analyze moral development in terms of its successive conceptions of how mutual expectations among cooperating individuals are established, and how the interests of individuals are to be balanced (Rest, 1979).

Kohlberg's Stages of Moral Development are divided into three distinct levels, which reflect a movement in moral perspective from the individual, to societal, to a universal point of view. Within each of these three levels, Kohlberg has identified two distinct stages of development. Moral judgment at the **Preconventional Level** is characterized by the morality of obedience and an inability to construct a social viewpoint. In

stage one, Punishment and Obedience, the physical consequences of action is most important in determining its goodness or badness, regardless of the values of the consequences. In stage two, referred to as Instrumental-Relativist, the focus is on which satisfy one's own needs as a way to insure survival. Reciprocity is considered a matter of "making deals," not one of justice.

The **Conventional Level** is characterized not only by a need to conform to personal expectations and social order, but of actively seeking to maintain, support and to justify the order. In stage three, termed Interpersonal Concordance, behaviors which conform or please others is considered appropriate. Judgment proceeds from conventional perceptions of goodness which reflect a concern for others and the relationship of the group appears to be more important than individual needs. In stage four, the morality of Law and Duty to the social order is apparent. Fulfilling ones obligations to groups, institutions or society becomes paramount.

Moral judgment at the **PostConventional or Principled Level** is freed from both individual and societal constraints and becomes rooted in principles of universal justice. Rest (1979) suggested the problem at this level is that of "devising a plan for cooperation that minimizes arbitrary inequities and maximizes the stake each individual has in supporting cooperation" (p. 32). In stage five, the Social Contract, correct behavior is determined by standards of government and human rights which have

been reached by means of societal consensus. "Right" however, is more concerned with issues of individual rights and the dignity of all human beings, than simply with developing consensus, and, therefore, conflicts between legal and moral perspectives may arise. In the final stage, referred to as the Universal-Ethical-Principle Orientation, individuals select a set of ethical principles that are aligned with universal principles of reciprocity, equality and justice. Individuals at this stage in their development understand that these universal principles must be defended over and above existing societal laws and hence, civil disobedience is often considered an acceptable action.

According to Kohlberg, progression through the stages is done sequentially, and occurs when new experiences cannot be assimilated into existing cognitive structures, thus inducing a state of cognitive conflict which leads to structure disequilibrium and accommodating or changing the cognitive structures so that the new structures can assimilate the experience (Rest, 1986b). Kohlberg and others have contended that the best way to induce this cognitive disequilibrium and stage advancement is by presenting moral arguments consistent with the next stage's structure, or one stage above the person's stage of reasoning. Rest (1986b) also found that students understand but reject examples of thinking lower than their own and fail to comprehend examples more than one stage above their own.

Kohlberg (1972) suggested that there is no reason to believe that the reorganization of basic cognitive structures can take place in a relatively short period of time. He asserted that an individual takes on average over 12 years to move a full stage in his or her moral development. There is also evidence to suggest that excessive cognitive conflict or challenge in one's environment may create a situation that could cause students to actually regress in their moral thinking (Deemer, 1987).

James Rest (1986b) has questioned the universality of Kohlberg's theory and the notion that moral development is sequential, hierarchical and an unchanged process. Carol Gilligan (1982, 1988) and others have also contended that Kohlberg's theory misrepresents and inappropriately characterizes women's moral development, and have suggested that many traditional theories of moral development such as Kohlberg's, do not adequately account for and address the developmental orientations of people of lower social power and status.

Rest's Model of Moral Development

Rest admitted that many of the basic concepts in his model are "borrowed" from Kohlberg's stage scheme. However, he suggested that there are some subtle, yet important differences between the two. While Kohlberg contended that the content of issues can be separated from stage structure, Rest argued that this assumption is problematic and that in

attempting to understand the process of moral judgment, content cannot be separated from stage distinctions.

In addition, Kohlberg tended to view moral development through a simple stage theory which suggests that individuals move one step at a time through the stage sequence and always in the same order. This is in contrast to Rest's perspective which tended to view moral development in terms of "patterns" or "shifts," either upward or downward, in an individual's distribution of responses, where upward is defined as increases in higher types of moral reasoning at the expense of lower types (Rest, 1986b). Although both Kohlberg and Rest focus on issues of fairness and justice, Rest's scheme attempts to more directly analyze the underlying logic of people's moral sense in terms of different social arrangements for distributing the benefits and burdens of cooperation (Rest, 1979).

In stage one in Rest's model, referred to as Obedience, being moral is simply doing what you are told. At this stage the child doesn't comprehend any reason for the rules, nor any interconnectedness among set rules. In stage two, termed Instrumental Egoism and Simple Exchange, individuals begin to cooperate with others as rights and responsibilities are determined through simple "bargain type, favor for favor" interactions. In stage three, referred to as Interpersonal Concordance, reciprocal role-taking is evident. Individuals are aware of each other's thoughts, needs and expectations.

In stage four, termed Law and Duty to the Social Order, social interaction is governed through laws rather than mutual understanding based on group relations as in stage 3. At this particular stage, no personal consideration or circumstance can supersede the law, and respect for authority is part of one's obligation to society.

Rest (1979) argued that stages 5 and 6 are distinctive in that they deal with the problem of devising a plan for cooperation that minimizes arbitrary inequities and maximizes the stake each individual has in supporting cooperation. The major accomplishment in stage five, Societal Consensus, is to develop a rational plan for setting up a system of social cooperation, that must reflect the general will of the people and provide safeguards for basic human rights.

In stage six, Nonarbitrary Social Cooperation, individuals believe that moral judgments are ultimately justified by establishing principles of ideal cooperation rather than relying on social consensus. Individuals are viewed as ends in themselves and not means for some other good.

In his most recent book, Rest (1986b) has extended the scope of research to examine the complex question of how moral reasoning is linked to moral behavior. (Earlier work by Blasi (1980) found that 57 of 75 studies using Kohlberg's work showed moderate relationships between reasoning and behavior.) In his Four Component Model (1979), Rest presented an analytical framework, utilizing four major kinds of psychological processes,

for depicting what must go on in order for moral behavior to occur. First, the person must be able to "make sense" of the particular situation in terms of possible actions and who would be affected by the actions. Second, the person must be able to make a judgment as to which course of action is morally right. Third, the person must be able to prioritize moral values above all others. Finally, the person must have the skills and the perseverance to actually implement his or her intention to act morally.

Rest's Four Component Model assumes that moral development or moral behavior is not the result of a linear sequenced, unitary process, but four distinct processes with complex interconnections and complicated interactions among all four components. While the model may prove useful in helping researchers identify the complexity of the processes which link moral behavior and action, to date little research has been conducted to test the its validity.

A Feminist Critique of Moral Development Theory

Virginia Held (1993) contended that traditional moral theory has provided us with two alternatives: survival of self or duty to all mankind. She argued that the feminist perspective of morality, which more fully takes into account the experience of women, provides researchers with an opportunity to examine the ways in which women and men differ in their experiences and approaches to dealing with moral problems.

In her book In a Different Voice, Carol Gilligan (1982) claimed that girls and women experience themselves and their world much differently than do boys and men. She argued that for boys and men, issues of separation and individuation are critically tied to gender identity, whereas for girls and women issues of feminine identity are linked to a continuing importance of care and attachment to others. She contended that women are often torn between caring for themselves and caring for others, and tend to view their failures to care as failures to be "good" women, which suggests a link between moral judgment and self-identity development.

In Mapping the Moral Domain, Gilligan and others (1988) advanced the notion that because boys and girls follow markedly different social pathways, they tend to develop within two distinct modes of moral judgment or moral orientations: (a) a morality of justice (predominantly male), or (b) a morality of response and care (predominantly female).

The Morality of Justice orientation, as defined by Gilligan (1988, p. 75), draws attention to problems of inequality and oppression and holds up an ideal of reciprocity and equal respect. Reciprocity is defined in terms of maintaining standards of justice and fairness established independently of persons, to legitimize existing rules and standards. **The Morality of Care,** draws attention to problems of detachment or abandonment and holds up an ideal of attention and response to need. This perspective rests on an understanding of relationships as a response to another on their terms

(Lyons, 1983) and involves the question of how to act responsively and to protect vulnerability in a particular situation.

Gilligan and Attanucci (1988) suggested that detachment, the mark of mature moral judgment in the justice perspective, becomes the moral problem in the care perspective - the failure to attend to need. Conversely, the authors argued that attention to the particular needs and circumstances of individuals, the mark of mature moral judgment in the care perspective, becomes the moral problem in the justice perspective - failure to treat others fairly and as equals.

Gilligan's Stages in the Moral Development of Women

Gilligan used a three-level model with transitional stages which link the different levels to describe development. In Level 1, referred to as **Orientation to Individual Survival,** the person is focused on issues which relate to the preservation of self. Moral considerations arise only when the individual's needs are challenged. Women at this level often feel powerless and relationships are viewed as painful. This level is followed by a transitional stage, termed Selfishness to Responsibility, in which the individual begins to move from a self-centered focus to assume a greater sense of understanding and connectedness to others: peer acceptance is key at this time.

In level two, **Goodness as Self-Sacrifice,** the individual tends to focus on the needs of others, at the expense of her own developmental needs.

Individuals come to view their own self-worth in relation to their ability to care for others. Fear of abandonment and protecting those most disenfranchised are key issues at this stage. This level is followed by a transition from Goodness to Truth, in which the individual begins to realize that care of self is critical to her ability to care for others. The individual begins to accept and hold as legitimate her thoughts, feelings and attitudes, rather than basing her perceptions on the opinions of others.

In level three, **Morality of Non-Violence,** an individual begins to deal with others in nonviolent ways without compromising her own self-worth. Universal obligations of care for self and others as developed and maintained through relationships are accentuated.

Gilligan (1988) argued that since Kohlberg's theory is derived from the study of men's lives and reflects the importance of individuation and separation, it tends to misrepresent women's moral development and to obscure an understanding of the morality of care. She suggested that his traditional theory mistakenly portrays women as deficient in moral development because his scheme views issues of connectedness and relationship building as lower level tasks (Stage 3) and fails to deal with the fact that advanced stages of moral development for women may well include issues related to their care for and sensitivity to the needs of others.

Measuring Moral Development

The Moral Development Scale

Kohlberg attempfed to measure levels of students' moral judgment using his Moral Judgment Scale (1976). This process involved time consuming, expensive clinical interviews in which individuals were presented with a situation or dilemma and asked to make a decision and to give a rationale for that decision. The scoring was based primarily on the nature of the explanation.

The Defining Issues Test

By far the most widely used instrument to measure levels of moral judgment and reasoning is Rest's Defining Issues Test (DIT) (1986a). Rest developed the DIT in response to the need for a more practical, validated method of assessing moral judgment and the need to establish a data base for the major claims of the moral development theory (Rest, 1979).

The DIT, while utilizing moral dilemmas similar to Kohlberg's, does not ask subjects to provide a rationale for their decisions, it simply asks them to rate how important each given question is in making a decision, and to then rank order the four most important questions. In other words, the DIT doesn't measure spontaneous moral reasoning, but rather recognition, comprehension and preference for moral judgments. From the results, the researcher gains a P% (percentage of principled thinking) and a D score (a composite score).

The P% indicates the relative importance an individual gives to principled moral considerations in making a decision and is based on Stages 5 (a & b) and 6. Since the P score does not include information about lower stages of reasoning (Stages 2, 3, and 4), Davison and Bobbins (1978) offered the alternative D score, an empirically weighted sum which uses information from all stages. Their research suggested that the D score may be more sensitive to longitudinal change.

Data from numerous studies which have used the DIT report that scores can be significantly increased by moral education interventions (e.g., service-reflection experiences) of several months duration, but not by short-term interventions (Rest, 1979). Deemer's (1987) extensive 10-year study correlating interviews over time with the DIT found that civic responsibility and political awareness were significantly associated with DIT scores.

In addition, the normative data collected from the DIT studies mentioned above indicate that scores on the instrument were positively correlated with education, age and IQ, with years of formal education having the strongest correlation (upward development tends to level off when individuals cease to be involved in the formal educational setting).

Despite Gilligan's claim that justice-oriented scoring systems, such as the one used in the DIT, tend to diminish and distort the development of women, studies by Thoma (1984), Walker (1985) and Moon (1986) have

indicated that sex differences are trivial on the item level, at the story level, at the composite level, and for all age and education groupings. In many instances women participating in these studies actually scored higher than men on the DIT.

Deemer's (1987) extensive ten-year study involving over 100 subjects (first tested as high school seniors) found that "civic responsibility" ($F(4,96) = 4.94$, $p < .001$) and "political awareness" ($F(3,93) = 11.13$, $p < .0001$) were both significantly associated with DIT scores. She concluded that moral development may be as much a by-product of general social development as a product of a result of participation in a particular set of moral courses, particular experiences with moral crises, or involvement with moral leaders.

Margaret Gorman and her colleagues at Boston College (1979) were possibly the first to attempt to identify the effects of community service on college students' levels of moral judgment, as measured by the DIT in a classroom setting. The Defining Issues Test (DIT) was administered pre and post to 70 students (41 enrolled in a service course, 29 enrolled in a non-service course) at Boston College. Their findings indicated that while there was no significant difference between the men and women within the service group or between men and women within the non-service group, in both cases the women scored higher than the men as shown in both the P% and the D score. In addition, service men did not score significantly higher

than non-service men, but service women scored significantly higher than those women in the non-service course.

Cheryl Keen's (1990) study of high school seniors participating in the New Jersey Governor's School (a one-month residential, experience-based program designed to enhance students' commitment to civic and social responsibility) found that while participants made no gains in their development of a sense of civic and social responsibility (as measured pre and post by the DIT), they showed significant gains in this area when tested nine months following the program.

Getz (1985) in her doctoral dissertation found a significant relationship between levels of moral reasoning and attitudes towards human rights. Sampling both liberal and conservative church members and undergraduate students using the DIT, she concluded that support for human rights was associated with higher stages of moral reasoning and principled thinking, while individuals with more conventional moral reasoning were not as likely to indicate support for human rights.

While the relationship between DIT scores and religion is somewhat ambiguous, there is some indication that DIT "P" scores and religious beliefs are positively correlated. Six of seven recorded studies (Rest, 1986a) using the DIT to assess the relationship between moral judgment and religious ideology/belief found that liberal religious thinking is associated with higher P scores than is conservative religious thinking.

There is also some evidence to suggest that the DIT is a valid measure of moral judgment among non-Western populations (Snarey, 1985). However, there is little empirical evidence to determine whether or not the DIT is an appropriate instrument to measure moral judgment in African Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans and Latino Americans. In addition, no consistent relationship has been found between DIT scores and college major and DIT scores and socioeconomic background.

There are those, however, who remain skeptical about the use of quantitative instruments such as the DIT to assess levels of moral judgment. Jim Ostrow (1994) has argued that researchers should not attempt to match a presumed "learning process" up with some prefabricated model or models of development. In The Moral Life of Children Coles (1986) cautions researchers that "moral life is not to be confused with tests meant to measure certain kinds of abstract (moral) thinking or with tests that give people a chance to offer hypothetical responses to made-up scenarios" (p. 29).

Alternative Ways to Measure Moral Development

Researchers such as Mentkowski (1980), Hamilton & Fenzel (1988), and Keen (1990) have all stressed the importance of employing a multi-dimensional approach to moral development assessment which includes the use of more qualitative measurements such as semi-structured

interviews, aggregated research methods and "triangulation" to confirm the validity of findings.

Utilizing just such a multi-dimensional approach, Cagenello (1993) studied the impact of a semester-long service-learning project in Great Britain on the lives of 10 American college students. In an effort to understand the effects of the service experience on participants levels of empathy, reciprocity, civic responsibility, diversity, and views of learning, he employed quantitative instruments such as the Learning Environment Preferences (LEP) (Moore, 1987) and the Learning-Style Inventories in combination with extensive interviewing procedures. Cagenello interviewed the participants on four separate occasions, coding all data along the five variables previously mentioned. His findings indicated that all ten students experienced degrees of growth in terms of the five variables, while each participant gained in cognitive complexity on the LEP and demonstrated slight shifts in their learning styles. More specifically, Cagenello utilized his extensive interviewing technique to determine that:

- nine students were perceived to have become more empathic,
- nine students were perceived to have gained in additional awareness of mutuality and reciprocity,
- eight students were perceived to have an increased understanding of civic responsibility and the role of the citizen,
- nine students were perceived to have a heightened appreciation of diversity, most notably with students with physically and emotionally disabilities, and

- ten students were perceived to have demonstrated a more multiplistic, multifaceted view of learning.

Referring to the developmental Service-Learning Model advanced by Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990), Cagenello asserted that all ten students exhibited upward developmental shifts within the Realization phase (phase three) of the model.

A number of researchers, who maintain that the DIT is based on a justice conception of morality and, therefore, not representative of women's moral development, have sought to address the question of whether or not women develop morally and construct reality quite differently than do men by analyzing the content of open-ended interviews. Lyons (1983), drawing on the work of Gilligan (1982), conducted interviews with 36 individuals in an attempt to identify participants' conception of self and orientation to morality. The data were analyzed first for descriptions of self, and then for considerations participants presented from their own real-life moral conflicts, and finally for correlations between the two.

Results of this study indicated that participants described themselves in relation to others in two distinct ways: a self separate or objective in its relations to others, and a self connected or interdependent in its relations to others. The data supported the assertion that women and men tend to consider moral conflicts and issues from quite different perspectives: a morality of rights and justice (predominantly men) and a morality of response and care (predominantly women).

Langdale (1983), who adapted Lyon's procedures in order to code hypothetical dilemmas, found that Kohlberg's dilemmas elicit significantly more justice considerations than hypothetical or real-life dilemmas, and that the same dilemmas can be seen in different ways. Gilligan and Attanucci (1988) also found that while about two-thirds of the men and women in their study viewed questions about their personal experience of moral conflict and choice from both care and justice perspectives, the care focus is much more likely to occur in the moral dilemmas of women. The researchers found that men were virtually absent from the care perspective.

Liddell (1992) has developed an instrument which attempts to measure moral development while being sensitive to issues related to both distinctly different moral voices: the justice-centered morality and the ethic of care morality. The Measure of Moral Development Orientation is a paper and pencil instrument which consists of two components. A 12-item self-description inventory (6 to measure care, 6 to measure justice) was developed to reflect students' perceptions of themselves as just and/or care people. The second component instructs students to respond to 77 questions (36 justice items, 41 care items) related to 10 moral dilemmas.

A study, which asked 366 undergraduates at a large, state university to complete the Measure of Moral Orientation and items from the thinking/feeling scale of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, revealed that females and males differed in their feeling/thinking preferences, with

females more feeling-oriented and males more thinking oriented. When thinking/feeling preferences were statistically controlled for, women scored significantly higher than men on the ethic of care, but there were no gender differences on the ethic of justice (Liddell, Halpin & Halpin, 1993).

Cheryl Keen at Monmouth College in New Jersey is currently involved in a research project which attempts to link involvement in community service with faith and spiritual development. She has identified and interviewed extensively 50 or so people considered to be life-long servant leaders in our society. Initial findings indicate that the one element most often identified as having central importance to participants' lives is their commitment to faith and spiritual development.

In The Call of Stories Robert Coles (1989a) argued that literature has a powerful role to play in helping students to develop what he refers to as a "moral life." He suggested that by reading works such as those written by Tolstoy, Dickens, Eliot, Hardy, Emerson O'Connor, and William Carlos Williams, students are encouraged to wrestle with moral contradictions and inconsistencies which leads them to a deeper questioning and understanding of their own humanness and of their relationship and commitment to others, particularly those most in need in our society.

Moral Education Programs and Initiatives

Over the past 15 years, a great deal of time and effort has been devoted to creating programs for the purpose of promoting the development of

moral judgment and reasoning. While there is little empirical evidence to suggest that moral education programs increase significantly students' levels of moral development, there is much discussion about this notion in the literature and some evidence to suggest that certain educational strategies may enhance students opportunities for growth in this area.

Rest (1979) is one researcher who believes that moral education programs can actually speed up the natural development of moral judgment. While gains in moral judgement as a result of having participated in moral education programs have tended to be small, possibly due to the fact that the instruments used to measure changes (e.g., DIT) were designed to depict broad changes in thinking over the life span, Rest contended that even small gains are of theoretical and practical interest.

Linda Rosenzweig (1980) has identified a number of ways in which to increase students' levels of moral reasoning within the context of a moral education program. Her strategies are reflected in four basic models: (a) classroom discussions of moral dilemmas; (b) the introduction of moral issues through experiential components (i.e., community service); (c) extensive infusion of ethical considerations and supplementary materials dealing with moral issues; and (d) the establishment of participatory democratic structures.

Two meta-analyses (Rest, 1986a and Schaefli, et al., 1985) reviewing the impact of moral education programs on changes in moral judgment

concluded that: (a) the discussion of moral dilemmas tends to increase moral reasoning, (b) academic courses in the humanities and social studies do not seem to have an impact on moral judgment, (c) programs with adults (24 years and older) seem to produce greater increases in moral judgment than programs involving younger subjects, (d) effect size tends to be related to exposure to Kohlberg's theory, and (e) interventions longer than 12 weeks have no more impact than interventions of 3-12 weeks; yet durations less than three weeks tend to be ineffective when measuring moral judgment by the DIT. These studies did not, however, clarify the conditions necessary to produce the above mentioned effects (Rest, 1986b).

Writing in Conversations (1992), a Jesuit magazine focusing on issues in higher education, Charles Shelton S.J., stated that "the moral mission of higher education is a noble one but it is more and more a mission facing imposing if not insurmountable odds as we face the full brunt of culture's dominating influences" (p. 11). He suggested that in order to help students enhance their capacity to make moral decisions, college faculty and administrators must: (a) create a climate in which on-going dialogue about moral issues occurs, (b) serve as role models and mentors for students as they struggle with moral issues, and (c) take seriously the teaching of moral education at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Knefelkamp designed a strategy for restructuring classroom environments which has implications for the development of more

effective moral education programs. Her Developmental Instruction Model (1974), based on cognitive-developmental theory, identifies four elements which can assist educators in creating environments which both challenge and support students and, ultimately, help to promote moral and ethical growth and development.

Knefelkamp (1974) contended that students' opportunities for growth and development are significantly enhanced when the elements of Experience, Diversity, Structure and Personalism are considered in the design of educational experiences. The elements of Experience and Diversity contribute primarily to issues of challenge in the environment, while the elements of Structure and Personalism deal more specifically with support. She argued that students at lower levels of moral and intellectual reasoning should be emersed in environments with a high degree of experience and structure, and that while all students can benefit from direct, concrete learning opportunities such as community service, those students at lower levels of cognitive and moral development tend to need such experiences in order to cement their learning.

Rest (1988) concluded that it is not so much specific moral experiences (i.e., moral education programs, moral leaders, moral crises, thinking about moral issues) that foster the development in moral judgment as it is "a growing awareness of the social world and one's place in it" (p. 57). He asserted that people who tend to develop in moral judgment "are those who

love to learn, who seek new challenges, who enjoy intellectually stimulating environments, who are reflective, who make plans and set goals, who take risks, who see themselves in the larger social contexts of history and institutions and broad cultural trends, who take responsibility for themselves and their environs" (p. 57).

Experience-Based Learning

> Learning is a process whereby knowledge
> is created through the transformation of experience.
> (Kolb, 1984, p. 36)

Student Involvement

In his Student Involvement Theory, Astin (1985) asserted that:

> the amount of student learning and personal development with any educational program is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement in that program, and that the effectiveness of any educational policy or practice is directly related to the capacity of that policy or practice to increase student involvement. (p. 136)

By involvement, Astin quite simply referred to the amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experience. Astin suggested that students tend to learn more in the classroom when faculty take steps to actively (as opposed to passively) involve them in the course material.

Active Learning

Although the active learning literature does little to address directly the ways in which students can link their service experience to more formal academic learning, it is clear that many of the strategies and techniques promoted in this area have important implications for those attempting to understand the student learning which may take place when service is integrated into the classroom environment.

While active learning has been defined in various ways in the literature, Bonwell and Eison (1991) suggested that it is anything that involves students in doing things and thinking about things they are doing. In Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom, the authors identified some general characteristics which appear to be commonly associated with classroom-based active learning strategies:

- listening is only one aspect of learning,
- more emphasis is placed on developing students' skills than on transmitting information,
- higher-order thinking skills such as analysis, synthesis and evaluation are present,
- students are actively engaged in the teaching-learning process,
- and there is greater emphasis on students' exploration of their own attitudes, beliefs, values and perspectives.

Active learning advocates have stressed a variety of techniques and strategies which foster students' involvement in the teaching-learning

process and ultimately enhance student learning. Strategies include the use of role playing and simulation exercises, debates, peer teaching, in-class writing, case studies, cooperative learning, and out-of-class experiences (e.g., internships, service projects). Bonwell and Eison (1991) have suggested that faculty have tended to resist implementing more active learning techniques for a number of reasons related to: (a) their tendency to favor the lecture approach, (b) their lack of experience with possible strategies, and (c) their general hesitancy to try introduce new pedagogical approaches to their subject matter.

Baxter Magolda (1992) stated that in order to fully involve students in the learning process, educators must seek to "situate learning in students' own experience, recognizing that experience sets the stage for validating their reflection upon it, and thus further confirms their ability to know" (p. 294). She argued that perceiving learning as a relational activity is also central to the development of complex ways of knowing and thus encourages instructors to help students construct their own view by interacting with others and taking other ideas and information into consideration. Baxter Magolda contended that by truly listening to students' experiences and by working from their knowledge, instructors can better understand knowledge construction from their perspectives and can keep abreast of changes in them (p. 295).

In regard to research in this area, Bonwell and Eison (1991) reported that the vast majority of articles published on active learning have been descriptive in nature rather than empirical investigations, many of which are out dated, either chronologically or methodologically. It is clear that the area is in much need of both quantitative and qualitative research.

Emancipatory Learning

Mezirow (1990) referred to emancipatory education as an "organized effort to help the learner challenge presuppositions, explore alternative perspectives, transform old ways of understanding, and act on new perspectives" (p.18). He and others (e.g., Heaney & Horton, 1990) believe that new ways of thinking about and working toward social change become possible only when individuals develop a keen sense of critical self-reflection. This self-reflective learning process must occur, according to Freire (1973), not apart from the world, but while deeply engaged in it [society]. Freire suggested that as individuals become more aware and critical of assumptions they have about social issues, they begin to develop a conceptual framework through which effective problem solving around these issues becomes possible.

Experiential Learning Models

Dewey, Lewin, and Piaget, often regarded as the intellectual ancestors of experiential education, have all made significant contributions to the field. All three have argued that individuals must be active and involved

in their education and that learning is a continual process grounded in experience. The Lewinian Model of Experiential Learning (Lewin, 1951) was designed to help illuminate the learning process. The model conceived learning as a four-stage cycle which begins with a current experience, followed by collection of data and observations about the experience. The data are then analyzed and the conclusions of this analysis are fed back to the individual for use in modifying behavior and choice of new experience. Lewin has argued that learning is best facilitated in an environment where there is dialectic tension and conflict between immediate, concrete experience and analytic detachment (Kolb, 1984).

Kolb's Experiential Learning Model

Kolb's Experiential Learning Model (1984) also offers insight into how to design an environment for the purpose of enhancing students' learning. The model identified a four-step cycle students constantly revisit in their efforts to develop a better understanding of themselves and the world around them. It begins with concrete experience, followed by reflective observation, abstract conceptualization and active experimentation. Stewart (1990) stated that "through a multidimensional understanding and implementation of Kolb's Experiential Learning Model, service-learning is enhanced and serves to promote the holistic development of the student" (p. 41). He suggested that by engaging in deliberate and planned service-learning interventions, particularly those designed through a learning-styles

filter, students are challenged to clarify and to act on their values, and hence, exhibit higher levels of moral reasoning and judgment.

Kolb's Experiential Learning Model (1984) has also led to the development of four distinct learning styles, each with a tendency to favor two learning types. **Divergers** tend to have well developed imaginations, which enables them to view situations from a variety of perspectives. **Assimilators** tend to favor inductive reasoning techniques, and are often more focused on ideas than on people. **Convergers** tend to be highly organized in deductive reasoning, however, they are quite capable of conceptualizing in abstract ways. **Accommodators** tend to favor concrete experiences and are often considered risk takers and people of action. Stewart (1990) suggested that accommodators and divergers may tend to gravitate to direct service-learning experiences.

Kolb (1984) argued that it is important to recognize that experiential learning is not a series of techniques to be applied in current practice but a program for "profoundly re-creating our personal lives and social systems" (p. 18).

Learning Assessment

Hutchings (1989) asserted that many of the current methods utilized to assess student learning tend to focus on outcomes alone and, therefore, fail to accurately reflect important aspects of the teaching-learning process.

She suggested that at its best, assessment raises and illuminates practical, day-to-day questions about teaching and learning such as:

- What do we expect out students to know and do?
- What expectations and goals do students bring to our classes?
- What motivates students?
- What do we do in class to promote the kinds of learning we seek?
- How can we help students make connections between classroom learning and experiences outside of class?

Hutchings (1989) called for a more comprehensive view of learning assessment that focuses not only on outcomes, but on what students are learning along the way, and on understanding the context or conditions under which students learn best. In addition, she argued that assessment needs to take place within a broader conception of learning which "values the connections between learning and experience, and the view that aspects of student growth and development are integrally linked to students' intellectual development" (p. 4).

Assessment Tools and Instruments

It is clear from a review of the classroom assessment literature that the concepts of teaching and learning are inextricably linked. Angelo and Cross (1993) stated that "while learning can and often does take place without the benefit of teaching - and sometimes in spite of it - there is no such thing as effective teaching in the absence of learning" (p. 3). Classroom assessment, as pioneered by Cross, is an approach designed to help teachers

find out what students are learning and how well they are learning it. Angelo and Cross (1993) described the approach to learning as learner-centered, teacher-directed, mutually beneficial, formative rather than summative, context-specific, ongoing, and rooted in good teaching practice. The approach is based on the assumptions, among other things, that the quality of student learning is directly, although not exclusively, related to quality teaching, and that to improve their learning, students need to receive appropriate and focused feedback early and often, and to learn how to assess their own learning.

Angelos and Cross (1993) have developed a variety of classroom assessment techniques to assist faculty in assessing: (a) course-related knowledge and skills (i.e., analysis, synthesis, critical thinking, and problem solving), (b) learner attitudes, values and self-awareness, (c) learner reactions to instruction, and (d) learner reactions to class assignments, activities, and materials. It is important to note that the purpose of the above mentioned techniques is to better understand and to improve the quality of student learning, not to provide evidence for evaluating or grading students.

As previously indicated, varied academic objectives, the generality of quantitative instruments, and the idiosyncratic nature of community service experiences have made it difficult and impractical to test academic learning assumptions through any general test of facts or concepts.

However, researchers such as Coles (1989a), Baxter Magolda (1992) and Angelo & Cross (1993) have focused less on quantitative measures to assess student learning and instead emphasized more student-centered approaches and techniques which more fully consider the learning experience of the individual student. In other words, these researchers have made attempts to better understand knowledge and learning from the students' frame of reference, rather than from interpretations of statistical procedures.

Robert Coles (1989a) was one of the first researchers to explore the ways in which stories can provide deep insight into the moral lives of young people. He suggested that as researcher listens to students' stories from their [students] frame of reference, themes and patterns emerge which reflect the idiosyncratic nature of the individual student's learning experience, and offer insight into the moral dilemmas, paradoxes, choices and ironies with which students are struggling. This technique, first utilized by Coles while doing his doctoral research in the South in the early 1960s, has been used by service-learning researchers in recent years (e.g., Cagenello, 1993) to measure the impact of service on student learning.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Using a multi-method approach consisting of both quantitative and qualitative measures, the researcher assessed the developmental and learning outcomes of students participating in two sections of a Philosophical Anthropology II course. One section of the course participated in a service-learning initiative, while the other section performed a library reference assignment, in lieu of the service: all other elements of the two sections of the course were the same. The developmental and learning outcomes of those participating in the service section of the course were compared and contrasted with those of students participating in the non-service section of the course in an effort to determine the relationship of service to student learning and development. In addition, the researcher examined differences in developmental and learning outcomes based on gender.

Research Design

Participants

Those examined in this study were students in two sections of a course entitled Philosophical Anthropology II (Appendices A & B) being offered at Loyola College in Maryland during the spring semester, 1993. This course was selected for the study because of its focus on issues of economic class, poverty, power, and racism, and because the instructor (Dr. Rick

Boothby) was willing to participate and to provide access to students taking the course.

Students enrolled in the course based on their interest in the subject, their desire to take a course from this particular instructor, their need to fulfill an academic core requirement, and/or because of the course's compatibility with their schedules. Students had no prior knowledge of course or section requirements. Both sections of the course met Monday, Wednesday, and Friday for 50 minutes, the first from 12:00 - 12:50 pm, and the second from 1:00 - 1:50 pm. To address the concern that instructors are often more effective with their second class, the 12:00 pm section was designated as the service group, and the 1:00 pm class as the non-service comparison group.

A total of 57 students participating in the two sections of the Philosophical Anthropology II (28 in the service section, 29 in the non-service section) completed a demographic information sheet (Appendix C) administered during the first week of class. To determine if the two sections were "roughly equivalent," data collected on the following five variables were analyzed: gender, age, prior service experience, Standardized Achievement Tests (SATs), and grade point averages (GPAs). Information related to academic performance (as measured by SAT scores and grade point averages) was acquired, with students' permission, from the Records Office (Appendix D).

Service Section

Students in this section of the course were asked to participate in an ongoing service-reflection experience of approximately 25 hours. This component included at least 15 hours of an ongoing service experience at a community agency, maintaining a reflection journal (strongly encouraged), and writing a four-page reflection-synthesis paper at the conclusion of the semester as a way of demonstrating their ability to integrate their service experience with course materials (i.e., lectures, readings, class discussions). At the end of the second week of class, students submitted a one-page paper outlining their proposed service experience and how it related to and would help them understand the content and themes of the course.

The 15 hour minimum service requirement was determined after much discussion with the course instructor about the role of service in the class and following an examination of the assessment literature and a cross-section of syllabi from similar courses as identified in the Index to Campus Service-Learning Courses and Policies (Campus Compact, 1992). The journal writing was encouraged to assist students in recording their ongoing thoughts and feelings about the service experience and to aid them in writing the final paper. While the final reflection paper was reviewed and graded by the instructor, the journal was not. A number of questions were designed by the instructor and the researcher to assist students in writing the reflection paper (Appendix E). These questions, along with a description of

the reflection paper assignment, were distributed in-class around mid-term to help stimulate thinking about the task long before it was due.

The service-reflection component counted for 20% of a student's grade in the course. The grades in this component of the course were based on students' successful completion of the service experience and on their ability to integrate their thoughts about the service experience with course material on the final reflection paper.

Non-Service Section

In lieu of the service-reflection component, students participating in the non-service section of the class were required to read two brief additional philosophical texts on reserve in the library and to write a 5-page paper on each relating them to other course readings (Appendix F). It was suggested that students spend approximately 25 hours combined on these two assignments.

The topics and guide questions for these two papers were developed by the instructor. The two research papers counted for 20% of students' final grade in the course.

Service and Non-Service Sections

With the exception of the interventions described above, all other components of the two sections of the course were the same.

This consisted of:

- Ongoing lectures by the course instructor, and an occasional guest speaker,
- Assigned readings (eight books and articles),
- Ongoing class discussions related to required readings,
- Eight short quizzes (10 minutes in length) given throughout the semester to assess how well students were understanding the readings,
- Audio-visual presentations (e.g., films, slides)
- Take-home midterm examination (short essay),
- Pre and post completion of moral development (DIT) and civic and social responsibility (SPRS) instruments, and
- Final examination (five medium-length essays).

Research Hypotheses

Based on the three main questions and one exploratory question posed in this study, the following hypotheses were formulated.

H1. Students participating in the service section of the course will demonstrate greater gains in their levels of moral judgment from pretest to post-test on the DIT than will those students participating in the non-service section of the course.

H2. Students participating in the service section of the course will demonstrate greater gains in their commitment to social and

civic responsibility from pretest to post-test on the SPRS than will those students participating in the non-service section of the course.

H3. Students participating in the service section of the course will demonstrate a greater mastery of course content on the final examination than will those students participating in the non-service section of the course.

H4. (exploratory) Differences will emerge in students' changes in moral judgment, changes in commitment to civic and social responsibility, and in students' mastery of academic course content based on gender.

Measurement Tools and Instruments

The primary instrument utilized to measure changes in students' moral judgment was the Defining Issues Test (Rest, 1986a) and the main instrument employed to measure changes in students' commitment to civic and social responsibility was the Social and Personal Responsibility Scale (Conrad & Hedin, 1981a). The primary instrument used to measure students' mastery of course content was the final essay examination.

Secondarily, a number of qualitative methods were utilized for the purpose of obtaining descriptive, anecdotal information to further

illuminate and bring to life the effects of the course experience on participants' moral, civic and intellectual lives. These methods included: semi-structured interviews with a representative group of students (7, or 25%) from each class, an interview with the course instructor, and a review of the results of the College's standardized course evaluations. To better understand the impact of the service component on students in the service section of the course, a cursory review of students' final reflection papers and a review of the results of responses to a community service questionnaire were also conducted.

It is important to emphasize that the qualitative aspects of this study were not the primary methods employed to determine changes and differences in participants' moral judgment, commitment to civic and social responsibility and mastery of course content, but were intended to supplement and enrich the data collected and analyzed from the three main instruments (i.e., DIT, SPRS and final examination).

The Defining Issues Test

The Defining Issues Test (DIT) (Appendix G) was used (pre and post) to measure students' changes in moral judgment. The DIT is a paper-and-pencil test of moral judgment designed by James Rest (1979) and based on Kohlberg's research on moral development. The test consists of six moral dilemma stories which require students to consider 12 items about each dilemma and to rank the four most important items. The text assumes that

there are fundamental problem-solving strategies for making sense of social or moral situations, and it attempts to assess how people use different considerations in making sense of these different moral dilemmas. Moral judgment scores on the DIT are considered characterizations of the conceptual tools used by a person to make a moral judgment.

The DIT produces two indices: (1) the P% indicates the ranked importance of principled statements, and (2) the D score is a composite score which is an overall index of moral development. Data from over 500 studies using the DIT have been reported making it the largest and most diverse body of information on moral judgment available. Studies by Davison and Robbins (1978) concluded that the test-retest reliabilities for the P and D scores are in the high .70s or .80s.

There are two checks on the reliability of each subject's questionnaire. The first is the "M" score. M items are written to sound lofty and pretentious and have no significant meaning. Subjects who score 8 or greater on this measure are eliminated from the study. The second check is for consistency between subject's ratings (upper left side of the page) and rankings (the four items at the bottom of the page). Ranked items should always be higher or equal to those items rated in the top section. If there are inconsistencies on more than 2 stories or if the number of inconsistencies on any one story exceeds 8 instances, the subject's responses are eliminated.

The values for Cronbach's alpha index of internal consistency are

generally in the high 70s (.77 for the P score and .79 for the D score). Rest (1979) contended that while the major interest of the 500 studies tended not to test the validity of the DIT, the fact that so many of the studies produced meaningful results (i.e., change in the direction of higher stages of moral reasoning) indicates that the instrument is a useful measure in moral judgment research. Thoma (1984) reported that numerous longitudinal studies have showed upward movement (about ten times more than downward movement) which could not be explained away due to cohort or cultural change, or attributed to testing effects.

The Social and Personal Responsibility Scale

The Social and Personal Responsibility Scale (SPRS) was used to measure students' commitment to civic and social responsibility. Designed by Conrad and Hedin (1981a), the scale (Appendix H) attempts to measure the extent to which respondents express responsible attitudes toward social welfare and personal duty, a sense of competence to take responsibility, a sense of efficacy regarding their ability to fulfill social responsibilities, and the perception that they do perform responsible tasks in service.

The instrument contains 21 questions with each item rated on a 4-point scale providing a potential range of full scale scores of 21 to 84. The items assess the extent to which participants regard a particular facet of personal or social responsibility as characteristic of themselves. The full SPRS is divided into two subscales for purposes of analysis. The Social

Responsibility subscale assesses respondents' attitudes toward society's obligation to meet the needs of others, and the Personal Responsibility subscale assesses respondents' perceptions of their personal responsibility, competence, efficacy, and performance ability toward others in need.

The full SPRS has demonstrated acceptable reliability (Cronbach's alpha = .73) as have the two subscales for attitudes toward social responsibility at the societal level (alpha = .73) and the personal level (alpha = .68). The scale's construct validity is strengthened by its objective scoring system, random reversal of items to eliminate response bias, and its standardized administration procedures. Tests for concurrent validity include establishing correlations between the social responsibility scale and teacher supervisor ratings on student responsibility. In addition, five independent judges agreed (.92) on the category placement of the 21 items in the scale (Conrad & Hedin, 1981a). The SPRS was administered during the first (Time 1) and final (Time 2) weeks of the course. The SPRS took approximately 15 minutes to complete.

The full scale SPRS was used on the present study because clear factors to identify subscales did not emerge from a factor analysis. Reliability analysis was performed on the full scale SPRS measure for Time 1 and Time 2 resulting in the elimination of 3 items (1,2,17) which failed to correlate with other items in the scale. The resulting 18-item scale demonstrated acceptable reliability Time1 (alpha = .80) and Time 2 (alpha = .81).

The Final Examination

Based on the learning objectives of the course (as outlined on the course syllabus), this essay exam (Appendix I), administered in the final class session, attempted to measure the degree to which students developed a mastery of course content within a broader social context. That is, the final attempted to measure how well students could integrate the knowledge gained from course readings, class lectures and discussions, with their knowledge of real-life social issues and problems.

The exam, worth 35% of the course grade, was divided into two sections; the first (10 points) asked students to identify the correct authors with eight significant quotations, the second section (90 points) asked students to write comprehensive essays on five of seven questions provided. Students were given two hours to complete the exam. In order to control for instructor bias, all exams were graded anonymously by the instructor with no knowledge of students' names or section.

Semi-Structured Interviews

James Rest (1986a) has argued that general, quantitative measures such as the DIT often misrepresent idiosyncratic, content-specific influences on students' growth and development. Therefore, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a subsample of students in an attempt to identify many of the nuances and idiosyncracies of participants' course experiences, and to gain further insight into the similarities and differences

which may have existed between students in the service and non-service sections.

The researcher conducted semi-structured interviews (45 minutes in length) with seven students from each section (approximately 25% of the total number of participants) of the course at the conclusion of the semester. A stratified random sample technique was used to select students who placed at the low end, middle range, and the high end on the DIT administered the first week of class (Time 1). Four women and 3 men were interviewed from the service section, and 5 women and 2 men were interviewed from the non-service section of the course. All participants granted the researcher permission to tape and transcribe the interviews.

General, open-ended questions (Appendix J) related to the three principal questions examined in this study and based on the researcher's understanding of the literature related to student development, service-learning, and civic and social responsibility were asked of each participant.

Instructor Interview

The researcher interviewed the course instructor (Appendix K) at the conclusion of the semester (for approximately 2 hours) in an effort to solicit his thoughts about the similarities and differences in the two sections of the course as they related to the overall quality of the student learning experience, class dynamics (e.g., student interaction), as well as to his own teaching style and methodology. The instructor granted the researcher

permission to tape and transcribe the interview.

College Standardized Course Evaluation

Students participating in both sections of the course were asked to complete the College's standardized evaluation form (Appendix L) administered on the final class day. The form attempts to evaluate issues related to instruction, course materials, and the overall quality of the learning experience. The computer generated form is divided into two parts and asks students to rate their course experience using both a 4- point Likert scale and short answer responses.

Service Reflection Papers

Students participating in the service experience were asked to write a reflection paper (four-page minimum) at the conclusion of the service experience. The aim of the paper was not merely to have students summarize their service experience, but to encourage them to connect their experience in the community with ideas and themes they had encountered in the course readings and discussions. A series of questions developed by the instructor were distributed to students at mid-semester to help guide students' reflection-writing processes (Appendix E).

The instructor graded the service experience based on students' successful completion of the service experience (assessed in consultation with service providers), and on students' ability to link their service experiences with material read and discussed in class.

Community Service Questionnaire

Students in the service-section of the course were asked to complete a brief questionnaire (Appendix M) on the final class day as a means to help evaluate the effectiveness of the service-learning component. The five questions asked participants to evaluate the quality of their service experience, how well the service component was integrated into the overall course experience, and the impact of the service experience on their attitudes and behaviors.

Data Analysis

Quantitative Analysis

The key variables to be quantified and measured in this quasi-experimental design were changes over time (Time 1 and Time 2) in the development of students' moral judgment and commitment to civic and social responsibility, as well as students' mastery of academic course content, measured once at the end of the semester.

Since the two sections of the course had not originally been equated by randomization, five variables (age, gender, SAT score, grade point average (GPA), and prior service experience) were examined to determine whether the two groups were "roughly equivalent." Chi-square tests (two variable) were used to examine the independence of group membership and gender, and group membership and prior service, and t-tests were conducted to compare the two groups with respect to age, GPA, and SAT scores.

Variables that distinguished the two groups (found to be significant at the .05 level) were used as covariates to help equate and account for differences between students in both sections of the course.

In an effort to test the hypothesis about the relationship between community service and students' changes in moral judgment, and to determine the extent of change within subjects and differences in change scores between groups from pretest to post-test, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on participants' mean scores (Time 1 and Time 2) on the Defining Issues Test, using both the P% (sum of the weighted ranks of Kohlberg's stages 5 and 6) and the D score (composite score for stages 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6). In addition, gender was included as a second between-subjects factor in the MANOVA. Finally, between group differences of males and females in changes in moral judgment were examined by a group-by-gender-by-time interaction in the MANOVA.

In an effort to test the hypothesis about the relationship between community service and students' changes in their commitment to civic and social responsibility, and to determine the extent of change within subjects and differences in change scores between groups from pretest to post-test, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was also performed on participants' mean scores (Time 1 and Time 2) on the Social and Personal Responsibility Scale. In addition, gender was included as a second between-subjects factor in the MANOVA. Finally, between group differences of

males and females in changes in moral judgment were examined by a group-by-gender-by-time interaction in the MANOVA.

In an effort to test the hypothesis about the relationship between community service and mastery of academic course content, a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted using final examination scores as the criterion variable. Gender was included as a second variable in the analysis.

Qualitative Analysis

Unlike the quantitative aspects of this study which were utilized to prove or disprove the three main hypotheses and one exploratory hypothesis, the qualitative aspects of the study were designed and analyzed for the purpose of providing additional information about and insight into the ways in which participants made meaning of their course experiences. In other words, the researcher focused less on a strict analysis of the changes and differences in the two sections of the course as they related to moral judgment, civic and social responsibility, and mastery of course content, and more on attempting to gain insight into the nuances and idiosyncratic nature of students' thoughts, perceptions and stories regarding their course experiences.

Since the data in this area were considered to be of secondary importance to this study, the researcher did not engage in a more formal, rigorous, systematic approach to analysis (e.g., content analysis or

triangulation). Therefore, the approach employed to analyze the qualitative data, particularly the data collected in the student interviews, may have limited the researcher's ability to observe distinct differences and changes in participants' learning experiences and clearly restricted his ability to draw conclusions from his observations and findings.

The researcher utilized a modified version of the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) to examine data compiled from student interviews. This method emphasizes such tasks as unitizing, categorizing, filling in patterns, and member checks. Unitizing refers to the process by which the researcher identifies and records small pieces of relevant information or "chunks of meaning" which serve as the basis for defining categories. Categorizing is the process by which units of information are sorted and divided into groups based on same or similar content. These groups or categories that emerge from this process are constantly compared for the purpose of combining, establishing, or filling in new groups or categories. It is these categories that serve as the foundation for the conclusions or theory developed by the researcher. The member check, a process by which the validity of the reconstruction is examined, can be conducted either by an inquiry team or by returning the reconstructed data to the respondents for their examination and reaction.

The process used to collect and to analyze the data from the student interviews was as follows: (a) all interviews were taped and then

transcribed, (b) interviews were reviewed, both read and listened to simultaneously, and units of information were recorded (all information was coded to delineate students' section affiliation and gender), (c) units of information were divided into categories through which four major conceptual themes emerged, (d) units of information and categories were then examined in an effort to identify similarities and differences which may have emerged based on section and gender. Due to the distant relationship of these data to the study's hypotheses, a member check was not conducted.

The instructor's interview was transcribed and reviewed in an effort to identify major themes in his perceptions of the impact of the study on students' learning and development, the classroom environment, and on his teaching style and methods. Segments of this interview are included in Chapter IV to provide a general sense of the instructor's thoughts in each of these areas.

The College's standardized course evaluations were compiled and the mean scores of student responses to each of the 14 Likert scale questions were calculated and reviewed. A sign test was performed in an effort to determine the significance of student responses on the evaluation. Student responses to two open-ended questions were also compiled and examined in an effort to identify similarities and differences in students' perceptions of the overall quality of the educational experience.

All community service reflection papers (service section only) were graded by the course instructor. The criteria for grading included students' ability to understand the work of the philosophers discussed in class and their [students] ability to integrate the course material with their service experience. The researcher examined students' grades and reviewed all papers in an effort to gain some insight into their ability to integrate service and learning. Anecdotal information was identified for the purpose of providing examples of students' work in this area.

In addition, responses on the five question Community Service questionnaires (completed by service section only) were compiled and examined in an effort to better understand students' own perceptions of the degree to which the service-learning component enhanced their developmental and learning experience.

Adams (1981) and Sadler (1981) have both identified a number of limitations and constraints to conducting and making sense of qualitative research considered relevant to this study such as the researcher's tendency to: (a) anchor conclusions based on first impressions, (b) be overwhelmed by the sheer volume of the data, (c) ignore information that conflicts with already-held hypotheses and to emphasize that which confirms them, and (d) to devalue something for which some information may be missing or incomplete.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the results of the tests of the proposed hypotheses using the data obtained from both quantitative and qualitative measurements. First, demographic information about the participants is presented followed by the results of chi-square tests and *t*-tests undertaken to determine the relative equivalency of the two groups on certain potentially confounding variables. It then moves on to consider the three main research questions by examining the three hypotheses in light of statistical results obtained on analyses of the Defining Issues Test, the Social and Personal Responsibility Scale, and on the final essay examination.

Additional information obtained from the analysis of semi-structured interviews conducted with 14 students (7 from each group), an interview with the course instructor, and student responses to the College's standardized course evaluations is then presented in an attempt to respond more fully to the questions posed in this study. Finally, some summary thoughts about students' final reflection papers and their responses on the community service questionnaires (both completed only by students participating in the service section) are presented to illuminate further the influence of the service project on student learning and development. Results pertaining to the fourth exploratory question and supporting

hypothesis related to gender differences will be discussed throughout this chapter.

Demographic Information

A total of 57 students (41 women and 16 men) participating in Philosophical Anthropology II completed the demographic information sheet in class during the first week of the Spring semester, 1993. Twenty-eight students in the service section, 7 men and 21 women, chose to participate in the study (2 students in the service section of the class declined to participate). Twenty-three of the students were Caucasian (82.1%), two were Asian American (7.1%), and three were African American (10.7%). All students were between the ages of 18 and 22, with the mean age being 19.32 (SD=.77).

The non-service section had a total of 29 students, 9 men and 20 women participating in the study. Twenty-six of the students were Caucasian (89.7%), one Asian American (3.4%) , one African American (3.4%), and one referred to himself as other (3.4%). All students were between the ages of 18 and 21, with the mean age being 19.10 (SD=.82).

Twelve students (42.9%) in the service section reported that they had performed less than one hour per week of community service in the past year, while 15 students (53.6%) reported to have done at least one hour per week of service in the past year. In the non-service section, 6 students (20.7%) had performed less than one hour of service per week, while 23

students (79.3%) had participated in at least one hour of service per week in the past year. The mean SAT score for students in the service section was 1041.15 (SD=124.58), and their mean grade point average (GPA) was 2.87 (SD=.66). The mean SAT score in the non-service section was 1048.15 (SD=103.26) while their mean GPA was 2.95 (SD=.70).

Group Equivalency Tests

In an effort to determine whether the two groups were "roughly equivalent" on characteristics or experience that could potentially confound the study, five variables were analyzed (gender, prior service, age, SAT scores, and GPA). The results of chi-square tests (see Table 4.1) to determine the independence of group membership and gender, and group membership and prior service indicated that neither relationship was significant at the .05 level. Results of *t*-tests (see Table 4.2) conducted to compare the two groups with respect to age, SAT scores, and GPA also proved to be insignificant at the .05 level, and, therefore, none of the five variables used to determine the equivalency of the two groups were used as co-variates in performing the multivariate analysis of variance tests (MANOVAs) and the analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Table 4.1

Results of Chi-Square Tests Comparing Service and Non-Service Groups.

Variable	Chi-Square Value	df	p
Group membership and gender	.25	1	.61
Group membership and prior service	3.62	1	.06

Table 4.2

Results of t-tests Comparing Service and Non-Service Group

Variable	Serv. Mean (SD)	Non-Serv. Mean (SD)	t	p
Age	19.32 (.77)	9.10 (.82)	-.64	.52
SAT	1041.15 (124.58)	1048.15 (103.26)	-.63	.53
GPA	2.87 (.66)	2.95 (.70)	-1.19	.24

Tests of Hypotheses

Gains in Moral Judgment

The first hypothesis tested is as follows:

H1. Students participating in the service section of the course will demonstrate greater gains in their levels of moral judgment from pre to posttest on the Defining Issues Test (DIT) than will those students participating in the non-service section of the course.

The Defining Issues Test

DIT Reliability. A total of 17 students were eliminated from the DIT analysis when they failed to meet one or more reliability and consistency checks mandated by Rest (1990). Three students in the service section of the course failed the consistency check by registering M (meaningless) scores of greater than 8.0, and 14 students (7 from each section) were eliminated from the DIT analysis when their rankings proved to be inconsistent with their ratings scale (Rest, 1990, p. 4).

Although the high percentage (23%) of students eliminated from this study raised questions about the assumptions regarding the normal distribution of scores for such a small number of participants, tests for skewness and kurtosis revealed the scores to be within acceptable limits. In an effort to determine the extent of change within groups and the differences in change scores between the two groups, a multivariate analysis

of variance was performed using pre and post scores on the P% (sum of the weighted ranks given to Kohlberg's Stages 5 and 6) and the D score (composite score for Stages 2, 3, 4, 5a, 5b, & 6).

DIT Results. Results of multivariate analysis of variance, with Time 1 DIT scores and Time 2 DIT scores entered as dependent measures, indicate that overall, participants taken together failed to demonstrate a significant gain in levels of moral judgment from pretest to posttest as measured by mean scores on the P%, Difference = 4.32, $F(1,33) = 3.40$, $p = .074$, and D score, Difference = 9.05, $F(1, 33) = .41$ $p = .528$ (effect for time in Tables 4.3 & 4.4). There was, however, a significant group-by-time effect for P%, $F(1,33) = 4.14$, $p = .050$, such that non-service section students showed a significant increase in P% of 6.74 from Time 1 to Time 2, $t(40) = 2.96$, $p = .008$, whereas students in the service section showed no significant change, contrary to prediction. There were no other effects for the P%. In addition, there were no significant findings in the prediction of D score changes for group-by-time, gender-by-time, or group-by-gender-by-time effects. Thus, the results of the Defining Issues Test, depicted in Tables 4.3 and 4.4, show that there is no support for the first hypothesis nor for the fourth exploratory hypothesis related to gender differences.

Table 4.3

Results of MANOVA Analyzing Changes in P% in the Defining Issues Test

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Time	162.54	1	162.54	3.40	.074
Group x Time	197.87	1	197.87	4.14	.050
Gender X Time	10.24	1	10.24	.21	.646
Group x Gender x Time	95.34	1	95.34	2.0	.167
Error	1575.44	33	47.74		

Table 4.4

Results of MANOVA Analyzing Changes in D Score in the Defining Issues Test

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Time	523.77	1	523.77	.41	.528
Group x Time	932.47	1	932.47	.72	.401
Gender x Time	.34	1	.34	.00	.987
Group x Gender x Time	537.50	1	537.50	.42	.523
Error	42573.62	33	1290.11		

Gains in Civic and Social Responsibility

The second hypothesis tested is as follows:

H2. Students participating in the service section of the course will demonstrate greater gains in their commitment to civic and social responsibility from pre to posttest on the Social and Personal Responsibility Scale than will those students participating in the non-service section of the course.

The Social and Personal Responsibility Scale

A multivariate analysis of variance was performed to compare the pre and posttest scores of participants in an effort to determine the effects of group membership and gender (Hypothesis 4) on changes in SPRS scores. Results shown in Table 4.5 indicate that participants in both groups experienced no significant gain from pre to posttest at $p < .05$. Differences failed to emerge with respect to gender as well. Thus, the results of the SPRS, shown in Table 4.5, provide no support for the second hypothesis nor for the fourth exploratory hypothesis.

Mastery of Academic Course Content

The third hypothesis tested is as follows:

H3. Students participating in the service section of the course will demonstrate a greater mastery of course content on the final examination than will those students participating in the non-service section of the course.

Table 4.5

Results of MANOVA Analyzing Changes in Scores in the Social and Personal Responsibility Scale

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Time	2.95	1	2.95	.47	.497
Group x Time	1.55	1	1.55	.25	.622
Gender x Time	7.16	1	7.16	1.15	.293
Group x Gender x Time	2.83	1	2.83	.45	.506
Error	187.49	30	6.25		

The Final Examination

The final essay examination attempted to measure students' knowledge of the material presented in class, focusing on the degree to which students could connect their thinking about the philosophical readings to a much broader social context. The exam was cumulative in nature and consisted of eight multiple choice questions worth a total of 10 points, and five medium length essay questions worth a total of 90 points. The instructor graded the exams with no knowledge of students' identity or course section. Results of a two-way analysis of variance (Table 4.6) indicate that there was no significant difference between the grades attained by students in the service section (mean score, 78.04) and those of the students in the non-service section (mean score, 78.82), $F(1,36) = 1.097$, $p = .302$. In

addition, there was no significant effect found for gender nor a significant group-by-gender effect. Thus, the results of the final examination, depicted in Table 4.6, show there is no support for the third hypothesis nor for the fourth exploratory hypothesis.

Table 4.6

Results of ANOVA Analyzing
Grades Received on Final Essay Examination

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Group	87.007	1	87.007	1.097	.302
Gender	.004	1	.004	.000	.995
Group x Gender	42.066	1	42.066	.530	.471
Error	2855.021	36	79.306		

Qualitative Analysis

Although quantitative analyses failed to provide support for any of the three principal hypotheses and one exploratory hypothesis, qualitative data presented in the next section of this chapter suggest that a number of differences, albeit subtle, may have existed between the learning experiences of students in the service section and those of students in the non-service section of the class.

The qualitative data discussed in the next section consist of the results of semi-structured student interviews, an interview with the course

instructor, the College's standardized course evaluations, and data from service section students' final reflection papers and responses to a community service questionnaire.

Semi-structured Interviews

Fourteen students, seven from each section of the course, were selected to participate in the interview process based on their pretest scores on the Defining Issues Test (2 with lower scores, 3 with medium range scores, and 2 with high scores). All participants were Caucasian and between the ages of 18 and 20. The service section was represented by 4 women and 3 men, while the non-service section had 5 women and 2 men. The 14 interviews (lasting approximately 45 minutes each) were conducted individually during the final week in the semester.

The 11 interview questions (Appendix J), constructed by the researcher, were designed to elicit information regarding similarities and differences in the learning experiences of those in the service section and those in the non-service section of the course. Specific references to and follow-up questions about community service were made only after the topic was introduced into the conversation by students.

Utilizing a modified version of the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) described in Chapter III, the researcher identified four major themes in the student interviews: (a) general impressions of the course, (b) connected learning, (c) issues related to compassion and empathy,

and (d) issues related to responsibility and efficacy. Each of these themes is discussed in turn below.

General Impressions of the Course

The general impressions theme refers to students' perceptions of the learning environment. This includes students' impressions of the instructor's effectiveness, their levels of satisfaction and enthusiasm regarding course material, as well as their perceptions about the degree of difficulty and challenge involved in the academic experience.

Interviews indicated that students in both sections found the course overall to be enjoyable, interesting, and a very meaningful educational experience. One student in the service section commented: "This was the best class I've ever had. This course has given me things to relate so many of my thoughts to." One student in the non-service class asserted: "The class was harder than most, yet it was very interesting." There was also consensus among students interviewed from both groups that the instructor was an outstanding teacher and that he did a tremendous amount to help students to make sense of the material. Typical of the comments found in this area were the following:

> The instructor does a great job of helping you to make sense of the material. I'd rather be challenged in his class than take another philosophy class for an easy A. (service student)

> It's easy to pay attention because he [the instructor] makes it so interesting. He makes you want to learn, be informed, and to be

> educated about philosophy and about issues in general. (non-service student)

However, differences between the two groups of students interviewed did emerge in regard to the perceived degree of course difficulty. Only 1 student in the service section of the course referred to the work as difficult, 4 students referred to it as average, and 2 students found the work to be less difficult than others they had taken at the College. In contrast, 5 out of 7 students in the non-service section referred the course as difficult, 2 referred to it as about average, and no students found the course to be less difficult than others they had taken at the College. One student in the service section stated: "The course stimulated me to question the way I think about things. My interest is a lot greater in the material so I guess the course didn't seem as difficult." One non-service student commented: "Philosophy is so abstract, sometimes the reading is pointless because I don't understand it until he explains it in class."

When asked to identify the most beneficial aspect of the course, 5 of 7 students in the service section stated that the community service project was most beneficial. As one student stated, "the community service project was important because it provided us with an opportunity to see some of what the authors were really talking about." There was no consensus, however, among those interviewed in the non-service section about the most beneficial part of the course; responses included the instructor's style (2), the

readings (2), and American Pictures (2) (a multimedia presentation on poverty and racism viewed by both groups). One person suggested that actually writing the papers was most beneficial.

Connected Learning

The connected learning theme refers to the degree to which participants demonstrated an ability to make sense of the material read and discussed in class within their own life experiences.

Interview data showed that the course experience challenged and expanded the thinking of students in both sections. Typical of service student responses were the following:

> I find myself more critical of people who are ignorant. For instance, my manager at work is so self-absorbed. He thinks his problems are the most important in the world, he can't function because of his problems. I tend to see a broader scheme of things, and to see problems much worse than his.

> As a result of having taken this course I tend to see both sides of issues.

> There is no one reason why things are the way they are, and there are no simple solutions.

> I learned that my way isn't the only way to view a problem. There are other ways to look at things to help solve problems.

Typical of the responses from students in the non-service section were the following:

> When you deal with philosophy, more things are brought up that confuse the issues.

> The course has taught me to look below the surface in everything you read and everything you look at and try to see the real meaning of things.

> The nature of the class really makes you think about things in general about how things work and about life. It makes you realize how petty and how much emphasis we place on things that are irrelevant and unimportant in the bigger scheme of things.

> As a result of taking this course I find myself questioning and thinking more about issues, rather than just accepting things as they are.

However, students in the service section were slightly more likely to cite and to integrate the work of the philosophers' into their own thinking. That is, students interviewed from the service section made on average three attempts to integrate philosophers work into their own thinking, while non-service students made on average two attempts to do so. Typical of the responses from service students were the following:

> My beliefs and values about social issues and problems change daily. You read the material, you reflect upon your beliefs and everything you know,... the actions that you make, or thoughts that you have. The course contributed to a personal system of checks and balances. I often found myself asking the question, what would Freud and Nietzsche have said if they had seen me in my role as a tutor?

> I've always wanted to go out and help the homeless... and the community service project was something to kind of kick me in the butt to get me out there to do it. I think it related to Nietzsche when he said that we often do something moral for immoral reasons. Many of us were doing the community service project to get a good grade, not to go out and just help people.

> The semester, I've tried to relate all of the philosophers to my own life. I've tried to think about why I do things and why other people do things. For instance I've tried to tie a dying AIDS patient's faith in God to Freud.

Typical of the responses from non-service students were the following:

> Marx, what he thinks of the work ethic and things like that I found that I could apply to my views of things. I don't remember a whole lot of it, but the idea of the upper class-lower class struggle and things like that.

> Many of the readings made you realize how badly people have been screwed over.

> Marx helped to broaden my awareness of what is going on between the poor and the wealthy.

> Gosh, I don't know, I guess I never really thought about it.

It is noteworthy that 4 women (3 service, 1 non-service) mentioned that their strong religious beliefs (Catholic) made it difficult for them to consider fully the perspectives presented by non-Christian philosophers. Typical of the comments from these students were the following:

> I have very strong Christian values...therefore it's hard to get a grasp of a philosophy which challenges my basic religious beliefs.

> I've been raised a Catholic all my life and a lot of what we talked about was completely opposite of Catholic teachings.
>
> I grew up in a Catholic family, and, therefore, there are some issues I feel very strongly about and won't change like abortion. I don't agree and I don't trust a lot of the philosophers we read in class.
>
> I had a hard time with many of the philosophers' thinking about religion. I'd call home and tell my mother about it and she would tell me not to read the material.

Empathy

The empathy or compassion theme refers to the degree to which students' perceptions of self are embedded in their understanding and relationships with others, particularly with those who are poor or marginalized in our society. Gilligan (1982) referred to empathy as the degree to which individuals "experience another's needs or feelings as one's own" (p. 8).

In response to questions which asked participants to discuss ways in which the course challenged or changed their thinking about people somehow different from themselves (e.g., culturally, racially, socio-economically), service students tended to cite specific examples of their personal encounters with others and to demonstrate a more empathic or compassionate view toward those most disenfranchised in society, while students from the non-service section of the course tended to speak in generalities and more abstract terms about their interactions with and learnings about people different from themselves.

Typical of the responses to this issue from service students were the following:

> It really hurt me to see people with less in hard times as with the homeless people. I think it's because I've always tried to relate myself to them.
>
> It was really hard for me, I mean I think I learned a lot from the experience...but I don't know if I gave enough of myself. I was afraid to interact that much with the people [AIDS patients] because I didn't want to get attached for fear that our relationships would end in death. I learned so much about myself and about people suffering with AIDS from this experience. I learned that I'm not as secure in my emotions as I thought and that there are a lot of people really hurting and a lot of people who are helping and loving those most in need.
>
> Words are nice and everything, but when you meet people different than yourself you really see a lot more. It's easier to see someone's frustrations and understand their condition than just reading about them. I get a feeling of why they think the way they do.
>
> I felt so guilty because I have so much and they have so little. However, just talking to them [people living on the street] made me lose a lot of my guilt feelings and to try to get to know them as people.

Non-service students' responses to questions asking them about their thoughts and feelings about people who differ from them included the following:

> I don't discriminate and I don't see how I could be any less racist.
> I can't really think of a time when I thought about these issues, however, some of the readings helped to increase my awareness about the extremes, both the poor and the wealthy.
>
> Many of the readings made me realize just how bad people have been screwed over.

> I really experienced no change in my thinking about others, however, the course did expose me to other ways of thinking and, therefore, I came to understand where others are coming from.

> I never really thought about it. I guess the course has helped be to be aware of under-privileged and extremes of both wealth and poverty.

Gilligan and Wiggins (1988) asserted that "empathy and concern about feelings, once seen as the source of limitation in women's reasoning, are now viewed as the essence of morality but not longer associated particularly with women" (p. 111). Delve et al. (1990) and Nolan (1984) have indicated that empathy or compassion are critical to students as they seek to develop more complex, mature views of themselves and of their connectedness and commitment to others.

Level of Responsibility and Efficacy

The fourth theme refers to the degree to which students articulated their understanding of complex social issues and problems, their commitment to help resolve these issues and problems, and the extent to which they believed that they could make a difference. Such responses tap many of the issues the Social and Personal Responsibility Scale (Conrad & Hedin, 1981a) purports to measure.

Although all students interviewed believed that they had some sort of responsibility to help address societal problems, students in the service

section tended to express a greater commitment to working in their communities to help resolve social problems, and tended to be more convinced that their efforts could make a difference than did students in the non-service section of the course. Service students' comments on these issues included:

> Handing out sandwiches isn't going to change the world or change their [homeless] being there. However, everyone has a responsibility to do something. If it's not going out in the streets, it could be writing letters to their congressman or getting into government to try to change the structure of the system.

> You can't help but think that something major has to be done when you see those people in the city jail. If we don't do something, we are going to have all these people out there either in jail or just lost in life.

> I'm really tired of hearing people criticize the status quo... and not really doing anything about it! My goal now is to help find solutions to our problems.

> The responsibility is to think about the issues and to then decide your own personal response to them.

> It's not a responsibility but an obligation to help others. An obligation to at least think about the solutions to problems.

Comments from students interviewed from the non-service section of the course included the following:

> I think people should have a sense of responsibility, but I'm not sure how the course had anything to do with this.

> I think so, I think we could make a difference by just getting involved even though I'm not a volunteer.
>
> Not really. There are some things you just can't change.
> It depends, I think. I guess it depends upon your effort, what you put into it.
>
> It's not really a responsibility, just if you happen to feel something is right, do it.... It's hard for any one person to really make a difference.
>
> We should all try to be responsible for each other in some way or another.
>
> I have a responsibility to others because I've gone to college and I come from a middle-class background. It's not a responsibility I feel I owe to society, but a responsibility to myself.
>
> Things should matter to us, even if they don't affect us personally.
>
> I almost think that I could make a difference through my writing. Sometimes I sit in class and think, maybe I could write books and c a n change people's minds and make the world a better place.

Five students in the service class stated that they believed their involvement in the community could make a difference, while two students in the non-service class believed that their involvement could somehow positively affect society. Most students interviewed in the non-service section were unsure about whether their involvement could make a difference.

In summary, although neither significant nor dramatic differences among students interviewed in the two sections emerged, the data suggest

that there may have been some, more subtle, differences and nuances between the learning experiences of those students in the service section and those in the non-service section of the course.

Interview data suggest that service students were more likely than non-service to find the course experience less difficult, were slightly more likely to integrate course readings into their own thinking, tended to have greater personal connections with and a more empathic view of others, were somewhat more committed to getting or staying involved to help resolve social issues, and were more likely to believe that their efforts could make a difference in the community.

The richness and power of the stories told by students interviewed in the service section of the course was also quite evident. Their first-person accounts of their struggles to make sense of injustices and complex social problems was quite impressive.

Instructor Interview

A semi-structured interview was conducted with the course instructor immediately following the conclusion of the semester. The interview was designed to elicit information from the instructor about his general impressions of the course experience, his perceptions of the differences and similarities between the two sections, and his more general thoughts about integrating community service into the classroom. The

interview, which lasted approximately two hours, was taped, later transcribed and analyzed to determine basic themes.

It was clear from the interview that while the instructor had found the experience to be both meaningful and worthwhile, he had also found it to be a bit cumbersome and somewhat of a constraint on his teaching. He commented:

> I didn't do as good a job at integrating the service because I hadn't worked with this before and because I was concerned about focusing too much on the service section of the class. I feel as though I got hung up on trying to keep the two groups equal, with the exception of the community service and library experience. I couldn't spend enough time helping service students integrate their experiences outside the classroom.

The instructor also felt as though students in the service section may have found their course experience to be more meaningful than those in the non-service section. While his reasoning on this issue seemed somewhat vague, he commented:

> I think there was a perception in the service section that there was a special involvement, which oddly enough involved me. Although in fact I was not involved, the fact that I was asking them [service section] to go out into the world and have these experiences created a little bit more of a special atmosphere. The irony is that while I felt better in the first class, I think I did a better job teaching in the comparison group.

While the instructor had no knowledge of the results of the paper and pencil measures, student interviews, or course evaluations at the time

of the interview, he indicated that he had detected clear differences between the two sections of the course. He stated:

> There was clearly a difference in the tone of the two classes. The service class was more participatory, tended to show-up for class more often (instructor perception), was more alert, more open, and more plugged into what was going on [than those in the non-service class]. My general impression is that the service experience was very successful, however, I'm not fully confident in saying that service was the only key variable. [Instructor was unsure of other contributing variables.]

The instructor appeared to be most impressed with the quality of the final reflection papers submitted by students in the service section. He stated:

> In the reflection papers, students appeared to be more open to wrestling with complexities and ambiguities than in almost anything I have seen from students. It surprised me in large part because their efforts outdistanced what I felt we had prepared them for. I felt as though I was sending them out more or less on their own to see what they could make of it and they did well.

He commented further:

> The papers were an impressive display of writing. Students seemed to own the material, to really have something to write about, something they felt in their guts to write about. The voice was direct, and that translates, as it often does, into better prose. They did a good job of bringing their course readings to bear and in a way that wasn't artificial and simply external.

In response to the results on the final examinations the instructor stated:

> The key to pedagogical success or in any measure of academic mastery of course content is how deeply that content registered relevantly to

> their own sort of personal grounding, so that they can relate it to their lives, so that they can see around themselves, so that they can replicate it outside of class. I think that's what my exam failed to measure. However, while the results of the final exams appear to indicate that students in both sections did remarkably about the same, my intuitive impression was that the people in the service group had some greater feeling for the readings, they had a deeper kind of personally relevant connection to the philosophical texts.

It was clear from the interview that although the instructor had not previously integrated service into his courses, he had come to believe that service could have an important role to play in the classroom environment. He stated:

> I think the experiential dimension, where you confront some real "otherness" in their own experience, is conducive to setting up the fundamentally philosophical situation, mainly that you are stopped up short in front of something that is undeniably significant but that you feel you don't really understand. You then have to struggle to say, what the hell's going on here? What's this about? It challenges the categories and that seems to me to be the fundamental philosophical mystery.

In discussing ways in which the experience could be made more meaningful in future course, the instructor suggested five things:

(1) teach not only the philosophers but include readings about those that have tried to live the work of the philosophers (e.g., Dorothy Day),

(2) increase the service component from 15 to 20 hours,

(3) sharpen the definition of service to specifically mean contact with disenfranchised or marginalized people,

(4) more explicitly make the theme of "otherness and what it means to confront the other" the guiding thread of the whole course experience, and

(5) personally [the instructor] get involved in the service experience.

While the primary instruments in this study used to identify students' growth and development failed to detect significant differences between the two sections, the instructor appeared to be quite convinced that, in general, the educational environment in the service section of the class was more conducive to learning than was the environment in the non-service section of the course. In regard to learning outcomes, he postulated that students in the service section tended to demonstrate a deeper understanding of their relationships with "others" (a major theme of the course), a more complex understanding of social issues, and an understanding of course readings within a broader social context than did students in the non-service section of the course.

The instructor's enthusiastic embrace of the concept of integrating service into the classroom and his willingness to advance the thinking about specific ways in which to improve student learning from this integration appeared to reflect his belief that the service component did make a difference in advancing the goals and objectives of the course. This is somewhat remarkable given the fact that the instructor was hesitant to integrate service into his classroom prior to the study.

College Standardized Course Evaluation

Students in both sections of the course were asked to complete the College's standardized course evaluation forms (Appendix L). The computer generated form is divided into two parts. Part one asks students to rate their course experience in 14 areas using a 4-point Likert scale (4 indicates that students strongly agree with the question,1 means that students strongly disagree with the statement). Students participating in the non-service section were asked to respond to two additional questions (15 &16) in this first part regarding their thoughts about the library assignment, given in lieu of the service component. In the second part of the evaluation, students in both sections were given an opportunity to identify, in short answer form, their perceptions of the major strengths of the course, as well as their thoughts about ways to improve the course.

The results of the evaluations indicate that students participating in the service section of the course rated their overall educational experience more favorably than students participating in the non-service section on all 14 questions in the first part of the evaluation. Questions on the evaluation dealt primarily with issues related to pedagogy such as teacher effectiveness, course readings and assignments, and overall classroom environment. While the differences in the mean scores on each question were quite modest (service, 3.74; non-service, 3.56), a sign test indicated that the probability that the service section responses would be higher on all 14

questions if there really was no difference between the two sections is .0001. The responses to questions 15 and 16 indicated that while students in the non-service section believed their library assignment was somewhat relevant (18 students, 64%), an overwhelming number of them (20 students, 71%) would have preferred the community service assignment.

In the second part of the evaluation, students in both groups indicated that the instructor was the most positive aspect of the course. Seventy-seven percent of students from the service group listing comments in this section mentioned the instructor as the most positive aspect of the course, while 68% of non-service students responding to this question stated that the instructor was the major strength of the course. Students, in general, were impressed by such things as his grasp of the material, his ability to articulate the words of the philosophers in language they could understand and relate to, and his energy and enthusiasm for the material. Students in the service section (46%) identified the community service component as their second most positive course experience, while no clear second choice emerged from students in the non-service section.

Community Service Reflection Paper

Students in the service section of the course were asked to write a paper (4 pages minimum) that not only presented or summarized their community service experience, but one that connected their experience in a community service placement with themes they had encountered in

readings and discussions in the course (PL 202, syllabus). Although the paper was not due until the final week of class, a sheet that detailed the objectives and provided guide questions for the assignment was distributed mid-way through the semester in order to assist students in formulating their thoughts about the connections between their class and community experiences. Students were also encouraged to keep notes about their service experiences throughout the semester to assist them further in their efforts to write the reflection paper.

All 29 papers were read and detailed notes and anecdotal information were recorded in an effort to get a general sense for how well students were able to integrate their service experiences with class readings and discussions. Much like the response of the instructor, this researcher was struck by the quality of the students' writing and the power of their stories. Their candor regarding their feelings about the service experience, their willingness to struggle with their perceptions of others quite different from themselves, and their ability to integrate their thoughts about service with the course readings and discussions were profound.

Typical of students' responses were the following:

> People choose to ignore the homeless because they remind us that something is wrong with society and perhaps with ourselves. If we truly admitted it, we would realize that each one of us could do something to help or even change their situation. In admitting this, however, we suffer a loss of self-respect, which makes us anxious.

> The experience made me realize just how unfair the economic system is. It would be very difficult for these women to get out of poverty for many reasons. Many don't have foundations to build upon, like an education, others have been abused and beaten, likely to need counseling. This capitalistic system alienates these women from other people.
>
> These were people just like me, with a little less luck. I couldn't feel better about myself for helping either. I wasn't helping out of a self motivated desire, but in order to get a good grade. One man even asked if we were there for a project and I denied it, ashamed I hadn't done this on my own. Nietzsche would say I was doing something moral for immoral reasons. He would criticize the entire community service project because people participated for selfish reasons. And when confronted, I was dishonest, refusing to recognize my selfishness. For Nietzsche, who believed in the morality of honesty, this was the ultimate crime.

One student, who entitled his paper "Instigating Nietzche's Thunder," imagined himself lying awake in bed reflecting on his service experience as Nietzsche and Freud screamed challenges to him from the closet.

> Stop fooling yourself, son! Had it not been for the instructor's insistence that you participate in a community service project, you would have never considered volunteering your precious time in the inner city. You're just like those groveling followers of Christianity who lead subservient lives in order to appease their almighty God. Guilt is the motive of your pathetic actions!...Let us not forget, that Christianity is a deception where the promise of a heavenly utopia has deprived mankind the value of the body, and has rotted its soul with guilt, pity and power.

Students were also quite perceptive in their discussions about issues related to reciprocal learning. Typical of students' responses were the following:

> It really struck me that these men are human beings, not just the stereotypical bearded object that you have to step over on the sidewalk.
>
> I gained a new respect for these people through this project. In a sense, they are better than me. They endure more hardships than I ever could.
>
> I came away from my service experience with the vast realization of all my prejudices and corresponding behaviors.
>
> My attitudes towards the underprivileged has changed drastically since my service experience...These people are no different than the rest of us and they need to be treated that way.
>
> While I continuously want to change the lives of the people I am serving, in actuality it is I, the person doing the community service, that changed more from this experience.
>
> Each time I left that corner on Baltimore Street I felt that I was the one who benefitted most from the service, not the guy I handed a sandwich and a cup of coffee to.

The grades on the paper (17 A's, 10 B's, 3 Cs) reflected the instructor's high degree of satisfaction with students' abilities to integrate their service experience with course readings and discussions. While there was virtually no difference between the grades women [mean = 88.18] received on the paper and the grades of men [mean = 89.62]), a few more subtle distinctions between the two groups appeared to emerge. First, women students tended to discuss more openly their fears, anxieties, and vulnerabilities surrounding the service experience, and second, women students tended to

become more attached or connected to those they were serving than did the men.

Of interest was the fact that the three African American women students appeared to approach the assignment quite differently. While the vast majority of the white students emphasized the authors Nietzsche and Freud, the three Black students focused almost exclusively on the writings of Martin Luther King Jr (MLK Jr.) One student commented:

> I chose to relate my community experience to MLK Jr. because he's African American, and his views (quite a few of them) and my views are equivalent. We both have heard about and seen the constant struggles of our Black people.

The Black students also appeared to connect on a much deeper, more personal level with those in their service experience than did the White students. One black student wrote:

> Helping those children was a way of constantly reminding me that black people are still faced with the fight against injustice and prejudice. It was a way of reminding me of what is at risk if the fight is lost- both for our children and our future.

In addition, the three African American students spoke much more passionately about their commitment and sense of responsibility to help resolve many of the problems that plague society. One student wrote:

> Not only could they be like me, but if not for the grace of God I, too, could be like they are now. Knowing that so very little changes after my community service is over, is a harsh-stinging reality. These people have done nothing to deserve their plight, but have tried almost everything to change it. Working at this site had further rooted my conviction to do everything I can to help my people and all those who suffer this similar oppression and disappointment by the American system.

While there are no comparative data available from students in the non-service section of the class in this particular area, a review of the reflection papers revealed much about the quality of the service-learning experiences and about students' ability integrate their service with course readings and discussions.

Noteworthy is the fact that a review of the papers written by those interviewed for this study suggests that students were much more successful in connecting their service experiences with the course material on paper than they were in trying to verbalize the connections during the taping.

Community Service Questionnaire

Twenty five students in the service section of the course completed a short questionnaire (Appendix M) distributed by the instructor at the end of the semester. The evaluation asked students to respond to five questions related to their community service experience. Students were invited to check the response that best fit their opinions and to add any additional comments after each question.

A review of the responses to the questionnaire indicate that all 25 found the service component to be very useful, with all but 1 student indicating that she or he may continue serving in the community placement after the conclusion of the course. In addition, 17 of the students indicated that the community service experience had positively influenced their attitude toward and interest in community service in general.

Although 14 of the respondents indicated that the service component was well integrated into the content of the course, 11 students suggested that the integration could have been done more effectively.

Clearly the responses indicate that the service component was a valuable part of the course experience, helping the vast majority of them (71%) to develop further their commitment to working with those marginalized in society.

Table 4.7

Results of Students' Responses
to the Community Service Questionnaire

Question 1. How would you rate the community service project component of the course?

All 25 students who responded to this question checked the highest response indicating that the community service project was very useful and should remain in the course.

Question 2. Do you plan to work in the future at the community site where you did your project?

9 students indicated that they would continue working at the site
15 students indicated that they might return to work at the site
1 student indicated that she had no plans to return to the site

Question 3. Did the project change your attitude toward and interest in community service in general?

17 students indicated that the community service project got them more interested in doing community service.
7 students indicated that their level of interest was unchanged.
0 students indicated that the project had made them less interested in doing community service.

Question 4. Was the service component integrated into the content of the course?

14 students indicated that the service component was well integrated into the course.
11 students indicated that they were able to make some connections between their service project and the course content.
0 students indicated that they were unable to make connections between the service and the course content.

Question 5. In general, what were the greatest strengths and weaknesses of the service component as you experienced it?

Strengths:

- The paper was a great way to evaluate how philosophy and service come together.
- Helped to bring the writings to life.
- It did more good for me as a person than any reading ever could
- It made me do a lot of thinking
- It helped me to become aware of problems not related to me and how they fit in with philosophy
- A great way to glimpse the real world for sheltered students
- It helped me to learn more about myself and others.
- It emphasized the ties between philosophers and everyday life.

Weaknesses:

- It should be optional/voluntary,
- Transportation was a big problem,
- Need to have more class discussions about the service,
- It's a pain with so much other stuff going on.

Chapter Summary

Analysis of the data compiled from the three major instruments (i.e., DIT, SPRS, & final examination) utilized in this study to assess changes and differences in students' moral judgment, commitment to civic and social responsibility, and mastery of course content failed to provide support for the three principal hypotheses and one exploratory hypothesis.

However, additional data presented in the form of student interviews, the instructor interview, and the standardized course evaluations, as well as data gathered from the final integration papers and community service questionnaires of students in the service section, tended to conflict with and contradict the results of the quantitative measurements utilized in this study. The data indicate that modest, more subtle differences

may have existed between the overall educational experiences of those in the service section and that of those in the non-service section of the course. These subtle differences, related primarily to pedagogy, to levels of student involvement in the learning process, and to the degree to which students were able to make meaningful connections with social issues and concerns, combine to suggest that the overall quality of the teaching-learning experience in the service section may have been slightly higher and more meaningful than the teaching-learning experience in the non-service section of the course.

These findings and their significance will be discussed in detail in the final chapter of this study.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

Overview of the Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of a classroom sponsored community service initiative on students' moral judgment, commitment to civic and social responsibility, and mastery of academic course content. The three principal hypotheses and one exploratory hypothesis examined in this study were formulated from questions about how a classroom sponsored community service-reflection component (25 hours in duration) would affect students' learning and development in the above mentioned areas.

An analysis of the quantitative data collected in this study failed to support the three principal hypotheses and one exploratory hypothesis. More specifically, based on the results of the Defining Issues Test, the Social and Personal Responsibility Scale, and the grades on the final essay examination, little or no evidence was found to support the assertion that students participating in the service section of the course demonstrated greater gains in their levels of moral judgment, commitment to civic and social responsibility, and mastery of academic course content than did students in the non-service section of the course. In addition, an analysis of these data failed to support the exploratory hypothesis which suggested that

significant differences would emerge in the gains made by men and by women on the above mentioned instruments.

However, analysis of the findings of the more secondary, qualitative aspects of this study tended to differ and to somewhat contradict the quantitative findings. Data generated from student interviews, the instructor interview, student reflection papers, and the results of the standardized course evaluations and community service questionnaires suggest that some modest, subtle differences did exist between the overall quality of the educational experience for students in the service section and for students in the non-service section of the course. These differences related primarily to pedagogy, to levels of student involvement in the learning process, and to the degree to which students were able to make meaningful connections to social issues and concerns.

Results of the qualitative measurements suggest that students in the service section of the course were slightly more satisfied with the quality of instruction, class assignments, techniques used to evaluate their progress, and the degree to which the class stimulated their intellectual curiosity than were students in the non-service section of the course. Although a rigorous content analysis was not performed on the interviews conducted in this study, the results of both student and instructor interviews suggest that students in the service section of the course were more likely to make connections between course readings and broader social issues, to articulate

an empathic voice toward others, to express their commitment to get involved in their community, and to believe that they could make a difference in helping to resolve social issues.

Discussion of the Findings

As is evident from the summary of the results mentioned above, the findings of this study proved to be inconclusive and somewhat contradictory. An analysis of the findings of the principal quantitative aspects of this study taken alone suggest that a 25 hour, classroom sponsored community service component has little or no effect on students' moral development, commitment to civic and social responsibility and mastery of academic course content. These data present a case for the assertion that one cannot expect to observe significant change in students' learning and development from the integration of service into a course over the span of one semester.

However, an analysis of the findings of the more secondary, qualitative aspects of this study, while in no way conclusive, raises a number of additional questions about the influence of the classroom sponsored service component on the growth and development of student participants, and about the methodology utilized to measure that influence. For instance, if students in the service section of the course did in fact experience modest gains in areas the students in the non-service section did

not, why weren't these differences detected on the paper-and-pencil instruments?

It is possible that these differences failed to emerge on the DIT and SPRS because the instruments were too general in nature and not sensitive enough to identify subtle changes in students' thinking over a relatively short period of time. Rest (1979) has indicated that general, quantitative measurements can often misrepresent idiosyncratic, content-specific influences on students' growth and development. Hamilton and Fenzel (1988) have suggested that community service programs that involve relatively few hours of participation may be quite valuable but not in ways measurable on more general, quantitative instruments. It is also possible that these differences did not emerge on the paper-and-pencil instruments utilized in this study because there were none in the three areas measured as conceptualized by those instruments, or because the quantitative and qualitative instruments were actually measuring different aspects of students' growth and development related to service-learning.

In regard to the lack of differences that emerged between students' mastery of course content as indicated by grades on the final examination, it is possible that the exam itself did not provide students with enough of an opportunity to demonstrate an understanding of the course material within a broader social context. The instructor indicated in his interview that this may in fact have been the case. He stated that although differences did not emerge between the grades of service and non-service students on the final

exams he believed that "people in the service group had some greater feeling for the readings and a deeper kind of personally relevant connection to the philosophical texts."

However, it is also quite possible that the differences identified in the qualitative aspects of this study were undetected by the quantitative instruments because the differences were too modest and insignificant. Alternatively, the qualitative findings may overstate the case for differences in gains due in part to limitations inherent in the methodology utilized to analyze these data. These limitations include the tendency to anchor conclusions based on initial impressions, to ignore information (subconsciously) that conflicts with already formulated perceptions, and to emphasize that which confirms them (Adams, 1981; Sadler, 1981).

Most important to consider, however, in the discussion of the findings of this study is that significant changes and differences in students' moral judgment, commitment to civic and social responsibility, and mastery of academic course content failed to emerge on any of the measurements (with the exception of the P% on the DIT), quantitative or qualitative, employed in this study.

Although an analysis of the DIT did indicate that non-service men made significant gains in their levels of moral judgment from pretest to posttest as recorded on the P%, these findings are considered questionable given the small number of men who completed and successfully passed the

reliability and consistency checks (service=2, non-service=6), and the fact that all non-service men received extremely low scores on the pretest, with two of these participants receiving exceptionally high scores (outliers) on the posttest.

It is also possible that significant differences in the results may not have emerge because of reverse bias on the part of the instructor. In his efforts to provide equal treatment to both sections of the course, he may have inadvertently focused more of his attention on the students in the non-service section of the course, thus minimizing differences which may have emerged between the two groups.

Limitations of the Study

A number of limitations were evident in this study related to both design and methodology. Although the quasi-experimental design enabled the researcher to examine similarities and differences between students' development and learning in each of the three principal areas (moral judgment, civic and social responsibility and academic learning), it also proved to be somewhat problematic.

The concern for providing students in the two sections of the course with similar educational experiences, with the exception of the service-reflection and library assignment, appeared to have prevented the instructor from more fully developing and integrating the service-reflection component into the classroom (i.e., in discussion and tests). For instance, a

review of the transcript of the instructor interview suggests that this concern precluded him from making frequent, direct links between the service experience and academic material via class discussions, quizzes, and exams. The literature (Giles et al., 1991; Mezirow et al., 1991) is clear that the reflection and analysis component is critical to the advancement of student learning and development that may take place as a result of participation in community service.

The relatively short period of time (15-20 hours over the course of the semester) students spent in their service placements may have also limited the amount of growth and learning observed in each of the three main developmental areas. While a number of studies (Gorman, et al. 1979; Markus et al., 1993) have indicated that students can make significant changes in their thinking about social issues over a relatively short period of time, others (Deemer, 1987; Keen, 1990) have argued that to expect significant changes over short periods of time is unrealistic. Marsh (1993) suggested that it is often years after participation in community service that students begin to truly make sense of their experience. The relatively short time frame may also have caused the researcher to identify partial and, thus, inaccurate assessments of students' growth and development.

As discussed in the previous section, a number of limitations may have existed related to the limited ability of more general paper-and-pencil instruments to detect subtle changes in student development over relatively

short periods of time. There is also some question as to how sensitive instruments, such as the ones utilized in this study, are in accurately measuring levels of growth and development in women. While an analysis of the results of the quantitative data failed to detect significant differences based on gender, the qualitative data provide some evidence to suggest that, in general, women and men approached and made sense of their service experience somewhat differently. Gilligan (1988) and others have argued that instruments based on Kohlberg's work, such as the DIT, do not accurately account for and address the developmental processes in women and people of lower social and power status. Although women in this study tended to score higher on the DIT than did men, it is possible that the instrument may not have been sensitive to the ways in which most women students conceptualized and responded to their educational experiences.

In regard to the more qualitative aspects of this study, the lack of pretest data and the absence of a more systematic content analysis and reliability check on the student interviews limited the researcher's ability to analyze and to draw more definitive conclusions about differences which may have existed between the two groups of students. In addition, although the final reflection papers provided insight into the power of the service experiences and students' effectiveness in connecting their experiences with the course material, the lack of comparable data from the non-service

section of the course further limited the researcher's ability to examine differences between students in the two classes.

It also appears that the amount of challenge and, in particular, support students received in their service placement varied greatly, making it difficult to compare the experiences. Knefelkamp (1974) has suggested that students at lower levels of moral and intellectual reasoning, such as freshmen and sophomores in college, benefit most from environments with high degrees of experience (challenge) and structure (support). While students participating in the service section clearly experienced much challenge in their service placements, it is unclear to what degree they felt supported. It is also unclear how often and to what extent students had direct contact with marginalized people in their service placement. Delve et al. (1990) have contended that more direct (vs. indirect) contact with those being served tends to foster greater development.

A number of limitations to this study related to the students themselves. For instance, gains in the qualitative aspects of the study may have appeared to be greater because of "social desirability" factors such as students writing and saying what they believed the instructor and interviewer want to hear, and because of the Hawthorne Effect. This effect suggests that the students in the course were likely to notice they were being studied and, therefore, develop feelings and attitudes about being studied which influenced the outcomes. In addition, the strong reputation of the

instructor as one of Loyola's best teachers may have attracted only the best and brightest students and, therefore, the participants in this study may not be representative of the College's "typical" student.

Gains in moral judgment may also have been limited by the fact that students who participated in this study were for the most part traditionally aged (19 or 20) freshmen and sophomores. Student development theorists (e.g., Kohlberg, 1972) have suggested that the college setting has the potential to stimulate an upward shift in students' levels of moral reasoning, and that older, more advanced students may be reasoning at higher levels than younger students just beginning their college careers . It is, therefore, suggested that greater gains may have been detected in students' levels of moral judgment had the participants been older and more advanced in their college experience (i.e., juniors and seniors).

Stewart (1990) has suggested that service-learning interventions designed through a learning-styles filter can help students to clarify and to act on their values, and hence exhibit higher levels of moral reasoning and judgment. He contended that certain kinds of learners (i.e., accommodators and divergers) actually gravitate to direct service-learning experiences. This study did not consider issues related to learning styles and, therefore, was unable to detect the impact of learning styles on students' learning and development as a result of their participation in the course.

The researcher's interest in and commitment to linking service and learning in the academic environment may also have played a role in his assessment of the differences in the gains made by students in this study. However, the researcher was quite aware of his potential biases and drew only the most conservative and obvious of conclusions about the differences in changes made by students, particularly those changes observed in the qualitative aspects of this study.

Finally, the importance and generalizability of the results of this study may also have been limited because of the relatively small size of the sample (N = 54) and the nonprobability sampling procedure used.

Conclusions

Based on the findings identified in this study, it would be inappropriate to conclude that the service-reflection component had any significant effect on the moral, civic, and intellectual development of students participating in the service section of the course. It would also, however, be inaccurate to conclude that the integration of the service-reflection component into the class had no effect on the overall quality of the learning experiences of those participating in the study.

Although there is no support for the three principal hypotheses and one exploratory hypothesis advanced in this study based on an analysis of the quantitative instruments, the qualitative data appear to suggest that some differences, albeit subtle, did emerge in areas related to pedagogy, to

levels of student involvement in the learning process, and to students' ability to make meaningful connections to people and issues outside of their personal environment.

Stanton (1990) and others have suggested that linking service to discipline-based knowledge is the key to not only developing social responsibility, but to reforming the liberal arts and to improving undergraduate education. While the results of this study in no way prove such a assertion, it is evident that the inclusion of the service-reflection component did have an effect on pedagogical issues. For instance, participation in this study caused the instructor to reexamine his use of materials, to redesign his instructional approach, as well as to expand his thinking about new and innovative ways to assess student learning. As a result of participating in this study the instructor has now chosen to more fully integrate a service-reflection component into some of his other courses.

Student and instructor responses also indicated that the service section of the course "came alive," with participants actively engaged in the teaching-learning process in ways somewhat different than in the non-service section of the course. Astin (1985) suggested that learning is enhanced when students are actively engaged in the teaching-learning process. In addition, the level of class discussion, the intensity and power with which students told their stories, and the results of the course

evaluations all appear to suggest that learning in the service section of the course was somewhat more situated in students' own experience and therefore, in some ways more meaningful. The research of Coles (1993), Magolda (1993) , Angelo & Cross (1993), Mezirow et al. (1990), and Cagenello (1993) have all indicated the importance of situating learning in students' own experience and designing methods which enable students to share their own stories.

However, it is important to note that, in general, students from both sections rated the quality of the educational experience in Philosophical Anthropology II high, with almost unanimous approval of the course instruction. Clearly the instructor's presentation of course material and his genuine respect and concern for students enabled most participants to make sense of and even enjoy often difficult philosophical material. It is, therefore, concluded that the exceptional skills and abilities of this particular faculty member may have helped to create an unusual educational environment which maximized students' potential for learning and development, thus minimizing the possibility that significant differences would emerge between students in the two groups.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Future Research

Although the findings of this study have shown no significant relationship between the classroom sponsored service project and changes

in students' moral judgment, civic and social responsibility and mastery of academic course content, the modest findings in the qualitative data, the results of similar studies (Gorman et al., 1979; Markus et al., 1993), and the potential benefits to both higher education and the broader community all appear to reinforce the need for additional research in this area. Therefore, to better understand the influence of classroom sponsored community service on the teaching-learning experience, the following recommendations are offered.

1. Data from this study suggested that general pencil-and-paper tests may be unable to detect the nuances and often less dramatic changes in student learning and development over a relatively short period of time. Therefore, it is recommended that assessment measurements (both quantitative and qualitative) be developed and refined that are more sensitive to subtle changes in students' thinking in areas related to moral judgment, civic and social responsibility, and mastery of academic course content.

2. Data collected and analyzed from the qualitative aspects of the study gave some indication that students were more deeply affected by their involvement in the service learning initiatives in each of the three principal areas targeted in this study than the methodology allowed the

researcher to conclude. It is, therefore, recommended that additional studies include a stronger multidimensional approach to evaluation and assessment that involves more rigorous, systematic qualitative analysis for the purpose of capturing the idiosyncratic nature of the service-learning experience and giving voice to and affirming the human story.

3. Although aspects of this study and much of the literature (Eyler & Giles, 1993) continues to emphasize the role of reflection and analysis in helping students to develop advanced problem solving skills for the purpose of resolving social issues, little research has been done in this area. It is recommended that research be conducted which illuminates the ways in which both reflection and analysis can assist students in understanding intellectually the broad social dynamics underlying the situations of the people they serve (Levison, 1990). Freire (1970) and Fay (1987) have suggested that without this kind of understanding, people will continue to do "good work" yet will not seek to examine and change existing structures which often serve to perpetuate social problems. Heaney and Horton (1990) have argued that "new ways of thinking about the world become possible only when there is a political apparatus into which the energy of the transformed learner can flow" (p. 74).

4. The instructor in this study attempted to connect, with some success, the writings of modern philosophers with the social and moral lives of students. It is recommended that additional research be conducted to examine further ways in which course readings and literature can assist students in developing a deeper understanding of their own lives and of their roles and responsibilities in helping to create a more just society. Coles (1989a) has shown that literature can have a powerful impact on the moral and civic lives of young people.

5. The results of the quantitative data in this study found no significant differences in changes in moral judgment, civic and social responsibility, and mastery of course content based on gender. However, a review of the qualitative findings suggests that some subtle differences may have existed in the ways in which men and women made sense of their service experiences. It is recommended that future research examine the ways in which service-learning initiatives are impacted by issues related to participants' race, gender, and socio-economic class. If further research finds that traditional theory does not accurately reflect the moral and intellectual developmental processes in under-represented groups, expanded or alternative theories such as Gilligan's Ethic of Care (1982) must be more widely developed.

6. While this study focused primarily on the effects of service on students' moral judgment, civic and social responsibility, and mastery of course content, there are clearly other areas ripe for research such as the effects of service on issues related to tolerance, faith and spiritual development, learning styles, reciprocal learning, and student leadership. Research is encouraged in each of the aforementioned areas.

7. Much of the research in the service-learning field to date has been conducted by academic and student development administrators. It is suggested that a key to greater integration of service into the curriculum may lie in providing opportunities and incentives to full-time undergraduate faculty members from a wide variety of disciplines to conduct research which examines both the short and long-term affects of service on learning in their particular academic area. Research in disciplines not traditionally linked to service-learning such as the sciences and business is strongly encouraged.

8. Although this research focused primarily on changes in students' moral judgment, commitment to civic and social responsibility, and understanding of academic course content, it is clear that research designed to examine the critical link between students' thinking and subsequent behavior in these three areas is much needed.

Recommendations for Integration of Service and the Curriculum

To date, the literature shows that few institutions have successfully linked community service to the curriculum. It is suggested that as educators and community leaders learn how to better integrate service and the academic sector, and design instruments to more accurately measure the impact of this integration, more significant linkages between service and learning may emerge. Thus, the following recommendations are offered as ways to better link service and the curriculum.

1. It is suggested that faculty and administrators need to more fully embrace a concept of learning which must: (a) focus on the powerful link between knowing and doing, (b) value the reciprocal learning which takes place between both student and teacher, (c) affirm knowledge based on outside experience, (d) emphasize not only academic learning but aspects of student growth and development, and (e) pay close attention to how students learn along the way as well as final outcomes (Hutchings, 1989).

2. Faculty resistance to integrating service more fully into the classroom environment is well documented (Kendall, 1990). Therefore, it is recommended that workshops and seminars be conducted to: (a) assist faculty in better understanding the links between service and active learning, (b) to examine ways in which service can enhance pedagogy, and

(c) to discuss a variety of ways to measure effectively students' learning from service experiences.

3. Most faculty are not simply motivated to make changes in their courses by altruistic concerns (Benveniste, 1989). It is recommended that incentives, recognition, and rewards be provided for faculty who choose to include a service-learning component in their courses. This could include monetary incentives, reductions in course-loads, campus recognition, as well as consideration in the academic tenure and promotion process. The findings of this study suggest that the integration of service into the classroom may promote a more meaningful teaching-learning experience for both students and teacher and thus lead to greater student satisfaction and better course evaluations. This, too, may serve as an incentive to some faculty members.

4. Campus leaders also have a critical role to play to ensure that the culture and climate of the institution supports the integration of service into the curriculum. It is recommended that the president and members of her or his executive council continue to emphasize the importance of linking service to the curriculum and that they create ongoing opportunities for faculty, students, administrators, and service providers to dialogue about issues related to service learning.

5. The literature (Eyler & Giles, 1993) suggested that the discussion between campus leaders (faculty and administrators) and service providers in the community has been minimal. It is therefore recommended that service providers be invited to play a more significant in the design, implementation, and evaluation of classroom sponsored community service initiatives for the purpose of enhancing the service-learning experience for students, improving faculty members' ability to assess the learning that occurs from participation in such experiences, and to better meet the needs of service providers.

6. The role of experts outside the institution is also crucial in the integration process. It is recommended that outside speakers such as Robert Coles (Harvard University), Cecilia Delve Scheuermann (Willamette University), Timothy Stanton (Stanford University), and Ernest Boyer (The Carnegie Foundation of the Advancement of Teaching) be invited to campus to discuss with faculty, students and administrators issues related to the integration of service and learning, and to lend an element of legitimacy to the concept of integrating service and academic study.

7. The literature (e.g., Giles et al., 1991) suggested that the reflection-analysis component of service-learning programs is often underdeveloped and tends to lack the sufficient structure needed to facilitate

student learning and development. It is recommended that institutions work to strengthen their reflection and analysis components by providing multiple, ongoing opportunities for students to reflect on and to integrate (verbally and in writing) aspects of their service experiences with course materials. Ongoing class discussion, student portfolios, critical incidents, guided journals, reflection papers, integration papers, and essay exams represent ways in which the integration of service and learning can be promoted and enhanced (Angelo & Cross, 1993). Instructor feedback and support is critical in all aspects of this process.

8. It is suggested that any effort to more effectively integrate service into the curriculum must be grounded in a strong working partnership between faculty members (whose main area of expertise is academic learning) and student development educators (whose main purview is co-curricular student growth and development). Student development and service-learning professionals have a valuable role to play in advocating for a more holistic view of learning and development, and for alternative ways in which to assess this learning and development. In addition, service-learning people play a vital role in identifying and helping to place students in community settings which offer positive learning experiences.

Summary

It was postulated at the beginning of this study that the integration of service and the curriculum would be valued by faculty to the extent to which researchers could successfully demonstrate its effectiveness in enhancing moral judgment, civic and social responsibility, and in particular, students' mastery of academic course content. The results of this study, while somewhat contradictory, suggest that the influence of a classroom sponsored community service initiative on the moral, civic and academic lives of students is difficult to determine over a relatively short period of time, and that the effects may be more modest in nature, related primarily to pedagogy, to levels of student involvement in the learning process, and to the degree to which students were able to make meaningful connections to social issues and concerns.

While providing little support for the three principal and one exploratory hypotheses advanced in this study, it is hoped that the results of this research serve in some way to help educators to develop a more informed view of the relationship between service and learning, to expand their thinking about the potential benefits to linking service and the curriculum, to seek new and innovative ways to integrate service into the classroom, and to deepen their understanding of how to measure and assess student learning and development related to classroom sponsored service initiatives.

Appendix A

Philosophical Anthropology II

Course Syllabus

(Service Section)

PL 202 Philosophical Anthropology — Spring 1993

Dr. Boothby
Center

Office: W154 College

Hours Thurs. 1-3:00
Fri. 1-2:00

PHILOSOPHY AND THE CHALLENGE OF MODERNITY

Last semester, we read and discussed philosophical works from the distant past. In this second half of the course, we will consider recent philosophical reflection concerned with uniquely modern concerns. The path of our thinking will circle around two main themes: knowledge and relationship. On the one hand, the spirit of modernity is characterized by recurring suspicions about the possibility of knowledge and truth. These suspicions touch on a wide number of different fields human endeavor and have therefore had far reaching consequences for the way we understand our relationship to the world around us. New questions arise in the modern period about our relationships with the divine, with other people, with ourselves, and with nature. These four dimensions of relationship give the framework of our study:

relationship with the divine: Nietzsche and Freud

relationship with other people: Marx, King, and de Beauvoir

relationship with ourselves: Freud and Shaffer

relationship with nature: heidegger and LameDeer

Required Readings: (available in the Loyola Bookstore)

Friedrich Nietzsche, *Basic Writings*

Karl Marx, *The Marx-Engels Reader*

Martin Luther King, "Letter from Birmingham Jail" (Photocopy)

Sigmund Freud, *The Freud Reader*

Peter Shaffer, *Equus*

Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*

Martin Heidegger, *Basic Writings*

John LameDeer and Richard Erdoes, *LameDeer: Seeker of Visions*

PL 202 Philosophical Anthropology II Spring 1993

Course Requirements:

There are five basic parts of the course and final grades in the course will be figured according to the following consideration:

Class Presence and Participation	10%
Quizzes	10%
Service and Service Reflection Paper	20%
Midterm Exam	25%
Final Exam	35%

Class Presence and Participation:

Being in class, having read the assigned background material, and actively participating in class discussions is an important part of this course. **More than two unexcused absences (e.g. for illness, death in the family, or other extraordinary circumstance) will affect your grade.**

Quizzes:

I will periodically give brief, mostly objective (true or false, fill in the blank) quizzes during the term. These quizzes are graded by a measure of total points (typically between 3 and 10 points per quiz) added up over the course of the semester.

Service and Service Reflection Paper:

Over the course of the term you are required to complete 15 hours of community service in a placement chosen from a list of suggested placements. Your grade for this portion of the course requirements will be based on successful completion of the 15 hours service and, more importantly, on a 4 page (minimum) paper (typed, double spaced) that reflects on your experience and integrates it with course readings. The service requirement and reflection paper will be described more extensively on separate handouts.

Midterm exam:

The midterm exam will be a one hour, in-class exam, composed of a small number of short answer questions (identify authors, true or false, fill in the blank, etc.) and a handful of medium length essay questions that bear directly on the course readings and class discussions.

Final Exam:

The format of the final exam is very similar to that of the midterm, composed of a few short answer questions followed by a number of medium length essay questions.

PL 202 Philosophical Anthropology
Tentative Schedule of Readings and Class Discussions

Jan.	11	Introduction
	13	Nietzsche, *The Genealogy of Morals*, Part I, in *Basic Writings*, pp. 451-492
	15	"
	18	[King Holiday, no class]
	20	Nietzsche, *The Genealogy of Morals*, Part II, pp. 493-532
	22	"
	25	Nietzsche, *The Genealogy of Morals*, Part III, pp. 533-570
	27	" pp.570-598
	29	Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*, in *The Freud Reader*, pp. 685-706
Feb.	1	Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*, pp.706-722
	3	Marx, *The German Ideology*, *Marx-Engels Reader*, pp. 147-163
	5	Marx, *The German Ideology*, *Reader*, pp. 163-175
	8	Marx, "The General Formula for Capital," *Reader*, pp. 329-343
	10	Marx, "The Labor Process and Surplus Value, " *Reader*, pp. 343-361
	12	Marx, "Estranged Labor, *Reader*, pp. 70-81
	15	Marx, "The Power of Money in Bourgeois Society," *Reader*, pp. 101-105
	17	Marx, *The Communist Manifesto*, Reader, pp. 471-500
	19	Discussion of Marx
	22	MIDTERM EXAM
	24	No class, evening presentation of "American Pictures"
	26	Discussion of "American Pictures"
Mar.	8	Martin Luther King, "Letter from a Birmingham Jail" (Photocopy)
	10	Meeting with other classes in McManus Theater
	12	Freud, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, *Freud Reader*, pp. 722-753
	15	Freud, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, *Reader*, pp. 753-772
	17	Freud, "On Narcissism," *Reader*, pp. 545-550
	19	Freud, "On Narcissism," *Reader*, pp. 550-562
	22	Freud, The Ego and the Id, *Reader*, pp. 628-645
	24	Freud, "Screen Memories," pp. 117-126, *Interpretation of Dreams*, 129-142
	26	Shaffer, *Equus*, Act one
	29	Shaffer, *Equus*, Act two
	31	de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, "Myths: Dreams, Fears, Idols," pp. 157-191
Apr.	2	Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, pp. 191- 223
	5	Heidegger, "What is Metaphysics?" *Basic Writings*, pp. 95-104
	7	Heidegger, "What is Metaphysics?" *Basic Writings*, pp. 104-116
	14	Heidegger, "The Question Concerning Technology," *Basic Writings*, pp. 284-294
	16	Heidegger, "...Technology," pp. 294-305
	19	Heidegger, "...Technology," pp. 305-317
	21	LameDeer, *LameDeer: Seeker of Visions*, pp. 1-95
	23	LameDeer, *LameDeer: Seeker of Visions*, pp. 96-186
	26	LameDeer, *LameDeer: Seeker of Visions*, pp. 187-272

Appendix B

Philosophical Anthropology II

Course Syllabus

(Non-Service Section)

PL 202 Philosophical Anthropology II — Spring 1993

Dr. Boothby — Office: W154 College Center
Hours: Thurs. 1-3:00
Fri. 1-2:00

PHILOSOPHY AND THE CHALLENGE OF MODERNITY

Last semester, we read and discussed philosophical works from the distant past. In this second half of the course, we will consider recent philosophical reflection concerned with uniquely modern concerns. The path of our thinking will circle around two main themes: knowledge and relationship. On the one hand, the spirit of modernity is characterized by recurring suspicions about the possibility of knowledge and truth. These suspicions touch on a wide number of different fields human endeavor and have therefore had far reaching consequences for the way we understand our relationship to the world around us. New questions arise in the modern period about our relationships with the divine, with other people, with ourselves, and with nature. These four dimensions of relationship give the framework of our study:

relationship with the divine: Nietzsche and Freud

relationship with other people: Marx, King, and de Beauvoir

relationship with ourselves: Freud and Shaffer

relationship with nature: heidegger and LameDeer

Required Readings: (available in the Loyola Bookstore)

Friedrich Nietzsche, *Basic Writings*

Karl Marx, *The Marx-Engels Reader*

Martin Luther King, "Letter from Birmingham Jail" (Photocopy)

Sigmund Freud, *The Freud Reader*

Peter Shaffer, *Equus*

Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*

Martin Heidegger, *Basic Writings*

John LameDeer and Richard Erdoes, *LameDeer: Seeker of Visions*

PL 202 Philosophical Anthropology II Spring 1993

Course Requirements:

There are five basic parts of the course and final grades in the course will be figured according to the following consideration:

Class Presence and Participation	10%
Quizzes	10%
Two brief papers on reserve readings	20%
Midterm Exam	25%
Final Exam	35%

Class Presence and Participation:

Being in class, having read the assigned background material, and actively participating in class discussions is an important part of this course. **More than two unexcused absences (e.g. for illness, death in the family, or other extraordinary circumstance) will affect your grade.**

Quizzes:

I will periodically give brief, mostly objective (true or false, fill in the blank) quizzes during the term. These quizzes are graded by a measure of total points (typically between 3 and 10 points per quiz) added up over the course of the semester.

Two papers on reserve readings:

Twice during the term, I will ask you to read a brief additional text on reserve in the library and write a 5 page paper based on your readings. The specific objective of these papers will be to present the main points of what you have read and to relate it to the other course readings that we will be talking about in class sessions. I will tell you more about these assignments as the time approaches.

Midterm exam:

The midterm exam will be a one hour, in-class exam, composed of a small number of short answer questions (identify authors, true or false, fill in the blank, etc.) and a handful of medium length essay questions that bear directly on the course readings and class discussions.

Final Exam:

The format of the final exam is very similar to that of the midterm, composed of a few short answer questions followed by a number of medium length essay questions.

PL 202 Philosophical Anthropology
Tentative Schedule of Readings and Class Discussions

Jan.	11	Introduction
	13	Nietzsche, *The Genealogy of Morals*, Part I, in *Basic Writings*, pp. 451-492
	15	"
	18	[King Holiday, no class]
	20	Nietzsche, *The Genealogy of Morals*, Part II, pp. 493-532
	22	"
	25	Nietzsche, *The Genealogy of Morals*, Part III, pp. 533-570
	27	" pp.570-598
	29	Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*, in *The Freud Reader*, pp. 685-706
Feb.	1	FIRST PAPER DUE Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*, pp.706-722
	3	Marx, *The German Ideology*, *Marx-Engels Reader*, pp. 147-163
	5	Marx, *The German Ideology*, *Reader*, pp. 163-175
	8	Marx, "The General Formula for Capital," *Reader*, pp. 329-343
	10	Marx, "The Labor Process and Surplus Value, " *Reader*, pp. 343-361
	12	Marx, "Estranged Labor, *Reader*, pp. 70-81
	15	Marx, "The Power of Money in Bourgeois Society," *Reader*, pp. 101-105
	17	Marx, *The Communist Manifesto*, Reader, pp. 471-500
	19	Discussion of Marx
	22	MIDTERM EXAM
	24	No class, evening presentation of "American Pictures"
	26	Discussion of "American Pictures"
Mar.	8	Martin Luther King, "Letter from a Birmingham Jail" (Photocopy)
	10	Meeting with other classes in McManus Theater
	12	Freud, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, *Freud Reader*, pp. 722-753
	15	Freud, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, *Reader*, pp. 753-772
	17	Freud, "On Narcissism," *Reader*, pp. 545-550
	19	Freud, "On Narcissism," *Reader*, pp. 550-562
	22	Freud, The Ego and the Id, *Reader*, pp. 628-645
	24	Freud, "Screen Memories," pp. 117-126, *Interpretation of Dreams*, 129-142
	26	Shaffer, *Equus*, Act one
	29	Shaffer, *Equus*, Act two
	31	de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, "Myths: Dreams, Fears, Idols," pp. 157-191
Apr.	2	SECOND PAPER DUE Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, pp. 191-223
	5	Heidegger, "What is Metaphysics?" *Basic Writings*, pp. 95-104
	7	Heidegger, "What is Metaphysics?" *Basic Writings*, pp. 104-116
	14	Heidegger, "The Question Concerning Technology," *Basic Writings*, pp. 284-294
	16	Heidegger, "...Technology," pp. 294-305
	19	Heidegger, "...Technology," pp. 305-317
	21	LameDeer, *LameDeer: Seeker of Visions*, pp. 1-95
	23	LameDeer, *LameDeer: Seeker of Visions*, pp. 96-186

Appendix C

Demographic Information Sheet

Demographic Information Sheet

1. Code #: _____

2. Primary racial/ethnic identification:

_____ American Indian (Native American)

_____ Asian American or Pacific Islander

_____ African American or Black

_____ Caucasian

_____ Hispanic, Latino, or Chicano

_____ Other specify (_____)

3. Gender: _____Female _____Male

4. Age: _____

5. Did you vote in the 1992 Presidential election? ___Yes ___No

6. During the last 12 months, how much time did you spend during a typical week doing the following activities

	HOURS PER WEEK							
	none	less than 1 hour	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	over 20
Studying/homework	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Talking with teachers outside of the class	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Exercising/sports	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Partying	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Working (for pay)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Performing volunteer work	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Student clubs/groups	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Watching TV	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Attending religious services	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Socializing with people from different cultural backgrounds	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Appendix D

Student Consent Form

Student Consent Form

I, _____, agree to participate in a study regarding teacher effectiveness and student learning at Loyola College, which is being conducted by Timothy P. Leary. The purpose of the study is to examine the ways in which a number of teaching techniques and class assignments help students to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the material presented in this course.

I understand that I will be expected to participate in a number of experimental tasks including the completion of a demographic information sheet, and two developmental instruments administered twice (once during the first week of class and again during the final week of the course). In addition, I agree to give Timothy Leary access to my grade on the final exam in this class and to my SAT scores. I have also been told that I may be asked to participate in a short (45 min.) interview at the conclusion of the course.

I have been informed that any information obtained in this study will be recorded with a code number which will ensure my confidentiality. At the conclusion of this study the key that relates my name to the forms will be destroyed. My responses on these forms will in no way affect my grade in this course and Dr. Boothby will have no knowledge of my responses. Under this condition, I agree that any information obtained from this study may be used in any way thought best for publication or education, provided that I am in no way identified and my name is not used.

I understand that there is no personal risk or discomfort directly involved with my participation in the study and that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue participation in the study at any time. A decision to withdraw from the study will not affect my grade in this particular course.

If I have any questions or problems that arise in connection with my participation in this study, I should contact Timothy Leary, the project director at 617-2762.

_____ _____
(Date) (Signature of Participant)

_____ _____
(Date) (Investigator)

_____ _____
(Date) (Witness)

THE PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED BY THE LOYOLA COLLEGE HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW COMMITTEE (Phone: 617-2561).

Appendix E

Reflection Paper Assignment

(Service Section)

PL 210 Philosophical Anthropology **Reflection Paper on Community Service**

Due: April 19th

Length: 4 pages minimum, typed (10 or 12 point font), double spaced, 1" margins.

Objective:

The aim of this paper is not to merely present or summarize your experience in community service. It is rather to pursue a reflection that connects your experience in a community service placement with themes that we have encountered in readings and discussion in this course.

Virtually all of the writers we have read over the course of the term have engaged in critical reflection about the ways we commonly think and value. Nietzsche, for instance, explores issues of power, especially as the question of power may be hidden in our value oppositions; Marx raises questions about the ways our thinking and valuing are ideologically inflected by participation in a particular social class in a particular social-economic system; in the King "Letter..." issues of racial justice and equity, along with questions about the possibilities of social change are raised; de Beauvoir deals with questions about gender identity as they are sedimented in age-old metaphoric connections and prejudices about masculinity and feminity. In all of these thinkers, therefore, we find reflections about the relation of my own attitudes and values to a larger moral, historical, societal, economic, racial, or gendered framework.

My hope for this paper is that you find ways to connect your own experience in a community service placement to these styles of self-exploration. I would like you to use your own reactions to the service exercise as a point of departure. The point of this paper is, once again, not simply to not to summarize your experience in a community service placement, but think and write about your experience from the points of view offered to us by the philosophers we have been reading, to measure the ways in which these writers illuminate your experience and vice versa.

The objective is not necessarily to come up with a single thesis about your experience. On the contrary, I urge you to try to unfold a discussion that poses a series of questions. There is a danger here, however, of making some rather superficial connections (e. g. this reminds me of Marx . . ." or "that reminds me of Nietzsche") without real development of the point. Bear in mind that you need not address all the authors we have read and may find it most productive to focus on a couple, or even on one of them.

Some guiding questions to begin:

How did you feel doing community service? How did you feel in your particular placement?

Why do you think you felt this way? What might one or more of the writers we have read say about your reactions?

In what ways did you feel separate from those you served, in what ways connected? How are these separations and connections illuminated by the writers in the course?

How did community service fit in or not fit in with the rest of your overall college program/experience?

What sorts of specifically ethical problems or dilemmas did community service confront you with?

What might the writers we have studied say about the community service requirement itself? What purposes does it serve? for you? for those you served? for Loyola?

Have your attitudes toward others or toward yourself and your own ways of thinking changed as a result of the community service experience? How so and how does it relate to themes we have studied in these writers?

Appendix F

Library Assignments

(Non-Service Section)

PL 202 Philosophical Anthropology Spring 1993

1st Paper Assignment

Length:

5 pages, double spaced, typewritten.

Format:

All quotations from any texts must be marked with quotation marks and cited as to their origin. In the case of books from the syllabus or the reserve readings for this assignment, you need not make a full citation of publishing information, but can simply include the title and page number in parentheses.

Purpose:

The purpose of this assignment is to give you an opportunity to read independently a philosophical text not included in the syllabus and not extensively discussed in class and to relate it to the other readings for the course.

Reading:

The reading assigned for this exercise is by Ludwig Feuerbach: brief excerpts from his book *The Essence of Christianity* (1841) and his *Lectures on the Essence of Religion* (1846). Five copies of these two excerpts are on reserve in the Loyola library.

Topic:

The topic or question I'd like you to address is threefold:

1. Summarize the argument Feuerbach makes about the nature of religious belief.

2. Compare Feuerbach's views with those of Freud in *The Future of an Illusion*.

3. Evaluate what you take to be the main points of the two thinkers in your own terms. What seems most convincing and what most unconvincing or objectionable in their arguments?

Due Date:

Monday, February 8th.

PL 202 Philosophical Anthropology Spring 1993

2nd Paper Assignment

Length:

5 pages, double spaced, typewritten.

Format:

All quotations from any texts must be marked with quotation marks and cited as to their origin. In the case of books from the syllabus or the reserve readings for this assignment, you need not make a full citation of publishing information, but can simply include the title and page number in parentheses.

Purpose:

As in the last assignment, the purpose of this exercise is to give you an opportunity to read independently a philosophical text not included in the syllabus and not extensively discussed in class and to relate it to the other readings for the course.

Reading:

The reading assigned for this exercise is Evelyn Fox Keller's article "Reflections on Gender and Science." Six copies of this article are on reserve in the Loyola library, four of the six may be taken overnight, two are for library use only.

Topic:

1. What is Keller's argument and how does she develop it?

2. Relate Keller's basic approach to the question of gender and science to what we have read in Freud and de Beauvoir. What points of contact are there? How can her basic argument and its implications be augmented by material from our readings in Freud and de Beauvoir?

Bases of Evaluation:

Your paper will be judged on the bases of:

1. Clarity and coherence of organization and execution, including the success of your effort to identify and present key points.
2. Extent of integration between Keller's text and those of Freud and/or de Beauvoir.

Due Date:

Friday, April 2.

Appendix G

The Defining Issues Test

DIT

Opinions about Social Problems

The purpose of this questionnaire is to help us understand how people think about social problems. Different people have different opinions about questions of right and wrong. There are no "right" answers to such problems in the way that math problems have right answers. We would like you to tell us what you think about several problem stories.

You will be asked to read a story from this booklet. Then you will be asked to mark your answers on a separate answer sheet. More details about how to do this will follow. But it is important that you fill in your answers on the answer sheet with a #2 pencil. Please make sure that your mark completely fills the little circle, that the mark is dark, and that any erasures that you make are completely clean.

The Identification Number at the top of the answer sheet may already be filled in when you receive your materials. If not, you will receive special instructions about how to fill in that number.

In this questionnaire you will be asked to read a story and then to place marks on the answer sheet. In order to illustrate how we would like you to do this, consider the following story:

FRANK AND THE CAR

Frank Jones has been thinking about buying a car. He is married, has two small children and earns an average income. The car he buys will be his family's only car. It will be used mostly to get to work and drive around town, but sometimes for vacation trips also. In trying to decide what car to buy, Frank Jones realized that there were a lot of questions to consider. For instance, should he buy a larger used car or a smaller new car for about the same amount of money? Other questions occur to him.

We note that this is not really a social problem, but it will illustrate our instructions. After you read a story you will then turn to the answer sheet to find the section that corresponds to the story. But in this sample story, we present the questions below (along with some sample answers). Note that all your answers will be marked on the separate answer sheet.

First, on the answer sheet for each story you will be asked to indicate your recommendation for what a person should do. If you tend to favor one action or another (even if you are not completely sure), indicate which one. If you do not favor either action, mark the circle by "can't decide."

Second, read each of the items numbered 1 to 12. Think of the issue that the item is raising. If that issue is important in making a decision, one way or the other, then mark the circle by "great." If that issue is not important or doesn't make sense to you, mark "no." If the issue is relevant but not critical, mark "much," "some," or "little" --depending on how much importance that issue has in your opinion. You may mark several items as "great" (or any other level of importance) -- there is no fixed number of items that must be marked at any one level.

Third, after you have made your marks along the left hand side of each of the 12 items, then at the bottom you will be asked to choose the item that is the most important consideration out of all the items printed there. Pick from among the items provided even if you think that none of the items are of "great" importance. Of the items that are presented there, pick one as the most important (relative to the others), then the second most important, third, and fourth most important.

SAMPLE ITEMS and SAMPLE ANSWERS:

FRANK AND THE CAR: ● buy new car O can't decide O buy used car

Great Much	Some	Little	No		
O	O	O	O	●	1. Whether the car dealer was in the same block as where Frank lives.
●	O	O	O	O	2. Would a used car be more economical in the long run than a new car.
O	O	●	O	O	3. Whether the color was green, Frank's favorite color.
O	O	O	O	●	4. Whether the cubic inch displacement was at least 200.
●	O	O	O	O	5. Would a large, roomy car be better than a compact car.
O	O	O	O	●	6. Whether the front combibilies were differential.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Most important item	O	O	O	O	●	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Second most important	O	●	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Third most important	O	O	●	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Fourth most important	●	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

Note that in our sample responses, the first item was considered irrelevant; the second item was considered as a critical issue in making a decision; the third item was considered of only moderate importance; the fourth item was not clear to the person responding whether 200 was good or not, so it was marked "no"; the fifth item was also of critical importance; and the sixth item didn't make any sense, so it was marked "no".

Note that the most important item comes from one of the items marked on the far left hand side. In deciding between item #2 and #5, a person should reread these items, then put one of them as the most important, and the other item as second, etc.

Here is the first story for your consideration. Read the story and then turn to the separate answer sheet to mark your responses. After filling in the four most important items for the story, return to this booklet to read the next story. Please remember to fill in the circle completely, make dark marks, and completely erase all corrections.

HEINZ AND THE DRUG

In Europe a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging ten times what the drug cost to make. He paid $200 for the radium and charged $2,000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about $1,000, which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying, and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, "No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it." So Heinz got desperate and began to think about breaking into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife. Should Heinz steal the drug?

ESCAPED PRISONER

A man had been sentenced to prison for 10 years. After one year, however, he escaped from prison, moved to a new area of the country, and took on the name of Thompson. For eight years he worked hard, and gradually he saved enough money to buy his own business. He was fair to his customers, gave his employees top wages, and gave most of his own profits to charity. Then one day, Mrs. Jones, an old neighbor, recognized him as the man who had escaped from prison eight years before, and whom the police had been looking for. Should Mrs. Jones report Mr. Thompson to the police and have him sent back to prison?

NEWSPAPER

Fred, a senior in high school, wanted to publish a mimeographed newspaper for students so that he could express many of his opinions. He wanted to speak out against the use of the military in international disputes and to speak out against some of the school's rules, like the rule forbidding boys to wear long hair.

When Fred started his newspaper, he asked his principal for permission. The principal said it would be all right if before every publication Fred would turn in all his articles for the principal's approval. Fred agreed and turned in several articles for approval. The principal approved all of them and Fred published two issues of the paper in the next two weeks.

But the principal had not expected that Fred's newspaper would receive so much attention. Students were so excited by the paper that they began to organize protests against the hair regulation and other school rules. Angry parents objected to Fred's opinions. They phoned the principal telling him that the newspaper was unpatriotic and should not be published. As a result of the rising excitement, the principal ordered Fred to stop publishing. He gave as a reason that Fred's activities were disruptive to the operation of the school. Should the principal stop the newspaper?

DOCTOR'S DILEMMA

A lady was dying of cancer which could not be cured and she had only about six months to live. She was in terrible pain, but she was so weak that a good dose of pain-killer like morphine would make her die sooner. She was delirious and almost crazy with pain, and in her calm periods, she would ask the doctor to give her enough morphine to kill her. She said she couldn't stand the pain and that she was going to die in a few months anyway. Should the doctor give her an overdose of morphine that would make her die?

WEBSTER

Mr. Webster was the owner and manager of a gas station. He wanted to hire another mechanic to help him, but good mechanics were hard to find. The only person he found who seemed to be a good mechanic was Mr. Lee, but he was Chinese. While Mr. Webster himself didn't have anything against Orientals, he was afraid to hire Mr. Lee because many of his customers didn't like Orientals. His customers might take their business elsewhere if Mr. Lee was working in the gas station.

When Mr. Lee asked Mr. Webster if he could have the job, Mr. Webster said that he had already hired somebody else. But Mr. Webster really had not hired anybody, because he could not find anybody who was a good mechanic besides Mr. Lee. Should Mr. Webster have hired Mr. Lee?

STUDENT TAKE-OVER

Back in the 1960s at Harvard University there was a student group called Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). SDS students were against the war in Viet Nam, and were against the army training program (ROTC) that helped to send men to fight in Viet Nam. While the war was still going on, the SDS students demanded that Harvard end the army ROTC program as a university course. This would mean that Harvard students could not get army training as part of their regular course work and not get credit for it towards their degree.

Harvard professors agreed with the SDS students. The professors voted to end the ROTC program as a university course. But the President of the University took a different view. He stated that the army program should stay on campus as a course.

The SDS students felt that the President of the University was not going to pay attention to the vote of the professors, and was going to keep the ROTC program as a course on campus. The SDS students then marched to the university's administration building and told everyone else to get out. They said they were taking over the building to force Harvard's President to get rid of the army ROTC program on campus for credit as a course.

Were the students right to take over the administration building?

Please make sure that all your marks are dark, fill the circles, and that all erasures are clean.

THANK YOU.

Appendix H

The Social and Personal Responsibility Scale

INSTRUCTIONS

A. Look at the sample question below, but don't answer it until you very carefully read the instructions below.

Almost Always True For Me	Sometimes True For Me				Sometimes True For Me	Almost Always True For Me
☐	☐	Some college students worry about school grades	-BUT-	Other college students don't seem to worry about school grades.	☐	☐

B. To answer these questions, there are two steps.

1) First, decide whether YOU more like the college students on the left side who worry about school grades OR the college students on the right side who don't seem to worry about school grades. Don't mark anything down yet, but first decide which type of teenager is most like you and go to that side.

2) Second, now that you have decided which side is most like you, decide whether that is almost always true for you or sometimes true for you. If it's only sometimes true, then put an X in the box under sometimes true, if it's almost always true for you, then put an X in the box under almost always true.

C. Now continue to do the numbers below. For each number, you only check one box.

Almost Always True For Me	Sometimes True For Me				Sometimes True For Me	Almost Always True For Me
1. ☐	☐	Some college students feel bad when they let people down who depend on them.	-BUT-	Other college students don't let it bother them that much.	☐	☐
2. ☐	☐	Some college students think it's the responsibility of the community to take care of people who can't take care of themselves.	-BUT-	Other college students think that everyone should just take care of themselves.	☐	☐
3. ☐	☐	Some college students are interested in doing something about school problems.	-BUT-	Other college students don't really care to get involved in school problems.	☐	☐
4. ☐	☐	Some college students let others do most of the work in a group.	-BUT-	Other college students help in a group all they can.	☐	☐
5. ☐	☐	Some college students seem to find time to work on other people's problems.	-BUT-	Other college students find taking care of their own problems more than enough to do.	☐	☐
6. ☐	☐	Some college students are interested in what other students in class have to say.	-BUT-	Other college students don't care that much about what other students say.	☐	☐
7. ☐	☐	Some college students are interested in doing something about problems in the community.	-BUT-	Other college students are not that interested in working on problems in the community.	☐	☐
8. ☐	☐	Some college students carefully prepare for community and school assignments.	-BUT	Other college students usually don't prepare that much.	☐	☐

Almost Always True For Me	Sometimes True For Me				Sometimes True For Me	Almost Always True For Me
9. ☐	☐	Some college students would rather not present ideas in a group discussion.	-BUT-	Other college students feel comfortable in presenting ideas in a group discussion.	☐	☐
10. ☐	☐	Some college students let others know when they can't keep an appointment.	-BUT-	Other college students don't call ahead when they can't make it.	☐	☐
11. ☐	☐	Some college students think people should only help people they know—like close friends and relatives.	-BUT	Other college students think people should help people in general—whether they know them personally or not.	☐	☐
12. ☐	☐	For some college students, it seems too difficult to keep commitments.	-BUT-	Other college students somehow manage to keep commitments.	☐	☐
13. ☐	☐	Some college students' ideas are almost always listened to in a group.	-BUT-	Other college students have a hard time getting the group to pay attention to their suggestions.	☐	☐
14. ☐	☐	Some college students don't think they have much to say about what happens to them.	-BUT-	Other college students think they can pretty much control what will happen to their lives.	☐	☐
15. ☐	☐	Some college students don't think it makes much sense to help others unless you get paid for it.	-BUT-	Other college students think you should help others even if you don't get paid for it.	☐	☐
16. ☐	☐	Some college students are good at helping people.	-BUT-	Other teenager's don't see helping others as one of their strong points.	☐	☐
17. ☐	☐	Some college students feel obligated to carry out tasks assigned to them by the group.	-BUT-	Other college students don't feel that bound by group decisions.	☐	☐
18. ☐	☐	Some college students think when good things happen it's because of something they did.	-BUT-	For others, there seems to be no reasons—it's just luck when things go well.	☐	☐
19. ☐	☐	Some college students prefer to have someone clearly lay out their assignments.	-BUT-	Other college students prefer to make up their own lists to things to do	☐	☐
20. ☐	☐	Some college students aren't that worried about finishing jobs they promised they would do.	-BUT-	Other college students would feel really bad about it.	☐	☐
21. ☐	☐	Some college students think they are able to help solve problems in the community.	-BUT-	Other college students don't think they can do anything amount them because a few powerful people decide everything.	☐	☐

Appendix I

Final Essay Examination

PL 202 Philosophical Anthropology
Dr. Boothby

Final Exam
Spring 1993

PART 1 (10 POINTS)

Identify the author of each of the following quotations:

_____ 1. "Man has, as it were, become a kind of prosthetic God. . . . But in the interests of our investigations, we will not forget that present-day man does not feel happy in his Godlike character."

_____ 2. "Life is only comprehensible through a thousand local Gods. And not just the old dead ones with names like Zeus--no, but living Geniuses of Place and Person!"

_____ 3. "You are spreading death, buying and selling death. With all your deodorants, you smell of it, but you are afraid of its reality; you don't want to face up to it."

_____ 4. "If this book is incomprehensible to anyone and jars on his ears, the fault, it seems to me, is not necessarily mine."

_____ 5. "The merely correct is not yet the true. Only the true brings us into a free relationship with that which concerns us from its essence."

_____ 6. "Man is frightened of this night, the reverse of fecundity, which threatens to swallow him up. . . . But here again is the play of ambivalence: if germination is always associated with death, so is death with fecundity."

_____ 7. "Perhaps I have once again been too optimistic. Is organized religion too inextricably bound to the status quo to save our nation and the world?"

_____ 8. "Man is not lost in his object only when the object becomes for him a human object or objective man. This is possible only when the object becomes for him a social object."

PART 2 (50 POINTS)

Answer any five of the following questions as thoroughly as time permits.

1. What does Nietzsche mean by the spirit of revenge or "resentment" and how does it figure in his critique of philosophy, religion, and morality?

2. What does Freud mean by "aim-inhibited libido" and what role does it play in the civilizing process as he describes it in Civilization and Its Discontents?

3. Explain Marx's view of "The Power of Money in Bourgeois Society." How is Marx' critique echoed by LameDeer? How might Marx himself explain the sensitivity of a Native American to this issue?

4. How and why, according to Simone de Beauvoir, has the feminine in Western culture been equated with nature and the natural? What consequences follow from this equation for relations between men and women?

5. Draw on one or more of the writers we have read over the semester to offer an interpretive discussion of Shaffer's play "Equus." (N. B. This is the most open and inspecific question of the seven, and it is intended to give you an opportunity for maximum latitude for creative interpretation in a direction of your choosing. In view of the generality of the question, however, you should take special care to make your answer as carefully constructed and specific as possible.)

6. Heidegger acknowledges with the physicist Heisenberg that in the modern technological world there is a sense in which "everything man encounters exists only insofar as it is his construct" and that consequently "man everywhere and always encounters only himself." But for Heidegger, there is another, more important sense in which "precisely nowhere does man today any longer encounter himself, i. e., his essence." In explaining what he means, he offers this: "Where enframing holds sway, regulating and securing of the standing-reserve mark all revealing. They no longer even let their own fundamental characteristic appear, namely, this revealing as such." What is his point here?

7. Providing specific examples where you can, contrast "standing reserve" as Heidegger thinks of it with the Native American sense of the world described by LameDeer.

Appendix J

Student Interview Questions

1. Why did you sign up for this particular course, section of the course?

2. How would you compare the amount of work in this course with the amount assigned in other classes?

3. What did you like most about the course?

4. What part(s) of the course were most challenging for you?

5. Over the course of the semester, have you experienced any significant changes in your beliefs and values about social problems and/or issues? If so, what are they and how do you account for these changes?

6. Did this course in any way affect the way you interact with people who have beliefs or views different than your own?

7. Did this course in any way challenge and/or change your attitudes about, and behaviors towards people from different cultural backgrounds (racial, ethnic, socio-economic) than your own?

8. Did this course in any way help you to become more aware of problems in your community?

9. Did this course in any way motivate you to become more active in your community in helping to address and/or resolve key social problems?

10. Did this course cause you to become more aware of and sensitive to the needs of those most disenfranchised in our society? Please explain.

11. As a result of having taken this course, are you apt to...
(yes or no response)

___ take another philosophy course?
___ get involved on campus?
___ get involved in community service activities?
___ value alternative views about social issues?
___ be more open to people from different cultural backgrounds (racial, ethnic, socioeconomic) than your own?
___ view social problems as more complex and difficult to remedy?
___ believe that you can make a difference in solving social issues?
___ challenge your own attitudes and beliefs about any given issue?
___ believe that you have a responsibility to address and/or resolve key social issues.

Appendix K

Instructor Interview Questions

1. Did your approach to the subject matter change in any way as a result of integrating service into the classroom?

2. Was there a noticeable difference in the ways in which students in the two sections interacted with each other (i.e. class discussions), with you the instructor?

3. In your opinion, what effect, if any, did the community service experience have on students' ability to think about and make decisions related to social issues and concerns? How would you compare this with the non-service group?

4. In your opinion, what effect, if any, did the community service experience have on students' abilities and/or willingness to confront challenges and to think more complexly in the academic environment? How would you compare this with the non-service group?

5. In your opinion, what effect, if any, did the community service experience have on students' mastery of course content? How would you compare this with the non-service group?

6. In your opinion, what effect, if any, did the community service experience have on students' commitment to social/civic responsibility.

7. In your opinion, what percentage of the students participating in the service component had an experience of high quality?

8. How would you compare the level of class participation in the two sections of the course?

9. How much additional work was required of you to integrate service into your course?

10. Was your experience with integrating service into the classroom such that you would do so again in the future? If so, what kinds of pedagogical and epistemological changes would you make to better integrate service into your class?

Appendix L
College Standardized Course Evaluation

LOYOLA COLLEGE IN MARYLAND

STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

COURSE NAME	PHILOSOPHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY II
COURSE NUMBER	PL20208 MWF 12:00PM
INSTRUCTOR	BOOTHBY, DR RICHARD
TERM	93/SP

30

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

IMPORTANT

THIS FORM WILL BE PROCESSED BY AN OPTICAL SCANNER.
MARK ONLY WITH A #2 PENCIL.
- MAKE HEAVY, DARK MARKS
- ERASE COMPLETELY TO CHANGE

DIRECTIONS

This form provides the chance to express anonymously your opinions regarding this course. Please block out the number that best expresses your view, where:

0 (NA) means not applicable or don't know
1 (SD) means strongly disagree with the statement
2 (D) means disagree with the statement
3 (A) means agree somewhat with the statement
4 (SA) means strongly agree with the statement

THE PROFESSOR:

	NA	SD	D	A	SA
1. Clearly laid out the course objectives					
2. Conducted the course in a way that helped me fulfill these objectives					
3. Presented the course materials clearly					
4. Communicated interest and enthusiasm					
5. Was well prepared for each class					
6. Summarized or emphasized major points in lectures or discussions					
7. Showed genuine respect and concern for students					
8. Was available for consultation with students					
9. Stimulated intellectual curiosity					
10. Encouraged discussion, questions, and participation					
11. Encouraged students to think for themselves					
12. Used techniques which evaluated well my progress and my understanding of course materials					

13. Overall I would rate the effectiveness of the instructor of this course as:
Excellent Good Fair Poor

THE COURSE: Items specific to the course and/or department

	NA	SD	D	A	SA
14. Overall I would rate this course as challenging.					
15.					
16.					
17.					
18.					
19.					

COMMENTS:

20 What are the major strengths of the course?

21 Please write any suggestions you have to improve the course.

This questionnaire is intended to help in the development of excellent teaching by the professionals involved, and has not been validated and is not intended for use as a comparative instrument.

Appendix M
The Community Service Questionnaire

Name of Course _____
Name of Professor _____

COMMUNITY SERVICE EVALUATION

1. How would you rate the community service project component of the course? (check one)
   ___very good, definitely keep in the future
   ___so-so
   ___not worth it; get rid of it in the future.
Explanatory comments:

2. Do you plan to work in the future at the community site where you did your project?
   ___yes, I intend to go back there.
   ___I might go back there.
   ___I have no plans to go back there
Explanatory comments:

3. Did the project change your attitude toward and interest in community service in general?
   ___It got me more interested in doing community service.
   ___It left my interest-level unchanged.
   ___It made me less interested in doing community service.
Explanatory comments:

4. Was the service component integrated into the content of this course?
   ___Yes, very well integrated
   ___Yes, I made some connections between my service project and the course content.
   ___No, I was unable to make any connections.
Explanatory comments:

5. In general, what were the greatest strengths and weaknesses of this service component as you experienced it? Can you suggest changes that would improve this community-service component of the course?
Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Suggested changes:

REFERENCES

Adams, K. A. (1981). The keen-edged feather: Intuitive analysis and reporting in qualitative analysis. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Angelo, A. A., & Cross, K. P. (1993). Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1977). Four critical years: Effects of college on beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1985). Achieving educational excellence: A critical assessment of priorities and practices in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barber, B.R. (1991. Spring). A mandate for liberty: Requiring education-based community service. The Responsive Community, 46-55.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (1992). Knowing and reasoning in college: Gender-related patterns in students' intellectual development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Beneviste, G. (1989). Mastering the politics of planning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Berkowitz, L & Daniels, L. R. (1964). Affecting the saliency of the social responsibility norm: Effects of past help on the response to dependency relationships. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 68, 275-281.

Berry, H. A. (1990). Experiential education: The neglected dimension of international/intercultural studies. In J. Kendall, (Ed.). Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service. Volume I (pp. 324-332). Raleigh: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Berry, H. (1992, November). [Interview conducted by author with Howard Berry, director, The Partnership for Service Learning, at the Annual National Society for Experiential Education Conference (NSEE)]. Newport, R.I.

Blasi, A. (1980). Bridging moral cognition and moral action: A critical review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 88.

Bogdan, R. C. & Biklen, S. K. (1992). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bonwell, C. C. & Eison, J.A. (1991). Active learning: Creating excitement in the classroom. Washington, D. C.: The George Washington University.

Boyer, E. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience in America. New York: Harper & Row.

Boyer, E. (1994, March 9). Creating the new American college. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A48.

Boyer, E.L. & Hechinger, F. M. (1981). Higher learning in the nation's service. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brookfield, S. D. (1987). Developing critical thinkers: Challenging adults to explore alternative ways of thinking and acting. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cagenello, S. A. (1993). Plugged into the heart: Service-learning and student development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

Campus Compact Newsletter (1989-90, Winter). Integrating service and the curriculum. 4, (2), Providence: Brown University.

Campus Compact (1992). Index to campus service-learning courses and policies. Providence: Brown University.

Cohen, M. D. & March, J. G. (1974). Leadership and ambiguity. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Coles, R. (1986). The moral life of children. Boston: The Atlantic Monthly Press.

Coles, R. (1989a). The call of stories. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Coles, R. (1989b, September-October). Learning by doing through public service. Change, 21, 18-26.

Coles, R. (1993). The call of service: A witness to idealism. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1981a). Instruments and scoring guide of the experiential education evaluation project. St. Paul: Center for Youth Development and Research, University of Minnesota.

Conrad, D. & Hedin, D. (1981b). National assessment of experiential education: A final report. St. Paul: Center for Youth Development and Research, University of Minnesota.

Cross, K. P. & Angelo, T. A. (1988). Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for faculty. Ann Arbor: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, University of Michigan.

Cruz, N. (1990). A challenge to the notion of service. In Kendall, J. (Ed.). Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service. Volume I (pp. 321-323). Raleigh: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Davison M. L., & Bobbins, S. (1978). The reliability and validity of objective indices of moral development. Applied Psychological Measurement, 2, 391-403.

Delve, C., Mintz, S. D. & Stewart, G. M. (1990). Promoting values development through community service: A design. In Delve, Mintz, & Stewart (Eds.), Community service as values education, (pp. 7-29). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Demmer, D. (1987). Life experiences and moral judgment development. Doctoral dissertation. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Denneny, M. (1979). The privilege of ourselves: Hannah Arendt on judgment. In Melvin Hill (Ed.), Hannah Arendt: The Recovery of the Public World. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Dewey, J. (1909). Moral principles in education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education. Toronto: Macmillan.

Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. New York: Macmillian.

Donahue, J., Marullo, S., O'Connor, P. E., & Rue, P. (1992). Service learning: Integrating community service into the curriculum: A report on the faculty development institute at Georgetown University. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University.

Dooley, D. (1990). Social research methods. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Eyler, J. & Giles, D, Jr. (1993). What do we know about the impact of field based programs on students? Proceedings from the Annual Conference of the National Society for Experiential Education. San Francisco, CA.

Farland, M. & Henry, S. M. (1992). Politics for the twenty-first century: What should be done on campus? Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co.

Fay, B. (1987). Critical social science: Liberation and its limits. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: The Seabury Press.

Freire, P. (1973). Education for a critical consciousness. New York: Seabury Press.

Friedman, T.L. (1993, March 2). Clinton offers tuition and link to national service. The New York Times, p. A18.

Gansneder, N. J. & Kingston, D. W. (1990). A longitudinal study at the University of Virginia. In J. Kendall, (Ed.). Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service. Volume I (pp. 409-412). Raleigh: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Gardner, J. W. (1984, February 29). You can make a difference: Entrepreneurs in the public interest. Speech transcript in Stanford University Campus Report, pp.16.

Getz, I. (1985). The relationship of moral and religious ideology to human rights. Doctoral dissertation. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Giles, D., Honnet, E. P., & Migliore, S. (Eds.). (1991). Research agenda for combining service and learning in the 1990s. Raleigh: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C. & Attanucci, J. (1988). Two moral orientations. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, J. M. Taylor & B. Bardidge, (Eds.). Mapping the Moral Domain (pp. 73-86). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C., Ward, J. V., Taylor, J. M. & Bardidge, B. (Eds.). (1988). Mapping the Moral domain. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C. & Wiggins, G. (1988). The origins of morality in early childhood relationships. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, J. M. Taylor & B. Bardidge, (Eds.). Mapping the Moral Domain (pp. 111-138). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gitlin, T. (1987). The sixties: Years of hope, days of rage. New York: Bantam Books.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine.

Gorman, M., Duffy, J., & Heffernan, M. (1979). Service experience and the moral development of college students. Boston: Boston College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 223 173).

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). Servant leadership. New York: Paulist Press.

Hamilton S. F. & Fenzel, L. M. (1988). The impact of volunteer experience on adolescent social development: Evidence of program effects. Journal of Adolescent Research, 3, 65-80.

Harkavy, I. & Puckett, J. L. (1991, Summer). Toward effective university-public school partnerships: An analysis of a contemporary model. Teachers College Record. 92, (4), New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Harkavy, I. (1993, April 1). Keynote address, National service, schools, and higher education institutions: Toward the reinvention of the American urban university and the integration of the American schooling system from early childhood centers to urban research universities conference, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Hausner, S. (1993). The critical link between service and advocacy. In S. Sagawa & S. Halperin (Eds.). Visions of Service: The Future of the National and Community Service Act (pp. 31). Washington, D. C.: National Women's Law Center and American Youth Policy Forum.

Heaney, T. W. & Horton, A. I. (1990). Reflective engagement for social change. In J. Mezirow & Associates (Eds.). Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning (pp. 74-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Held, V. (1993). Feminist morality: Transforming culture, society, and politics. Chicago.: The University of Chicago Press.

Honnet, E. P. & Poulson, S. J. (1989). Principles for good practice for combining service and learning. Wingspread journal special report. Racine, WI.: The Johnson Foundation, Inc.

Hutchings P. (1989). Behind outcomes: Contexts and questions for assessment. The American Association for Higher Education Assessment Forum. Washington, D.C.: The American Association for Higher Education.

Hutchings, P. & Wutzdorff, A. (1988). Experiential learning across the curriculum: Assumptions and principles. In Hutchings and Wutzdorff (Eds.). Knowing and Doing: Learning Through Experience (pp. 1-81). New Directions for Teaching and Learning. 35.

Keen, C. (1990). Effects of a public issues program on adolescents' moral and intellectual development. In J. Kendall (Ed.). Combining service and learning: a resource book for community and public service. Volume I (pp. 393-404). Raleigh: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Kendall, J. (Ed.). (1990). Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service. Volume I. Raleigh: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Kendall, J. (Ed.). (1990). Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service. Volume II. Raleigh: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Kendall, J., Duley, J., Little, T., Permaul, J., and Rubin S. (1986). Strengthening experiential education within your institution. Raleigh: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Kennedy, D. & Warren, D. (1990). Action steps from a president's perspective. In J. Kendall (Ed.). Combining Service and Learning: A resource book for community and public service. Volume I (pp. 467-472). Raleigh: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Kennedy, D. & Warren, D. (1992). Integrating public service with academic study: The faculty role. Providence: Campus Compact.

King, P. M. (1978). William Perry's theory of intellectual and ethical development. In L. Knefelkamp, C. Widick, & C. A. Parker (Eds.). Applying New Developmental Findings (pp. 35-51). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Knefelkamp, L. (1974). Developmental instruction: Fostering intellectual and personal growth in college students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Kohlberg, L. (1972). A cognitive-development approach to moral education. The Humanist, 32, 13-16.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). The philosophy of moral development. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

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

Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E.J., & Associates. (1991). Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and development outside the classroom. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Langdale, S. (1983). Moral orientations and moral development: The analysis of care and justice reasoning across different dilemmas in females and males from childhood to adulthood. Doctoral dissertation, Boston: Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Levine, A. E. (1980). When dreams and heroes died. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Inc.

Levine, A. E. (1989, September-October). Learning by doing through public service. Change, 19-26.

Levison, L. M. (1990). Choose engagement over exposure. In J. Kendall (Ed.), Combining service and learning: a resource book for community and public service. Volume I (pp. 68 -75). Raleigh: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory in social sciences. New York: Harper & Row.

Liddell, D. L., Halpin, G. & Halpin, W. G. (1992, July). The measure of moral orientation: Measuring the ethics of care and justice. Journal of College Student Development, 33, 325-329.

Liddell, D. L., Halpin, G. & Halpin, W. G. (1993, Winter). Men, women, and moral orientation: Accounting for our differences. NASPA Journal, 30, 138-144.

Lincoln, Y. S., Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Lyons, N. P. (1983). Two perspectives: On self, relationships, and morality. Harvard Educational Review, 53, (2) 125-145.

Lyons, N. P. (1988). Two perspectives: On self, relationships, and morality. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, J. M. Taylor & B. Bardidge, (Eds.). Mapping the moral domain (pp. 21-48). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Markus, G. B., Howard, J. P. & King, D. C. (1993, Winter). Integrating community service and classroom instruction enhances learning: Results from an experiment. Educational Evaluation and Policy, 15, (4), 410-419.

Marsh, C. (1993, April). Speech presented to the faculty of Loyola College in Maryland.

McGinnis, J. (1984). Educating for peace and justice: Religious dimensions. Institute for Peace and Justice. St. Louis, MO.

Mentkowski, M. (1980). Creating a "mindset" for evaluating a liberal arts curriculum where valuing is a major outcome. In L. Kuhmerker, M. Mentkowski, & V. L. Erickson (Eds.). Evaluating Moral Development and Evaluating Educational Programs that have a Value Dimension (pp. 27-61). Schenectady, NY.: Character Research Press.

Mezirow, J. & Associates. (1990). Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Moon, Y. L. (1986). An examination of sex bias of test items in the defining issues test of moral judgment. Doctoral dissertation. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Moore, W. S. (1987). Learning Environment Preferences. Center for the Study of Intellectual Development, Olympia, Wa.

Morrill, R. L. (1982). Education for democratic values. Liberal Education, 68, (4), 365-376.

Morse, S. W. (1988). Developing a capacity for civic judgment. In Service learning: A resource for community and public service. Raleigh: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Morse, S. W. (1989). Renewing civic capacity: Preparing college students for service and citizenship. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 8. Washington, D. C: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.

Morton, K. (1993). Models of service and civic education. Campus Compact: The Project for Public and Community Service, Providence, R.I., Brown University.

Murchland, B. (1988). Educating for citizenship. Antaeus Report. Service Learning: An Annotated Bibliography. Raleigh: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Newman, F. (1985). Higher education and the American resurgence. A Carnegie Foundation Special Report. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.

Newmann, F. (1990). Reflective citizen participation. In J. Kendall (Ed.), Combining service and learning: a resource book for community and public service. Volume I (pp. 76-86). Raleigh: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Nolan, A. (1984). Spiritual growth and the option for the poor. Proceedings from the Annual General Meeting of the Catholic Institute for International Relations. London.

Ostrow, J. (1994, Spring). Sticking to our principles in research. NSEE Quarterly. Raleigh: National Society for Experiential Education.

Payne, B. (1987, August). Keynote address, Community Outreach Opportunity League Summit Meeting, Durham, NC.

Piaget, J. (1952). The origins of intelligence in children. New York: International Universities Press.

Rest, J. R. (1979). Development in judging moral issues. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rest, J. R. (1986a). Manual for the defining issues test. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Rest, J. R. (1986b). Moral development: Advances in research and theory. New York: Praeger.

Rest, J. R. (1988, October). Why does college promote development in moral judgement? Journal of Moral Education,17, (3), 183-193.

Rosenzweig, L. (1980). Kohlberg in the classroom: Moral education models. In B. Munsey (Ed.). Moral development, moral education, and Kohlberg (pp. 359-380). Birmingham, AL.: Religious Education Press.

Rutgers University. (1991). Civic education and community service at Rutgers status report. New Brunswick: The State University of New Jersey, Rutgers.

Rutter R. A. & Newmann, F. M. (1990, April). Community service to enhance civic responsibility. The Education Digest, 33-36.

Sadler, D. R. (1981). Intuitive data processing as a potential source of bias in educational evaluations. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 3, 25-31.

Sanford, N. (1966). Self and society. New York: Atherton Press.

Schaefli. A., Rest, J. & Thoma, S. (1985). Does moral education improve moral judgment? A meta-analysis of intervention studies using the Defining Issues Test. Review of Educational Research, 55, 319-352.

Schultz, S. (1990). Learning by heart: the role of action in civic education. In J. Kendall (Ed.). Combining service and learning: a resource book for community and public service. Volume I (pp. 210-224). Raleigh: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Seeman, H. (1990). Why the resistance by faculty? In J. Kendall (Ed.), Combining service and learning: a resource book for community and public service. Volume I (pp. 161-163). Raleigh: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee. (1992). Comparison of the senate bills on youth service in the 101st congress. National Association of Service and Conservation Corps. Washington, D.C.

Shelton, C. M. (1992, Fall) Helping college students make moral decisions. In Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education, (2), St. Louis, MO.

Sigmon, R. (1979, Spring). Service-learning: three principles. Synergist, 8, (1), 9-11.

Smith, A. F. (1978). Lawrence Kohlberg's cognitive stage theory of the development of moral judgment. In L. L. Knefelkamp, C. Widick & C. A. Parker (Eds.). Applying New Developmental Findings (pp. 53-67). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Snarey, J. R. (1985). Cross-cultural universality of social-moral development: A critical review of Kohlbergian research. Psychological Bulletin, (97), 202-232.

Stanton, T. K. (1990). Liberal arts, experiential learning and public service: Necessary ingredients for socially responsible undergraduate education. In J. Kendall (Ed.). Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service, Volume I (pp. 175-189). Raleigh: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Stanton, T.K. (1990). Service learning and leadership development: Learning to be effective while learning what to be effective about. In J. Kendall (Ed.). Combining service and learning: a resource book for community and public service, Volume I (pp. 336-351). Raleigh: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Stanton, T. K. (1990). Service learning: Groping toward a definition. In J. Kendall (Ed.), Combining service and learning: a resource book for community and public service, Volume I (pp. 65-67). Raleigh: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Stewart, G. M. (1990). Learning styles as a filter for developing service-learning interventions. In C. Delve, S. D. Mintz & G. M. Stewart, (Eds.). Community service as values education (pp. 31-42). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Strand, K. J. (1993, March). Critical thinking and service learning. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Eastern Sociological Society.

Thoma, S. J. (1984). Estimating gender differences in the comprehension and preference of moral issues. Unpublished manuscript, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

University of Maryland. (1992). Proceedings of the National Leadership Symposium. Personal, Social and Ethical Dimensions of Leadership. College Park, MD.

Veysey, L. R. (1965). The emergence of the American university. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wagner, J. (1986). Academic excellence and community service through experiential learning: Encouraging students to teach. Keynote presentation to Ninth Annual University of California Conference on Experiential Learning. Available as NSIEE Occasional Paper, National Society for Internships and Experiential Education, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Walker, J. J. (1985). Sex differences in the development of moral reasoning: A critical review. Child Development, (55), 677-691.

Waller, T. (1993, March 31). Youth service can rebuild cities. Philadelphia: The Philadelphia Inquirer, Commentary.

Winkler, K. J. (1988, October 26). Experts on moral development find common ground under fire from critics of America's schools. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A4, A8.