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ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: SERVICE HELIX: A GROUNDED THEORY OF COLLEGE STUDENT DEVELOPMENT AND OUTCOMES THROUGH INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY SERVICE

Mary Kay Schneider, Doctor of Philosophy, 2002

Dissertation directed by: Associate Professor Susan R. Komives
Department of Counseling and Personnel Services

Community service and service learning have been lauded as ways of teaching civic and social responsibility during college. In order to better understand the concept of social and civic responsibility and whether students gravitated toward these concepts, this study was undertaken. The grounded theory was designed to understand students' experiences with community service, what they see as outcomes from their involvement, and the role of responsibility in this dynamic.

Grounded theory was utilized as the methodology because of the lack of research and theory regarding service and the outcomes for the servers. To achieve depth of understanding, information-rich participants were selected, interviewed
three times, and then they participated in a focus group to hone the findings using a constant comparative process. From this, the grounded theory of the service helix developed.

While the original intent was to explore the outcomes of service, the participants articulated that the whole process of service was the core category. They could not discuss the outcomes without describing their experiences with service, their background and motivations, and their identity. The main story line of this grounded theory was a developmental model for college students who participate in community service. The core category was a service helix that was comprised of key categories of background, catalysts, service, personalization and responsibility, and outcomes. The students cycle through the service helix, and the movement illustrates the development and growth while the rate of growth may vary.

The grounded theory offers insight into responsibility that evolved from service as students internalized a social issue or the need to serve. The participants defined this as a personal responsibility or personalization. The service helix highlights the importance of background and catalyst to initiate and continue service. The service experience was also important in their development. The next key category was personalization that describes an integration of service, responsibility, and a connection to others and issues. Finally, students move to a combination of outcomes from their experience. The service helix helps articulate how students grow from service and how service can be used as a learning tool on a college campus.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

I was taught that the world had a lot of problems; that I could struggle and change them; that intellectual and material gifts brought the privilege and responsibility of sharing with others less fortunate; and that service is the rent each of us pays for living -- the very purpose of life and not something you do in your spare time or after you have reached your personal goals. (Marian Wright Edelman, as cited in Chambliss, Meisel, & Wolf, 1991, p. 10)

Background of the Study

Community service and service-learning have gained the attention of higher education from the late 1980s until today. The belief exists that these forms of service hold substantial outcomes for the college students performing the service as well as for those served. Despite the anecdotal evidence and loose research studies related to service, only small amounts of actual data exist related to the outcomes of service in general, and even less related to social and civic responsibility in particular. In the past few years, however, the amount and rigor of the research related to community service and service-learning has increased substantially. Service-learning is defined as "a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development. Reflection and reciprocity are key concepts of service-learning" (Jacoby, 1996, p. 5). Service-learning may occur in the classroom as well as in the co-curriculum. Giles and Eyler (1994b) stated that service-learning "suffers from the lack of a well articulated conceptual framework" and that it has been "quite marginal to the academic
With a similar sense of ambiguity, educators and the nation's leaders have been calling for increased social and civic responsibility. They are asking that colleges and universities develop responsible, committed citizens who can make a difference in their communities. Many people believe that service is one main way to encourage social and civic responsibility. In fact, U.S. Senator Wofford (1994) stated that service-learning "holds so much promise for reforming education at all levels while at the same time renewing our society, national imagination, and collective spirit;" however he went on to assert the need for research to substantiate the outcomes rather than rely on "educator's beliefs and experiences" (as cited in Myers-Lipton, 1996, p. 660). In the 1997 Presidents' Summit on Volunteerism, the current and previous Presidents of the United States were gathered with other leaders from a variety of areas to discuss the use of community service to address social issues and to increase social and civic responsibility, particularly in young people. Though social responsibility, civic responsibility, citizenship, and commitment to community are all separate terms with unique characteristics, they share many commonalities. All of these terms were considered to address one's responsibility to address social issues and the interconnectedness of all individuals to social problems. For the purpose of this study, they were combined as an area for exploration with the aim that the participants would define the terms in their own words and discuss whether they are seen as outcomes of service.

The inclusion of community service and service-learning in the higher education community has its roots in the work of John Dewey. In the beginning of the 20th century, John Dewey's theory of education promoted the inclusion of
experiential learning in all forms of education (Giles, 1991). His work focused on "principles of experience, inquiry, and reflection as the key elements of a theory of knowing in service-learning" (Giles & Eyler, 1994b, p. 79). In addition, Dewey's social and political philosophy had three key components — community, citizenship, and democracy (Giles & Eyler). Despite the respect for Dewey, experiential education did not really catch on, and service-learning didn't fully bloom until the 1960s and then had a decline until the 1980s when community service and service-learning began to make a resurgence.

As Giles and Eyler (1994b) stated, there has been little creation of theory related to service with the exception of a service learning model by Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990). This model was created to help define the developmental process that students experience as they perform community service. The stages of the model are described in great detail in Chapter II. The four key variables used in the model give greater definition to the types and settings of the service. These variables in the service-learning model are: intervention, commitment, behavior, and balance (Delve et al.). Intervention includes mode and setting in which mode "refers to whether the student engages in a service-learning activity individually or as a member of a group" and setting describes the server's relationship to the served including the distinctions of indirect, nondirect, and direct (Delve et al., p. 11). Commitment includes frequency, meaning how often a student engages in service, and duration of commitment which includes two facets of long-term or short-term commitment and an examination of where the commitment lies, be it with a student group, a service activity, or a service site (Delve et al.). Behavior is the third variable in the model that has components of needs, the motivations students have for engaging in service, and outcomes, describing the effects of the service (Delve et al.). The final variable is balance which includes challenges and supports. These variables signaled
important aspects to consider in the students' service for this study to define more greatly their service and its outcomes. The service-learning model provided some theoretical background and framework in the design of this study.

One of the main constraints of community service and service-learning has been the lack of guidelines and principles. The "Principles of Good Practice in Combining Service and Learning," developed at a Wingspread Conference, have contributed significantly to the design of community service and service-learning programs (Honnet & Poulsen, 1989). Some of these principles included a focus on the common good, the need for reflection and evaluation, and that needs must be defined by the people being served (Honnet & Poulsen). In Combining Service and Learning, Jane Kendall (1990) further defined service and 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). Key components of service include reciprocity, community, shared vision, and empowerment.

As definitions of community service and service-learning continue to appear in the literature, a fuzziness about the concept of service remains, or more accurately, regarding the concepts of reciprocity, reflection, and outcomes. While in this study the concepts of community service and service-learning were both examined, Thomas Ehrlich (1996) believes that "Community service linked to academic study can also promote civic learning on one hand and moral learning on the other" (p. xiii). The same has often been stated for co-curricular community service (Jacob, 1996; Scheuermann, 1996).

More research studies have begun to emerge partially because of the increased attention to service both nationally and within the realm of higher education. The findings have been varied, usually with only small positive effects or impacts or no
significant effects on the person serving. The small effect may be due, in part, to the short time of treatment or to the methodology. Despite minimal findings, the emphasis on student learning will continue to keep service-learning on the forefront; therefore, the effects of involvement in service must be documented and examined. A review of the literature indicated that most studies examined either service-learning integrated into the curriculum or community service as a part of the co-curriculum. This dichotomy reflects the current state of service in which many believe that service-learning does not occur in the co-curriculum, although others believe that reflection, reciprocity, and evaluation can be integral parts of service outside of the classroom as well as within the classroom.

All of the work points to the need for greater assessment of service outcomes, including calls for research such as the Research Agenda for Combining Service and Learning in the 1990s by Giles, Porter Honnet, and Migliore (1991). A study by Giles and Eyler (1994a) examined the impact of service-learning on students' personal, social, and cognitive outcomes. Markus, Howard, and King (1993) examined the effect of integrating community service into the classroom and found that the treatment group had higher mean ratings than the control group for the degree that the course had increased their "intention to serve others in need, intention to give to charity, orientation toward others and away from yourself, belief that helping those in need is one's social responsibility, belief that one can make a difference in the world, and tolerance and appreciation of others" (p. 413). Some of these variables seem related to social responsibility. Olney and Grande (1995) performed a study to validate an instrument they created to measure the Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990) model of service-learning and to assess student outcomes. They found that the model was statistically significant in that as students' commitment to service increased, so did their social responsibility. Tenley (1997) looked at belief in a just
world and its relationship with social responsibility. The findings from this study suggest that, "Involvement in community service, in a number of different commitment levels, leads to higher levels of social responsibility and lower levels of belief in a just world" (Tenley, p. 102). As can be seen, the results of previous research vary, yet they all seem to point to the need for greater theoretical models and an understanding of social responsibility. They also show how the outcomes of service relate to social and civic responsibility as well as to other developmental characteristics.

Documents by national policy makers and Campus Compact, a national association of over 300 college presidents committed to service, purport that the main intent of service for students is the "theme of civic responsibility/civic participation/citizenship" (Smith, p. 1994). However, Smith found that students, faculty, and administration at one higher education institution barely mentioned the theme of citizenship as an intended student outcome. The outcomes that the students focused on were personal connections, confrontation of social issues, and social change; only one student even mentioned citizenship (Smith). These results indicate that educators cannot assume that students make the connection between service and social and civic responsibility.

In a study of the outcomes for student volunteers of Learn and Serve America, Higher Education, a national service program consisting of grants given to higher education institutions, the researchers examined how service affected student development in the areas of civic responsibility, educational attainment, and life skills (Astin & Astin, 1996). The results indicated that the students involved in service were different from the nonparticipants when they came to college (Astin & Astin). Related to civic responsibility, the study found,
On all twelve measures, service participants indicated higher levels of civic responsibility than nonparticipants. The most dramatic differences are in the areas of commitment to serving the community, planning to conduct volunteer work in the near future, commitment to participating in community action programs, and satisfaction with the opportunities for community service provided by the college. In fact, a full 60 percent of service participants (compared with 28 percent of other students) believed their commitment to serving their communities had become 'stronger' or 'much stronger' during college. Service participants also were significantly more likely than nonparticipants to be committed to influencing social values, helping others in difficulty, promoting racial understanding, influencing the political structure, and getting involved in environmental cleanup. Similarly, service participants were less pessimistic than nonparticipants about an individual's ability to change society. These differences are consistent with the expectation that service participation will have a favorable impact on students' sense of civic responsibility. (Astin & Astin, p. 49)

Despite these findings that supported civic responsibility as an outcome of service, a strong need still exists to understand what students perceive as the outcomes of service and what motivates them to serve in the first place. By understanding the motivations to get involved in service, higher education administrators and faculty can be intentional about cultivating these motivations or about building on them to assure ongoing service. This information regarding motivation also can be used to involve nonvolunteers in service. As for gathering data about outcomes, the information from this study will help justify the inclusion of service in education or suggest modifications to develop social responsibility. By
understanding what students gain from service, reflection and education can be planned accordingly and intentionally. The purpose of the present study was to discover the meaning and role of social and civic responsibility for the participants while also coming to understand other potential outcomes of service. An examination of the relationship that may exist between other potential outcomes and social and civic responsibility for college students was also the intent of this study in order to create a grounded theory for this development and relationship.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to understand the outcomes of service and to explore the outcomes in terms of social and civic responsibility. The research design is critical for getting to the core issues and outcomes of service and the meaning of social and civic responsibility. "Relatively little work is being done to generate developmental theories that address the increasing diversity of today's typical college campus" (Bloland, Stamatakos, & Rogers, 1994). This study looked at the broadening experiences with service for college students and how their backgrounds may interact with their experiences.

The focus of the study was on the students' perceptions and meaning-making of their growth and development from their service. Due to the complex nature of service, the study looked at service related to the university as well as service that was independent of the academic setting. The qualitative nature of the study illuminated the similarities and differences that the students perceived between the varying types of service. In addition, the study was significant because it encouraged students to discuss their developmental outcomes as complex entities that might be related to more than just service. According to Pascarella and Terenzini (1991), "A majority of important changes that occur during college are probably the
cumulative result of a set of interrelated experiences sustained over an extended period of time. Consequently, research that focuses on the impact of single or isolated experience, a characteristic of most investigations of within-college influences, is unlikely to yield strong effects" (p. 610). Social and civic responsibility were of particular interest because of the call for committed citizens and the belief that these outcomes result from service.

**Qualitative Methods**

Qualitative methods fit well with the design of this study because service is a complex activity, and grounded theory builds understanding from the information gathered. This study gave the students an opportunity to describe the complexity of their experience and the outcomes in terms of their meaning making. "A grounded theory is one that is inductively derived from the study of the phenomenon it represents" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 23). In particular, "It is discovered, developed, and provisionally verified through systematic data collection and analysis of data pertaining to that phenomenon" (Strauss & Corbin, p. 23). Since limited theoretical frameworks existed related to the outcomes of service and the development of social responsibility, grounded theory seemed to be the most beneficial to the furthering of knowledge. "Grounded theory is a particularly appropriate research method when the discovery of new theoretical frameworks, based upon the perceptions and understandings of those living the experience, is needed" (Jones, 1995, p. 14). In this study, the inductive method generated an emerging theory regarding the outcomes of service and their relationship to social and civic responsibility for college students.
Guiding Research Questions

In order to give value to the nature of grounded theory, several guiding research questions were used to probe the outcomes of service, yet flexibility was maintained so that the findings could inform the next round of questions to truly get to the core of the research. The emerging theory was grounded in the findings from the interviews and focus group and developed through informed revision. The guiding research questions were:

1. In what ways do college students develop through their involvement in service? What outcomes do students identify as linked to their service experience?

2. If social and/or civic responsibility are outcomes of service, how do students define this outcome? What does social and/or civic responsibility mean to them?

3. What is the relationship between social and civic responsibility and involvement in service?

4. How are social and civic responsibility related to some of the other outcomes of service?

Definition of Terms

Service was defined as a process and a relationship in which an individual works with a community or an individual to identify needs, develop a mutual purpose, and work to effect socially responsible change while empowering others. Service included community service and service-learning. Significant to the definition of community service-learning is a recognition of the reciprocity that occurs through the process. The service is about both the learning and growth for the college student and for the person(s) being served. The term server was used to identify the individual who goes into a community to serve. The term served was
used to identify the community that is involved in the process of service. Served is used for the sake of simplicity despite the fact that it may carry the connotation that service is done to the served by the server, where in the true spirit of community service-learning, this is not the case. Community service referred to volunteer work without intentional reflection or evaluation. Service-learning described community service that is connected with intentional learning, reflection, reciprocity, and evaluation. For this study, service-learning could describe academic learning or co-curricular service. Often times for simplicity sake, the term 'service' was used to describe both community service and service-learning.

Outcomes referred to the developmental effect or changes that occurred from some activity or a combination of experiences. Outcomes could be cognitive, psychosocial, or moral to name a few. One of the proposed outcomes was social responsibility which is described as a sense of commitment to one's community. Social responsibility also included a sense that one can make a difference and that everyone's plight is interconnected. Giles and Eyler (1994a) used the following constructs to define social responsibility and to explore its outcome from service; these constructs are: a sense of personal efficacy that includes "faith that one can make a difference, a sense of being rewarded for involvement, and some connection to personal beliefs about change;" an attitude that one should make a difference including "valuing helping others and a commitment to helping others;" and a cognitive dimension that includes "reduction in stereotypes, development of empathic understanding, and a stronger sense of the social, structural elements opportunity and achievement" (p. 330). Civic responsibility implied similar meaning to social responsibility, but it is often viewed as more related to voting and other civic responsibilities. Despite the definition of terms given, what was most important was how the students defined and used the terms as well as what other terms emerged
from the interviews. The usage of the terminology by the students also informed the study.

Assumptions

In thinking about and designing the research, I brought several assumptions to the work, both about service and about qualitative research. Many of these assumptions developed from my professional and personal experiences with service. Informally, student development from service has been observed and discussed with students performing service. Personally, growth has occurred from my own experience with service. Service has challenged my beliefs and my assumptions about those being served. At times, my stereotypes have been reinforced; however, through extended service, I have been able to see the bigger picture and to understand larger societal issues and frameworks that often perpetuate the need for social services. While teaching a Leadership and Community Service class, I have observed students work through similar stereotypes and assumptions, often leaving with a clearer understanding of social issues and more critical thinking ability. Some of this parallels the Service-Learning Model that is presented in more detail in the literature review; however, I also have observed students become overwhelmed by the enormity of the social issues and retreat from service (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990). I do believe that when people have the opportunity to reflect on their learning and experiences and when they talk with people having similar experiences, the volunteers tend to persevere and move past this "stage." This assumption supports my belief that service should be accompanied by either formal or informal reflection whenever possible.

Many of my assumptions have guided my research including, most importantly, that service promotes the development of the volunteer. This
development may include cognitive, psychosocial, and moral development as well as social responsibility and citizenship. I believe that service can promote development of the people served, but attention must be given to this growth for it to be intentional. Reflection assists in learning and meaning making, similar to how Kolb (1984) viewed it in his learning cycle model. Without reflection, service has the potential of encouraging negative development such as reinforcing racial stereotypes. Though it is often difficult, I believe that service should involve both the server and those served in defining the needs and the relationship. This dynamic models leadership and service in which all persons develop. My experience has been that people's views toward service often vary based on their gender, race, socio-economic status, values, and parents' involvement in service.

In relation to the potential outcomes related to service, I believe that development through service takes time and that service encourages people to think more globally and critically about social issues. I often question whether service affects social responsibility in thought but not necessarily in action or whether they are necessarily connected. My assumption is that they are related and that more purposeful interventions by educators can assist in this development. To me, this is a fruitful area to explore, hence the design of this study.

Related to social responsibility, I question whether people truly are ready and able to work on social issues and to take responsibility for their community. People are not often willing to give up their privilege in order to achieve equity, but rather give up only enough privilege to help somewhat while maintaining status quo. Similar to many proponents of community service and service-learning, I think that students should be encouraged to be involved in service to promote their development and that it should also be connected to classroom learning, if possible.
My assumptions and experience related to the topic and the research question guided my use of grounded theory. Grounded theory offered the opportunity to think and learn more about how college students develop through extended service and to explore whether the amount of time and the quality of time spent in service affect the development and the outcomes. I also believed that grounded theory would illuminate some of the complexities of service and its outcomes. All of these assumptions and experiences helped shape the research question and design. After identifying these assumptions, the challenge remained to let the stories and experiences emerge and be shaped by the students, so that the theory that was created was grounded in their words, thoughts, and experiences.

Significance of the Study

By understanding how students view the outcomes of service, educators can use these findings in enhancing development as well as creating other learning opportunities to encourage additional growth. Educators can design curricular service-learning and co-curricular community service-learning opportunities more intentionally by utilizing the theory or model developed from the findings. The findings also can be used to help integrate current events like the tragedy of September 11, 2001 with ways that students help in their community and make meaning of the experiences and their responsibility. The findings also offer a foundation for policy and administration decisions that individual institutions can adapt to their situation.

As previously was stated, the outcomes of involvement in service primarily have been significantly positive; however, the effect has often been small, possibly because of the short time frame. In most of the studies reviewed, the volunteers had only performed approximately 15 hours of service, often during one semester.
Knowing that more time often is needed for developmental changes to occur, this study was designed to learn about students who had performed significantly more service and over a longer time frame. Grounded theory offered a unique opportunity to probe these changes in-depth and to see what other factors contribute to developmental outcomes of service and social responsibility, in particular.

This research offered the opportunity to delve into the developmental outcomes of service through the voices of the college students involved in service. According to Kuh, Whitt, and Shedd (1987) in Student Affairs Work 2001: A Paradigmatic Odyssey, naturalistic inquiry is "absolutely necessary to describe and make meaning of the complex and mutual shaping interactions that occur within the campus milieu" (p. 91). Similarly, Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) support the use of naturalistic studies by stating, “When employed judiciously, such approaches are capable of providing greater sensitivity to many of the subtle and fine-grained complexities of college impact than more traditional quantitative approaches” (p. 634). This study was designed to do just that. Students who are involved in service for extended periods of time talk about being changed by the experience, but the question remains in what ways are the students different.

This qualitative study, which utilized the methodology of grounded theory, provided a critical stepping point toward the assessment of learning and development. In addition, the results informed the model which can be further tested using quantitative methods. The research also identified critical points of learning and further considered the role of reflection, evaluation, and reciprocity to see whether they were as vital to outcomes as believed. Finally, the results have implications for pedagogy and policy surrounding service as well as for related student development grounded in the words and meaning of the students.
Summary

Much can be learned about the outcomes of service through this study, and the information gained informed a grounded theory related to this topic. The development of social and civic responsibility as an outcome of service was the primary focus along with the relationship of the other outcomes to social responsibility. The intended outcomes of service can be described in the paraphrased words of an Aboriginal woman: if you are coming over to help me, don't bother; if you are coming over because you see that your plight is intimately connected to mine, join me in the fight (S. Burton, personal communication, February 12, 1996). In order to provide some background for this study, a literature review was conducted. The literature helped create a context for this study without guiding the theory that was to emerge. The methodology for the study is presented in Chapter III. The grounded theory that emerged from the students' words and experiences is portrayed in Chapter IV followed by the discussion of the model and implications for practice.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The studies included in this review of literature were considered to be the most informative related to the topic of service and the outcomes for college students. Key literature was reviewed in order to understand existing research better so that the current study could build on the findings and the lessons learned. Literature and previous studies are meant to "enhance, rather than constrain, theory development" (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 49). The literature was organized in sections around the constructs related to the topic. The first section examined relevant principles, theories, and constructs related to service. Much of this literature has helped define how higher education promotes service to students as well as how it creates service programs. Student development and service were reviewed in the second section. The third section examined studies on the impacts of involvement on students since service is one form of involvement in which the constructs explored may be relevant to this study. Studies of the characteristics and motivations of volunteers are included in the fourth section to review what is known about volunteers and to illuminate areas for future study. The studies in the fifth section examined the outcomes of service for volunteers. Complementary to this, the sixth and final section contains studies on the outcomes of service that have direct connections to this study, particularly around the concepts of social responsibility, civic responsibility, citizenship, and commitment to community. These constructs were considered to be similar; the actual definitions of these constructs emerged later from the interviews with the students. These constructs had varying levels of importance or meaning for the students. This review of literature was believed to set the
groundwork for the current study of the outcomes of service for college students with particular attention to social and civic responsibility.

Foundations of Service

Components and Principles of Service

To more fully examine the outcomes of service for students, a greater understanding of service, its principles, and its practices must be delineated. The primary definitional element of service is that an individual is involved in a relationship with a community or an individual with the intent of meeting a mutually defined need or creating change for a mutual purpose. It is desirable that the community members or member are empowered through the process. For the purpose of this literature review, service and service-learning may be used based on the original source; however, for the purpose of this study, service was primarily used to convey both service-learning and community service without defined, intentional learning outcomes.

In Combining Service and Learning, 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). Reciprocity, community, shared vision, and empowerment are considered to be vital; however, little research exists in this area. Instead, more focus has been given to the effects of service for the students performing the service as opposed to the community being served. Though beyond the scope of this study, the lack of attention given to the community or individual served may, in fact, affect students' sense of social and civic responsibility since it has not been discussed in classes or possibly in personal reflections.
Others have also outlined their views of service. Three principles of service were defined by Sigmon (1990) to include:

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

Principle 2: Those being served become better able to serve and be served by their own actions.

Principle 3: Those who serve are also learners and have significant control over what is expected to be learned (p. 57).

These three principles are fairly consistent throughout definitions of service, but the principles are fairly idealistic. These principles formed some of the basis of the questions for the interviews because they examined the view of the server regarding the served which relates to outcomes.

To further elaborate on service and its connection to social and civic responsibility, it was helpful to examine the Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning. These principles were developed at a Wingspread conference hosted by the Johnson Foundation in order to provide some groundwork for programs that involve service and learning. As defined by the Wingspread Special Report (Honnet & Poulsen, 1989), an effective program:

1. engages people in responsible and challenging actions for the common good.

2. provides structured opportunities for people to reflect critically on their service experience.

3. articulates clear service and learning goals for everyone involved.

4. allows those with needs to define those needs.

5. clarifies the responsibilities of each person and organization involved.

5. matches service providers and service needs through a process that recognizes changing circumstances.
7. expects genuine, active, and sustained organizational commitment.

8. includes training, supervision, monitoring, support, recognition, and evaluation to meeting service and learning goals.

9. insures that the time commitment for service and learning is flexible, appropriate, and in the best interest of all involved.

10. is committed to program participation by and with diverse populations.

(PP. 1-4)

After examining these principles, one area that needed to be explored in the interviews was whether the students reflected on their service. With good service programs, the reflection provided strong links to learning and allowed the server to examine the development that may have occurred. Whether the outcomes differed depending on the type and quality of linkage between service and learning was also relevant. These principles of good practice had a foundation in the development of questioning for the interviews.

**Historical Background**

Much of the background of service and service-learning lies in education, in general, and in experiential education, specifically. Dewey (1964) viewed education as fluid and requiring an experience to educate. Giles (1991) examined Dewey's theory of education and experience and then examined the implications for service-learning. The linkages that Dewey described are the Principle of Continuity and the Principle of Interaction (Giles). This theory was applied to create three implications for service-learning. The first implication was that education and service-learning are multi-dimensional and that theory and practice as well as the individual and society are constructs that are "held in tension" (Giles, p. 89). The second implication was that attention must be given to the interaction and relationship between the server and
the served as well as to past and present experiences (Giles). In other words, all
levels (micro, macro, and interactive) should be considered. The final implication
was that service-learning is a philosophical foundation for all experiential learning
based on the idea that "experience is ultimately social and communal and that
education is interactive and reciprocal" (Giles, p. 89). The article offered an
increased emphasis on the interaction between experience and education that was
used to offer suggestions for questions for participants.

Giles and Eyler (1994b) completed further work by applying the philosophy
of Dewey to service-learning. The authors utilized Dewey's social and educational
philosophy to create an impetus for the development of a service-learning theory to
drive research and practice. A theory of service-learning was viewed as a framework
for creating and organizing knowledge. Dewey's work focused on "principles of
experience, inquiry, and reflection as the key elements of a theory of knowing in
service-learning" (Giles & Eyler, p. 79). Dewey emphasized the importance of
reflective thinking in that it "enables us to know what we are about when we act"
(Dewey, 1964, p. 212). In addition, his social and political philosophy had three
key components -- community, citizenship, and democracy (Giles & Eyler). Giles
and Eyler expounded on Dewey's theory to create nine areas for the development and
testing of a service-learning theory, including some relevant guiding questions for
each area. These areas are: the continuity of experience, the principle of interaction,
inquiry, reflective activity, truly educative projects, concrete and abstract knowledge,
the Great Community, citizenship, and democracy (Giles & Eyler). These areas
contributed to the knowledge base of service-learning by focusing the examination on
the quality of the experience and the educative value of the experience, all of which
would affect student learning outcomes.
Student Development and Service

In addition to reviewing the background of service programs and guiding principles, it also was important to examine student development theory related to service since this could affect the outcomes of service. Profound learning and developmental outcomes can occur for students from carefully designed service experiences (McEwen, 1996). With this in mind, it is important to review some student development theory and then examine the Service Learning Model and its theoretical framework. "Theories provide valuable perspectives for understanding students as they enter service-learning experiences, how students experience the process of their involvement in service-learning, and what their learning and developmental outcomes might be" (McEwen, p. 54).

Psychosocial Development

Psychosocial development is one of the main constructs of student development theory. Chickering and Reisser's (1993) vectors of psychosocial development provide a framework for growth by describing seven vectors through which students may develop. The first vector, developing competence, relates to service in that students will likely encounter situations where they develop at least intellectual and interpersonal competence. Managing emotions in vector two becomes relevant in service as people respond not only intellectually but also affectively to the situation or relationship. As experience with service increases, one is likely to increase the integration of these emotions. The highlight of vector three, moving through autonomy toward interdependence, occurs with the recognition and acceptance of interdependence (Chickering & Reisser). In service, this move becomes obvious as "the need to be independent and the longing for inclusion become better balanced. Interdependence means respecting the autonomy of others
and looking for ways to give and take with an ever-expanding circle of friends" (Chickering & Reisser, pp. 47-48). Similarly, developing mature interpersonal relationships occurs as one develops a tolerance and appreciation of differences as well as a capacity for intimacy. Service can encourage development in this vector, particularly through interactions with diverse populations and communities. The fifth vector of establishing identity may or may not occur through service. Much of this may depend on the type and quality of the experience. Similarly, one has the potential to develop purpose (vector six) and develop integrity (vector seven) through service; however, these vectors are more difficult to reach due to the depth of development. In fact, development through any of these vectors depends strongly on the experience of the individual. It is important to recognize that the service experience is only one facet of the individual's life, thereby only partially responsible for development.

Cognitive Development

In addition to psychosocial development, service may encourage growth in cognitive development. Perry's scheme for intellectual and ethical development provides a context for understanding how students involved in service come to understand and accept the pluralistic world (Perry, 1970). In positions 1 and 2 of dualism, the individual views the world in polar terms and has difficulty with the recognition of conflicting points of view (Perry, 1981). The diversity of viewpoints becomes evident as students involved in service work in communities with different values and positions, and without adequate support, the individual often struggles with this discrepancy. As students become more comfortable with the plurality of viewpoints, they move into multiplicity where they have not yet established criteria to evaluate the merits of differing opinions (Perry, 1981). From multiplicity, one
moves into relativism where all knowledge and values are disconnected from rightness but eventually are evaluated in relation to one's experience and judgment (Perry, 1981). The final stage of cognitive development that one may encounter is commitment to relativism in which one not only accepts the responsibilities of a pluralistic world but also takes responsibility through a commitment based on one's identity (Perry, 1981). It is here that one may incorporate the responsibility of service into one's identity, career, and world view. Applying Perry to service, cognitive development may outline the growth that occurs as individuals come to understand the complexity of the service relationship and experience.

Moral Development

Moral development also provides another context for understanding growth and acceptance of complexity that occurs through service. Additionally, moral development can lead to discussions about and commitments to social and civic responsibility. Students involved in service frequently are confronted with ethical situations. To understand moral development better in the context of service, two moral and ethical development theories are examined, one focusing on an ethic of justice and the other on an ethic of care. Kohlberg's (1975) model outlines three levels of moral development. The first level of development, preconventional, focuses mainly on right or wrong with the consequences of action consisting of punishment or the satisfaction of needs that occurs from positive behavior. The preconventional level is broken down into the punishment and obedience orientation and the instrumental relativist orientation (Kohlberg). At the conventional level, one's behavior is more one of conformity and loyalty to family, group, and personal expectations. The conventional level is broken down into stage 3 of interpersonal concordance or "good boy-good girl" orientation and stage 4 of "law and order"
orientation (Kohlberg). The last stage, postconventional, is broken down into stage 5 of social-contract legalistic orientation and stage 6, the universal-ethical-principle orientation (Kohlberg). In stage 5, right action tends to be defined by individual rights and standards which have been agreed upon by society. The emphasis is on values and opinions with an awareness of the relativism of these values and opinions (Kohlberg). At stage 6, right action is defined more internally based on ethical principles with greater universality (Kohlberg). As students reach the postconventional level, they may question the ethics of people being treated differently and having differential opportunities. From here, the move is more to one of social justice for a higher good. It becomes obvious through Kohlberg's model that individuals move from being inwardly focused to being outwardly focused. It is important to note that when applying Kohlberg's model of moral development to service that it has been criticized for being a male-normed model that focuses on justice without equal attention to an ethic of care.

To help illustrate the ethic of care, Carol Gilligan's (1982) model of moral judgment is examined. Gilligan's work looks predominantly at women's moral development which she sees as embedded in relationships. Level 1 represents an orientation toward individual survival. From here, individuals move through a transition toward a sense of responsibility to others (Gilligan). Frequently, this is where individuals get involved in service. At Level 2, the focus is on goodness as self-sacrifice where "societal values are adopted, acceptance by others becomes of utmost importance, and there is a tendency to hold others responsible for the choices they make" (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990, p. 9). At the transition between Level 2 and 3, the focus is on a move from goodness to truth with little attention now to self-sacrifice (Gilligan). In this period, students move from viewing service as self-sacrifice to a concept of correcting societal problems by searching for the truth.
Finally, at Level 3, caring becomes a universal obligation and nonviolence is fundamental (Delve et al.). In both Kohlberg’s and Gilligan’s models, the focus shifts from self to others as it does with service. In particular, service calls for individuals to focus on justice and care as they work to effect change in society. The difference between the two moral development theories is predominantly the discrepancy between an ethic of care and an ethic of justice as well as the role of relationships. In service, it appears to be incredibly difficult to separate justice and care; therefore, this study may help illuminate how students integrate these concepts in their moral development.

**Experiential Learning Cycle**

Kolb’s (1984) Learning Cycle can also provide greater insight into the experience and outcomes of service. The model identifies a four stage cycle consisting of concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. Though most people enter the cycle at concrete experience, entrance can occur at any point. The learning cycle increases understanding about how individuals learn from service. Frequently, the action of service will constitute the concrete experience, and from there, the student will reflect upon what occurred and evaluate the experience. The next step would be abstract conceptualization during which the student may hypothesize about the experience, work to integrate the experience into one’s world view, and create some informal theories. Finally, the student would actively experiment to determine whether the informal theories created had value and were consistent with the next experience. In this way, service may assist in the learning process.
Service Learning Model

The Service Learning Model provided an important context for examining student development and the outcomes of service. This service-learning model was based on the work of Perry, Kohlberg, and Gilligan and recognized the importance of the interaction of the individual with the environment. The Service Learning Model by Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990) included five phases of student development that result from a continuum of service-learning interactions. Intervention, commitment, behavior, and balance are the four key variables for this model that are utilized at each stage and are explained in Table 1 (Delve et al., p. 12-13).

Exploration was Phase 1 of the Service Learning Model which involved individuals looking for ways to help or get involved. Students at this stage are excited about all of the opportunities for service but are also fairly naive about the complexity of the problems facing others. Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990) termed this phase as "bright-eyed and bushy-tailed" (p. 14). In terms of involvement, this phase can be used to describe students who want to get involved on campus or in the community and make a difference. Similarly, these students often need to gain more self-knowledge as well as knowledge about campus and/or the community. Phase 2, Clarification, can be viewed as a "salad bar approach" during which students investigate a variety of service opportunities and pertinent issues (Delve et al., p. 15). Students begin to clarify which service has personal significance to them through this phase. Phase 3 is Realization during which students become aware of what service-learning is about and begin to see a bigger view of service. A student may commit to a specific issue or population during this phase. Described as the "Aha!" stage, a student in this phase begins to grasp reciprocal learning (Delve et al., p. 15).
TABLE 1. Scheme of the Service Learning Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental Variables</th>
<th>Phase 1: Exploration</th>
<th>Phase 2: Clarification</th>
<th>Phase 3: Revolution</th>
<th>Phase 4: Reflection</th>
<th>Phase 5: Internalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Mode</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-direct</td>
<td>Non-direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Frequency</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Long-term in activity, site, or issue</td>
<td>Lifelong on issue</td>
<td>Lifelong in social justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Needs</td>
<td>Participate in inclusive activities</td>
<td>Identify with group members</td>
<td>Communicate in activity, site, or issue</td>
<td>Advocate issue</td>
<td>Promote values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Feeling good, personal satisfaction</td>
<td>Belonging to the group</td>
<td>Understanding activity, site, or issue</td>
<td>Changing behaviors</td>
<td>Living one's values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Challenges</td>
<td>Breaking into involvement cycle</td>
<td>Choosing from multiple opportunities</td>
<td>Confronting diversity</td>
<td>Questioning authority</td>
<td>Living compassion with values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Activism, non-defensive, structured</td>
<td>Group setting, identification</td>
<td>Personal service coordinator, supervisor, volunteers</td>
<td>Parents, clients, volunteers</td>
<td>Community inner peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals for Transition</td>
<td>From individual to group</td>
<td>From group to site, issue, or activity</td>
<td>From activity, site, or issue to community</td>
<td>From community to society</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990, p. 12-13)

Activation describes Phase 4 during which students question authority and examine larger societal issues. A student's development can be described as being from "cognitive bystander to full participant in the discussion of the larger and more complex questions of racism, classism, and economic injustice" (Delve et al., 1990, p. 16). For the students, reciprocity now comes to mean that the individuals are gaining more from their service than they are giving. The final phase is Internalization in which students "fully integrate their community-service experience into their lives and, as a result, make lifestyle and career decisions consistent with the
values gained from such experience” (Delve et al., p. 17). At this phase, students’ values seem to be much more integrated into their actions and lifestyle.

The Service Learning Model had much translation to examining the outcomes of service particularly in terms of student development. Despite the connection, the researcher had some criticisms of this model. First of all, the model only addressed the role of the server and not that of those served. Second, the model did nothing to describe the role that the individual may already have in the community and what this means in terms of commitment to community and service. A third question of the model is that there seemed to be a step missing between phase 3 and 4 during which students may retreat slightly to ascertain the depth and breadth of societal concerns, assess their values, and determine the impact that one can have on and with a community. This step would be similar to Resistance/Immersion/Emersion in racial identity models (e.g. Cross, Helms). Strand (as cited in Leary, 1994) has been critical of most service-learning models and programs and contends that these 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” (p. 33). The literature reviewed about the principles and theories of service created the building blocks for the rest of the literature review. The literature also informed the study for areas to probe and things to listen for from the participants.

Involvement Literature

Involvement literature was included in Chapter II because it added insights into motivations for and effects of involvement in service. The importance of involvement has been examined in the last 10-15 years. Astin (1977, 1984) found
that students who participate in almost all kinds of co-curricular activity are less likely to drop out and more likely to be satisfied with their college experience than students who do not participate. A report done by the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education (as cited in Fitch, 1991) found that "The more highly involved students are (through studies, participation in student organizations, work on-campus, and frequent interactions with faculty and student peers), 'the greater will be their growth and achievement, their satisfaction with their educational experiences, and their persistence in college, and the more likely they are to continue in their learning'" (p. 534). It was thus obvious that involvement usually exerts a positive influence on students.

The five postulates of involvement developed by Astin (1984) examined the nature of involvement and its connection to learning. These postulates had application to the study of the outcomes of service; these five postulates are:

1. Involvement refers to the investment of physical and psychological energy in various activities.
2. Involvement occurs on a continuum.
3. Involvement has both a quantitative and a qualitative feature.
4. The amount of student learning and personal development is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement.
5. The effectiveness of any educational policy or practice is directly related to the capacity to increase student involvement. (Astin, p. 298)

Postulate 4 was particularly applicable to this study since the quantity of service was expected to be fairly high so that the students would have had significant exposure to service and to the person or community being served. In addition, the quality of the service was relevant. Students in the study were expected to have performed direct service in which they were interacting with the community members being served.
Both the quantity and the quality of involvement in service were explored in the interviews.

In *What Matters in College?: Four Critical Years Revisited*, Astin (1993) researched the pattern of outcomes connected with the hours per week that students spent volunteering. The time spent volunteering had the strongest positive correlations with "the personality measures of Social Activism and Leadership and with participation in campus demonstrations, tutoring other students, and self-rated growth in leadership abilities" (Astin, p. 392). Participation by students in volunteer work also positively correlated with the attitudinal outcomes of commitment to developing a meaningful philosophy of life, promoting racial understanding, and participating in programs to clean up the environment (Astin). Though all of the research on involvement was not directly related to involvement in service, it still offered background and ideas to explore with the college students who were interviewed.

**Motivations and Characteristics of Students Involved in Service**

A variety of research studies regarding service exist, and most have found a small effect from service or no significant effect (Astin, 1993; Fitch, 1987; Leary, 1994). Similarly, some research has found that student volunteers differ initially from non-volunteers although other studies have found no significant differences (Fitch, 1987; Fitch, 1991; Winniford, Carpenter, & Grider, 1995). Weak methodology and short time span for service were often believed to be responsible for the small effects. A need still exists for research studies with strong methodologies and an in-depth experience. According to a research agenda by the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education, there is a "scarcity of replicable qualitative and quantitative research on the effects of service-learning on
student learning and development" (Giles, Porter Honnet, & Migliore, 1991, p. 5). Educators and political leaders still assert the impact of service on the individuals performing the service, on those receiving the service, and on the community, despite the need for research and the previous minimal results. The studies reviewed hint at the potential vastness of the impact of service on college students.

As was stated previously, some of the research indicated that students involved in service are different from non-volunteers (Fitch, 1987; Fitch, 1991; Winniford, Carpenter, & Grider, 1995). In a study of the characteristics and motivations of college students volunteering, Fitch (1987) studied 76 college students who were members of student organizations focused on service to the community. His literature review yielded that "Most studies indicate that motivations for volunteering can be divided into three categories: (a) altruistic, with a goal of increasing others' welfare; (b) egoistic, with a goal of increasing the helper's welfare; and (c) social obligation, with a goal of repaying a debt to society" (Fitch, 1987, p. 425). Fitch (1987) investigated the motivations for volunteering based on the three categories determined from the review of literature. The students completed a survey, the Student Community Service Involvement Survey, designed by the researcher for this study to ascertain the motivations. No validity or reliability information was reported for this instrument. Despite the categorization of motivations, the researcher performed no analysis to examine the motivations in this manner.

The researcher performed one-way analyses of variance "to determine whether the top three reasons listed as very important for volunteering were affected by the three demographic independent variables (sex, academic major, and religiosity)" (Fitch, 1987, p. 426). Overall, no or minimal effects were found. Most of the students (89%) had been involved in service prior to college (Fitch).
The most highly rated reason for being involved in service was "It gives me a good feeling or sense of satisfaction to help others" (Fitch, p. 426). This was the only response that was significantly higher than the following responses after performing a t test on the whole sample (Fitch). The study had several limitations including the lack of information about the survey, the sample was underrepresented in several sample cells including men and freshmen, and the number of analyses performed may signal Type I error (Fitch). In addition, students involved in service organizations may be different from individual students who volunteer. One possibility explored in the current study, gained from this study by Fitch, is whether having strong volunteer role models is important. Fitch found that 78% of the participants had parents who volunteer which he believed supported the idea that "role models play a significant part in the development of humanitarian concern and volunteerism" (p. 428).

In a later study by Fitch (1991), the researcher examined the differences between community service volunteers, extracurricular volunteers, and nonvolunteers. A previous study by Allen and Rushton (1983) compared volunteers and nonvolunteers and found that volunteers were more empathic, had more internalized moral standards, had a more positive attitude toward self, perceived themselves as more self-efficacious, self-directed and competent, and were more emotionally stable than nonvolunteers. In Fitch's study, the sample of 285 students was gathered through academic courses, and the students completed the Survey of Interpersonal Values (SIV) developed by Gordon (1976) and a demographic questionnaire (Fitch). The SIV yielded scores on the following scales: Support, Conformity, Recognition, Independence, Benevolence, and Leadership (Fitch). The survey had strong reliability and validity. In order to examine the differences among the students, they were classified into the categories of non extracurricular
involvement; current involvement in extracurricular activities, none of which were community service in nature; and current involvement in extracurricular activities, at least one of which involved community service (Fitch). There was no category created for students who are only or mainly involved in service.

The results examined the differences in student characteristics and found that the service group scored significantly higher on Conformity than the other two groups, that there were significant differences for all of the groups on Independence with the noninvolved students scoring highest and the service group scoring lowest, and the service group was significantly higher in Benevolence than the other two groups (Fitch, 1991). In addition, the service group had many more women, more residence halls students, and had an overrepresentation of Social majors based on Holland's typology (Fitch). The SIV needs further exploration to determine whether the survey is designed to ask about what students do or what they believe. Finally, another area raised by Fitch to be explored through the grounded theory study is "whether involvement influences values or values influence involvement" (p. 539).

A third study examining the traits and motivations of college students involved in service organizations was conducted by Winniford, Carpenter, and Grider (1995). The researchers wanted to explore the findings from previous studies including Serow's (1991) findings that students' motivation to volunteer was most often connected to a sense of satisfaction from helping others and Ilsley's (1990) writing that what motivates students to get involved in a service organization does not seem to be the same as what motivates them to stay. The two research questions in the study by Winniford, Carpenter, and Grider related to the characteristics of the volunteers and to the motivation for getting and staying involved in a college service organization. The sample consisted of 350 students who were members of service organizations at Texas A & M University which represented 79.46% of the
population of student members of student service organizations. The students completed a questionnaire designed by the researchers to gather demographic information and motivational factors as well as qualitative data gained from three open-ended questions about motivation. The instrument was reviewed by a panel of experts and pilot tested. The questionnaire had strong reliability and content validity (Winniford et al.).

The demographics yielded that the majority of the respondents were female (67.7%) which was overrepresentative of the campus population. The ethnic diversity was fairly representative of the campus with the exception of African Americans who were underrepresented. In regards to academic level, the large percentage of participants were sophomores (34.7%) followed by juniors, seniors, and freshmen. Many of the students (63%) had been involved in service prior to college (Winniford et al., 1995). In addition to this, "the majority of students also said that their parents were either moderately or extensively involved in service (70.8%)" (Winniford et al., p. 30). As for motivations to serve, altruistic motivations were rated most strongly followed by egoistic motivations and then social obligations (Winniford et al.). These results differed from previous studies. In addition, the results also indicated no significant difference between the reasons that students got involved and the motivations for staying involved (Winniford et al.). The researchers performed a factor analysis to evaluate their grouping of items according to the three motivation categories: altruistic, egoistic, and social obligation. The loadings were similar as was predicted; however, the egoistic factors for continued motivation were divided into "(a) enrichment motivations -- when the primary motivation for volunteering is to enhance or enrich the helper's skills and experiences for the helper's present or future benefits; and (b) affiliation motivations -- when the primary motivation is to meet the helper's needs for inclusion, affiliation,
and friendship" (Winniford et al., p. 32). The qualitative data yielded slightly different responses from the quantitative data in that the motivations for getting involved and those for staying involved differed although with the quantitative data, the reasons were the same. To some extent, the motivations for staying involved as opposed to getting involved were found to be more egoistic particularly "related to friendships and interactions with other people" (Winniford et al., p. 33). This result indicated the value that qualitative data can add to research. Winniford, Carpenter, and Grider drew five conclusions from their study:

1. Altruistic motivations are most important to students in their initial involvement in volunteer service organizations, followed by egoistic motivations.
2. Although students seem to be involved in volunteer service out of an altruistic concern for others, many students see egoistic rewards as important to their continued involvement.
3. Social obligation does not play a particularly important role in students' initial or continued involvement in service organizations.
4. The respondents' traits (background variables and demographics) were fairly similar to those of other volunteers as reported in the literature.
5. The instrument used by the researchers was shown to have good construct validity and moderate to good reliability, indicating that the altruistic, egoistic, and social obligation framework is appropriate for assessing volunteer motivation, although the social obligation factor may be less useful than the other two. (pp. 34-35)

This study was significant in that the findings were contradictory to some of the previous literature. The study suggested areas related to continued motivations for investigation in the grounded theory approach related to outcomes. Similarly, the
concept of social and civic responsibility may be related to the view of and involvement in service of the parents of the students. This related to the finding that "students whose parents were extensively involved in community service reported that social obligation responses were more important in becoming involved and staying involved in service than did those students whose parents were not involved in service" (Winniford et al., p. 35). It was difficult to determine whether social obligation was similar to social responsibility, but upon examining the individual items, it seemed unlikely. This study was very strong methodologically and can serve as a model to future research on service. This study also called for future studies utilizing one-on-one interviews to gain greater information regarding motivations and to clarify goals (Winniford et al.). Finally, the complexity of the volunteer dynamic and of the motivations and outcomes was illuminated through this study, thereby, highlighting the importance of a grounded theory study to illustrate the breadth and depth of the service experience.

Research on the Outcomes of Service

In addition to looking at the traits and motivations of volunteers, research has also been focused on the impact of service on the volunteers. In a research study by Myers-Lipton (1996), the effect of service-learning on the attitudes of students toward international understanding was studied. The study contained two groups of students who were involved in an intensive two-year service-learning experience including a minimum of six hours of service a week and four academic classes in which the service experience was integrated into the material and structured reflection occurred. The two control groups consisted of students performing service but without structured learning and a group of students involved in no service. The International Understanding Scale, designed by the Education Testing Service, was
administered to the participants. The results were factor loaded using principal components methods. The results were two "waves" which were described by Myers-Lipton as global concern and cultural respect. After controlling for pretest differences in international understanding, a multivariate analysis was run which yielded a moderate to strong result that students involved in service-learning gained greater global concern and cultural respect (Myers-Lipton). The researcher attempted to control for two of the problems believed to cause minimal effects of service in prior studies; these were weak methodology and lack of time span or intensity of service-learning. Despite the researcher's attempt at stronger methodology, the study had very small cell sizes to use the statistics, and the statistics used to control for initial differences were not delineated prior to the study. To support the finding regarding international understanding, further studies are needed.

Another study of academic service-learning examined the results of integrating a service-learning component into an undergraduate political science class at the University of Michigan (Markus, Howard, & King, 1993). The 89 participants were mainly sophomores and juniors enrolled in "Contemporary Political Issues." To control for confounding variables, two of the eight discussion sections were designated as community service sections while the remaining six control sections focused primarily on discussions related to the lecture or the reading. The students were unaware of the differences when enrolling. The participants completed pre- and post-tests related to their social and political beliefs and values using the "Social Responsibility Inventory" designed by Jeffrey Howard and Wilbert McKeachie (Markus et al.). The survey at the end of the course also included questions related to the students' perceptions of how the course had affected their personal orientation toward service and their community. In addition, all of the
participants completed a course evaluation. Grades and class attendance were also used for analysis. The students in the test group performed 20 hours of service over the 13 week semester at designated community agencies. The discussion sections for the test group reflected on the lecture and readings as well as on the service experiences and the connections to the course content. In addition, the teaching assistant for the community service sections periodically checked on the quality of the service at the community agencies. The study was well-designed to assure comparable experiences for the control and test groups, and the results revealed no significant differences between the test and control groups in terms of personal attitudes and values early in the class.

Utilizing paired t-test, the results indicated significant individual-level changes on 3 out of 15 items for the control group and 8 out of 15 items for the community service group on items related to beliefs and values (Markus et al., 1993). The students in the treatment group also had higher mean ratings for the degree that the course had increased their: "intention to serve others in need, intention to give to charity, orientation toward others and away from yourself, belief that helping those in need is one's social responsibility, belief that one can make a difference in the world, and tolerance and appreciation of others" (Markus et al., p. 413). Further results came from the course evaluation. A MANOVA was used to analyze the data which yielded statistical significance between the profile of means on eight items with the service group reporting more positive results (Markus et al.). Finally, the grades were significantly better, and the attendance was higher yet not statistically significant for the service group. The study offers potential for the outcomes of service considering the limitation of no psychometric information about the instrument.
A study by Batchelder and Root (1994) was designed to examine the outcomes for students involved in a program to integrate academic learning and service. The researchers combined quantitative and qualitative procedures to gather data, and they attempted to control for potential confounding variables. The researchers sought to measure dependent variables of cognitive approaches to social problems, prosocial moral development, and identity development (Batchelder & Root). In addition, they had a goal of investigating the effect of service-learning on occupational identity development. Student journals were also evaluated in regard to moral reasoning.

Participants in the study were recruited from undergraduate classes at a small, Midwestern liberal arts college. Of the 226 recruited, 96 students participated in the matched samples to measure a comparison of the effects of service-learning and non-service-learning classes on the cognitive variables; therefore, there were 48 people in each sub-sample (Batchelder & Root, 1994). These participants completed the Responses to Situations (RS) at the beginning and the end of the course to examine complex thinking. The students enrolled in the service-learning course with comparable content and the same instructor as the non-service-learning group. The service-learning students completed weekly journals and took the Evaluation of Service-Learning (ESL) at the end of the course. The ESL was designed by the researchers to assess the following constructs believed to be related to service-learning: autonomy, role clarity, in-class reflection, instructor support, relationship to site supervisor, perceived contribution to recipient, potential contribution to recipient, and instructional quality (Batchelder & Root). No psychometric information was given for either instrument; however, the interrater reliability for scoring the journals was 0.77 to 0.93 (Batchelder & Root). Hierarchical multiple regression procedures were utilized to assess the outcomes. In general, the results
indicated that participation in service-learning courses had a significant effect on students' "resolve to act in the face of acknowledged uncertainty and greater awareness of the multiple dimensions and variability in dealing with social problems." for the responses related to the course with some secondary results giving some support to the positive outcomes of service-learning (Batchelder & Root, p. 352). The methodological concerns of this study implied that the results must be regarded as suggestive only.

Another study compared ninth grade student perceptions before and after service-learning on the concepts of social and civic responsibility and political efficacy (Ridgell, 1994). Despite the age and developmental differences between high school and college students, the results were still believed to be related. Social and civic responsibility and political efficacy were measured by a pre- and post-test design using the National Learning Through Service Survey which has three scales of attitudes toward personal and social responsibility, intent to serve, and locus of control (Ridgell). The instrument had content validity but only minimal to moderate reliability. The sample consisted of 706 ninth graders from three high schools. The students took the post-test following four months of service. The results from the study found no significant differences on any of the three scales. The short length of time between the pre- and post-test and the small amount of time spent performing service may be responsible for the result of no significant differences. This study indicated the need for depth of service in studies and for qualitative research to illuminate the experiences of students involved in service and the outcomes for them.

One major national push to increase community service was the creation of the National Community Service Trust Act. One of the programs that developed from this is the Learn and Serve America program that consists of grants to promote service among students. Often the grant recipients were coalitions of schools,
agencies, and community action groups. The results from the first year of the program were promising. In particular, Astin and Astin (1996) from UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) were hired by RAND to study the outcomes of service for the college students from the Learn and Serve America, Higher Education (LASHE). They utilized the data from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) at HERI from the freshman survey and a follow-up survey. This study had the benefit of being both longitudinal and cross-sectional. The sample contained 3,450 students who attended 42 LASHE institutions. This sample was comprised of 2,309 service participants and 1,141 nonparticipants (Astin & Astin).

All of the results were statistically significant. The service participants were found to be significantly different from the nonparticipants in that the service participants were "more likely to have engaged in the following activities during high school: performing volunteer work, tutoring another student, attending religious services, participating in a community action program, and being a guest in a teacher's home" (Astin & Astin, 1996, p. 44). In addition to this, service participants were more likely to be women, had more confidence in the leadership abilities, and were less likely to attend college to make more money (Astin & Astin, p. 44). The LASHE study also examined some attitudinal differences and found that "nine out of ten students believed that helping other people is a very important reason to provide service;" about six out of ten students "felt that either personal satisfaction, improving the community, or improving society as a whole are very important reasons for service participation;" and three out of ten "participated in service in order to fulfill their civic or social responsibility" (Astin & Astin, p. 48). The results of the outcomes of service have been varied, but each study offered valuable information for the current study.
Service and Social and Civic Responsibility

It is believed that social and civic responsibility frequently occur as an outcome of service, particularly as individuals begin to understand their responsibility for societal problems. Much of the federal funding for service programs within education was based on this belief that service produces better, more committed citizens. According to Newmann (1990), community participation alone was "unlikely to offer much educational benefit unless it is accompanied by solid, in-depth study and rigorous reflection" (p. 76). The main task for democratic public citizens was hypothesized to be to "deliberate with other citizens about the nature of the public good and how to achieve it" (Newmann, 1990, pp. 76-77). Newmann (1990) believed that the civic participation agenda calls attention to five dimensions that can be addressed through education, service, and leadership. These five dimensions included (Newmann, 1990):

1. The necessity for decision and action in the face of pervasive uncertainty and ambiguity,
2. The morality of public policy and personal choice,
3. Issues of strategy in setting of policy and action goals,
4. Clarification of students' personal civic commitments,
5. How to enable students and teachers to talk with one another honestly and seriously about these issues. (p. 79)

Education and reflection aid in the development of students as public citizens, and this development can be furthered through service and leadership. In fact, Morse (1989) cited community and public service and leadership education as two of five main ways to prepare students for citizenship. According to Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990) and Newmann (1987), students who are involved in service are "not only educated about community needs, concerns, history, and culture but also
develop a deeper sense of civic responsibility" (Winniford et al., 1995, p. 27). Conrad and Hedin (1981) viewed civic and social responsibility to include responsible attitudes toward social welfare and personal duty, a sense of efficacy about the ability to fulfill social responsibilities, competence to take responsibility, and the concept that their actions and services are responsible tasks (p. 12). Civic responsibility, along with service, can be utilized to assist students in their development as public citizens in which they are active learners, reflect on their experiences, integrate their values, and act on their responsibilities. Additionally, service can assist students in synthesizing their private and public selves which is essential for citizenship. Finally, Morse saw the role of colleges and universities as helping students "to refine and expand their notions of citizenship and the common world through the classroom and how it is structured, by providing opportunities for experiential learning, and in creating a campus community where all constituencies can think together about their shared lives" (p. vi-vii).

In an article about citizen leadership and service, Perreault (1997) discussed three approaches to service including charity, service learning, and being a citizen leader. The charity approach was perceived as when those serving are helping those served and often focus on the have-have not differential. Learning may occur, but the potential for supporting stereotypes also existed. Little intentional learning was planned. For the service learning approach, the emphasis was on the combination of learning and service. Reciprocal learning was encouraged. The citizen leadership approach to service integrated service and leadership by teaching all of the community members, both the server and the served, how to be citizens who take responsibility for their community. This approach was created to address the absence of individuals taking responsibility for civic and social issues. It appeared that leadership training was offered to both the students and to the community
members who jointly defined the training needs. The citizen leader option in this model may be just a comprehensive, well-run service-learning program. While, in theory, the citizen leadership option appears good, a lot of challenges and roadblocks seemed to exist in this program. It was obvious from this article that civic or social responsibility is viewed as desirable and as connected to service.

In a study of the outcomes of service, Leary (1994) examined the effects of an academic service-learning program on the students' moral judgment, commitment to civic and social responsibility, and mastery of academic course content. The study occurred over the semester in two sections of an anthropology course in which one section participated in a service-learning experience of about 25 hours in length and the control section completed a library assignment requiring about 25 hours to complete. Leary used the Defining Issues Test (DIT) developed by Rest (1986) to measure moral judgment and the Social and Personal Responsibility Scale used in a study by Conrad and Hedin (1981) to measure changes in the commitment to social and civic responsibility. Academic mastery was determined by performance on a final essay examination. In addition to the instruments, the researcher also conducted interviews with the students and the instructor. Additional qualitative data was gathered through student reflection papers and the results of the community service questionnaires and the standardized course evaluations (Leary).

No significant differences were found for the volunteers versus the non-volunteers in gains in moral development, social and civic responsibility, and mastery of academic course content (Leary, 1994). Some modest differences were found for the volunteers from the qualitative data. "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" (Leary, p. 148). Some of the limitations of this study were the
short length of the service experience, the difficulty in integrating a service-reflection component into the course while providing a comparable experience for the two sections, and the generality of the instruments used. Twenty-five hours of community service is fairly minimal to expect significant differences. It may have been that it takes more time for changes in moral development and social and civic responsibility than a semester. Marsh (as cited in Leary) suggested that "it is often years after participation in community service that students begin to truly make sense of their experience" (p. 153).

Smith (1993) undertook a study using qualitative methods to examine the view of citizenship and civic responsibility as a desired outcome of service. A document analysis was completed as well as interviews and focus groups as a part of an institutional case study (Smith, 1994). Upon examining national level documents including the National and Community Service Act of 1990 and Campus Compact literature, Smith (1994) discovered that enhanced civic participation was the primary intended outcome of service for students. To examine how higher education viewed the desired outcomes of service, a case study was performed at a medium-sized, very selective, Catholic liberal arts college. The college offered a structured service-learning program and community service opportunities. Smith interviewed the Vice-Provost, four faculty members, and the Director of Community Service, none of whom mentioned civic responsibility or citizenship. When probed about the absence of citizenship as a desired outcome, most of the interviewees mentioned social responsibility and moral development as more primary goals (Smith, 1994). They tended to view citizenship as political. The student perspective was gathered from a total of eleven sophomores, juniors, and seniors who had recently completed a service-learning course. The outcomes that they focused on were personal
connections, confrontation of social issues, and social change; only one student even mentioned citizenship (Smith, 1994).

Toward the end of the interview, the students were questioned about how they viewed the connection between service and citizenship, and they saw it primarily as a disconnect. In a prior pilot study, none of the students mentioned civic participation, civic responsibility, or citizenship as an outcome of their service (Smith, 1994). The concepts that they did mention were not directly related to these concepts either. The implications of this study are that the institutional mission may affect students' perception of the desired outcomes of service. Similarly, if there is to be congruency between national priorities and institutional missions, a common language and a dialogue must be created. The study failed to mention the method of obtaining the students' perspectives. The study established the importance of language in clarifying desired outcomes. Similarly, this study informed the current study about the need to hear from the students what they perceive as the outcomes of service and to analyze the language that they use, which will occur in grounded theory.

In another study of the outcomes of service, Olney and Grande (1995) created and validated a measure of social responsibility based on the Service-Learning Model developed by Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990). This study was designed to assess the psychometric qualities of the Scale of Service Learning Involvement (SSLI) which was designed to measure college students' social responsibility related to community service and service learning from the Delve, Mintz, and Stewart model of service-learning. The researchers found it necessary to merge the five phases into three phases of Exploration, Realization, and Internalization because the statistics failed to discriminate between the first two stages as well as between the last two stages. Because of this, independent scales could not
be created for all five stages. (Olney & Grande). The SSLI was compared with both intellectual and moral development models because the service-learning theory emerged from these student development theories. The instruments were administered to a random sample of 285 college sophomores during a college assessment day at a mid-sized comprehensive university. The instruments administered were the Scale of Service Learning Involvement (SSLI), the Scale of Intellectual Development (SID) designed to measure Perry's intellectual development model, the Defining Issues Test (DIT) which assesses moral reasoning development as defined by Kohlberg and measured by Rest, and the Measure of Moral Orientation (MOM) that assesses moral development related to Gilligan's theory utilizing the two orientations of care and justice (Olney & Grande).

Despite varying results, overall "this validity study indicated that the SSLI could detect different levels of social responsibility development across groups who had varying degrees of commitment to volunteer service" (Olney & Grande, 1995, p. 49). In addition to the validity study, the researchers examined the relationship between level of service and social responsibility development. Four categories of service were identified related to the Center for Service Learning (CSL) and are listed in hypothesized order of commitment to service: no experience with CSL, experience as a requirement to complete an academic course, CSL experience as a volunteer and as a course requirement, and CSL experience as a volunteer (Olney & Grande). Using a one-way MANOVA, the model was found to be statistically significant in that as students' involvement in service increased, so did their social responsibility (Olney & Grande). Follow-up comparisons were also calculated with varying results. In general, the SSLI seemed very promising in terms of validity and its ability to measure social responsibility. The researchers also found that "the scale was able to discriminate among groups of students with differing levels of
commitment to volunteer work and social justice issues. The authors are currently revising the SSLI to create more independence between the Realization and Internalization subscales and to shorten the instrument to 50 items (Olney & Grande). The researchers had strong methodology, and their classification of level of service offered information to future studies.

Tenley (1997) used the Scale of Social Responsibility Development (SSRD), the revised version of the SSLI, in a study of the relationship between belief in a just world and social responsibility for college students involved in varying levels of community service. One of the findings in the study was that students who were involved in service on a more regular basis had higher scores on the Internalization subscale of the SSRD (Tenley). Internalization was previously described for the Service Learning Model; in this instrument, "the Internalization subscale represents a stage of development where students consider the implications of their life decisions on others, look for root causes behind social problems of concern, and think in a more complex manner about their service and community commitments" (Tenley, p. 89). This finding supported the relationship between service and social responsibility as well as supported the use of college students with ample service experience in the current study.

Giles and Eyler (1994a) looked at the outcomes of service in a more general sense of student development. The researchers examined the impact of a required service-learning experience of limited intensity and duration on college student development in terms of personal, social, and cognitive outcomes. The participants studied were 72 undergraduate students at Vanderbilt University who were enrolled in a one credit "Community Service Laboratory" as a requirement for interdisciplinary majors (Giles & Eyler). The researchers hoped to gain a greater understanding of social responsibility, recognizing the limitations of this short-term
study when social responsibility is "ultimately measured by the behaviors of citizenship over a lifetime" (Giles & Eyler, p. 330). Giles and Eyler used the following constructs to define social responsibility and to explore its outcome from service. The constructs are: a sense of personal efficacy which includes "faith that one can make a difference, a sense of being rewarded for involvement, and some connection to personal beliefs about change"; an attitude that one should make a difference including "valuing helping others and a commitment to helping others;" and a cognitive dimension that includes "reduction in stereotypes, development of empathic understanding, and a stronger sense of the social, structural elements of opportunity and achievement" (Giles & Eyler, p. 330). The study also attempted to gauge the students' commitment to continue service after the program was over.

Data were collected at the first class, at the fifth week of classes prior to beginning one's service, and at thirteen weeks following the completion of the community service. To collect the data, the researchers measured personal values and social responsibility with an instrument used in the Michigan study of "Social responsibility outcomes for students in service learning" (Markus, Howard, & King, 1993) as well as asked open-ended questions about their learning and experiences. To analyze the data, the open-ended questions were content coded and the scales in the instrument were scored on a 5-point interval scale. No reliability or validity information was given regarding the Michigan study. On the pre-post measures of efficacy and social responsibility, several measures were significant (p<.05) including work for equal opportunity and misfortunes due to circumstances, while other measures were significant (p<.01) including community involvement importance, become community leader, should give time, important/influence politics, and possible to impact the world (Giles & Eyler, 1994a). While other findings are listed, they are examined only in terms of frequency of responses that
offers little to the study. The authors recognized several limitations of the study including the inability to separate the effects of the service from the effects of the classroom piece of the service learning. The open-ended questions also needed further revision and validation. The study was viewed as an exploratory study and offered some insight into the connection between service and social responsibility and also recommended future directions for study. Further examination of the instrument and other data collection measures would be required to learn more about the results.

In the previously mentioned study of the Learn and Serve America, Higher Education program, Astin and Astin (1996) also studied the relationship between involvement in service and civic responsibility. On all twelve measure of civic responsibility, the service participants scored higher than the nonparticipants. "The most dramatic differences are in the areas of commitment to serving the community, planning to conduct volunteer work in the near future, commitment to participating in community action programs, and satisfaction with the opportunities for community service provided by the college" (Astin & Astin, p. 49). Other measures of civic and social responsibility that service participants were more committed to than nonparticipants were: "influencing social values, helping others in difficulty, promoting racial understanding, influencing the political structure, and getting involved in environmental cleanup" (Astin & Astin, p. 49). On a variety of measures and questions all meant to assess civic responsibility, students involved in service scored higher than non-volunteers; however, the statistical significance was not given.

Related to the concept of social and civic responsibility is the idea of commitment to community. Commitment to community could entail taking responsibility for social issues, working toward equity, and continued service.
Community, in many ways, is defined by the students. Community could be the campus community, the local community, the larger surrounding community, or one's home community. Service may help students to develop commitment to one's community, a concept similar to social responsibility.

In Levine's (1980) classic work, *When Dreams and Heroes Died*, college students of the 1970s were described as the "me" generation who turned their focus from others to self. Fortunately, the focus seems to be reverting to others and the need for commitment to community. Levine (1980) described this concept as community ascendancy which included "emphasis in duty to others, concern with responsibility, acceptance of the propriety of giving, future orientation, focus on the commonalities people share, and ascetic" (p. 25). In *When Hope and Fear Collide*, Levine (1998) described today's students as "more socially active than at any time since the 1960's" (p. xiv). Students are hopeful for the future yet also afraid of the enormity of societal issues. Overall, Levine (1998) found students to have a new level of localism. Levine goes on to say,

Students do not believe there can be quick fixes or universal solutions. They do not expect government to come to the rescue. Instead, they have chosen to become personally involved and to focus locally, on their community, their neighborhood, and their block. Their vision is small and pragmatic; they are attempting to accomplish what they see as manageable and possible. (p. 36)

Service can also assist in the development of community and a student's commitment to community. Relationships are tantamount to service, and relationships are the basis of community. The outcomes of service may relate to the relationships that are formed through service and how these relationships challenge
one's beliefs. Even if one's service is with an individual, it may help develop one's commitment to community or sense of responsibility for others.

In a fairly idealized perspective of community, Peck (1987) described community as "a group of individuals who have learned how to communicate honestly with each other, whose relationships go deeper than their masks of composure, and who have developed some significant commitment to 'rejoice together, mourn together,' and to 'delight in each other, make others' condition our own'" (p. 59). Some of the characteristics used to describe community are inclusivity, commitment, consensus, realism, and contemplation (Peck). Additionally, Peck described community as a safe place, a laboratory for personal disarmament, a group that can fight gracefully, a group of all leaders, and a spirit. While all of these descriptors may not apply equally to service relationships, they may at least be some of the desired outcomes. Service and community both strive to create something that is greater than the sum of its pieces. Finally, community is respectful, dynamic, empowering, and has a common purpose. The previous descriptions of community defined the desired outcome of service in which all people are valued and people take responsibility for social issues and creating positive change. It is the sincere hope that an outcome of service is commitment to community and social responsibility.

Summary of Literature Review

The literature reviewed contained principles of service, service as involvement, and some theoretical frameworks. Research studies related to the characteristics and motivations of volunteers were also included. Most pertinent was literature about the outcomes of service with many studies focused particularly on
social and civic responsibility. According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), literature in
a grounded theory study is used in the following ways:

1. Concepts derived from the literature can provide a source for making
comparisons to data at the dimensional level.
2. Familiarity with relevant literature can enhance sensitivity to subtle
nuances in data, just as it can block creativity.
3. There is a special sense in which published descriptive materials can be
used to enhance sensitivity.
4. Knowledge of philosophical writings and existing literature can be useful
under certain circumstances.
5. The literature can be used as a secondary source of data.
6. Before beginning a project, a researcher can turn to the literature to
formulate questions that act as a stepping off point during initial observations
and interviews.
7. The technical literature also can be used to stimulate questions during the
analysis process.
8. Areas for theoretical sampling can be suggested by the literature,
especially in the first stage of the research.
9. When an investigator has finished his or her data collection and analysis
and is in the writing stage, the literature can be used to confirm findings and,
just the reverse, findings can be used to illustrate where the literature is
incorrect, is overly simplistic, or only partially explains the phenomena. (pp.
49-52)

The literature helped weave a background canvas for things to probe with the
participants. The literature will be revisited in Chapter V for the interpretation and
application of the grounded theory.
The literature review was designed to give depth and breadth to the concepts explored in this grounded theory study of the outcomes of service. The literature informed the methods and the interviews in terms of key concepts to explore with the students involved in the study. Finally, the reviewed studies highlighted the need for qualitative research to enliven the view of service and its outcomes of college students. Many of the concepts and outcomes described in the literature review had small levels of significance or were unclear regarding their meaning. This study was designed to hear in the words of the students what they viewed as their outcomes of service and what responsibility might mean to them. It was structured to probe how participants thought they were different from their involvement in service and the literature helped inform this process.
CHAPTER III
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

As service has increased on campuses, faculty and student affairs professionals have cited it as a catalyst for student development, yet little research or theory exists related to this phenomenon. According to Thomas Ehrlich (1996), "Community service linked to academic study can also promote civic learning on the one hand and moral learning on the other" (p. xiii). Mostly anecdotal evidence supports student development through involvement in service. To examine this arena in more depth, this study using grounded theory was designed to explore the experience of college students involved in service to examine what they saw as the outcomes for themselves and how social and civic responsibility are connected to service and to the other outcomes.

A grounded theory approach is "a qualitative research method that uses a systematic set of procedures to develop an inductively derived grounded theory about a phenomenon" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 24). Because of the cyclical nature of data collection and data analysis, grounded theory is frequently labeled as "the constant comparative method of analysis" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, pp. 101-116). Grounded theory was selected for the methodology because of the lack of research and theory connecting service and the outcomes for servers.

The study was designed to create grounded theory related to the outcomes of service, particularly focused on social and civic responsibility. College students perform community service and service learning for a variety of reasons, and it is likely that they all gain something. The students cannot be untouched by their service; therefore, they change and grow from this service. The study was intended to explore how the students make meaning of their involvement and its outcomes.
Design of the Study

Understanding the methodology of the study was significant to the findings. Grounded theory was developed by two sociologists, Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss, to "build theory that is faithful and illuminates the area under study" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 24). According to Strauss and Corbin, "A well-constructed grounded theory will meet four central criteria for judging the applicability of theory to a phenomenon: fit, understanding, generality, and control" (p. 23). These criteria first were developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967). According to Glaser and Strauss, "the theory must fit the substantive area to which it will be applied" (p. 238). It is very important that the theory is induced from the data as opposed to being developed from the researcher's views and beliefs. Secondly, a grounded theory will be understandable and make sense to lay persons and people working in the particular area of the theory (Glaser & Strauss). In referring to the criteria of generality, Glaser and Strauss stated,

In deciding upon the conceptual level of his categories, the sociologist generating theory should be guided by the criteria that the categories should not be so abstract as to lose their sensitizing aspect, but yet must be abstract enough to make his theory a general guide to multi-conditional, ever-changing daily situations. Through the level of generality of his concepts he tries to make the theory flexible enough to make a wide variety of changing situations understandable, and also flexible enough to be readily reformulated, virtually on the spot, when it does not work in application. The person who applies the theory will, we believe, be able to bend, adjust or quickly reformulate a grounded theory when applying it, as he tries to keep
up with and manage the situational realities that he wishes to improve. (p. 242)

Finally, the criteria of control refers to the ability of a person using the grounded theory to apply it to everyday situations and to understand both the object of change and the total situation. The control also refers to the idea that the "person who applies the theory must be enabled to understand and analyze ongoing situational realities, to produce and predict change in them, and to predict and control consequences both for the object of change and for other parts of the total situation that will be affected" (Glaser & Strauss, p. 245). All four criteria are central to grounded theory and were utilized in this study.

Grounded theory reflects the diversity of the sociologists' backgrounds and taken together creates a stronger methodology. From Strauss, the contributions are "(a) the need to get out into the field, if one wants to understand what is going on; (b) the importance of theory, grounded in reality, to the development of a discipline; (c) the nature of experience and undergoing as continually evolving; (d) the active role of persons in shaping the worlds they live in; (e) an emphasis on change and process, and the variability and complexity of life; and (f) the interrelationships among conditions, meaning, and action" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, pp. 24-25). Glaser promoted the structure because he "saw the need for a well thought out, explicitly formulated, and systematic set of procedures for both coding and testing hypotheses generated during the research process" (Strauss & Corbin, p. 25).

Research Questions

Though grounded theory promotes flexibility in interviewing in order to adapt to the findings through constant comparison, some general questions were designed to initiate the first interviews in order to give some direction to the participants. The
questions were designed to probe the experience of service and what the outcomes have been for the students. These initial questions were seen only as starting points at gathering information and developing trust and rapport. According to Creswell (1994), the researcher should expect that the research questions will evolve and change during the study as is typical of an emerging design.

The grand tour question of the study was what are the outcomes of community service and/or service-learning for college students, looking in particular at social and civic responsibility. A grand tour question is a "statement of the question being examined in the study in its most general form" (Creswell, 1994, p. 70). The interview questions that were designed to begin the exploration of the grand tour question were:

1. Describe your experience with service.
2. Who or what motivated(s) you to get involved in service?
3. Do you believe that you are different because of your involvement in service? If so, in what ways have you changed because of your service? What have you learned through your involvement in service?
4. How do you think you are different now from before your service experiences? What would you describe as the outcomes of service for you?
5. Do you feel a sense of responsibility for others or for your community? If so, in what ways is this responsibility exhibited?
6. How is your sense of social responsibility connected to your service? What service experiences have been pivotal in your exploration of responsibility?
7. What other factors may have contributed to your social responsibility and/or commitment to community?
Based on the comments from the initial focus group and the first round of interviews, the list of questions was too ambitious for the first interviews. The goal of the first interviews was to create trust and to begin exploring the experience of service. The questions and focus for the second and third interviews evolved from the previous interviews, thereby taking into account the new findings and coding. Throughout the process, the researcher was open to emerging questions that came from the words of the students (See Appendix H for Interview Questions used).

Participants

The participants were undergraduate students at the University of Maryland, College Park in the academic year 1997-1998. They were primarily juniors and seniors who had been involved in service throughout their college experience, in one way or another. They represented a variety of academic majors and a diversity of service experiences. All of them had completed at least 100 hours of community service while in college. This quantity of service was selected because it represented significant time volunteering; therefore, the students were more likely to have been affected by the service and to be able to articulate the outcomes of this service. In order to represent maximum variation, some were members of service organizations at the University of Maryland and some performed community service either individually or with an off-campus organization such as a church or temple or a community group. None of the participants had taken a service-learning course.

The participants were selected using purposeful sampling because for grounded theory, it is important to utilize information-rich participants with respect to community service and service-learning. The purpose in selecting the participants was "to develop a deeper understanding of the phenomenon being studied" as well as to discover theories (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996, p. 217). The sample size was small
in order to "achieve an in-depth understanding of the selected individuals, not to select a sample that will represent accurately a defined population" (Gall et al., p. 218). For qualitative research, the goal is applicability, not population validity. The theory determined the appropriate sample size; therefore, it was difficult to begin with concrete numbers; rather, the sample emerged from the defined methods.

In particular, snowball sampling was used to identify students who were information-rich and to create a highly credible sample that occurred when the names of several students were mentioned by different well-situated people (Gall et al., 1996, p. 234). According to Gall, Borg, and Gall, "Snowball or chain sampling involves asking well-situated people to recommend cases to study" (p. 234). Members of the campus community were asked to nominate students who they knew to be actively involved in service. In order to get a varied sample, the well-situated people who were contacted to elicit participants included entry-level student affairs professionals, academic deans, directors, and high-level administrators. The researcher believed that the diversity of nominators would assure a more varied participant list. The use of snowball sampling also allowed the researcher to add several participants as their names occurred repeatedly from the already established sample. These participants were added following the first interviews, but they were interviewed for the first round. It must be noted that a central feature of qualitative research and purposeful sampling was the "evolving nature of sampling as the study progressed" (Jones, 1995, p. 76). Therefore, the sampling occurred until the participants fully represented the phenomenon being studied. The exception was that none of the participants had taken a service-learning course, but no one in the nominated sample had this experience.

The challenge in qualitative research is to balance breadth and depth (Gall et al., 1996). Since the participants were all determined to be information rich, eight
people were originally selected for the sample based on the recommendations of the "experts;" however, one subject chose not to participate. Following the reiteration of snowball sampling with the participants, the sample was expanded by two people to greater represent maximum variation in order to understand the diversity of the service outcomes. At the conclusion of the interviews, the participants met as a focus group to examine the theory and model that the researcher had developed from the findings. This component helped increase the depth of the work. The sampling in this study was critical in reaching redundancy that is vital to grounded theory.

Researcher as Instrument

In qualitative research, the researcher serves as the instrument; therefore, it seemed critical that as the researcher, I examined my experience and bias related to service and its outcomes. The analysis of data occurs through the human instrument, rather than through surveys or inventories (Creswell, 1994). With this in mind, I considered my experiences with service, both personally and professionally. Community service and service-learning are things that I value for what they give to both the server and the served. I believe that through this interaction, particularly if ongoing, both parties learn a lot about one's self and about others. From my own participation and from my observation of college students involved in service, I believe that some measurable outcomes can occur. Depending on the type and extent of the service and whether there is a reflection component, I believe that the outcomes are generally positive, but that some of the outcomes may be negative and can reinforce stereotypes.

Personally, my sense of social responsibility has increased through service as have my understanding of power and privilege. In particular, the inequity of our society has been enforced through my experiences with service as well as my
responsibility for the social issues. My difficulty in bounding this study was in describing the phenomenon of social responsibility which many view as civic responsibility. Another question around these concepts that is usually present for me is whether social and civic responsibility are attitudinal, behavioral, or both. Through the interviews, the participants were asked to describe their responsibility and what it meant to them and whether they acted on this responsibility.

My professional experiences with service have included creating a community service program at a university, starting a community service organization for students, coordinating an alternative break program, and teaching a service-learning course. My abstract thought is that social responsibility is affected by service; however, I am uncertain whether the change is just in thinking or if it is in action. Similarly, I question the direction of the relationship; a sense of social responsibility may encourage service or vice versa. The lack of research on the outcomes of service combined with my interest in service as a means of student development prompted me to use grounded theory to explore the outcomes of service, with particular focus on social and civic responsibility. In order to account for my previous experience and knowledge of the literature base, a team of peer debriefers was utilized to question the meaning making and to increase credibility.

Considerations for Enhancing the Trustworthiness of Qualitative Research

Qualitative research must be judged by its own standards rather than applying the considerations for a different paradigm, quantitative research. This study should be evaluated in terms of its trustworthiness which was accounted for by four constructs defined by Lincoln and Guba (1985); these constructs are credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Credibility, the concept that "the inquiry was conducted in such a manner as to ensure that the subject was accurately
identified and described," was assured by the deep, rich description complete with levels, conditions, and consequences (Marshall & Rossman, 1995, p. 143). Credibility was insured by the use of peer debriefers and member checking as the participants reviewed the findings. Peer debriefers assisted the researcher in examining the findings and questioning the meaning making of the research to assure that the lens of the researcher did not bias the findings. Peer debriefers also assisted in designing future questions to get at the grand tour question. Transferability was taken into consideration by stating the parameters of the research recognizing that applying the results to another setting would be the responsibility of the next researcher or practitioner. Though generalizability is mainly a quantitative construct, transferability was improved in this study by triangulating the data through the use of multiple participants with diverse experiences. Dependability was the third construct considered in the study by recognizing that the social world is constantly changing and being re-constructed (Marshall & Rossman). Finally, confirmability was strengthened by taking steps to assure that "the data help(ed) confirm the general findings and lead to the implications" (Marshall & Rossman, p. 145). The use of an inquiry auditor assisted in confirmability as this person reviewed all of the research steps and the findings to ascertain that the process was followed. The inquiry auditor reviewed the transcripts and the coding notes (See Appendix A for a letter confirming his participation). This person was familiar with community service as well as methodology. In addition, the participants met as a focus group following the third set of interviews to review the findings and evolving theory and to offer feedback, critiques, and suggestions.

Some of the controls taken by the researcher to improve the trustworthiness of the study included enlisting the assistance of peer debriefers to question the data analysis and to check the meaning making, using participants with diverse
experiences with service and potential negative cases, and following the methodology defined for grounded theory. The researcher also "devise(d) tests to check analyses and appl(ied) the tests to the data, asking questions of the data" (Marshall & Rossman, 1995, p. 145). The participants also checked the data at multiple points by reviewing and clarifying transcriptions. Finally, an audit of the data collection and analyses was conducted (Marshall & Rossman). All of the design choices and methodology intentionally were designed and followed to increase the trustworthiness of the study.

Pilot

A pilot focus group was conducted to determine reaction to the research questions and to assess what the focus group perceived from the questions prior to beginning the data collection. The focus group consisted of students known by the researcher to be involved in community service and/or service-learning. The focus group responded to the questions following the brief overview of the study (similar to what was given to the study participants). The answers and reactions helped the researcher to revise the questions. Upon completion of the pre-determined questions, the focus group gave feedback about the questions. They also suggested other questions for the first round of interviews as well as hints about what things to probe in greater depth in future interviews. The focus group also assisted in identifying some potential key participants. It is important to note that none of the students who participated in this focus group were members of the actual study. In addition to the focus group, service-learning professionals were asked for feedback related to the questions and to the study, in general. They also were asked to nominate information-rich students. As was stated previously, purposeful sampling was utilized to identify students who had extended experiences with service (See
Appendix B for the letter sent to nominators, and Appendix C for the nomination letter).

Procedures

The study began with the pilot study that was described previously. From the pilot study, it was determined that the original list of questions was too ambitious for the first set of interviews since the participants share a lot about their service experiences and its meaning for them. In general, the focus of the first interviews was on the participants' service experiences, how they started serving, and their motivations to continue serving. The use of grounded theory encouraged the questions to emerge from the interviews. The original questions were maintained as a guide for the interviews. Concurrent to the pilot study, the researcher used snowball sampling to identify potential, information-rich participants. A variety of "experts" from the University of Maryland were asked for the names of potential participants after hearing about the design of the study. These experts represented various offices and departments on campus as well as various levels of responsibility. Experts from several culture-specific or multicultural offices and programs were also asked for potential participants; they were selected because they were knowledgeable about diverse students involved in service who might not be known by the other experts and who might be more truly "insiders." These "experts" were selected because of their high contact with students, particularly with those students who were involved in service, and because of the belief that they are "well-situated people to recommend cases to study" (Gall et al., 1996, p. 234). The lists of students were cross-referenced to create a sample of nine participants who were considered to be a highly credible sample based on the feedback from the well-situated people.
The potential participants were sent a letter (see Appendix D) describing the study and listing the people who had recommended them for inclusion. The intent of the letter was to provide background to the study. Shortly after the potential participants received the letter, the researcher phoned the potential participants to determine their interest in participating in the study. At the time of the phone call, the study was described in greater depth and an initial interview was set up (see Appendix E for the Participant Information Sheet sent to each of the participants). The participants were told about the incentive to participate both in the letter and on the phone. The incentive was a $25 gift certificate to the location of their choice for each participant or $25 donated to the charity of their choice.

The initial interviews were done in the student union and in other public areas selected by the students, all of which were selected by the participants for convenience. The initial interviews lasted between forty-five and ninety minutes, and they were audio tape recorded. The interviews began with an overview of the purpose of the study that stressed the importance of understanding the student's experience. Confidentiality and anonymity were guaranteed at this time, and the participants completed an informed consent form (see Appendix F) and a Participant Identification Agreement Form (see Appendix I). Building rapport was a goal of the first interviews. In addition, the format for the interview and for the rest of the study was described. This included the requested review of transcriptions and additional interviews until saturation was reached. The expectation of meeting as a final focus group to review and critique the findings also was described.

For the first interviews the research questions served as a guideline, but the students' words served as a greater road map of where the information gathering would proceed. At the end of the first interviews, the participants were asked if they thought there was anyone else who should be included in the study who would
greatly illuminate the phenomenon (i.e. snowball sampling). From this, a list of two potential participants was created. These students were contacted in the same manner as before, and both agreed to participate. They all were interviewed a little later for the first round of interviews.

Following each interview, the audio tape was transcribed, normally within a 72 hour period. The transcription was reviewed by the researcher, and a copy was sent to the participant so that he or she could review what was said and make changes or comments (see Transcript Cover Letter in Appendix G). A comment sheet was attached to the transcription to gain feedback. This assisted in identifying future discussion topics or areas that needed further exploration. The participants were asked to return the reviewed transcription within two weeks; upon receipt of the transcription, a second interview was scheduled. If the participant missed the deadline, a follow-up call was made, and in all cases, the reviewed transcription was returned within a week and a second interview was scheduled. Though participants reviewed and returned the transcripts, few comments were given. Instead, the perusal of transcripts frequently served as a review to prepare for the next interview. Using the constant comparative method, the researcher examined all of the transcriptions from the first set of interviews for working hypotheses (e.g., themes and areas to delve into further). At the conclusion of each round of interviews, a team of peer debriefers assisted in coding and analyzing the findings. The coding was described in the data analysis section. This method increased confirmability and credibility as well as assisted in the data analysis to ascertain whether the meaning-making was biased and to gain additional perspectives. At this point, additional areas to explore were noted.

The second set of interviews was scheduled in a similar fashion following receipt of the reviewed transcriptions. All of the interviews again lasted between 60-
90 minutes. During these interviews, the researcher explored questions that had emerged from the review of the previous transcriptions as well as probed areas related specifically to the individual participants. In an attempt to reach redundancy and to explore further variation, the participants were asked for the names of students who may have had different experiences or who might be negative cases (C.C. Strange, personal communication, March 19, 1997). Negative cases would be individuals who have been involved in similar service but have had very different experiences and outcomes. None of the participants knew people who were negative cases, so no new participants were added. After each second interview was completed, the tape was transcribed and once again sent to the participants for review and feedback with the same guidelines as before. The researcher and the team of peer debriefers were also simultaneously culling through the findings using primarily open and axial coding techniques described in the following data analysis section.

The final stage in data collection was a third set of interviews that were needed to reach redundancy. At this point, the emerging themes were shared with the participants for their thoughts, agreement or questioning. The remaining questions were explored, with greater focus on the meaning given to social and civic responsibility. The participants also agreed to, not only review the third transcription, but also to explore the emergent framework created from the findings as a focus group of all of the participants. After the researcher had developed the emergent framework from the findings, a focus group was conducted to gather feedback and suggest revisions. This was extremely helpful to revisioning the emergent theory and framework. The whole data gathering process was an ongoing cycle of meaning-making and comparisons. For the remaining data analysis, selective coding was utilized as well as the use of a conditional matrix (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).
Data Analysis

Unlike quantitative research, data analysis is an ongoing endeavor in qualitative research because of the continual need to make meaning and reassess the data. In other words, "data collection and data analysis are tightly interwoven processes, and must occur alternatively because the analysis directs the sampling of data" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 59). Coding is at the heart of data analysis in grounded theory. "Coding represents the operations by which data are broken down, conceptualized, and put back together in new ways" (Strauss & Corbin, p. 57). Coding is critical in creating theoretical frameworks from the data that accurately make meaning of the findings.

According to Strauss and Corbin (1990), "The analytic procedures of grounded theory are designed to" do the following:

1. Build rather than only test theory.
2. Give the research process the rigor necessary to make the theory "good" science.
3. Help the analyst to break through the biases and assumptions brought to, and that can develop during, the research process.
4. Provide the grounding, build the density, and develop the sensitivity and integration needed to generate a rich, tightly woven, explanatory theory that closely approximates the reality it represents. (p. 57)

In order to achieve these goals of grounded theory, coding was utilized following each set of interviews. The analysis in grounded theory consists of three types of coding which are often used sequentially; these are open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin). In addition, a conditional matrix was developed.
Following the first set of interviews, open coding and then axial coding were performed. Both types of coding were used in order to break down the data and then to, in a way, rebuild the data. "Open coding is the part of analysis that pertains specifically to the naming and categorizing of phenomena through close examination of data" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 62). For open coding, the researcher started by breaking down the data (transcriptions) by word, phrase, or sentence, depending on which fit with the findings. At this point, the data were labeled to conceptualize their meaning. From here, the researcher grouped the concepts into categories that were then labeled. The naming of the category was an important step for the meaning making (see Appendix J for the categories formed).

Following the open coding, or actually accompanying it, the researcher used axial coding to put the data "back together in new ways by making connections between a category and its subcategories" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 97). More specifically, the focus of axial coding is "on specifying a category (phenomenon) in terms of the conditions that give rise to it; the context (its specific set of properties) in which it is embedded; the action/interactional strategies by which it is handled, managed, carried out; and the consequences of those strategies" (Strauss & Corbin, p. 97). A paradigm model was created in axial coding to relate the subcategories to the categories (Strauss & Corbin). Axial coding assisted in creating distinct differences among the findings. According to Strauss and Corbin, "The discovery and specification of differences among and within categories, as well as similarities, is crucially important and at the heart of grounded theory" (p. 111).

Both open coding and axial coding were repeated following the second round of interviews to analyze the data. Their utilization as a process usually is thought of in tandem; "though open and axial coding are distinct analytic procedures, when the researcher is actually engaged in analysis he or she alternates between the two
modes" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 98). This second review of the findings created some new paradigm models. Upon completion of all of the data collection, the researcher analyzed the volumes of data by selective coding that involved creating a grounded theory by integrating the categories. Though this step was complex, it was similar to axial coding but done "at a higher more abstract level of analysis" (Strauss & Corbin, p. 117). The steps of selective coding, paraphrased, are "explicating the story line, relating subsidiary categories around the core category by means of the paradigm, relating categories at the dimensional level, validating those relationships against the data, and filling in the categories that need further refinement and/or development" (Strauss & Corbin, pp. 117-118).

The final step of data analysis was making use of the conditional matrix to examine the levels of conditions and consequences. This was critical in assessing the grounded theory as a transactional system that "examines action/interaction in relationship to their conditions and consequences" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 158). At the conclusion of the analysis, the grounded theory was completed and a model was created which is explained in the results.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS OF THE STUDY AND EMERGING THEORY

Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it's the only thing that ever has. (Margaret Mead, as cited in Chambliss, et al., p. 9)

Overview

The participants in this study are thoughtful, committed students who openly shared their experiences and thoughts regarding community service. This chapter offers the opportunity to learn about the rich grounded theory that emerged from the words of the students. The study was conducted to examine the outcomes of community service for college students with particular attention to social and civic responsibility, yet much more emerged from the participants. While the outcomes of community service were an important key category, the whole experience or "cycle" of community service became the main story line. Grounded theory methodology was utilized in order to reap the richest results by analyzing the interview transcripts for the nine participants from their three individual interviews as well as the focus group. The constant comparative method of grounded theory required that the researcher was immersed in the words, thoughts, and texts of the college students to best understand their experiences of community service and their outcomes. The researcher went beyond identifying themes to ground the emerging theory in the words of the participants and flesh out the categories to redundancy. While each of the participants had a unique story to tell, the stories merged into a rich description of their growth, learning, and process of community service.
The three levels of coding described in Chapter III were utilized to make meaning of the transcripts. This coding resulted in the core category, five key categories (Appendix K), 40 categories (Appendix J), and over 1,800 concepts. The core category is the central story line of the research and describes the framework of how the key categories are integrated into the theoretical framework of the college students' experiences and development with community service. "The central phenomenon is at the heart of the integration process. It is the essential cement in putting together—and keeping together properly—all the components in the theory" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, pp. 123-124). In order to describe the results most effectively, a description of the participants is given, followed by an overview of the emerging theory. Following this, the key categories from the grounded theory are described, ending with the theoretical framework of the core category and synthesis of the findings.

Description of the Participants

The participants are the heart of grounded theory, so it is particularly important to learn about them. The emerging theory and the description of the categories are enhanced with the words of the participants throughout this chapter. The participants ranged from sophomores to graduating seniors with a diversity of academic majors. The breadth of majors ranged from physics to nutrition to health education to women's studies. Overall, the participants seemed to be committed students academically with over half of them also involved in co-curricular activities on the college campus, some even in leadership positions. The sample was comprised of six women and three men, and the racial and ethnic makeup was five White students, two African-American students, one Asian American student, and one self-described Hispanic student. As was an expectation of the sampling, all of
the participants had performed a minimum of 100 hours of community service; most had substantially more service experience. The service of the participants included ongoing service at one site, service through a student organization, and more sporadic service at a variety of sites. In order to learn a bit more about the participants, a brief description is given of each student as they described themselves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hugh     | 20 year old, white, openly gay male  
Junior majoring in health education  
Community service mainly in health education and HIV/AIDS  
Deeply committed to these issues |
| Shari    | Caucasian woman  
Junior majoring in community health education  
Californian and values the perspective her origin gives her  
Serves mainly with HIV/AIDS and health issues |
| Christina | Filipina American woman  
Graduating senior majoring in Asian American studies  
Self-described as an activist and an advocate for Asian American issues |
| Christopher | Sophomore Hispanic male  
Currently majoring in physics but likely changing to education  
From the local area of the university  
Serves as a tutor and mentor |
| Ashley   | Black female from Maryland  
Senior majoring in education  
Serves primarily as a tutor and in classrooms |
| Habitat 1 | Caucasian female  
Junior majoring in political science and journalism  
Highly involved in Habitat for Humanity  
Served as the student organization president  
Editor for the school newspaper |
| Suzanne  | Caucasian female  
Senior majoring in women's studies  
Identifies herself as a women's advocate  
Serves with a women's shelter and with prostitutes |
Debra  Caucasian female  
Senior dietetics major  
Highly involved with Alpha Phi Omega service fraternity  
Worked in Community Service Programs, a campus office that furthers community service and service-learning

Vincent  African American male  
Senior anthropology major  
Volunteers at a homeless shelter and soup kitchen as well as with Alpha Phi Omega

The experiences and words of the participants were rich and truly created this study. Their voices are heard in each of the key categories to enliven the findings.

Overview of Emerging Theory: Service Helix

While the original intent of the study was to understand the outcomes of community service for college students with a particular emphasis on social and civic responsibility, the whole developmental experience or cycle of involvement in community service became the emerging theory. The outcomes of community service was a key category, but the process of the service experience became the major focus. The main story line of this study was the developmental model of community service through which the participants moved. The students could not describe their outcomes without talking about their experiences with service as well as what continued to bring them back to the service. This section provides an overview of the service cycle or helix (core category) before presenting the key categories that are a part of the main story line. A more in-depth discussion of the core category of the service cycle takes place following the key categories.

A helix best describes this grounded theory for its multidimensionality and movement that symbolize growth and development during the participants' experiences with community service. Each experience and outcome builds on a previous one and predominantly increases in complexity. The helix illustrated
below has some similarities to Kegan's (1982) helix of evolutionary truces that demonstrates development and lifelong tensions. The participants in this study frequently discussed their change and development through community service. The students recognized that there were some key "places" for them in this development, representing the key categories. These key categories are background, catalysts, service experience, personalization, and outcomes. The relationship between these key categories and how they comprise the core category can be seen in Figure 1. The participants described their growth and movement through these categories as places they "visit" again and again but usually with increasing complexity; hence, the illustration of a helix (Figure 2). This figure shows the development that occurs with time as students cycle through the respective key categories.

Figure 1: Service Cycle
The students described getting involved in community service when their background and at least one catalyst created the impetus to begin serving. This was the converging point of their background and one or more catalysts as can be seen in Figure 1. Frequently, there was an overlap between these two key categories since many of the background features served as catalysts at one point or another. The students then progressed to an actual service experience. The service experience may vary based on the type of service, the amount of time at the service site, the level of commitment, the other volunteers, and the interaction with community members, to name a few. The service experience has many categories that are explained in that section.

Figure 2: Service Helix
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Following an experience with service, these students described a place of personalization where they internalize something related to service. This personalization, another key category, could be a connection to the social issues, a sense of belonging with the community, a feeling of responsibility, or knowledge about privilege and responsibility as well as other concepts. Personalization meant that an involvement in service became a part of their identity. As before, this category of personalization is described in detail later in this chapter. Finally, the participants discussed a constellation of outcomes that was the final location on this service cycle before returning to some catalysts to continue service. Their new experiences with service as well as outside experiences became the new background category. The outcomes ranged from personal development, intellectual development, and a sense of responsibility to leadership. This key category also is discussed more fully. The reason for the model of the service cycle was that the participants frequently discussed the process of their community service along with the content, thereby becoming the main story line with the key categories elaborating on the participants' development through community service.

A helix is used to discuss this service cycle because the participants continued to cycle through the same key categories, just usually at a different level of complexity or development the next time. For this model, the vertical axis is defined as development to illustrate the movement through the different key categories. The helix itself describes the service journey. While the study revealed that all of the participants moved through this service helix, the rate of development varied for the individual participant as well as it would fluctuate at different times per individual participants, i.e. both inter- and intra-participant rate variation. As the participants had different experiences with community service as well as other life experiences, they would progress through the cycle and hence the helix at different rates.
The helix model of development with community service suggests consistent movement; however, the development is not that regular. The participants had periods of greater growth, symbolized by a larger space between coils (Figure 3), as well as periods of minimal growth where they continued to develop but at a much slower pace. This is illustrated in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Model of participants' growth
In addition to this, most of the participants had at least one time where they stopped off or paused on the service helix. The pause was related to outside factors, experiences with service, or both for the participants. The stopping off did not occur at a predictable time or place. Frequently, the participants cited being overwhelmed with all that they were doing, particularly schoolwork, so they took a break from service until they had time and energy to serve again. For a variety of reasons, these participants ceased serving until a catalyst started them on the developmental helix again. The lack of movement illustrates that the service journey has temporarily ceased as has the development from this aspect of the student’s life. This phenomenon is discussed in greater depth under the key categories of catalysts.

The other characteristic of the service helix that is critical to understand before proceeding in describing the key categories is that the key categories or “circles” are not as distinct as the figure may seem. Many of the concepts that are a part of the key categories are not insular; they may appear in several of the key categories and have different meanings at each site. For example, a belief that one can make a difference can be a catalyst to serve, a component of personalization, and an outcome. Similarly, a belief that one can make a difference can even affect the community service including the quality, the interaction, or the level of involvement with the issue, site, or community member. This example illustrates the relationship between the key categories and the interconnectedness of many of the concepts. With this said, several of the other concepts are distinctive to their key category, but they still may affect the development through the service cycle.

This overview of the main story line should set the context for understanding the five key categories. Each of the key categories is described in depth and with words from the participants before returning to the main story line. At that time, the theoretical model of the service helix is further explored thereby revealing its
complexity. Each of the five key categories should be viewed through the lens of the service helix, realizing that each category is revisited with greater development and growth. The first key category that is explored is background — one of the starting places for service. The words of T.S. Eliot in his poem, *Little Gidding* may help one begin to think about the movement and travel of the service helix:

We shall cease from exploration
And the end of all our exploring
Will be to arrive where we started
And know the place for the first time. (Eliot, 1971, p. 145)

**Key Categories**

*Background*

Background for the participants was a critical component in their description of and experience with community service. All of the participants discussed how nothing occurs in isolation, meaning that the background that they bring to community service plays a major role and became a key category. Initially, the background referred to the elements in a participant's life that had led up to community service; however, once the participants began serving, the background remained a key component in their experience and development. Background represented the other facets of participants' lives which they brought to their service as well as their background with service. The categories comprising background are environment, role models, social support, school, and identity. Background later symbolized all of other facets of their lives that may be separate from the service but have many correlations to the service cycle. The key category of background would interplay with the catalysts to encourage the participants to continue their service. This intersection of background and catalysts will also be described.
Environment. The participants were raised in environments that affected their world view and their concept of self and service. All of the participants grew up in safe, privileged environments both financially and emotionally with the exception of Vincent. Vincent served as a negative case because his lack of privilege and resources also affected his world view on the importance of helping others. Instead of viewing the need to serve through the eyes of privilege, his parents taught him that when you see something, you try to do something about it. For the rest of the participants, understanding that they had more than others connected them to service. Debra stated that she "grew up in a little bubble of 'perfect' life." When she realized that others did not have the same advantages, she was quite shocked.

As the participants moved to college, their analysis of their background grew, and they all spoke about the privileges and responsibilities of going to college and gaining a college degree. As college students, they had more opportunities and greater exposure to experiences and meaningful work. Being in college also enveloped the participants in a learning environment where they utilized theory and classroom materials to discover more about the community. The participants also were more cognizant of selecting an environment or community that "fit" with who they are. Examples include a political framework; an empowering, feminist environment; and performing service within a gay community. The students were likely to recognize the environmental context in which they lived and studied. For them, there was a parallel between the privileges of their upbringing and the advantages one has being in college. They also recognized that college encouraged them to be self-focused and that service gives them perspective and helps them see the broader community. Ashley stated that, "I always want to be aware of my
community wherever I live and feel a part of it, and I think that serving is a good way to do that."

Values also were a crucial part of the participants' environment. These values could be shaped by many factors. Religion was a significant part of the background for many of the participants, but a broader life philosophy was a background characteristic for all of the participants. Habitat 1's, Christina's, and Debra's service started with a religious group. Debra was the social action chair of her synagogue youth group. Debra described that in the "Jewish tradition that service is important." Ashley's religion and spirituality are an important part of her background and of her life. Habitat 1 spoke of the role of her religion in that "I wouldn't have probably been as involved with it if it wasn't for my church." Habitat 1 examines her privilege through her religion. She is particularly bothered by homelessness. Regarding religion, she said, "I know I'm Christian and I always pray and I thank God for my family and friends and the things that I always take for granted, are all the things I try to think about and housing is probably the biggest thing I take for granted." The values of the participants that were a part of their background included a grounding to give back to others less fortunate and a desire to help. As the participants developed through their service, their appreciation and understanding of their environment increased. Their background values also evolved as these values were challenged by service as well as by theory in the classroom. For example, one's desire to help initially was fairly simplistic and then it progressed into an understanding that to help, one must be a part of the relationship, not separate from those needing assistance. Vincent described why he believes people serve in that "once you see a need and you realize you're someone who can help or lessen that need, then I think a lot of people do service at that point." All of the participants spoke of how they were different each time they entered service and how they continued to view the issues.
and themselves more complexly. All of these environmental factors were a part of the background of the participants that they took with them into the service cycle whether initially as they began service or years later as they continued with service and recognized the outside factors that influenced them.

Role models. Role models played a significant part in the lives of the participants, particularly in relation to their service. All of the participants spoke of the guiding factor of their parents, usually the most impactful individuals. Vincent saw his mother as a role model who is "active and socially conscious." He works to emulate this behavior. Suzanne feels the influence from her father who is passionate and feels others' pain; she learned this from him. The ironic part of this relationship is that her father also learned from her and began serving at one of her community service sites. Participants described how their parents instilled values and taught them to recognize inequities. Habitat 1 talked about this in that her "mother and father are also very giving people. Like for birthdays and anniversaries, they don't give each other presents. They take the money they would spend on each other and they donate it to a children's' house in the Middle East because my dad's from the Middle East, so that's kind of their way of giving back."

In addition to parents, other role models also were involved in the lives of the participants. After students were engaged in service, they frequently met other role models who affected their views on life and on service in specific. The president of Chris's service site, a tutoring project for Hispanic youth, became a role model for Chris based on the fact that he was always available, talked to and motivated people, and gave his utmost to the site. For Hugh, one of his role models was a peer who performs service with integrity and thinks about the service dynamics. He felt like he learned a lot about himself and his attitudes by listening to her talk and question the
meaning of service. Debra shared that two people she had served with had both "helped to shape my definition of service and teach me about service learning."

Finally, Suzanne had role models in her Women's Studies professors who connected theory to action, something she valued. These are just four examples of the pertinent place that role models played in the lives of the participants. Role models affected the background that participants came into service with, and they played different roles at various points in the service helix.

**Social support.** Social support was a significant category for the participants. The social environment was comprised of friends and peers, predominantly who were at college with the participants. These friends and peers played an important role in their service and self-concept. All of the participants felt like they received support from others for their involvement in service. Some received this support from groups with whom they volunteered. Alpha Phi Omega service fraternity (co-ed) was a catalyst for service and a support for many of the participants including Debra, Vincent, Shari, and Hugh. Through Alpha Phi Omega (APO), the participants also gained a more theoretical understanding of community service. These participants particularly talked about the PARE model which stands for preparation, action, reflection, and evaluation as integral components of community service (Maryland Student Service Alliance, 1994). Some of the participants were still involved with APO as seniors while others went inactive with the group. According to Debra,

I probably wouldn't have started to get involved in service without Alpha Phi Omega...It was a really important part of college, sort of finding your community to do community service with...I think it helped me to break a lot
of barriers in terms of populations I would then feel comfortable working with.

For Habitat I, the group she served with at Habitat for Humanity building sites and the members of the student chapter of Habitat for Humanity provided important support and incentive to continue serving. Chris developed many important friendships among the fellow volunteers at the tutoring site. Ashley gained support from the people she rode in the van with to tutor. They were the people with whom she reflected. When she began tutoring individually, she noticed a big difference in not having others with whom to process. Ashley, Hugh, and Debra were student employees in the Office of Community Service Programs which also provided them with support and interactions with peers who had similar values. Their work in Community Service Programs helped them learn about other service sites and social issues and think about the connection of social issues in a broader context. They also learned theoretical models for understanding their service. Many of their peers were fellow students of the participants, yet other participants gained their support from other volunteers at the service site. All of these relationships helped participants feel supported and challenged when needed. As the students continued their service with these people, the relationships deepened or changed indicating that the levels of support and challenge grew. The participants were also able to identify and ask for what they needed from these relationships.

Social support also referred to the relationships with the people who are being served. This component appeared as individuals cycled through the service helix, and they developed friendships at the site. These relationships could also be with service providers of the agency that provided support and feedback. The relationships at the service site became background categories later in the helix. Vincent felt a strong connection with the homeless men where he served, and he
continued serving there despite some disagreements with the agency because the men asked him to continue. Chris became friends with several other tutors, and he even helped tutor some of them in math and science. Many of these relationships evolved and deepened with time and continued service. This social support was a significant background characteristic for the participants, and it frequently related to their service.

*Education.* The academic major and coursework of the participants were a significant part of the background category. The students frequently talked about the difficulty in finding time around class work for community service. They also spoke about their major and how it shaped them and interacted with their service experiences. Several of the participants performed community service in areas that connected to their major including Vincent working at a homeless shelter and soup kitchen to learn about urban planning and redevelopment. Both Hugh and Shari were community health majors, and they both volunteered on related public health issues. Habitat I viewed her service as a way to complement her school work and give perspective to what she was learning. In addition, Christina and Suzanne served in sites related to women's issues and activism as a way to put their theory into action. Finally, three participants changed majors because of their experiences with community service. They found gifts and interests in an arena they had not previously explored. Chris spent every Saturday tutoring Hispanic youth. Chris stated, "now I plan on being a teacher, but before I had planned on being an engineer or a physicist or something." Similarly, Ashley began college as an agronomy major and switched to elementary education after tutoring. Also, Debra will be graduating with a degree in dietetics but plans to attend graduate school in college student personnel with a focus on community service and service-learning, predominantly
based on her community service experiences. The participants' choice of academic major could influence where they chose to serve, but likewise, their service could affect and change the choice of one's major and career goals.

The educational background of the participants could also function as preparation for service and as a theoretical framework. Suzanne believes that "education provides preparation" and helps one understand systems which for her related to comprehending oppression and injustice. Vincent stated that "more education leads to better service." Several participants reinforced that academics should not be separate from one's activism. While all of the participants valued their education, they discussed wanting it to inform their service and not separating them from other people. For all of the participants, the role of education was undeniable. Early on, the participants searched for the connections to what they were learning or looked forward to service as an outside classroom learning opportunity. As the participants continued with service and increased their complexity of thinking and experience, they looked for theoretical models or frameworks to understand their service. Several participants also used their education to examine more global problems and systemic issues. Regardless of academic major, the educational background informed the community service and the community service informed the college experience in a fairly reciprocal relationship.

Identity. The identity of the participants was the final category in the key category of background. How one viewed one's self and the facets of identity entered into the service dynamic, both initially and throughout. Sometimes an identity of difference played a major role in beginning community service. This was true for Hugh as a gay man, for Christina as an Asian-American, and for Suzanne and Christina as women. Other facets of the identity of the participants were as
individuals with privilege and as college students as was mentioned previously. All of the participants also discussed their identity as service providers. For Chris, this facet played a large role in defining him. "I actually had a really hard time in life, actually last year and the year before...and one of the things that kept me going was that I felt needed there," says Chris.

The self-knowledge of the students also was a part of their background. While they entered community service with some understanding of their skills, they entered service again and again with an increased recognition of their gifts and skills and how to put them to good use. As they moved through the service cycle, they also increased their strength of values and convictions. They gained a better understanding of the balance that they needed. Christina discussed recognizing her limits because "over commitment doesn't help anyone" and needing a "balance of public and private lives."

Complementing their identity and self-knowledge was the attitude they brought into the community service. Participants described being passionate, sensitive, positive, and enjoying service even though it could be difficult. According to Ashley, service "keeps me grounded in humanity." The participants also had the perspective that service should be part of everyone's life and that one should give back. This was a major discussion point in the focus group. Attitude also referred to the attitude that students had toward the community members. Participants felt that they needed to understand their own motives for serving to be genuine and that they needed to recognize what they gained from serving. Christina captured this concern about coming into a community thinking you have all of the answers, thinking "you can solve their problems." As the students came to know themselves better, they described being able to provide better, more meaningful service. Thus, the background category of identity enters the service cycle.
The key category of background intersected with the key category of catalysts in some areas that are illuminated in the next section. In particular, one's identity, knowledge and academic study, and understanding of social issues overlapped in both categories. Sometimes these categories would be catalysts, yet they could also serve as background characteristics that occurred simultaneously to service, yet separate from it. Some of the outcomes of community service also became background characteristics. As the students cycled through the helix model, the complexity of their understanding of background characteristics increased with time and development. For some, this development was swift, but for others, the growth was more subdued as was shown in Figure 3. Background as a key category symbolized the participants' other facets of life that are not directly related to community service yet still impact it since nothing occurs in isolation. Background also characterized the foundation that students brought to their service the first time and every time after that.

Catalysts to Serve

The second key category along the helix represents the catalysts to serve. The participants usually had more than one catalyst to serve, and the catalyst(s) could vary based on the service experience, the level of personalization, and/or the outcomes for the student. Depending on the current life circumstances, some of the catalysts could weigh more strongly for the participants at different times. Catalysts instigated the participants to serve and had overlap with the background of the participant. The background came into play not only as one initiated service but throughout the service cycle. Catalysts to serve were significant not only in getting the participants involved in community service, but also for the continuation of
service or as a motivator to begin serving again after a respite. Catalysts could serve as either challenge or support, depending on what the participants needed at the time.

As the participants spent more time serving, hence moving along the service helix, their development was accompanied by an increasing self-understanding as well as an increasing knowledge of society. The participants addressed areas of moral, personal, intellectual, and identity development for themselves; and this development could be seen in the increasing complexity of the catalysts they described. A reciprocal relationship existed in that the development was both encouraged by the community service modeled by the helix as well as the development encouraged growth and development along the service helix and experience. In addition to this, most participants also addressed how nothing occurred in isolation; their life and experiences outside of service also affected the catalysts and the rest of the development. In order to best understand the key category of catalysts, the seven categories that comprise it will be described. The seven categories are a desire to help others, belief that one can make a difference, awareness, social issues, knowledge/academic study, service as a need, and the negative case of roadblocks.

Desire to help others. All of the participants reflected on a desire to help others and how this encouraged them to serve. Many of the participants could not even define the origin of this desire to help others. For some, this desire to help others was present when they were young. At least four of the participants identified a desire to help others when they were as young as grade school or junior high school. A significant moment for Debra was when she found money and gave it to a woman living on the street because she realized that the woman needed it more. According to Debra,
This old lady, this Japanese woman, homeless, obviously homeless pushing a really big cart of stuff, and I just, for whatever reason, I had never done anything like this, for whatever reason, I gave her all the change I had found. And she was so happy. She gave me a big hug and she ran over to my mom and told her what a good girl I was. And, that feeling was like really positive.....And this feeling that I got from this woman was so much better than candy, definitely. And when I came home pretty soon after that, I started looking for things to do, and the only thing at that time that I really knew about, in terms of volunteering, was being a candy striper....So, I did that and that's sort of how I got started. And then at the same sort of time, I got, umm, involved with this youth group and we started doing some service, so it sort of snow balled from there.

Several of the participants also performed some type of occasional service through their church or temple and learned the importance of helping others. Christina developed this mentality through school. Christina said,

I went to Catholic schools for first to eighth grade, so the philosophy of giving back to community or helping others especially helping others who are less fortunate than you, so I learned that at a very young age. Doing things for underprivileged communities, whether it was like the smallest act of collecting money for the poor or reading books or doing marathons for like, underprivileged people. But to really learn, so I guess it was more like, just a part of living.

Two of the participants first became involved in community service in high school. Shari got involved with peer education out of a desire to help others,
something which she continues to this day. She stated, "When someone asked me what I wanted to do with the rest of my life, the first thing that came into my head was I want to help people. You know, so that was something I think I felt when I started doing community service and that's I guess another thing that wakes me up at 8:00 in the morning on Saturdays like, 'Yeah, I'm going to go do this.'" Chris, on the other hand, got involved in tutoring because it was a requirement for high school; the desire to help others evolved out of this experience and continues to motivate him to service. For the others, they first became cognizant of wanting to help others when they started college or at least acted upon this desire as a catalyst for service during college.

The desire to help others was high for all of the participants; however, the prominence of it as a catalyst to serve varied both by participant and by the amount of development in the service helix. One component of this category was an empathy and care for others. This empathy was exhibited by participants' abilities to put themselves in the place of another and feel a sense of compassion. The participants all valued people, relationships, and helping others and thereby viewed service as a way to act on these values. At least two participants started performing community service because they were asked to or were recruited to serve. For most others, the relationships they developed and the sense of appreciation they received either from the people they were serving or from the agency frequently was a catalyst to continue serving. "One of the things that kept me going was that, like, I felt needed there," stated Chris. For other participants, the relationships also developed with fellow volunteers and would frequently motivate one to serve. For Debra, service with a group was an important catalyst. She said,

I probably wouldn't have started to get involved with service without Alpha Phi Omega. It was a really important part of college, just being part of
college, sort of finding your community to do community service with. It was really important. I think it helped me also to break a lot of barriers in terms of populations I would then feel comfortable working with.

In addition to initial involvement with service, knowing that there were people counting on you also served as a catalyst to serve. This catalyst also could be viewed as motivation received from finding a community of others who also want to help. Shari stated,

I think it also helps you get a sense of there are other people, because I think you can forget, you interact with a lot of people everyday, and I think a lot of them don't see community service as an important aspect in their life. And so it helps you realize that there are a lot of people out there who really do care and who are really trying to make a difference and you are not the only fish in the pond. You know, and because they always tell you one person can't make a difference. I don't believe that at all. I think that one person can make a difference, but when you can see all of those other people that are those one people out there trying to make a difference, you really realize that there are people out there who are going to change the world.

A grounding to give back to others less fortunate was another component and catalyst to the category of a desire to help others. The majority of the participants had values or beliefs that promoted helping others in need. Six out of the nine had religious or family backgrounds that valued helping others. For the others, they developed this philosophy on their own. As students moved through their service and through the helix, the grounding to give back to others emerged from their awareness of their interdependence with others and because they saw themselves as members of a larger community. Regardless of from where it came, the desire to
help was often coupled with a responsibility to help others that served as a catalyst to begin or continue community service.

The last component of a desire to help others had more of a personal tone. Every one of the participants recognized that they got something from the service. They discussed the reciprocity in the service dynamic in that both the server and the people served received something from the service. Collectively, the participants stated that helping out makes you feel good and being thanked and appreciated serves as reinforcement for the service. In addition, all of the participant loved the work and the service, even when it became challenging or even painful. For many, the idea that service is fun could also motivate one to serve. The participants often mentioned that service was more honest when the server recognized that s/he was receiving something from the service. Hugh called it the "myth of altruism" that altruism was a higher form of service, whereas he recognized the mutuality in the relationship between server and those served was better. Likewise, the participants could not think of any service where the server was truly altruistic, and therefore, they felt justified in recognizing the personal benefits. During the focus group, participants responded to Hugh's statement about the "myth of altruism." They all agreed that altruism does not exist as a part of their service because they get something from the service and because they are in a relationship with those served. They viewed altruism as separating one from those served and not appreciating the outcomes for the server. This honesty of self-benefit, increased knowledge, and growth could therefore serve as a catalyst.

As one can see, catalysts were significant in the service helix not just to start someone in serving but also to encourage them to continue serving. A desire to help others was one category of catalysts to serve. "I think sometimes you forget to actually do it (community service). I think you get so involved in your other daily
things that you are kind of like, whoa, wait a second, this is something I really
enjoyed and I ended up cutting it out of my life because of these other things, so I
think you need to make the time if you think community service is important to you,"
stated Shari.

Belief that one can make a difference. "I think you get a sense of 'I can make
a difference' because they always tell you you can't make a difference, one person
can't, they can't, but then you get involved and you think, I can make a difference."
These are the words of Shari, and they are indicative of the thoughts of the
participants. This belief that one can make a difference served as a catalyst for
community service for the participants. Some of the participants developed this
belief in one's ability to make a difference from their actual experiences with
community service. As they saw the outcomes of their service, they learned they
could make an impact, which then became a catalyst to continue service. For some
of the others, they entered community service with a belief that they could make a
difference. The participants wanted to have a positive change but had realistic
expectations and realized they would not change the world. They had a sense of
empowerment, regardless of how small or large the differences were.

These participants shared a desire to effect change and get involved. They
recognized the deficits in society and believed they could make an impact. For six of
the participants, the belief that they could make an impact developed originally from a
combination of parental influence, school, peers, and religious beliefs. The other
three participants developed this belief that one can make a difference during high
school and/or college and predominantly from getting involved in community service
and making an impact. Vincent believes that some people ignore the need and choose
not to see themselves as someone who can make a difference. "I don't think most
people are uncaring about them [people in need], but if you choose not to see the need, if you choose not to see that you are someone who can make a difference, then it's easy not to try to make a difference," stated Vincent. Because of his belief that he can make a difference, Vincent is very committed to service.

For the participants in this study, their belief that one can make a difference continued throughout their service experience; however, it also evolved into being complemented by a sense of empowerment. The participants were able to see results and know that they were helping people in a variety of ways. They also understood that they were helping themselves and making a difference in their own lives. In addition, their belief in the ability to make a difference was reinforced by the community members and other recipients of the service by being thanked and feeling a sense of accomplishment. As a catalyst to community service, the belief that one can make a difference was significant and often was a fueling factor in the decision to continue with community service complemented by the knowledge that one had already made an impact.

**Level of conscious awareness.** The participants entered into their community service at different levels of conscious awareness. For some, an awareness of one's privilege and gifts instigated their commitment to service and continued to work as a catalyst. These participants spoke of how, with time, their guilt about their privilege evolved into an understanding of the larger systemic issues, and they no longer served out of a sense of guilt but more from a perspective of a responsibility and a desire to utilize their gifts to help others while also helping themselves. Some of the other participants reached a level of awareness through and because of their community service. Once this status was reached, the awareness then served as a catalyst but not until that point. All of the participants except for one grew up in
fairly privileged circumstances, being at least middle class socio-economically. The one participant who grew up poor and with little resources viewed the concept of guilt as a motivator differently from the rest of the participants. Vincent described his motivation as, “My idea of ‘human’ is someone who treats others like they’d wish to be treated.” He believed that his responsibility and awareness was more about being human, not about guilt based on privilege.

One of the components of conscious awareness was a recognition of one's gifts. Regardless of socio-economic status, all of the participants felt their life had been good and that they were very fortunate, particularly in terms of family, friends, and the ability to get a college education. These gifts frequently motivated them to give to others. For Chris, his recognition of his gifts encouraged him to help others who did not have these gifts. This is an awareness that he described being particularly poignant in high school when he realized that not everyone had a house or parents to look after them. Chris stated,

I personally have always felt that I had, like, a lot. I always, like, was pretty much, like, we’re not rich. I always had...I mean I always went to private school. I was always like, more well off than my friends. I have a friend who was working; he was like fourteen in junior high, because his family needed his help and support, and so I always felt like I had a lot. We had a house, and my friends have apartments. I always felt that I, I used to actually feel like a little guilty that maybe I had too much or something, like what did I do. I didn’t work for this. I didn’t do anything for this.

The paradox of the recognition of the participants' gifts is that the participants recognized that they did nothing to deserve them; they were blessed by virtue of birth. Hugh discussed that one of the reasons he serves is because of his luck. He said, “I could have been born in a third world developing country or could have been
born into a much different social status than I was born into, so I feel like I was
given a head start from the get-go.” This awareness of the randomness of life helped
them identify with the people who they served and understand that they could just
have easily been in the situation of need. The participants developed this awareness
through their service and for some in combination with their course work. This
recognition of the randomness of life appeared to occur later in the development for
the participants. Earlier they seemed to recognize their gifts, but they had not
thoroughly thought through the absence of gifts for others. Once they understood
how fragile the difference is in the privileges one is born with, they saw themselves
as more connected with others.

From an awareness of their gifts, the participants described moving to an
understanding of privilege. Many of them described the discrepancy between
"have's" and "have not's." Habitat I talked about the privileges of being a college
student and how she did as much as she could because of this privilege. She went
on to discuss what it meant being from a privileged background, and for her focus on
Habitat for Humanity, how housing is taken for granted. When Suzanne first began
to speak about privilege, she attached a variety of words to it, these words include
"random luck, thankful but didn't do anything to deserve it, socio-economic status,
race, anger, frustration, pain, racism, sexism, classism, and heterosexism."
Suzanne took the concept of privilege one step further as she described "having the
privilege to serve" and how through classes, she gained an understanding of the
history of privilege. Not every participant spoke as complexly about privilege as
Suzanne; however, all of the participants understood that they were privileged, and
this discrepancy of resources and gifts served as a catalyst.

Guilt was often connected to privilege for the participants, but guilt did not
become a stagnating force. Guilt, however, at points could be a roadblock. Chris
said, "I used to feel guilty that I had so much." During the focus group, the tentative helix model was presented, and the participants spent a lot of time talking about guilt and what it meant to them. In the focus group, Hugh discussed his understanding of privilege and guilt and how that was a catalyst for him.

Well, basically I tied it a lot to this women's studies class. I took Women's Studies 250: Minority Culture with Nancy O'Neill, and it was one of the very first times that in an academic sense, in a theoretical frame of really organized, structured manner I was able to really examine what issues of privilege and power I have in the culture and what kind of organizational structures, societal structures umm, kind of exist and how do I fit into those things. And really realizing that I was White, with a capital W, and I'm a man, capital M, you know and like, issues like that. And that really helped get me started thinking towards, like that was a very catalyzing moment for me, I think, with regards to doing service. The thing that really got me involved into like, I just thought, service, capital S, like "SERVICE" like instead of just something that would be neat or good for grad. school but like, something that I thought that I would be very dedicated to was going to the AIDS Quilt and seeing the AIDS Quilt was a very catalyzing moment and it was actually what I used when I talked with Mary Kay because I was seeing like this, patchwork quilt of like people that had died and this was something that I didn't experience. Like these were faces that I didn't know and names that I had never said, and that... there was an amount, for me, of survivor guilt. In the sense of, I'm a young gay man who is in this community who is not affected or infected by this in the extent that I thought I should be or would be or could be. So that kind of said, I have to be doing something. There wasn't, as much as I like to say, I deal with wanting to do
empowerment or whatever, there was an amount of guilt saying like "I should be doing something." Like I lucked out, I have a chance others didn't have, and so for me, like I think that's something our culture doesn't like to talk about, like because guilt is a bad thing and guilt can't drive you to do good things. "Only good things drive you to do good things" which I think we kind of need to challenge, which is important here.

In the focus group conversation, the multiple dimensions of guilt became evident, particularly as the participants were able to interact together about the meaning of guilt. Guilt could be both a catalyst and a roadblock. Guilt could also be a spot in the development of responsibility. To illustrate the complexity, an excerpt of the focus group is given.

I got over the guilt part because I figured guilty would be if I just went "Oh well, I'm lucky I can get like ____ [blank] because my flesh tone" and lots of people can't. You know, but, it wasn't that. Guilty, I think, to me sounded more like, well I just feel bad about it but didn't then doing something about it wasn't good... I don't know if I'm making myself clear.

I think I know what you mean. That guilt feeling is stagnating.

I'm not sure how I feel about guilt being in there because I really like, the more I think about it, I do think of guilt as being a stagnating force. When I felt guilty, I wasn't doing anything. But it was like, it's important still. I believe that like, feeling guilty about something was like, I think about it as sitting there and being like, "Oh my gosh, I feel guilty for having this White privilege" but not necessarily acting on it. There were a hole, what I called it was responsibility. Was responding to that guilt or responding ... it was
almost like, privilege leads to guilt which leads to responsibility to do something.

When guilt was acted upon, it could deepen the understanding of the service dynamic. However, as the participants stated, guilt could also be a roadblock, or a negative case of a catalyst. Regardless of how guilt was perceived, it was a component of awareness for the participants, and it frequently assisted as a catalyst for action. For Shari, "Once I think I got over that guilt and I took that step to action, then it was something else that kept me involved."

Awareness of others as a category evolved as a catalyst after an awareness of self and one's gifts and privilege. At this point, the participants were able to move beyond thinking about themselves and began to focus on the needs of others. At this point, the participants were more able to "put themselves in the shoes of another" and understand their needs. In the focus group Suzanne talked about wanting to learn more about others in need and how this motivated her.

Yeah, just the recognition that I was privileged innately in our society and then also, I mean, the same that I heard you say, when you went to the AIDS Quilt and like, you just didn't know anything about that kind of experience and those people. You didn't know those people who died, you didn't really know anyone affected or infected by those... that was exactly how I felt with prostitutes, you know. I didn't know anything about that community. I didn't know anything about that experience. I wasn't affected by anything like that and yet, the fact that I wasn't, related back to the fact that I was privileged which then motivated me to become more informed about that.

For Vincent, service breaks down barriers and creates a sense of "it could happen to me" which is a catalyst for service. Habitat 1 increased her awareness of others by
the support of others which helped her step out of her comfort zone and also helped her not reinforce stereotypes. Despite the greater cognitive complexity of understanding the needs of others and reacting to them, none of the participants particularly examined the gifts of others. The exception to this was Habitat 1 who talked about the "sweat hours" that families receiving Habitat for Humanity houses need to contribute in order to receive the house. She recognized that the people being served had gifts that they could offer to the project and to empowering themselves. For the participants, an awareness of others was a catalyst to serve as well as an outcome from service.

The final concept comprising the category of awareness is an awareness and understanding of the bigger picture and of systemic social issues. Both Chris and Suzanne believe that servers are aware of the problems. Suzanne went on to describe a choice whether to see issues. Many of the participants believe that the issues are ever-present, but many people choose not to really see them. They believe that once one truly has an awareness of issues, they have a responsibility to act in service, thereby this awareness becomes a catalyst, at least for them. For Vincent, "knowledge of social issues affects every facet of my life including motivation to serve and dedication to serve." A connection to a specific issue or population was frequently a major catalyst to service for these participants. Finally, an awareness of issues could encourage leadership. Several participants, including Hugh, Shari, Debra, Vincent, and Christina, talked about a need to raise the consciousness of others and make them aware of others' struggles and differences. Debra described being a "change agent in the fraternity to try to get learning and understanding to go on during service." Habitat 1 also discussed that she thinks "everyone should do something because the way this society is, it's so unequal between the have's and the
have not's," and she does her part to educate others particularly about issues of housing and homelessness.

*Socia l issues.* Similar to the previous catalyst of level of conscious awareness is the catalyst of social issues. Social issues and their omnipresence motivated the participants to serve. As with all of the other catalysts, social issues was an evolving catalyst that deepened with time and understanding. In other words, all of the participants gained a more complex understanding of social issues through their service as well as from outside factors or background, and this understanding and development continued to motivate them to perform community service. The participants also were able to see the interconnectedness of social issues and problems and realized that their involvement in community service could affect issues broader than their service scope.

Some of the participants were passionate about one issue in particular although others connected with social issues more universally. Those participants who didn't serve with one agency or issue still tended to have an issue or two about which they felt most strongly. Suzanne believed that as a Women's Studies major she had a responsibility to serve and service was how she put theory into action. "I've always been doing community service, but the thrust behind why I do what I do now is because I see it as a translation of my theory into practice because I am a student in Women's Studies and do feminist theory, so I cannot. I'm always wondering about my colleagues, how can you read this theory and take the test and write your papers and not do something? So, to me it's a logical move, like I couldn't be a student in feminist theory and not work with women's issues," says Suzanne. She goes on to state, "I enjoyed doing community service, but it wasn't until I started doing work that was grounded in theory, like where I read about how
systems of oppression really affected people and how these injustices were perpetuated in our society that really motivated me to work." The passion for the issue even led some participants to what they referred to as "activism." Christina quoted Martin Luther King, Jr.'s statement that, "If there's nothing you are willing to die for, then there's nothing you have to live for." This participant became involved in advocacy and activism around Asian American issues following an empowering experience of learning more about Asian American history, her personal history.

Similarly, Hugh connected to a social issue from one catalytic experience. He attended the AIDS Quilt which created a moment which changed his life. He stated, "At the quilt, like that kind of turning point for me was that it was not just the quilt. I was in my Women's Studies class and really kind of beginning to solidify a lot of my ideas about political change, responsibility, activism, inequality, oppression, and was also really coming into my own as understanding myself as a gay man." This connection with the social issue, that was also a personal interest for Hugh, incited him into service with HIV and AIDS issues.

Similar to this, all of the participants recognized a deficit and this compelled them to act on it. Habitat 1 was particularly bothered by social issues related to housing and homelessness. She saw needs everywhere. While Chris identified needs, he also looked for solutions. Chris "really believes that education is the key for the future of this world." He said,

Education is the key because the reason why people don't make it is because, like, if everyone was educated properly and everyone had the same chances in the world. I mean, everything is in some way related to education. The quality of the work a person can do is directly related to education and I think crime is directly related to education.
While the participants got overwhelmed by the needs and deficits, they were also motivated to serve by the enormity of the issues and the need to "dig in" and make an impact.

Related to a community needs analysis, the participants also examined the social systems and services frequently at different levels of understanding. Overall, the participants identified problems with the systems and ways to improve the agencies. The possibility for change motivated the participants at different points to continue service. Ashley found the needs of the students she tutored to be broader than just academics, so she explored ways to incorporate additional components including mentoring and counseling. Through Chris's years tutoring predominantly poor Hispanic students, he saw funding cut and the program threatened. Chris worked with the program director to examine new alternatives for funding and ways to redesign the summer science program to be more relevant to the needs of the population. To Debra, the systems are "set up against 'wrong doers' instead of for people with sincere needs." Debra advocated a philosophical re-positioning of service agencies to meet needs in proactive ways that assist individuals in becoming self-sufficient. Her service with a diversity of agencies and sites helped her gain a broad perspective on systems while also teaching her about complex issues and ways to effect change. From Vincent's perspective, the systems can be impersonal and lack long-range thinking and an adequate analysis of the problems. A significant amount of his work was with homeless shelters and food banks where he observed people mistreated by the systems, realized inequities, and analyzed social problems. This poor quality service motivates him to continue service and improve the systems. In fact, he will be attending graduate school to prepare for such work.

With an examination of the service systems, the students analyzed the root causes for the problems and deficits and looked beyond the symptoms. The
participants illustrated an increased cognitive complexity in understanding the social issue and systems through their ongoing service which, in turn, continued to serve as a catalyst. In summary, both the service site and the issues served as catalysts at many phases for the participants, reflecting the increasing development and complexity of the students. The connection to the issues and to the people also increased the commitment. "Since there is always going to be people that need help, it's important to be there," stated Chris.

*Education as meaning making.* Both knowledge and academic study served as catalysts for the participants, particularly as they gained a more complex understanding of social issues and service systems as well as theoretical frameworks to analyze the issues. Knowledge broadened their perspective, increased their exposure, and helped them learn about others. Knowledge and academic study also encouraged self-growth and a more diversified experience. This catalyst assisted students in providing leadership with issues, service sites, and with fellow servers, thereby improving the service cycle. The theory and understanding of systems and social issues also motivated ongoing service. According to Vincent, more education leads to better service. This concept also points to the importance of education for people being served. As knowledge and education are shared, all parties win and everyone has a stronger experience that hopefully creates change. Some participants thought more complexly about the catalyst of knowledge and how that motivated and improved their service. For Shari, Christina, Hugh, Debra, Suzanne, and Vincent, knowledge helped them take a systems approach to service. For Ashley, Chris, and Habitat 1, knowledge informed their service, but their critical analysis was not as complex as the others. Regardless, the knowledge and study motivated individuals to continue with service.
Another component of this catalyst is the responsibility of knowledge. Suzanne was motivated by service as the "translation of scholarship into practice." Several of the participants described how service is inherent in their major of study. The service made them better students as they saw concepts in action or were able to transfer relevant concepts to their field of study. The translation of knowledge into action motivated students to take informed actions that better served the community and shared knowledge with the community. Christina strongly felt that academics should not be separate from one's activism. She described how taking an Asian American studies class helped her to learn about her ancestors and moved her to advocate for things "that Asian American studies addresses and in general, like an egalitarian education to democratize the whole process." In a similar vein, she said, "you don't want your education to separate you from other people and that can happen so easily as you are building up this jargon and you are using all these big words." Education should allow students to talk with more people and to understand issues more complexly. The catalyst to share knowledge and education with the people being served was significant to the students as well as using this knowledge to provide better service for both the server and those being served.

*Service as a personal need.* All of the participants believed that service was a need for them, and this need served as a catalyst for them to perform community service. The participants exhibited great insight and self-understanding in recognizing that they received benefits from serving; many of the participants thought that their benefits were greater and often outweighed the benefits to the community. The participants realized that the service relationship was mutually beneficial, and for this catalyst they focused on their personal outcomes and benefits. This catalyst balanced the catalysts that focused on social issues and the needs of the community.
The participants frequently were motivated by a combination of self-interest and an understanding and empathy for the social issues and needs of the community.

In this catalyst, service was viewed as a part of the participants' identities. For Chris, "it's actually one of my defining characteristics." He realized that he "gets most of (his) strength from doing service." The service gives meaning to his life and has even helped him get through some difficult times. Shari described how service gave her balance and put things in perspective. When she took a break from community service, she often felt a lack of perspective with other areas in her life.

For other participants, the "need for service" also related to relationships, whether with other servers, community members, or the agencies. The social nature of community service meant that the participants felt needed or at least valued. This affirmation was frequently a catalyst to continue service. For Ashley, Chris, and Vincent, relationships with the community members being served were critical motivators. Others including Suzanne, Shari, Christina, and Hugh identified more with the connection to the agency and felt like this was a "home" where they could make a difference and where they had responsibilities. Finally, the social relationships with fellow servers were a catalyst and a need for Debra and Habitat 1 as well as for Shari, Chris, and others. All of the participants spoke about the need for balance between community needs and server needs. To them, when the servers could articulate their needs and benefits, they could be more genuine with their service and appreciate the reciprocity including what they gained from community service and the gifts of the community members and agencies.

**Roadblocks.** Roadblocks were the opposite of catalysts for the participants, yet roadblocks are included in the key category of catalysts because they affected the motivation to serve. The variety of roadblocks served as deterrents or pausing places
for the students doing service. The roadblocks could be personal or environmental. Regardless, the participants talked about having some control over the roadblocks and that one or more of the other catalysts could serve to overcome the roadblock and stimulate the student to continue with community service. The focus group spent some concentrated time talking about roadblocks for service after they had reviewed the emerging service model. This was a fruitful conversation for them. In the focus group, the conversation was,

I think that when there is a negative outcome, there needs to be another catalyst that happens because like, at least for me... I don't know if anyone's had negative experiences before but umm, a negative service experience generally tends to send me into phases not really wanting to do service for a little while including (being) negative toward certain service sites and so that, I need a new catalyst. I cannot rely necessarily on my old catalyst or my old motivation. I need a renewed fervor for service.

In some cases, time was simply needed to overcome the roadblock such as getting through final exams. Some of the roadblocks could be classified as resources including time, transportation, and money or the need to work for pay. Other roadblocks related to information or the absence of it including a lack of knowledge about community service, no model or framework for thinking about community service, or the lack of preparation and knowledge about how to provide good service. Vincent discussed how not having a framework like the PARE model could be stagnating; the PARE model is something he learned about through Alpha Phi Omega and through his involvement with other servers (Maryland Student Service Alliance, 1994).

Roadblocks could also be personal. Participants discussed pauses in service related to not having someone else to volunteer with them, getting caught up in other
things, and being over committed to other priorities. Debra discussed how being a college student gave her an excuse for not doing service. Other roadblocks in this area were not seeing the need for service or having a low comfort level with the issue or the service site. Guilt could serve as a catalyst, but it could also be a roadblock. During the focus group, the participants had a lengthy discussion about guilt and its role in their service. The discussion focused on how one needs a catalyst to initiate service after a roadblock. Their conversation was:

So if they either don't feel guilt or they have guilt and don't act on it, they'll probably stay kind of here (pointing to the tentative service helix model) until some other catalyst also interacts.

Such as consciousness raising or..

A friend says come with me..

For all of these roadblocks, a catalyst whether personal or originating from others was needed to "jump start" the students back into serving.

The final classification for roadblocks was environmental. Poor leadership at a service site was frustrating for Vincent, and he frequently deliberated whether to continue serving. His commitment to and relationships with the homeless men outweighed his frustration, but this roadblock still hampered his service. Debra identified a lack of perceived or easily accessible service projects as another environmental roadblock to service. Finally, all of the participants described at least one negative experience with community service that caused them to pause and re-evaluate their service before continuing on. The decision to continue with community service, whether at the same site or a new site, required additional energy and catalysts. Interestingly, the roadblock of a negative outcome can be the catalyst
to serve. "Like, she didn't want the experience with men, so that's the catalyst to working with women," according to Shari. The roadblocks were described as sometimes being frustrating but also being good for the process of reflection and evaluation. The roadblocks required students to analyze themselves and the community service, almost always with ultimately positive, developmental outcomes.

As was previously stated, the catalysts and background can overlap depending on timing for the participants. Both key categories occur before one serves, and frequently they both inform and lead one to service.

Service

The key category of service represented the various components of the actual service experience. Many things led up to service and transpired from service, but the actual experience of performing community service was pivotal. The students discussed in detail why they served, their intentions and motivations, the stages and components of their service, the types and foci of their service, the relationships, and the reciprocity in the service experience. The participants performed a variety of types of service and at differing increments, yet they all described the same core categories of service.

Intentions and motivations. The category of intentions or motivations was raised by the participants; yet the thoughts about it were something they were still exploring throughout the interviews. The participants felt differently about their own motivations and those of others. Some of the difference may be attributed to various levels of intellectual or moral development of the participants in that they would judge their own motivations yet they did not apply the same standards to others. They seemed to exhibit a lack of judgment regarding others because they wanted to value
all of the intentions of others as long as they were performing positive community service. Motivations and intentions can be examined as motivations of self and motivations of others. The participants were highly conscious of their own motivations and wanted them to be positive and concerned with the community although the motivations of others did not matter as much as long as the actual service was good. The attitudes regarding intentions were often a disconnect for the participants. Debra's motives for serving were that she wanted to work with and help the community, yet when we talked about motivations for others, she stated,

"I think that the action is what is the service, so if the action is positive and good and working, well then it's service. It doesn't matter why you are doing it, to me. I don't care, do it. That's all I care about. But, it can be bad service in terms of not, in terms of harming the community instead of helping them and that sometimes is affected by the motivations of why you're there, so it's kind of complicated to me sometimes."

As one of the participants stated, "motivations do and don't matter."

The intentions and motivations of the participants can be conceived of in terms of the question, For whom? The participants described their motivations regarding self and then regarding the advancement of others or community. They made this distinction because they believed that servers should be honest about their personal motivations and what they receive from service. For Christina, "self-interest is inherent," and in the focus group, participants focused on what they called the "myth of altruism." The participants were cognizant that they gain much from being involved in service. Debra "benefits more from service than people being served" and can get frustrated because she thinks that service can be selfish. Shari sees service as "always a part of life" in that she is dedicated and receives the self-benefit of knowledge, education, and feeling good.
The intentions for serving others were crucial to the participants themselves. Intentions shaped the way they did service both in the quality of the service and the way they approached the people they were serving. Christina believed in "listening to the community and their problems" in order to "identify the needs and address the needs or at least plan for the needs." Suzanne talked about service as not "do-gooding" in that an approach to service of charity can be "problematic and not help the person." Instead she thinks one "needs to change the social norms" by taking a bigger perspective and being conscious of all of one's actions. Suzanne goes on to describe the people she serves,

I see the people I want to help as the people who just naturally get nothing from the system and have to work for everything they get. People ignore them and think that they are not important. People put them on the back burner because they don't have the power and they are not beautified enough to make a difference.

All of the participants believed in empowering communities and community members, yet some of the participants viewed this more simplistically than others. As participants continued with community service, they focused more on things like Debra described as "working with and for communities" and "helping them help themselves." Similarly, Habitat 1 described her thoughts on her service that "it was just so much more fulfilling for me to see the community helping itself while we were helping it." Not everyone could easily identify the gifts and resources of the community and its members. Some of the participants believed in respecting the community and identifying its needs, but they did not yet see the community members as partners like some of the other participants. Several of the participants had moved from valuing those people they served to seeing them as partners in change. Regardless of where a participant might be on the service helix, their
intentions and motivations, both toward themselves and toward the community, were important in describing their service dynamic despite the fact that they overall did not think intentions mattered for others, or at least they were unwilling to judge the motives of others.

Christina believed that for others "intentions don’t matter if the quality of service is high." The general sentiment of the participants was that motivations of others are probably not important as long as people are doing service and that motivations will change as people do sustained service. Vincent stated,

I'm not sure how important motivations are as long as people are doing service. I mean everybody comes into service for a different reason, and I think that anybody who does sustained service is going to change and so that motivations change also, so I'm not sure the motivations are really important. I mean from a service doer point of view, maybe from a service provider who is looking for people to help me provide service, motivation might be really important, but from my point of view, no.

In his third interview, Vincent commented on his intentions when serving. At this point, he said,

A lot of people serve for different reasons, and I think intentions definitely matter, maybe not even saying, maybe tertiary, but they do matter some I think....Your intentions shape the way you do service. I know a lot of people who do service for different reasons, and I mean there's a lot of selfish reasons for doing service even. You really see the difference in those people who do service for the sake of helping people because their quality of service and the way they approach people they're serving is a lot different.

The participants believed that you can change people’s motivations through powerful service. Despite the fact that the participants thought the intentions of others did not
matter, they still talked about using strong service experiences to change the intentions to more positive, helpful intentions.

The intentions or motivations that the participants continually entered service with were important to them and to the community. They still were examining the role that the motivations of other servers played. Since the motivations of others entered into the service dynamic, it was mentioned to show the complexity of thought for the participants; however, this was not crucial to this category. The motivations of others just greater informed the service dynamic. This category illustrated that the participants were thoughtful about how and why they were entering into community service as well as how their motivations and intentions might affect their actual service. The category of motivations illustrated the progression from helping others, to knowing and respecting the community, to being a partner with the people being served in order to help create positive change.

Stages and components of service. Many of the participants described their service using the model of PARE (Maryland Student Service Alliance, 1994). The students who worked in the Office of Community Service Programs learned this model there, and Alpha Phi Omega also used these components to think about service. A pivotal point for Debra was when she started learning about service-learning; "before I learned about using a process like PARE or incorporating important steps into my service, I think I wasn't gaining everything I could gain."

One participant talked about service as the whole PARE cycle, not just the "event" or action. The students who were not familiar with PARE still described their service as comprised of these components, though they may have used different words. Frequently, they also combined the reflection and evaluation components as one step.
Preparation for service could be structured or informal, yet it always built a foundation for service and helped improve the quality of the interaction. Preparation for service was important for Christina in "assessing her own needs and contemplating potential needs of community." For Suzanne, preparation enriched the experience which she describes, "it wasn't until I started doing work that was grounded in theory, like where I could read about how systems of oppression really affected people and how these injustices were perpetuated in our society that really motivated me to work." Preparation was very important for Debra to be educated about the community she would be serving. Preparation allowed her to examine stereotypes, expectations, and assumptions. Preparation can occur by individuals or in groups. Most of the preparation was individual for Hugh, Christina, Chris, Ashley, and sometimes Suzanne. The others tended to prepare in a group, sometimes in more formal, structured ways but often informally. Debra described the role of preparation in a group:

I think that groups definitely need to do preparation or reflection for a lot of reasons -- one of which is that different people in the group have different experiences and different comfort levels, different knowledge of populations, different educations. They've done different amounts of service...I also think preparation and reflection exercises help to sort of bond a group, bring a group together, and that's a really valuable part of doing service together.

Regardless of the structure of the preparation, all of the participants described it as significant before beginning the action of serving.

The quality and depth of the reflection increased as participants moved along the service helix. The participants discussed how they began reflection asking about their expectations and who they were serving. As they progressed, the participants questioned social issues that were endemic in the community along with thinking
about ways that the service agencies could be more effective. The students built upon their past experiences with service to inform their reflection and upcoming service.

Service is the action component of the PARE model (Maryland Student Service Alliance, 1994). In analyzing their action of serving, the participants viewed it as consisting of types of service, benefits to self, benefits to community, complexity of issues, social issues, time on task, and leadership. The participants described the service continuum from charity and philanthropy to activism. They viewed service as a way of giving back for all of their gifts and privileges and as Shari stated, for the "betterment of self and others." Overall, they felt that they gained more from the service than the community members and this could make them feel self-focused.

The participants also illuminated continuums from helping to harming, piecemeal to integrated. The participants described a variety of experiences and components of service. Sometimes their service was welcomed and other times it was unwelcomed. Christina discussed her "differing experiences of others not wanting (her) help." She believed that an acceptance of service requires "humbling." All of the participants were quite attuned to the thoughts and feelings of the community members they were serving. This awareness grew with more time performing service and typically with increased knowledge about the community and the service dynamics.

The participants also valued direct service more highly than indirect service or philanthropy. Similar to this, they described the range of service from separate to integrated into one's life. The participants believed that service was better for them personally if it was more integrated into their lives, yet they could conceptually understand service that was distinctive from the rest of one's life. In describing their
service experience, the participants all mentioned the community and its role. Habitat 1 thought one should have an "understanding of the multifacetedness of community" and offer "encouragement and support for the community." She saw her work as "holistic helping" in that they were "rebuilding economic and physical community."

The participants believed that more time at a service site improved the quality of service and built a depth of understanding, something that Astin (1996) contributes to time on task. With more experience, many of the participants took on leadership responsibilities either at the service site or on campus. Debra believed in "taking on leadership to educate others about doing good service" as she said, "personal service is no longer enough." The final piece of the action of service was examining systems and examining the service agency as well as the larger structures focused on the social issues.

Reflection was a critical component for all of the participants, whether done formally or informally. According to Vincent, reflection helps to gain a "perspective on one's self and one's role" as well as "analyze the quality and experience of service." He described the evolution of serving as moving from feeling good to responsibility. Shari used reflection to examine her learning, feelings, outcomes, and to evaluate. The amount of reflection that the participants engaged in tended to vary by person, by their time involved in service, and their serving as an individual or a group. When Chris began serving, he started with negative feelings, which with time and reflection, turned into a strong commitment to the students and the tutoring. Ashley enjoyed reflecting with others and serving with them. She did less reflection when serving by herself even though she valued reflection for the richer, more positive experience. Habitat 1 described how she participated in "little, conscious reflection" for a long time. Some of the participants were more cognizant of the role that reflection plays in meaningful service. Several even articulated the value and role
of structure and reflection in service. Debra examined things from her preparation and how they had actually occurred, both good and bad. She believed that reflection helped "translate negative experiences into change" as well as process good feelings to be motivators. Finally, the participants spoke about how reflection helped them be better servers. Debra stated, "reflection is very important because you evaluate what things worked and how people were affected by it." The participants described how reflection was initially casual or simplistic. They mainly examined only what actions they just completed and their feelings about it. As students moved along the service helix, they discussed how they took more control of their reflection and how they asked more critical questions, both of themselves and of the community. Later, they employed reflection to examine broader social issues, plan out their service involvement, and explore their commitment.

Evaluation was a part of the service model that the participants described, yet they predominantly combined the reflection and evaluation components. They used the reflection to alter their service when needed and to examine their actions. Suzanne would evaluate her service to ascertain whether it was achieving her goals of "helping others, learning, and taking an active stance and trying to correct inequalities." According to Christina, "Reflection is probably the most important part of service because if you never reflect upon it, then you're not really evaluating how things worked and how people were affected by it." Evaluation was also used to look at the results of the service and to determine if it was helping the community. Overall, participants used evaluation to make changes in their service or at their site or take some other action. The reflection and evaluation components would lead the students to adjust their service if needed and to cycle back to preparing before service, hence the PARE model continued (Maryland Student Service Alliance, 1994).
As the participants described their involvement in service, they also reflected on the development from beginning service to being immersed in service to an ending or changing of service followed by a re-initiating of service. Some of the participants even went a step further to take leadership roles at service sites or to work at involving others in service. In many ways, this cycle that the participants described mimics the service helix. As participants began service, they were learning about the service site, the community members and needs, and what their role might be at the site. As they became more engaged and with time, the participants felt more at home and that they could contribute in a more substantial way. For many, this is when they felt like they had hit their stride and were working with community members. At this point, the participants were more invested and they might give feedback into the process where they would not have before. Finally, many of the participants changed community service sites at some point. For some, they thought that their gifts could be used better elsewhere. Other participants wanted to be involved in different issues or in different ways. Some of the other participants, like Chris and Vincent, stayed at the same service site, but they changed positions, frequently taking on more responsibility. Finally, many of the participants took on leadership roles. Leadership could entail role modeling, speaking, inspiring others to do service, working with a student organization, or even creating a service program like Ashley was doing in the midst of the interviews. Shari lead a group that worked with community health in an improvisational theater setting. Chris trained new volunteers and taught a summer science course. Habitat I served as the president for the student Habitat for Humanity group and actively involved other students in service. The participants described motivating others to serve because it would change these other people for the better as they would feel a sense of usefulness, be a part of something, and could make a difference. The participants encouraged others to get involved with
something they were passionate about and where they felt they "fit." Lastly, the participants wanted to do some consciousness-raising and instill in others a sense of responsibility. These are some of the ways that the participants took on leadership and progressed in their service involvement.

Types of service/Focus of service. As was stated earlier, the participants varied in the type and focus of service in which they were engaged. All of the participants performed direct service in that they worked face to face with the community members. Most of the participants performed ongoing service at one site or ongoing service at different sites. Two participants predominantly served in one-time service experiences in a continual fashion. Debra, for example, participated in service almost weekly, but she worked at a variety of sites, mainly with Alpha Phi Omega. Vincent served both with Alpha Phi Omega in one-time sites as well as regularly with a homeless shelter. Regardless of type of service, the participants all maintained their involvement with service fairly continuously. Some of the participants took small breaks because of their college workload with exams and projects or because they became burned out. Even with these small breaks, the participants maintained a commitment to community service and were actively engaged.

The focus of the service did not vary greatly with each participant. Once the students found an issue they were passionate about, they tended to continue working with it. Some of the participants could point to why an issue was meaningful for them, but others just started serving somewhere they thought would be interesting. The focus of the participants' service is given below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Focus of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td>HIV/AIDS and other health issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shari</td>
<td>HIV/AIDS and other health issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina</td>
<td>Asian American and women's issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Tutoring and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Tutoring and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat 1</td>
<td>Homelessness and affordable housing issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Women's issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Variety of social issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>Homelessness and hunger issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Shari, her connection to health issues and HIV/AIDS developed from a speaker who challenged her. For others, their identity and exploration were critical for selecting an issue with which to be involved. Suzanne stated:

Service crosses all gender and class and racial, ethnic, religious lines. You can serve anyone, but I think it's just that much more meaningful when you have that certain relationship with this person or whoever you are serving, and sometimes it is based on your identity.

Christina described mobilizing around an issue for her as activism and advocacy. She, as well as several others, believed in taking a systemic approach to service even though this was often difficult. Identifying and understanding the needs of the community was a significant part of the service. Allowing the community to define the needs was crucial to the students. For all of the focus on one predominant issue, the participants talked about the interconnectedness of issues and that sometimes there were even competing needs. The social issue or focus of the service was meaningful for the students and was a contributing factor to their commitment to
service. The other focus of the service was the specific site. While all of the participants talked about the social issues they were most passionate about, the participants also highlighted their service site and why it was a connection for them. Their commitment to service was fertilized by their focus on a social issue and their relationship or connection to a service site.

*Relationships.* All of the students thought of themselves in relationships with the community and with other servers. In terms of other volunteers, the participants had shared experiences, beliefs, identity and values with other servers. These relationships were described as a fellowship with other volunteers; there was "comfort of having colleagues in service and support." These relationships could be with people with whom the participants volunteered as well as independent relationships with other people who valued and performed service separate from the volunteers. Shari felt this relationship was "symbolized by an open mind, open ears, and open heart." The relationship with fellow servers could be a friendship or mentoring as well as a coalition of people working on similar issues. Vincent's relationships with other servers were varied ones, including friendships, business-like, and some where he was not as interested in camaraderie. Habitat 1 talked about how there might even be some conflict with other volunteers, but that was a part of the relationship. Christina described the "bond/relationship with other servers with the same idealism and recognition of gifts to help others." Regardless of the types of relationships the participants had with other servers, they all appreciated the support of other service doers and having a community of service providers. As the participants continued with their service, their relationships with other servers tended to deepen and become more genuine such that they could talk, disagree, and
challenge each other sincerely. The participants were also able to identify which relationships were significant to them.

The other relationships that were valued by the participants were with community members and the agency staff. They felt it was critical to recognize the person being served and to learn about the community members. The participants worked to help the community in a reciprocal manner, but they talked more about the importance of not harming the community. Habitat 1 talked about "understanding the multi-facetedness of community." Habitat 1 worked with future homeowners and believed that Habitat for Humanity is not charity because it empowers people and tracks for success and has safety nets as a part of the program. She sees the work as rebuilding economic and physical community. Ashley talked about being appreciated and cared for by the people she was serving. Suzanne worked at a feminist organization that empowers and hires women. She saw no distinction between staff and residents (servers and people being served). Habitat 1 talked about her realizations as she got to know the community. She believed you can't ignore people's needs because of fear that people are feeding off of the system. Debra talked about how one can serve his/her own community as well as other communities. Community service should help communities; Debra warned that "service can teach reliance by community members which is not what servers want." "It was just so much more fulfilling for me to see the community helping itself while we were helping it" was Debra's sentiment about her relationships with community members. Vincent believes that a "personal relationship with people I serve is particularly important in a homeless community." He continued there because of the relationships.
The participants described needing to hear people's stories and understand them. Habitat 1 described working "with the homeowners or the future homeowners." She said:

You get a chance to hear their side of the story and hear what their life is like and just talk to them. It's not like "I'm helping you out;" it's like you're helping yourself out and I'm just kind of here.

Suzanne was affected by other activists and community members. She was inspired by community members who are empowered and saw them as "participants in a joint struggle." Debra believed she could serve two populations at once -- community members in need of things and people who need to learn about service and what is going on. She saw her relationships with other servers and with community members as not necessarily separate entities. These relationships were also important in defining the participants. "It (service) definitely makes me feel good and feel better about myself knowing that I am not just living my life for me, but living it or trying to at least live it to some degree for other people," stated Habitat 1. In sum it, the participants found relationships were important to service and they evolved through the service. These relationships were knowing others, being known, and learning about their perspective.

Reciprocity. Reciprocity is the last category that comprises the key category of service. Reciprocity implies that the servers give to the community members as well as the service site and that the servers gain from their service as well. All of the participants easily identified what they gained or learned from their service. Frequently they felt like they gained more than they gave. Some participants viewed reciprocity simplistically; however, others described it more complexly. Habitat 1 tried to accomplish and see "what I wanted to get done happen and completed and
someone benefiting from that and me benefiting from seeing someone else happy." The women from My Sister’s Place and from HIPS “taught [me] a lot about analysis on battered women, battered women’s issues,” said Suzanne. She also discussed how the executive director at My Sister’s Place “taught [me] to look at the baby steps people make. You get satisfaction out of that.” The understanding of the reciprocity varied by participant. The participants had heard people talk about selfless service, yet they felt that you always enter service with yourself, your strengths, and your needs. In the focus group, they discussed the topic of selfless service and they agreed unanimously that it was a false concept. They termed it the “myth of altruism.” They believed there was always a balance of giving and receiving. Suzanne described it as shared gifts. Christina stressed the importance of taking time to rejuvenate and not always keep giving because she had gotten burned out when she was giving more than she had the energy to give and was not receiving enough back. Overall, participants described a reciprocity and mutuality in the serving relationship. While the different parties might not be receiving the same things and the needs of both groups might be different, the participants all believed in reciprocity being a core ingredient to positive, meaningful service.

Personalization and Responsibility

As students completed service on the helix model, they moved to the key category of personalization and responsibility. Personalization describes that the participants internalized the need or responsibility to serve or a connection to a social issue. This key category was comprised of identity as a service provider, connection to an issue, personal responsibility, and a responsibility to others. In other words, personal responsibility was self-imposed by the participants while a responsibility to others was more dictated from society. The participants understood the societal
pressure to serve and help others, but they tended to be more motivated and committed by their personal responsibility or sense that they could and should make a difference. The concept of personalization meant that the participants integrated responsibility into their identity as described by the participants.

Identity as a service provider. An important part of personalization was viewing one's self as a service provider and integrating this view into one's identity. A reciprocal relationship existed as involvement in service encouraged the development of one's identity while at the same time, one's identity encouraged the participants to serve. The participants personalized service so that it was intimately a part of their lives and of themselves. Hugh said, "If I wasn't doing service, I wouldn't be comfortable in my life. I need to be doing more." He went on to say, It connects with my identity in that I feel that it's just a part of who I am...I need to, I want to continue doing service, make service a part of my life. I would feel I would be incomplete without some part of that going on. This is a sentiment that was shared by many of the participants. Ashley didn't necessarily view service as a part of her identity; instead, she thought about particular qualities that she possessed and that service enabled her to use these qualities. Some of the participants made decisions to serve based on their need or desire to serve while others developed an identity and a need for service after beginning to serve. Hugh talked about moving from service being something fun to service being a really important part of his life. Suzanne's conscious decision to be a Women's Studies major meant to her that she was taking on a political role of being an activist. She said, I'm an activist partially because of my race and my gender and it's informed; I'm an activist in different realms of my, like well religion, coming to that
kind of feminist consciousness has pulled me away from my traditional
religion which isn't to say that I won't at some point go back and
reconceptualize religion.

Debra views herself as a service provider because she sees a need for service. Debra
sees herself as willing and able to serve.

I think that everybody knows that these problems are there, but if you don't
see it, and you're not confronted with it, then you can ignore it. I don't think
that's a conscious choice, but to me, that's not even something I would
imagine doing. Why ignore it? Solve it.

Vincent views his identity complexly saying, "I think service gives me the identity of
a service provider, but I think it also influences a lot of my identities, my identity as
an anthropologist, my identity as a computer specialist because I really try to bring
service...I think service really influences those, and I try to act in a service-y manner,
for lack of a better word." Vincent saw himself as able to provide service, therefore,
he should provide service.

Many of the participants talked about their progression to a service identity.
Hugh's illustration of this is that "If I look back at when I first came in as a
freshmen, I have changed in that service will be a part of my life forever." Chris
talked about how service is now "one of my defining characters." Christina viewed
her life as service in many forms including career, family, and other roles. She then
talked about how service is just a part of her and a part of how she lives. She went
on to quote an inspirational saying for her of "you make a living by what you get,
you make a life by what you give." Christina believed that "your life is what you
give of yourself, and so that's why it's [service is] important to me, because it's my
life." As is evident, the participants all took ownership for and integrated service into
their life and identity.
Connection to social issues. Personalization was also comprised of connections to social issues in the words of the participants. While social issues could be a catalyst for the participants to begin or continue serving, social issues were also what the participants were passionate about and how they personalized their service. For example, Habitat 1 began serving by building houses because it looked interesting and fun. She did not really think about getting to know the people. She said she "started to realize that they were really great people, they had stories, they had lives, and they weren't lazy and they weren't feeding off the system like politicians try and make them out to be." Habitat 1 went on to note her connection with the community. She stated, "They're not 'these people;' they are individuals." Habitat 1 said that homelessness has become something that she feels very strongly about. She voted for people who support her issues, and she hopes the "older I get, I'll find some way where my voice can make a difference."

Similarly, Suzanne talked about her commitment to the cause of women and in particular being adamant about violence against women. Some of the things that she cited as contributing to the connection to the issue were empathy; the experience of being oppressed; and being shocked, appalled, and saddened about the treatment of women. Shari described her attachment or personalization of an issue as based on the people she met and their struggles and hardships. Her interest in HIV/AIDS and gay and lesbian rights was connected to a friend "coming out" as gay, HIV/AIDS being viewed as a gay disease, being upset by the discrimination, and understanding her privilege as well as the belief that she could make a difference. Similarly, Christina's catalyst for personal activism was an emotional experience in the classroom related to Asian American history. This is when her commitment to this issue developed. All of the participants were passionate about one or more issues. As their knowledge and experience with the issue(s) deepened, so did their
integration of the issues into their identities. This commitment to service and more specifically to a particular social issue was a key ingredient to their development of personalization in the service helix.

*Personal responsibility and responsibility to self.* Personal responsibility played a notable role in the development of personalization. Personal responsibility or a responsibility to self is the concept that people have gifts and resources and therefore should act upon these gifts by serving others. Christina described the responsibility to do service because she sees a need, and Vincent believed that service was his responsibility as a person who has the ability to serve. His ability to serve led to a responsibility to serve. Vincent's responsibility came from his belief system, was self-imposed, and expanded his belief that all should serve. Hugh stated, "I have a responsibility to make a change in the world for the good." The participants related that everyone has a responsibility to serve but they, as participants, have accepted their responsibility to serve, partially because they understand the social issues and see themselves as able to make a difference. They also believed that some responsibility comes from understanding one's privilege. According to Christina, "It's your responsibility to give back because you have been given so much so you need to give back." Hugh believed that there would always be needs and that it was his personal responsibility to address these issues. He also stated,

I want to make change. I want to make the world a more just place or towards social justice. You know how that works...using my knowledge and going back to this idea of, I am being gay has really opened my eyes to a lot of the privilege that I have had. The whole personal responsibility, I think that key was, is knowledge of my own minority status.
Suzanne stated, "It's a responsibility to myself because it's what legitimizes my own personal values." Similarly, Christina mentioned, "For me it definitely comes from within that I recognize that this is my responsibility and what I want to do." Vincent talked about the development of his responsibility. He said, "I just think it comes about when you begin to view your role in the greater world, when you view yourself as a similar entity in a sea of people and you become a part of something which I think I am." Hugh related similar thoughts. "I started to feel an intense amount of personal responsibility. And I think this is kind of the key word for me in service is personal responsibility," said Hugh. He went on to talk about his role in society, "I should be held responsible for the world I am living in." Hugh described his commitment and personalization of service by saying,

If someone says, Why? Why is it your responsibility? Because it is.
Because I'm a human being. Because I'm intrinsically connected to every other person that is living in this world right now. What I do affects everyone else.

Christina also talked about this accountability for one's actions and life. "I think a major thing now that I think about it was just the whole concept of accountability and that you are responsible for your actions and anything you do, you're responsible for it," stated Christina.

For some of the participants, the development of personal responsibility happened at some catalytic moments, but for most, it was an evolution of understanding one's self and one's community. Hugh cited a critical point in his development of personal responsibility as he reviewed his transcript from the first interview. He developed the following equation, that he wrote in the margin of his returned transcript, to describe the convergence of viewing the AIDS quilt, taking a Women's Studies class, and coming out as a gay man as,
Quilt = Problem
Women's Studies = Responsibility
Being Gay = Personal

Debra's responsibility was not to a particular community, instead she described it as a human thing. "I should help others help themselves," she said. She went on to say, "I think we have to take ownership for what happens in our world, and I think that's part of the responsibility, that, that sense of responsibility."

The other component of personal responsibility was a melding with a desire to help serve. The responsibility to serve was frequently activated by a desire to serve or make a difference. Shari believed that we all have a responsibility to help others, but we do not always take on that responsibility. People who want to help others take on the responsibility of those who do not want to help from Shari's perspective. Ashley thought "it's like a marriage between wanting to do it (serve) and feeling a responsibility that drives me to pursue it." Similarly Hugh stated, "I want to help others but I understand at the same time I have a responsibility to help others." Shari also talked about her life goal of helping others. "I continue in the causes that I've started because I feel really strongly about them, to see that change come about, to see a cure for AIDS, to do what I can do to make a difference, to meet other people who really feel strongly about it. I want to change the world, and I feel like community service is one way to start," said Shari.

The categories of personal responsibility and responsibility to others had many similar characteristics. For the participants, differentiating was often difficult, but it was clear that personal responsibility was the guiding force of their personalization. As was mentioned, a responsibility to self and a responsibility to others can be quite intertwined. Overall, the participants thought this was a good merger. Hugh put it,
I have a responsibility to myself to serve because I know it will help me grow. I have a responsibility to my community because that's what being part of a community, working with a community on behalf of community, working as a part of community. It's almost like they're all together, like responsibility to all of them and one's self.

Habitat 1 also described it as, "I think they (wanting to help others and the responsibility to help others) kind of mesh together because I feel that I should do it but I also want to do it, so there's never been a conflict."

**Responsibility to others.** The last part of personalization is a responsibility to others. This concept was similar to social responsibility in that some of the sense of responsibility originated from others including parents, religion, school, and the community members one was serving. When participants were asked about social and civic responsibility, those terms meant little to them. Most of the participants did go on to talk about responsibility to others but that the concept needed to be connected to their personal sense of responsibility or desire to serve. None of the participants developed a level of personalization because of a responsibility to others until they saw their own role in the service cycle or their ability to make a difference. The wording of responsibility to others was significant in that participants saw themselves connected to the plight of others instead of viewing this responsibility as being placed on them from authorities. Christina defined this responsibility as "kind of like the stone in the pond, like the little things that you can do ripple out to other people and will affect other people, hopefully in positive ways. That's what I'd like to think of social responsibility as like the things that you do in a positive way of giving socially to your community, to your world will affect everyone." While the participants recognized the need to serve as a value, they believed that servers must
embrace the responsibility in order for their service to be a commitment and to reach a level of personalization.

A piece of responsibility to others was encouraged by religion, family, and other meaningful people. This component is similar to the catalyst to continue serving. The sense of responsibility was partially developed by others valuing or encouraging the participants to serve. Debra’s sense of responsibility was formed partially from her religion and from her parents. “I also think that service is really a big part of my religion. Judaism is really founded in a lot of service beliefs, and I was raised very strict...so I think my parents have definitely instilled a sort of sense of responsibility to fellow human beings and the environment and our planet.” Vincent described how his background helped give him a sense of responsibility but it did not penetrate until later when he had other experiences, readings, and people that helped him understand his responsibility. Religious background was also significant for Suzanne, Habitat 1, and Christina. All of the participants were encouraged to take responsibility either by parents, role models, or teachers; many had multiple sources of support and development.

Another component of responsibility to others was a sense of responsibility to the community members where one served or to a particular community. Vincent described this as, “Because service is needed and there's communities in need out there and no one's there to help them or few people are there to help them or the resources that are there to help them aren't reaching them, so service providers or service doers are needed to help connect people to resources.” Ashley felt a responsibility to the Black children she was serving. “I thought to myself that it's time for people to take responsibility for educating Black children about their identity,” stated Ashley. She realized that in this statement she was contradicting what she “said in the beginning about the difference between wanting to do it and
feeling a responsibility to do it.” For this issue, Ashley had both a desire and a responsibility to help. Suzanne talked about a responsibility or connection to a movement or struggle, in this case women’s issues. She felt responsible to educate the community about the issues and to educate the women she’s helped so they get to some of the roots of the problem. She wanted to help others because she was empathetic and felt their pain and realized that there was nothing separating her from them but a few choices. A final example is Vincent who felt a responsibility to the homeless community he served because they asked him to come back and he thus had a commitment to them.

Similar to personal responsibility, responsibility to others was also comprised of a sense of interconnectedness to others. This relationship led to a sense of responsibility. Habitat 1 described how everyone should do something, that there is a duty to serve. Hugh stated, “I'm a human being and I have a responsibility to help others not through market incentives or competition but through collectivity and sharing and using my strengths along with others.” Hugh realized the interconnectedness of people and the ramifications of his actions. Christina thought that one’s identity also played into responsibility. She stated,

Service crosses all gender and class and racial, ethnic, religious lines. You can serve anyone, but I think it’s just that much more meaningful when you have that certain relationship with this person or whoever you are serving.

And sometimes it is based on your identity.

Debra believed that this connection to others meant that she should “help others help themselves.” She realized that her goal was to empower the community and that she alone could not help them; everything had to happen in relationship with others. Chris saw his relationship to the students he tutored as well as to the fellow volunteers. Habitat 1 described her relationship to society and how “differentials”
affect responsibility. She stated, "I think everyone should do something because the way this society is, it's so unequal between the have's and have not's. I mean there's such a huge divide." Some of the participants understood their interconnectedness to others early in their service experience; however, others came to recognize this through the process of serving.

The final piece of a responsibility to others and personalization was an effort to involve others in service. Habitat I talked about passing on a sense of responsibility. She said, "You breed other people that you know are really interested and want to get involved because you know they can make a really great contribution, and you look for those people and you encourage them." Those participants involved in Alpha Phi Omega actively worked to get others serving and to foster a sense of responsibility. The other participants also shared leadership and worked to actively involve others. A responsibility to others was a significant part of personalization for the participants. A quote by Shirley Chisholm (as cited in Chambliss, et al., p. 10) summarized the key category of personalization nicely:

Most Americans have not seen the ignorance, degradation, hunger, sickness, and futility in which many other Americans live...They won't become involved in economic or political change until something brings the seriousness of the situation home to them.

Outcomes

Outcomes is the final key category in the service cycle and was the original focus of this grounded theory research. The initial intent was to see how students changed from their involvement, particularly with regards to responsibility. This section illuminates what the students saw as their outcomes of community service as
well as how this leads back to the beginning of the service cycle, to background and catalysts.

In the beginning of the interviews, many of the participants had difficulty articulating the various outcomes they received through their involvement in community service. As more time was spent discussing the service experience, the participants reflected on the ways they were different. Many of them were surprised as they discussed the ways they had grown, often unearthing differences as they began speaking. They came to realize that their growth had deepened as they continued in community service. The participants also expressed gratitude for the time to explore the role that community service played in their lives.

Outcomes frequently were not insular changes but were related to each other. In many ways, the outcomes interacted together as a complex constellation where some worked together although other outcomes were more distinct. Each participant's "constellation" was unique, yet the key category of outcomes contained the same threads, just woven together differently. The key category of outcomes consisted of personal development, intellectual development, responsibility, relationships, and leadership.

*Personal development: Knowing who I am and what I believe in.* For all of the participants, involvement in community service translated into a personal learning opportunity. They were challenged through their experiences, and because of this, they came to better understand who they were, what they believed in, and where they chose to expend their energy. Their personal development consisted of self-knowledge, having service as a value or priority, commitment to an issue, and developing an identity as a service provider.
Service helped create a sense of self for these participants. Chris seemed to "come alive" after several months of tutoring. He felt that he made a difference and eventually found a calling to teach because of his service. Chris explained that service made him "more stable when (he) was going through some unstable times." For many, they discovered their strengths and their career path because of their involvement in community service. They really came to "know themselves." Hugh developed goals for his service and tried to accomplish them. These goals were learning, increased awareness, social change and correcting inequalities, growth as a person, and confidence. As for correcting social inequalities, Hugh realized that he could help but that his work was just a piece of effecting change.

Most of the participants described an increased self-understanding and a personal growth that was an outcome of their service. Some of this occurred as they received feedback or as their perceptions were challenged by what they heard or experienced. The participants also came to recognize their own gifts and skills as well as developed a raised consciousness. Christina described how she came to understand human nature and increase her compassion and thoughtfulness as a result of her community service. Chris focused on having better communication skills, and Ashley learned her personal limits along with how to be empathic. Habitat 1 described her increased self-confidence and humanity. For Suzanne, service helped meld her identity as a feminist and an activist as she put her knowledge into action. Debra expanded her comfort level, particularly in regard to handling differences and her own stereotypes. She developed a sense of humility and a perspective on what is important to her, mainly in regards to values clarification. Finally, Vincent's increased self-understanding manifested itself as identity clarification or "growing into his own skin" as he put it. He believed that he understood his own values,
thoughts, and beliefs; had done career and environmental exploration; and now understood multiple perspectives.

In addition to describing their outcomes, the participants explained how the depth of their growth had deepened as they continued with service. The challenging of their identity and insight into their strengths and weaknesses took time and experience with their service. Some of the participants exhibited greater development in this category; Suzanne, Christina, Debra, and Vincent discussed their identity as advocates and working for social justice as increased development from when they started serving. Several of the other participants simply described learning about their skills, weaknesses, and values. The varying levels of self understanding illustrate the development through the service helix.

The second part of this category is having service as a value or priority. Some of the participants began service with a sense that service was important, but others began service more naively. Regardless of the initial status, all of the participants described the development of a value for service. None of the participants could imagine their life without service being an important part; they would be incomplete without this component. Some of the participants explained that service might look different at various points in their lives but service would be present. For some, service would be an experience that they participated in weekly although for others, they choose career paths and lifestyle choices based on service as a priority. They were more committed to causes and willing to challenge stereotypes and expand their comfort zones.

Commitment to an issue was the third component of personal development. The participants talked strongly about the development of their commitment either to social issues in general or to a specific issue. This commitment was the underlying current to their service. The participants discussed how the commitment may
manifest itself in different ways at different points of their lives, but the commitment remained a constant. Hugh described having a "stronger commitment to social problems, especially HIV and AIDS." Shari stated "once you meet people and you realize all the struggles and the hardships that they face, it really attaches you to the subject." Shari plans to work in health education which she views as service. The varying understanding of social issues and the level of commitment was the differentiating characteristic for the participants. In many ways, the outcomes of service as a value and a commitment to an issue are connected. However, some participants noted that they might change the social issue they are passionate about, but they believed they would remain committed to both service and social issues.

The final component of personal development was fostering an identity as a service provider. This category overlaps with the same named category of personalization and is similar to the catalysts of belief that one can make a difference and desire to help others. Through their involvement in service, the participants became competent to perform community service, more knowledgeable of social structures and dynamics, and more aware of power and privilege. They believed they had the ability to change things and this made it their responsibility to serve. When asked who they were, all of the participants quickly declared that part of their identity was as a service provider.

Involvement in community service created an outcome of personal and identity development for these participants. Within this outcome, they explored privilege, power, racism, classism, sexism, and homophobia. They better understood who they were, what they believed in, what their strengths and weaknesses were, and where they would focus their energy.
Intellectual development. Intellectual development was the second category of outcomes. Intellectual development consisted of participants becoming more complex thinkers, learning about social issues, and having a greater understanding of service and the cycle/dynamics. Many of the participants thought that their service complemented their academic studies although a few others thought that their academic work informed their service. All of the participants believed that education was a key to good service.

Being a more complex thinker was a major thread as participants described how they now challenged their assumptions and what they read. They became critical analyzers of situations and knowledge as well as came to realize that there were many sides to most issues. They realized that there are multiple experiences and viewpoints. According to Hugh, "It's an ongoing or everyday challenge for me to say, keep your eyes open, remember that your perspective is not the only one." Suzanne believed that "education provides preparation" for service. She also saw service as the translation of theory into action. She understood oppression and injustice both intellectually and experientially. For all of the participants, the scope and depth of knowledge increased as an outcome of service. They remarked how they learned things they never would have in the classroom. Finally, they learned or developed frameworks with which to analyze information.

An awareness of social issues and an understanding of systemic dynamics was another piece of intellectual development. Participants gained much knowledge about poverty, physical abuse, racism, drug and alcohol problems, HIV/AIDS, and poor educational systems. The participants became interested in the root causes of the problems and became more willing to do research into solutions. The basic assumptions of the participants were challenged along with their concepts of justice. Shari developed a consciousness of privilege as did many of the other participants.
"I knew that I was privileged...I could do something about it and I could make a
difference and I didn't have to sit back and let it happen to people," stated Shari. In
the focus group, the participants commented that their privilege and guilt helped
motivate them to serve. The only exception was Vincent who believed that service
was connected to his humanity, and he had not grown up privileged. The idea of
service as giving was also challenged for all of the participants. Through his
involvement, Hugh understood that service is more than giving, that it is about
reciprocity. These students now serve because they see themselves connected to the
community they are serving and because they believe they need to change the power
structures and create sustainable change; charity is no longer enough. A connected
outcome was that they developed an understanding of the meaning of community and
are now able to identify and understand needs. This was a pivotal development for all
of them. The participants believed that what they learned related to social issues and
broader issues of justice would impact all areas of their life and their decisions to
continue serving.

Sense of responsibility. A sense of responsibility emerged as an outcome of
service for the participants. This sense was comprised primarily of a belief that one
can make a difference and because one is able, one should serve. This sense of
responsibility appears as both an outcome and a category of personalization. As the
participants came to understand themselves in the context of service, they
personalized this outcome. The sense of responsibility is fully defined under
personalization, so only a synopsis will be given here. This is one of the cases
where there is great overlap between categories within key categories. The
participants described how they internalized the responsibility to serve but that this
sense of responsibility was also an outcome of their service.
Whether participants began their service with some level of responsibility, this sense of responsibility emerged as an outcome for all of the participants. Chris' background helped give him a sense of responsibility, but it did not penetrate until later when he had other experiences, readings, and people that helped him understand his responsibility. The participants saw this sense of responsibility often making them different from other students who performed community service because the study participants built service into their lives while the others served when it was convenient. Suzanne saw the need to change social norms. Other participants explained that they have a responsibility to create change, small or large. Debra stated, "Since there are things that I can definitely do to change it and should be doing to change it, then that's kind of the responsibility coming in. It's MY responsibility to do everything that I can to make the world a better place." "I feel a responsibility to make a change in the world for the better," Hugh stated strongly. He went on to say, "I went from being service would be like something fun or neat to do, to something, this is really an important part of my life." Shari explained the difference between wanting to help others and a responsibility to help others. She described that "we all have a responsibility to help others, but we don't always take on that responsibility." She went on to say, "I think it's the people who want to help others that take on the responsibility of the people who don't." Shari later described that "I don't feel like I have a responsibility necessarily except to my family, but it's because I want to help people." When asked what social and civic responsibility meant to him, Vincent believed that it is "part of my humanness idea whereas part of a community, you have some type of responsibility to serve the community or to participate in a way that's constructive to that community." He stated, "I guess my idea of human is someone who treats others like they'd wish to be treated or would like to be treated." Finally, Debra thought the development of responsibility "comes
about when you begin to view your role in the greater world, when you view yourself as a similar entity in a sea of people and you become a part of something which I think that I am.” As the participants moved through their service, their sense of responsibility emerged as a consistent outcome. Their responsibility and understanding of their role in society evolved and developed with time, reflection, and experience.

**Deepening relationships.** The participants gave much attention to the relationships that developed as an outcome of service. These relationships could be with other servers or with the people being served. Relationships were formed through community service, but the participants also learned more about the dynamics involved in relationships. For all of the participants, there was an evolution of relationships as they continued with their community service, either at the same site or at different locations. Christina increased her understanding of human nature as well as cultivated friendships that she described as intimate because they shared the same ideals. She also articulated the importance of empathy to understand others. Chris talked about his significant, deepening relationship with the director of the tutoring program who became a role model for him as well as helped him network. Chris and the other tutors also had a special relationship that transcended their volunteer experience. Finally, Chris developed relationships with the students he tutored. These relationships were frequently quite complex and evolved with time. The majority of Debra’s service was with a service fraternity, and the service sites varied. As Debra grew and learned more about service dynamics, her relationships changed with the other servers because they tended to serve more out of a charity perspective, however, Debra moved to an increased justice and
change framework. Finally, Suzanne described being immersed in her community of "passionate, strong, amazing women."

The relationships were a valued outcome of service for the participants. They were mindful of all of the constituents and those who are affected by the service. The quality of their relationships and their understanding of the dynamics of relationships became more complex as they served. Through service, the participants learned how to interact with different populations and learned about themselves through these relationships.

*Leadership and motivating others to serve.* Not all of the participants used the word "leadership" to describe one of their outcomes, but they all discussed taking ownership at a service site. They became more empowered to make changes for the better and to challenge the current process. For some of the participants, they developed personal leadership skills, but other participants began leading others as an outcome of their involvement in community service. Vincent was continually frustrated by the lack of respect given to the people who were homeless at the shelter where he volunteered. He took the initiative to change the process so that the people being served could have their needs met in a way that was not demeaning. Another participant talked about Vincent without knowing he was in the study. This participant said that Vincent also served as a role model to many other college students because of his focus on community service and addressing the issues.

Shari, Christina, and Habitat 1 were all compelled to bring others into the service cycle and to take responsibility for their preparation and reflection on their service. This might happen within an existing group or with individuals. Shari also exerted individual leadership in that she looked for organizations or ways in get involved in issues. She did this monetarily or through her participation and support.
Ashley decided that she should take leadership for teaching the children she tutored about Black history since this was something she believed was important for their self-esteem and identity. She and some friends were even in the process of creating a service program. Similarly Vincent took ownership for the need to raise the consciousness of others and make them aware of others' struggles and differences. Debra took on leadership to educate others about doing good service because personal service was no longer enough. She also tried to instill in others personal responsibility to affect change.

The development of leadership progressed from leadership for one's self to leadership at the service site or with the issues to encouraging and leading others into responsible service. The participants did not take on leadership lightly. They encouraged people to serve where they "fit" and where there is a need. They wanted others to understand their gifts and privilege so they would serve others. This outcome of leadership was very significant to the participants.

**Vertical Axis**

All of these key categories formed the core category of the service cycle; however, it would be a flat model without the framework of the vertical axis that creates the helix. Background, catalysts, service, personalization, and outcomes created a two-dimensional model. While the participants cycled through these key categories or places, they also deepened in their experience, growth, and knowledge, to name a few. Development formed the third dimension of the vertical axis, and the movement illustrated the service journey that occurred for the participants. All of the participants moved through the service cycle, but they began their initial entrance at different places or levels of development.
To understand this development better, helix models for two participants are described (Figure 4). Chris entered community service because it was mandatory for his high school. He described how he initially served hesitantly and did not get very invested in the tutoring. Before long, he was identifying himself through his service, hence the broader distance between the coils or cycles. Chris continued to develop greatly through his tutoring and mentoring including making close friends, gaining a mentor, and changing his career direction. After some of this major growth, he moved back to slower, more continual growth through the service helix.

For Hugh, his visit to the AIDS quilt along with other catalysts of a Women's Studies class and coming out as a gay man catapulted him to service with an AIDS clinic. This created major growth illustrated by the large space between the service cycles. Hugh described this powerful service as more of an immersion that lasted for approximately a year until he settled into a more moderate level of service that fit with the rest of his commitments in his life. At this point, his development through service has slowed as can be seen by the smaller spacing between coils. Hugh talked about how roadblocks and then catalysts can slow down and then jump start his service. Despite this more erratic movement, Hugh believed that his commitment and growth from community service became more consistent after he determined its integration into his life. This development is illustrated in the second helix.

Development as the vertical axis completed the main story line of the service helix which described the participants' journey in terms of their experiences, movement, and growth through this community service.
Summary of Emerging Theory: Service Helix

Like DNA as the basis of life, the service helix became the core category of the college students' involvement and development with community service. The
key categories connected conceptually, but many of the concepts are not as distinct as they appear. For example, some concepts may be outcomes which later serve also as catalysts. To think about the service helix as a journey, much of the landscape is the same yet it is in a different location or is perceived differently by the traveler. The participants realized that the development is ongoing and not insular; there was frequently greater overlap than what may even be discussed here.

The purpose of this study originally was to explore the outcomes of community service for college students using grounded theory. What emerged from the words of the participants was a whole model of development that was grounded in the experiences and texts of the nine participants. In order to get to this point, the concepts were examined and re-sorted a number of times to form the emerging theory. The focus group assisted by giving the participants a chance to view the emerging model at that point and examine the categories and their relationships. Through that experience and utilizing a process of filling in the categories, the soundness and grounding of the theory was increased. The product of this research was the core category of the service helix and the five key categories of background, catalysts, service, personalization and responsibility, and outcomes. Many categories and concepts comprise this model and work to describe the organic nature of grounded theory. By utilizing the research strategies and methodology of grounded theory, a community service theory evolved that is "grounded" in the words and experiences of the nine college student participants.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The purpose of Chapter V is to discuss the findings of this study in relationship to the research questions and to the literature reviewed in Chapter II and more recent works. The implications for practice and future studies will also be analyzed. Finally, the strengths and limitations of this study will conclude the chapter.

Discussion of Theory in Relation to Research Questions

The intent of this research was to understand better how college students change and grow by performing community service. The original research question was designed to explore the outcomes for college students from their involvement in community service, particularly related to social and civic responsibility. This was broken down into the following questions:

1. In what ways do college students develop through their involvement in service? What outcomes do students identify as linked to their service experience?
2. What is the relationship between social and civic responsibility and involvement in service?
3. How are social and civic responsibility related to some of the other outcomes of service?

While these questions were answered, the whole service experience became the theme that emerged as a grounded theory of community service development. The service helix illustrates the movement of the participants' development and growth, sometimes fast and sometimes slow, steady or halting. The service helix is a
developmental model that explains how the participants deepened in all of the key categories, but to begin, the relationship between the original research questions and the results are described.

In what ways do college students develop through their involvement in service?

What outcomes do students identify as linked to their service experience?

Outcomes for college students from their involvement in community service, particularly related to social and civic responsibility were explored through the words and experiences of the participants. The participants described how they learned about themselves, others, and their relationships with others through their involvement in community service. As was previously described in Chapter IV, the students developed through their involvement in service in the areas of personal development, intellectual development, responsibility, relationships, and leadership. The outcomes were frequently related in their development. Through community service, the students came to better know themselves and what they believed in. For many, service helped define future career paths and for others an understanding of their strengths and weaknesses. Students became more complex thinkers and critical analyzers. They also developed an awareness of social issues and an understanding of systems affecting these issues.

The participants developed a sense of responsibility as an outcome of service. The sense of responsibility emerged as the participants developed a belief that they could make a difference. Relationships were another outcome of service. These relationships were with other servers and with members of the community where service was being provided. The relationships deepened with time and experience and helped the participants learn more about themselves. The final outcome for the students was leadership and a motivation to help others serve. For some of the
participants, they developed personal leadership skills. As the students continued to serve, they took responsibility for bringing others into the service cycle. As this occurred the students would educate the new servers about what to expect, the background of the service site, and how to process the service experience. The outcomes of service varied for each individual participant, yet they all developed in the areas of personal development, intellectual development, responsibility, relationships, and leadership.

What is the relationship between social and civic responsibility and involvement in service?

Responsibility was a significant word for the participants in regard to service, but social and civic responsibility held little meaning for them. The students instead described personal responsibility as emanating from themselves once they understood their connection to others and that they could use their talents for the good of others. Students recognized that they had responsibilities as told by their parents, teachers, and others, but they needed to internalize this responsibility before they felt that they needed to act on it regularly in the form of service. By performing service, the participants might have also further internalized this responsibility. Language was very important for the students in that when probed about civic responsibility, they either did not know what it meant or felt that it had little connection to them. For social responsibility, they tended to view this as an external focus that emanated from parents, teachers, or others in society. It wasn’t until they personalized the responsibility as an internal focus that they increased their commitment to service. This language use is a very important distinction for the participants.
Responsibility was, in some forms, a catalyst but was also connected to personalization and an outcome of service; in other words, an input and an output. Predominantly, responsibility evolved out of participation in service; however, this responsibility would later re-emerge as a catalyst that encouraged the students to continue service. The categories of desire to help others and belief that one can make a difference that partially comprise the key category of catalysts are part of the definition of responsibility for the participants. This category of desire to help others relates to what Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986) termed “connected knowing”. In Common Fire, the authors consider this empathy and compassion as interpersonal perspective-taking. They cite,

> Connected knowers seek to ‘imagine themselves’ into the other’s positions not simply by ‘effortless intuition’ but by a ‘deliberate, imaginative extension of one’s understanding into the other’s position.’ This imaginative extension is part of the felt connection foundational to compassion; it requires one not only to compose an image of the other’s world but to experience the feelings of living in that world. (Daloz, Keen, Keen, & Parks, 1996, p. 113)

As such, responsibility as a catalyst was an impetus for the continuation of service.

Responsibility also evolved out of an involvement in community service as students internalized the need to serve or developed a connection to a social issue. This personalization included both a personal responsibility that was self-imposed and a responsibility to others that came from society and role models. Finally, responsibility was also related to outcomes as the participants came to better understand themselves and in what they believed. The participants tended to take responsibility for social issues or communities for which they cared and/or to which they felt connected. The participants also illustrated this responsibility by encouraging and recruiting others to do service.
How are social and civic responsibility related to some of the other outcomes of service?

As was stated previously, personal responsibility was the significant term not social and civic responsibility for the participants. In the model, responsibility is shown largely as a part of the key category of personalization, but there are many overlaps between responsibility and outcomes. As was illustrated in this model, nothing occurs in isolation; thereby, responsibility was related to the other outcomes.

One of the components of outcomes was a sense of responsibility; therefore, the rest of this section will cover the relationship between responsibility and the other outcomes. Personal responsibility was related to some of the other outcomes in that as the students increased in their personal development their sense of responsibility also increased. As the participants gained a greater sense of their gifts and skills and the importance that they placed on service, they developed a sense of responsibility. As they gained self-confidence and as they gained more skills, they felt more able to take responsibility for service. In particular, the components of commitment to an issue and fostering an identity as a service provider were strongly related to personal responsibility.

The outcome of intellectual development consists of participants becoming more complex thinkers, learning about social issues, and having a greater understanding of service and its dynamics. Students could now challenge their assumptions and those of society in order to take ownership for creating change. As their intellectual development increased, the participants were able to critically analyze their own level of responsibility. Some of the participants reflected a high level of understanding of their responsibility and relationship to others that correlated to a higher level of intellectual development. Other participants, including Habitat 1,
Ashley, and Chris, were still beginning to understand the full implications of social issues. This coincided with their lower level of analytical skills. Overall, the students came to understand why they felt committed to service and what role it played in their lives. The participants also developed more of an understanding and an appreciation for the role of reciprocity in the service dynamic. When they saw themselves as active members in solving the problem, they took responsibility for the issue or for the community.

Deepening relationships was another outcome of service that related to responsibility. As the participants served, their relationships with fellow servers and with the community became more complex and mature. The students came to understand themselves through these relationships and saw how they were interrelated to others. With these relationships, the participants became mindful of all of the constituents and took responsibility for the ways that they could improve the relationships and impact the social issues. As is indicated by the service helix, the level of relationship and the depth of responsibility varied with the participants. As the participants came to know the community members in more meaningful ways, their sense of connection and commonality with the community members increased, thereby leading to greater responsibility.

The outcome of leadership also related to responsibility as participants began to take ownership at their service site. They created changes and tried to improve the service for all involved. Some of the participants even took responsibility for bringing others into community service. As the leadership for the participants increased, so did their responsibility for affecting social issues and understanding the broader ramifications of their actions. As is evident, there is a strong connection between the development of personal responsibility and the other outcomes of
personal development, intellectual development, deepening relationships, and leadership.

**Broader Findings of this Study**

Although the original research questions were answered by this study, the emerging theory was more expansive than the original expectation. As the students made meaning of their service, they could not separate the outcomes of service and the role of responsibility from the actual experience of performing service or from their background and catalysts that continued to bring them back to service.

The developmental model of the service helix demonstrates movement and growth that occurred for the participants. The model highlights how students cycle through the same categories and issues but frequently at greater levels of complexity. They incorporate their past experiences with service and with other areas of their life into their community service. The service helix demonstrated the increasing complexity when applied to the individual participants, so one could follow their development. The service helix could also be used as a comparison between the participants such that one could chart which participants were at "higher levels" of development than other participants. The service experiences and other life experiences all enter in to affect the outcomes for the participants. The findings of the service helix are explained in greater depth in comparison to the literature review.

The idea that background and catalysts were significant for the participants illustrates how nothing occurs in isolation. The background and catalysts indicate what affected these participants' intentions to serve and their behavior of committed and ongoing service. The original intent was to explore the outputs of service, but the research illuminated the fact that the inputs of background and catalysts also matter for the participants in their experience with community service. The
participants could not discuss their outcomes without first discussing how they got involved in service and why they continued to serve. The type of service, role of the community and other servers, as well as level of reflection all affected their service.

Personalization was also a significant finding of the study. The key category of personalization and responsibility illuminated the importance of the participants integrating their service identity into their perceptions of themselves. When compared to other students who serve, this may be a critical component that differentiates students who perform community service sporadically to those who have a commitment and personal responsibility for service. While all of the participants had performed substantial service before this study, they may have previously skipped this key category of personalization earlier in their development. Until another study is conducted that accounts for students who have less experience and commitment to service, this possibility of lower levels of development in the service helix will only be conjecture.

The other notable characteristic is that the participation in the interviews and focus group seemed to be meaningful experiences for the participants. The participants all thanked the researcher for giving them time to explore their experiences and development from service as well as the opportunity to reflect in structured ways. Their involvement in the research may have been significant to their meaning making and may have entered into the service helix as background, personalization, or outcomes. The involvement literature has some parallels here.

Relationship of Emerging Theory to Existing Literature

In order to create context for the service helix, the relationship between the emerging theory and existing literature was examined. The goal of this study was to inform the literature regarding community service and its outcomes specifically in
regards to social and civic responsibility, and it appears that this goal was accomplished.

**Foundations of Service**

The foundations of service were used to set some context for the study. The results of the study helped explore whether the principles and historical background are relevant and applicable to the actual experience and development of college students through their involvement in service.

**Components and principles of service.** In agreement with the work of Kendall (1990), the participants in this study concurred that reciprocity was a key component of service. For most, it took them a little while to realize what they were receiving from the service relationship; however, later many of the participants believed that they were receiving more from the relationship than they were giving. This is an evolution in thinking as most began their service with more of a philosophy of charity.

In comparison to Sigmon's (1990) three principles of service, two of the three principles were reflected in the words of the participants. These students believed that "those being served become better able to serve and be served by their own actions" and that "those who serve are also learners and have significant control over what is expected to be learned" were accurately reflected in their service (Sigmon, p. 57). On the other hand, they frequently did not experience that "those being served control the service(s) provided" (Sigmon, p. 57). Some of the participants did not reflect thinking about this although others talked about how the service agency might discourage this empowerment from happening. Vincent had commented on how the homeless shelter kept the men from being involved in the
process of having their needs met on significant issues such as clothing. There seemed to be a disconnect from beliefs and practice, since the majority of the participants believed that those served should be able to determine the services, yet the participants did not see this happening. This principle seems to be separate from the service helix because the participants overall did not feel that they had the power to determine whether those being served could control the services. When given an ability to control this aspect, the participants did try to involve those being served in determining the services they needed. This empowerment particularly was reflected by Suzanne.

The Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning was the final piece of foundational literature from the literature review (Honnet & Poulsen, 1989). All of these tenets were desired by the participants, but the principles were found to exist in varying degrees in actuality. The participants all concurred with principles 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9 (as seen on p 19-20). They tried to live these principles in their lives and in their service. One of the main points that was examined in the interviews related to the role of reflection because of principle 2 which states "provides structured opportunities for people to reflect critically on their service experience" (Honnet & Poulsen, p. 1-4). Some of the participants reflected in a structured manner by themselves or with others. They found reflection significant in their meaning making and personalization. The other participants reflected in more informal ways, often not realizing the impact of their service until later. Several of the participants had remarked about how this study really encouraged them to think about the way service impacted their lives.

In the key category of service, very few of the service experiences or programs "articulate(d) clear service and learning goals for everyone involved;" thereby, not all of the participants directly had considered what they wanted to
achieve or learn (Honnet & Poulsen, 1989, pp. 1-4). As the participants progressed through the service helix, they learned to ask these questions of themselves. Principle 8 also was not reflected by most of the participants’ experiences. Principle 8 stated, "an effective program includes training, supervision, monitoring, support, recognition, and evaluation to meeting service and learning goals" (Honnet & Poulsen, pp. 1-4). Suzanne was the only one who discussed this occurring at the women’s shelter where she served. Several other participants described the model of PARE: Preparation, Action, Reflection, and Evaluation as being a significant framework for their service (Maryland Student Service Alliance, 1994). Despite their knowledge of this, the participants themselves were the ones who thought about their expectations as they prepared for service, reflected on the service, and tried to take steps to improve the service. They did not have the structure, training, supervision, and reflection from the program where they were serving. The final principle 10, that the program "is committed to program participation by and with diverse populations," was slightly involved in the findings. The service sites did not all express explicit commitments to diversity; however, most of the participants learned a lot about diversity and working with people who are different from themselves. This growth in an appreciation of diversity was a part of the key category of outcomes under personal and intellectual growth. As one can see, the foundations of service literature assisted in setting the groundwork for the study and had many threads throughout the findings.

**Historical background.** Dewey’s theory of education was the primary historical guiding force for service and service-learning. The findings of this grounded theory supported the three implications of Dewey’s work that Giles (1991) described. These are mainly that the individual and the community are constructs that
are held in tension, that the relationship and interaction between the server and the community must be given attention, and that the learning that occurs through service is "interactive and reciprocal" and can be applied to other experiential learning (Giles, p. 89). The emerging theory described the tension between the development of one's self and the outcomes for the community as well as the outcome of deepening relationships for the students. In addition, the findings, related to the interactive nature of the service, have application to other learning. Finally, Dewey's concept of reflective learning was significant for the students as they cycled through the service helix and made meaning of their service and their outcomes.

Student Development and Service

Psychosocial development. The participants changed and developed throughout their experience with service, often in psychosocial ways. Chickering and Reisser's (1993) psychosocial development theory had direct application to the participants' movement through the service helix and the outcomes from service. The participants gained competence as service providers, as critical thinkers, and in their relationships with others and with themselves. They came to understand their feelings including guilt and integrated those feelings into their experiences. Oftentimes, those emotions were related to their experiences with others and their understanding of social issues. The servers came to see themselves in relationship with others as opposed to being autonomous. This is evident in their identity as service providers, their sense of personal responsibility, personal development as an outcome, and their deepening relationships. The fourth vector of developing mature interpersonal relationships was described by the participants as a component of service and as an outcome. Through these relationships, the participants learned about diversity, socio-economic differences, and privilege. The participants
developed meaningful relationships with the community members and with fellow servers that kept them returning to serve. The identity of the participants was a background category that encouraged the students initially and in an ongoing manner to perform service. Through the experience of serving and reflecting on one's service, the participants came to better know themselves and their values and beliefs. As the students served, they learned more about their identity as a service provider that became a category of personalization and responsibility. They also knew more about who they were and what they believed in. This became a part of personal development as an outcome. All of the participants discussed the first five vectors of Chickering and Reisser. Psychosocial development theory obviously informs the service helix for the participants. For some of the participants, they developed purpose through their service. This was mainly true for Suzanne and Christina; however, others discussed the role that service played in defining how they should live their lives and what career they plan to pursue. The seventh vector of developing integrity was harder to gather from the interviews, but future studies on the long-term impacts of service following graduation possibly could examine this development.

Cognitive development. The participants' increasing cognitive development was illustrated by their understanding of social issues and community problems. Students moved from viewing the social issues at their service site insularly to understanding the broader correlation among social issues. The participants began to view things more systematically and adjusted their service to try to address issues this way, even though they found it difficult. Just as the participants came to understand social issues, they also developed relationships with the people they were serving, and this interaction frequently proved helpful in debunking stereotypes and challenging the participants in their thinking. Many of the participants described their
more dualistic thinking as they began serving when they viewed problems in very black and white terms or saw things as good or bad. As they continued serving, they came to understand the nuances of life and how complex many situations are. For many, this plurality of many different viewpoints moved participants to multiplicity (Perry, 1970) where they did not believe that they had a right or ability to judge any perspective as not valid. By the end of several of the participants' years of service, it seemed that they had developed a commitment to relativism as they took responsibility for the pluralistic world and its problems. These participants were realistic about the realm of their influence, but they still were committed to making a difference and serving their community. The service helix model addressed cognitive development as the participants described their intellectual development as an outcome of service.

Moral development. The participants in this study discussed the robust moral dilemmas and situations they encountered. In some of these situations they observed, they felt powerless to act. An example of this is when Suzanne worked with battered women. She frequently would see the abuse occurring but believed that she could not act to get the women out of the situation. She saw her role as being supportive and trying to empower the battered women, with the hope that the women would remove themselves from the situation. In this case, Suzanne was guided by an ethic of care.

Vincent acted with an ethic of justice when he saw the employees of a homeless shelter not meeting the clothing needs of some of the men because the policy stated that each person could only get one outfit at that time. Vincent believed that the just thing to do was to meet the needs of the people as best as he could, thereby illustrating Kohlberg's (1975) postconventional level of development.
These situations are examples of the moral development that the participants described. Kohlberg's (1975) work helped set a framework for questioning that illustrated some of the outcomes for the participants. The participants discussed various levels of development. Many of the participants began serving out of a "good boy-good girl" orientation that is described in Kohlberg's stage three of interpersonal concordance. This entrance into service may have begun in college or before. Through the interviews, the participants also described the postconventional stage where they recognized the relativism of values and opinion and have examined their own values (Kohlberg). In addition, the participants struggled with how the individual rights for some people tended to be more important than the individual rights of others, particularly those who were more disenfranchised by society. Finally, some of the participants questioned why some people were treated differently and they looked past rules and laws to examine the basic good of all people. This has some similarity to stage six, universal-ethical-principle orientation, but it is unlikely that the students have reached this development (Kohlberg). As a framework, Kohlberg's model of moral development helped to design questions and show how students moved from being internally focused to externally focused.

The participants, in describing their experiences and outcomes from service, discussed the importance of relationships and an ethic of care, though not in these words. The participants tended to see themselves in relationship to others at multiple stages of the service helix. Gilligan's (1982) work had many parallels to the stories of the participants. In particular, the students discussed the catalyst of a desire to help others, responsibility to others as a category of personalization and responsibility, and the outcome of a sense of responsibility all of which parallel Gilligan's move toward a sense of responsibility toward others from a more self-focused orientation. Also similar, the students described how they moved from
doing service out of responsibility and charity toward a desire to effect change in social problems. The point where the participants began to focus on personalization and responsibility appears to be consistent with the transition from Level 2 to 3 (Gilligan). As the participants described their growth and experiences from community service, they discussed a movement from a focus on self to understanding one’s self in relationship to others and caring about social issues and the community. At every point in the helix, an emphasis on an ethic of care is present; therefore, Gilligan's model of moral development offers insight into the findings and the findings also offer applications to Gilligan's model.

*Experiential learning cycle.* Kolb's (1984) Learning Cycle model shares commonality with the service helix in the symbolism of movement that is core to the model and some similarities between the four stages of Kolb and the key categories of the findings. The participants tried to make meaning of their service throughout the cycle. The key category of service has strong similarity to Kolb's concrete experience in that the students are personally involved with the community in everyday situations and tended to be "open-minded and adaptable to change." They didn't necessarily use a systematic approach to learning during their actual service experience. The participants utilized reflective observation as they tried to understand situations and issues from different points of view. They exhibited abstract conceptualization as they examined larger social concerns and tried to develop a mental framework for why these issues exist. The participants relied on logic and systemic thinking to develop ideas on how to solve problems. Finally, the participants also engaged in active experimentation as they took a more hands-on approach and tried to influence situations and create greater change by thinking about the big picture.
Throughout the interviews, it became obvious that some of the participants had preferred styles of learning as illustrated by Kolb. Ashley and Habitat 1 seemed to be accommodators in their learning style because they learned best from practical experience and relied more on people in making decisions than on analysis (Stewart, 1990). Hugh, Christina and Debra tended to exhibit characteristics of converger as their learning style. They would apply theory and ideas for practical purposes and use deductive reasoning. Shari and Chris had the ability to view problems from a multitude of frameworks, and they both had a strong interest in people. They tended to apply logic to creating change. These are all characteristics of a diverger. Finally, Vincent and Suzanne often used their academic frameworks in abstract conceptualization to create an understanding of the need for community service and the broader social issues affecting the community. They both appeared to be assimilators who create models, have an interest in theory and ideas and utilize inductive reasoning. Christina often would use this learning mode as well.

Kolb's (1984) Learning Cycle helped frame how students make meaning of their service and of their development from involvement in community service. This theory also gave clues about the roles of active involvement, reflection and feeling, systemic thinking and theorizing, and trying active solutions to create positive change thereby providing a greater understanding about how the different key categories might have different meaning for the participants. The overlap between the key categories of the service helix and the stages of Kolb's Learning Cycle were not significant as a framework that represented a parallel movement. Instead, the Learning Cycle informed about ways that the participants learn about and become engaged in service. Kolb's model helped illustrate the complexity of learning that occurs through service. All of the participants experienced concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation though
with different foci and importance of those stages for the participants. In Kolb’s model, the helix eventually converges into a conical shape as one moves upward in the model illustrating one’s use of all learning styles in a more integrated way. Unlike Kolb’s Learning Cycle, the service helix maintains its original dimensions as students move through the five distinct key categories. None of the participants described a convergence of these key categories during their college experience.

Service-Learning Model. One of the most significant models to compare the service helix to is the Service Learning Model by Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990). The Service Learning Model provided one of the original theoretical frameworks for community service and student development. The Service-Learning Model has a strong relationship with the vertical axis of the helix model. The parallel between the Service-Learning Model phases and the service helix offers a greater understanding of service and a deepening development of outcomes. The four key variables also have some shared qualities that will be explained below.

The participants in this study described their experiences with service, their personalization, outcomes, and then catalysts and background for beginning service again. In the Service-Learning Model, Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990) describe mainly the service experience and some of the outcomes for the students. The descriptive variables in the Service-Learning Model give greater depth and have similarities to the words of the participants. The participants described how they began serving, whether in college or before. For many of them, they began serving similar to the Service-Learning Model phase 1 of Exploration where they were excited and naive about what they were doing. Through this service, they gained self-knowledge similar to what the Service-Learning Model describes. The second phase of the Service-Learning Model is Clarification which is described as a salad bar
approach where the servers try different types of service with different issues as they begin to clarify what type of service has personal significance for them. Debra was the primary participant who described Clarification. For the rest of the students, they all appeared to remain with their original social issue or service site. In some cases, it is unclear whether they were committed to this issue before they began serving or if their commitment to this issue developed from the service experience. Some of the participants described beginning service at a later phase similar to phase 3 of Realization where they were more aware of the bigger picture of service and social issues. Frequently, these students began serving because they were committed to a particular issue and wanted to make a difference such as Suzanne volunteering with women's issues. Phase 4 of Activation seems to have many parallels to the stories of the participants as they began to explore reciprocity, guilt, justice, racism, and classism. At this point of development, the participants began to examine the larger societal issues and search for possible solutions or changes they could make to create a difference. Finally, the fifth phase of Internalization where students fully integrate community service into their lives and actions has great similarity to the key category of Personalization and Responsibility.

The four descriptive variables of the Service-Learning Model are important to consider when examining the relationship between the Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990) model and the emerging theory. These variables can be seen in Table 1 (p. 27) for greater clarity. The first variable of Intervention has two classifications: mode and setting. "Mode refers to whether the student engages in a service-learning activity individually or as a member of a group. The setting is characterized by the individual's relationship to the client population" (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, p. 11). Setting is comprised of nondirect, indirect, and direct service. For the study, the majority of the students began serving and continued serving as individuals. Shari,
Debra, and Habitat 1 were the only ones who had substantial service with a group. As for the setting, most of the participants’ service was direct service even when they began serving. There seems to be a lot of inconsistency between the emerging theory and the Service-Learning Model in regards to the variable of Intervention. The Service-Learning Model shows people serving with a group for the first three phases and mainly beginning with nondirect or indirect service, moving to direct or indirect service. For the students in this study, it was important to them that they were interacting with the community they were serving. When the participants talked about their past experiences with service, they predominantly began serving as individuals through indirect or direct service. This main difference seems to suggest a discrepancy in the models, not that the participants began their service like the Service-Learning Model states and are now at a later stage. These students just performed service with a different mode and setting than the Service-Learning Model suggests.

The second variable in the Service-Learning Model is Commitment which consists of frequency and duration of service. The students described their service as ongoing and long-term even from the time they began serving with few exceptions. The Service-Learning model shows a move from one time service to more consistent service, a distinction that only really applied to one participant in this study. The other contrast was that the emerging theory describes a significant duration of service from long-term to a lifelong commitment although the Service-Learning Model shows a move from short term service and a long term commitment to the group before a duration that is more similar to the emerging theory. The other main difference with the variable of commitment is that the Delve, Mintz, and Stewart (1990) model does not account for any pause in service. The participants described an occasional break or stopping off from service even at a point of high commitment.
to social issues and service. This break could be for a reflective renewal or because other life factors such as homework and family required more time so they did not have the time or energy to continue service as they had been doing. The participants knew that they would return to service and that their background and catalysts would converge to encourage them to begin serving again and that their commitment to these issues did not assuage during their break.

Behavior is the third variable of the Service-Learning Model, and it describes both needs and outcomes. Needs refers to the motivations that students have for engaging in service, and outcomes describe possible effects of serving on the students. The concept of needs compares fairly closely with the combination of background and catalysts, though there is more overlap with catalysts. While there is conceptual similarity, the actual findings are different. The Service-Learning Model describes needs that begin with "participate in incentive activities" and moves through "identify with group camaraderie; commit to activity, site or issue; advocate issue; promote values" (Delve et al., 1990, p. 12). The participants instead described needs to serve or catalysts of desire to help others, belief that one can make a difference, awareness, social issues, knowledge/academic study, service as a need, and the negative case of roadblocks. It is evident that the catalysts for the participants are more similar to the needs further along the Service-Learning Model; however, it should be noted that the participants never talked significantly about needs similar to those in the phases of Exploration and Clarification. This may simply be due to the fact that the participants are now more advanced in the service helix; however, some of the participants definitely began service because of needs like a commitment to an issue or site. The second facet of this variable is outcomes which is similar to both categories of personalization and responsibility and of outcomes in the emerging theory. The relationship in this case is similar to needs because the overlap between
the Service-Learning Model and the service helix is mainly on the later phases of realization, activation, and internalization. Although the participants described outcomes like feeling good and belonging to a group or more accurately, relationships, these were not the complete picture of outcomes for them. Instead the emerging theory included the key category of personalization and responsibility that was comprised of identity as a service provider, connection to an issue, personal responsibility, and a responsibility to others. The key category of outcomes consisted of personal development, intellectual development, responsibility, relationships, and leadership. As can be seen, this was a more complex finding than that covered in the Service Learning Model.

The fourth variable of Balance also provides insight into the relationship between these two models. Balance is comprised of challenges and support. Although challenges and support did not come out as significant categories in the service helix, they did play a part in the service experience for the students. Except for the challenges of breaking from the group, these parts of the Balance variable seem to fit with the service helix. Finally, the goals for the transition category in the Service Learning Model was from charity to justice which parallels what the participants described as their developmental movement as they came to understand service, social issues, and responsibility.

The Service-Learning Model overlaps with the emerging theory, but there are some distinct differences. The Service-Learning Model functions from the framework of students beginning service with a group, in a sporadic manner and moving toward more individualistic service with a high level of commitment. The participants of this study mainly served as individuals and some served as a part of a group at the service site, but the role of a group with which they served was not a piece of the service helix. The Service-Learning Model takes the stance that students
begin service with groups and then transition to service as an individual - this may be true in some instances, but it does not seem to be the main experience with the participants in this study. Similarly, Delve, Mintz, and Stewart take the stance that service begins for students as one-time experiences and then transitions into being committed, ongoing experiences. The emerging theory did not support this claim as many of the students began their service with a semesterly, committed experience. Even those participants who began serving before college started with a longer range commitment and almost always began as individuals. This may be accounted for in the differences in commitment or the phase of service where these students likely began service. The question may arise as to whether the students in this study were simply at a more developed point in the Service-Learning Model and this accounts for the discrepancies. Although the participants do seem to be more likely in phases of realization, activation, and internalization, they described their reasons for beginning service and their journey to where they were.

Reviewing their start in service, most of the participants began serving with a focus on a particular issue and had consistent, ongoing service. Habitat 1, Debra, and Ashley did have some service experiences with a group, but this was not their only beginning experiences with service. In this possible explanation of maturation on the service helix, there are still gaps between the Service-Learning Model and the emerging theory that are not accounted for by natural progression through the service helix. At several stops, the two models appear to be distinctly different.

Involvement Literature

The participants in the study viewed community service as a form of involvement, whether connected to the campus through student organizations or connected to the community. The students reflected that the more they were involved
in service, the greater they believed the outcomes were for them. This was similar to the findings by the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education (1984) that says as students are highly involved, "the greater will be their growth and achievement, their satisfaction with their educational experiences, and their persistence in college, and the more likely they are to continue in their learning" (p. 17). However, the students also described how their involvement in service caused them to question their academic learning and its applications to society. The students were more likely to attempt to apply theory to their service and to try to synthesize their courses. As the students became more critical thinkers, they sometimes became less satisfied with their educational experiences until they began to take greater control of their learning such as Christina designing her own major or Christopher deciding to move to education from physics.

Both the quantitative and qualitative features of involvement, postulates of involvement by Astin (1984), had relevance to the service helix. As Astin stated in his fourth postulate, "the amount of student learning and personal development is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement" (p. 298). As the students performed a greater quantity of service, their cycling through the helix increased, hence so did their development. As was indicated in Chapter IV, the participants' extent of development could vary greatly as is illustrated by larger or smaller vertical gaps between cycles. Regardless, with a quantity of service experiences, the participants believed they understood the big picture of service and social issues better, their level of personalization and responsibility increased, they had significant outcomes, and they continued to have more catalysts and more expansive background features that encouraged them to continue service.

The other characteristic of this involvement postulate is qualitative. In the interviews and focus group, the participants described how the quality of their
service experiences could vary greatly, particularly for students who served at multiple sites. When the students were engaged in meaningful, high quality service, they felt that they were contributing more and that they were learning more about themselves and about the community and the social issues. When the students did less connected or meaningful service, they described how they could feel like they were just "going through the motions" or not really making a difference, hence not getting much out of the service as well. The learning and development of the participants thus did vary with the quality and quantity of involvement like Astin postulated (1984).

The final relationship between the involvement literature and the findings supported Astin's (1993) work that participation in volunteer work correlated positively with the outcomes of commitment to developing a meaningful philosophy of life. The students described their personal responsibility to service and/or social issues and their need to make a difference. The emerging theory did not cover racial understanding or participation in environmental programs (Astin). Finally, the key category of outcomes in the service helix model did relate to "the personality measures of Social Activism and Leadership" and to self-reported leadership abilities (Astin, p. 392). There was no evidence in the emerging theory that for these participants time spent volunteering was correlated with personality measures of participation in campus demonstrations and tutoring other students (Astin).

Involvement literature was informative as background to this study particularly in regards to the quantity and quality of service. The finding from this study that might be helpful for future studies of involvement is to examine the sometimes sporadic nature of involvement and how and why students "stop out" and then return to involvement or in this case, service.
Motivations and Characteristics of Students Involved in Service

The literature on the motivations and characteristics of students involved in service was particularly important in yielding possible interview questions. Many of the studies examined nonvolunteers versus volunteers which does not provide much relevance to this grounded theory since the population was selected just for their service experience. The idea of motivation has a relationship to the key category of catalysts, and the characteristics of students involved in service relates to the emerging theory key category of background.

The service helix model illustrates the effects from service that have been previously difficult to document (Astin, 1993; Fitch, 1987; Leary, 1994). Because of the format of grounded theory, all of the participants were strongly involved in service so no information was available about whether there are significant differences between volunteers and non-volunteers like some earlier research has examined (Fitch, 1987; Fitch, 1991; Winniford, Carpenter, & Grider, 1995). Based on his literature review, Fitch (1987) looked at the following motivations for volunteering: altruistic, egoistic, and social obligation. Although his findings were not statistically significant, these three categories of motivation do have some overlap with the categories that comprise catalysts. Desire to help others, belief that one can make a difference, and education as meaning making could be viewed as altruistic. Service as a need could be viewed as egoistic, and social issues and level of conscious awareness could be linked to social obligation. Although there is some similarity, this relationship does not bear much insight into the emerging theory. In his next study, Fitch (1991) suggested that future research examine "whether involvement influences values or values influence involvement" (p. 539). The movement or helix of the emerging theory indicates that both reactions happen thereby supporting the idea that background and catalysts affect involvement in
community service but that community service also affects personalization and responsibility and outcomes, as well as the background and catalysts.

A study by Winniford, Carpenter, and Grider (1995) examined the traits and motivations of college students involved in service organizations. It is important to note that the students in this study were involved in service organizations; however, the participants in the grounded theory were mainly serving as individuals. Despite this fact, the findings of Winniford, Carpenter, and Grider have meaning for the service helix. These findings were that the students rated altruistic motivations highest followed by egoistic motivations and then social obligations (Winniford, Carpenter, & Grider). They also found no significant difference between the reasons that students got involved and stayed involved in service through the quantitative part of the study. In the emerging theory, the students did not prioritize their catalysts for service; however, they discussed how they cycle back through the helix to need catalysts for service and how these motivations or catalysts can vary based on how the service is going as well as on outside factors that may affect background. The three classifications of motivations for Winniford, Carpenter, and Grider do seem to encompass the categories of catalysts in the emerging theory. More than that, the themes of altruism, egoism, and social obligation seem to match the words of the participants. Individually and in the focus group they talked about the tensions of wanting to help others and make a difference while also understanding that they were gaining personally from their involvement in service. They discussed the continuum of serving others' needs and their own and that frequently both occurred at the same time, hence they are not mutually exclusive. In many ways, this was connected to the reciprocity that was discussed in Chapter IV.

The lowest rating for social obligation also has a relationship with the emerging theory and personal responsibility. The participants discussed how they
understood there was a social and civic responsibility to help others, but that this type of responsibility was not compelling enough for them to serve. It was only when they internalized the responsibility that it served a critical role in the service helix.

In the qualitative part of the Winniford, Carpenter, and Grider (1995) study, they found differences in why students originally got involved in service and why they stayed involved, a finding that differed from the quantitative findings. Winniford, Carpenter, and Grider found that the motivations for staying involved were more egoistic, particularly related to relationships. In the grounded theory study, the participants described how their catalysts to serve can remain the same but they may also vary depending on the background, what is occurring at the service site, and if they have paused in their service. Connected to the egoistic motivations, relationships were a significant part of background, service, and outcomes though they did not serve as a catalyst. While the presence of relationships in the emerging theory is evident, this study did not ask the level of significance for the participants like the other study did. The Winniford, Carpenter, and Grider study was helpful in formulating the research questions originally and was found to have overlap with the emerging theory key categories of catalysts with a small relationship to background, service, and outcomes.

Research on the Outcomes of Service

The participants in this study discussed multiple ways that they are different because of their involvement in service. Their level of personalization and responsibility and their constellation of outcomes are evidence of the ways they have changed. Myers-Lipton (1996) studied the effects of service-learning on students in regards to international understanding. He found that students involved in service-learning gained greater global concern and cultural respect (Myers-Lipton). Although
the participants did not discuss anything similar to international understanding, they
did describe concepts related to global concern and cultural respect. In
personalization and responsibility, the category of connection to social issues
includes an understanding of broad social concerns and an understanding of
diversity. Despite some small similarities, the participants in the grounded theory
tended to think in more national and local terms rather than globally in their analysis
of social issues and their service; hence there was not a strong relationship of this
literature to the current findings.

In another study of the outcomes of academic service-learning, Markus,
Howard, and King (1993) found greater individual level changes for the students
serving related to beliefs and values. The students in the service-learning sections
also had increased their "intention to serve others in need, intention to give to charity,
orientation toward others and away from yourself, belief that helping those in need is
one's social responsibility, belief that one can make a difference in the world, and
tolerance and appreciation of others" (Markus, Howard, & King, p. 413). The
participants in the grounded theory study were involved in service co-curricularly,
yet the findings for them had a strong relationship with the results of Markus,
Howard, and King. The whole key category of personalization and responsibility
was related to the findings of the other study such that identity as a service provider
had a connection to 1) intention to serve others in need, 2) intention to give to
charity, and 3) belief that one can make a difference. It is interesting to note that
belief that one can make a difference was also a category of catalysts in the emerging
theory. Responsibility to others as well as personal responsibility under the key
category of personalization and responsibility had a relationship with orientation
toward others and away from self and also to the belief that helping those in need is
one's social responsibility. Finally, tolerance and appreciation for others related to
the emerging theory component of both connection to social issues (personalization and responsibility) and deepening relationships (outcomes). It is obvious that the findings of Markus, Howard, and King had a strong relationship to personalization and responsibility and some connection to outcomes in the emerging theory. Upon examining this study, it encourages one to view personalization and responsibility as a form of outcome from service, even though it is also a critical step in the emerging theory to meaning making before reaching the outcomes.

Batchelder and Root (1994) designed a study to examine cognitive approaches to social problems, prosocial moral development, and identity development. Because of methodological concerns, the results were only viewed as suggestive. These results suggested that participation in academic service-learning affected the students' "resolve to act in the face of acknowledged uncertainty and greater awareness of the multiple dimensions and variability in dealing with social problems" (Batchelder & Root, p. 352). Despite the tentativeness of the findings, there was a strong relationship to connection to social issues within the key category of personalization and responsibility as well as to the two catalysts of level of conscious awareness and social issues. Mainly, these results indicate the complexity of the social issues that the students confronted and their willingness to work within this complexity.

The next study that was considered to have overlap with the emerging theory was Astin and Astin's (1996) study of the outcomes of service for college students from the Learn and Serve America, Higher Education. This study looked at ways that volunteers and nonvolunteers are different, but this information offered little for the emerging theory. In general, the Astin and Astin study examined attitudinal difference, and they found that students perform community service because they believe that helping others is important, feel personal satisfaction, want to improve
the community, or want to improve society in general. Although these were
classified as attitudinal difference, they are more similar to catalysts in the emerging
theory and have a lot of similarity there. Finally, the attitudinal differences also have
some connection to personalization and responsibility.

A report by Gray, Ondaatje, and Zakaras (1999) summarized the results of a
RAND study that evaluated Learn and Serve America Higher Education. Students
from 28 colleges and universities completed surveys related to their participation in
either a service-learning course or a similar course that did not involve service. The
study was designed to examine "students' beliefs about the influence of a service-
learning or traditional, nonservice course on their development in four areas: civic
responsibility, life skills, academic development, and professional development"
(Gray, et al., p. 8). The results found a strong correlation between participation in a
service-learning course and civic responsibility as well as a statistically significant but
smaller correlation with life skills, including "interpersonal skills and an
understanding of people with a background different from one's own" (Gray, et al.,
pp. 8-9). Civic responsibility was connected to "the self-reported likelihood that
students will continue to do volunteer work and will take an active role in helping
address societal problems" for this study (Gray, et al., p. 8). Given this definition
of civic responsibility, the results of this study were similar to the outcomes for the
participants in the grounded theory. RAND also examined factors that promote
success; these factors were "tradition of service, leadership of a single individual,
faculty support, and service centers" (Gray, et al., pp. 18-19). These success
factors are basically the same as the implications for educators for the grounded
theory study.

Another newer article that had relevance to this study was by Astin and Sax
(1998). They assessed the Learn and Serve America Higher Education program
effects on student development by utilizing national survey data from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP). In general, “results indicate that participation in service during the undergraduate years substantially enhances the student’s academic development, life skill development, and sense of civic responsibility” (Astin & Sax, p. 251). Astin and Sax controlled for the effects of student input characteristics before examining the effects of service involvement. The study indicated that “the most predisposing factor [to college service] was whether the student volunteered during high school” (p. 253). This finding supported the implications from the grounded theory study that college educators learn about students’ high school service so that they can support their ongoing participation in service and help them reflect.

The outcomes from this study were quite consistent with the grounded theory study. The students engaged in service “to help others” (91%), “to feel personal satisfaction” (67%), “to improve my community” (63%), and “to improve society as a whole” (61%) (Astin & Sax, 1998, p. 254). These four reasons were the most heavily cited as the rationale for service. It is important to note that three of the four reasons pertained to Astin and Sax’s definition of civic responsibility and service to others. A significant distinction needs to be made here in definition and meaning because only 30% of the students said they provide service “to fulfill my civic/social responsibility” (Astin & Sax, p. 255). This finding is similar to the grounded theory as students cite reasons and factors for service that seem to relate to higher education’s definition of social and civic responsibility, yet the students do not see these components comprising social and civic responsibility. Instead, they connect these factors to their idea of personalization and personal responsibility; something they view as different from social and civic responsibility.
Astin and Sax (1998) examined the 35 student outcome measures and found that "participation in volunteer service during the undergraduate years enhanced the student's academic development, civic responsibility, and life skills" (p. 255). The most major finding of the study is that "all 12 civic responsibility outcomes were positively influenced by service participation" (Astin & Sax, p. 255). The researchers pretested seven civic responsibility items so they could determine differential change from the beginning of freshmen year to the follow-up study. They did find that the students who later performed community service originally scored higher on the seven items than future non-service participants. This finding indicated a level of self-selection for those who serve. Despite this, the service participants still had a greater change between pre- and post-test than nonparticipants.

Astin and Sax found that, "the largest differential change favoring service participation occurred with the values, "promoting racial understanding," "participating in community action programs," and "influencing social values"""" (pp. 255-256). This study supported the premise that service participation during college has positive effects on students' sense of civic responsibility (Astin & Sax). A powerful intervention can also arise from the finding that nonparticipants decreased their commitment to serve, thereby supporting the implication from the grounded theory that faculty and student affairs professionals should integrate service opportunities into orientation, the curriculum, the residence halls, and student organizations. This study also found that service participants "become less inclined to feel that individuals have little power to change society." This finding parallels the grounded theory categories that involvement in service promotes a belief that one can make a difference.

The other outcomes of service that Astin and Sax (1998) studied related to some of the grounded theory outcomes. They found that service participation
enhances academic development similar to the current study's outcome category of intellectual development. The life skill outcomes supported one of the most common rationales given by higher education to serve — “that service participation increases students' awareness and understanding of the world around them” (Astin & Sax, p. 259). In particular, “service participants showed greater positive change than did nonparticipants on all 8 items, with the largest differences occurring in understanding community problems, knowledge of different races and cultures, acceptance of different races/cultures, and interpersonal skills” (Astin & Sax, p. 259). The study also revealed positive effects for three areas of student satisfaction: “leadership opportunities, relevance of course work to everyday life, and preparation for future career” (Astin & Sax, p. 259). The last two outcomes in life skills that were significant were greater increases in social self-confidence and leadership ability. The significant findings for life skills correlate with the grounded theory categories of personal development, level of conscious awareness, social issues, and leadership. This study provides support for the emerging theory. Finally, the researchers studied the duration of service and the effects; they found that the amount of time devoted to service had specific benefits in the areas of civic responsibility and life skill development. This last piece related to the vertical axis that students cycle through the same key categories but their level of development is heightened with more time spent serving. In closing, Astin and Sax stated, “Service learning represents a powerful vehicle for enhancing student development during the undergraduate years while simultaneously fulfilling a basic institutional mission of providing service to the community” (p. 262).

One of the important differences of this study in comparison to previous studies is that Astin and Sax (1998) controlled for student input variables and college environmental characteristics in their hierarchical regression. Obviously for the
grounded theory, the participants could not solely separate their experiences and outcomes related to service from other areas of their life. Instead, they tried to explain the complex relationship that exists between multiple factors and experiences to add depth to the understanding of college students’ experiences and outcomes from community service.

Jones and Hill (2001) used naturalistic inquiry to examine the outcomes of community service-learning for college students particularly in regards to diversity. In this study, they looked at the physical boundary of High Street by The Ohio State University and how this barrier represents other separations between the college students and the community. "This separation initially gave way to mutual stereotyping and lack of engagement, on the part of the students, in community issues. Service-learning significantly helped to break down this boundary" (Jones & Hill, p. 210). It is important to note that overcoming of barriers existed to a great extent for the students but not for the community members. A food pantry executive director talked about that for the community members being served; "Their relationship with another student is more the student looking at them and watching them" (Jones & Hill, p. 210). "The boundary appeared much more penetrable for students than community members," according to Jones and Hill (p. 210). The findings of this study support the implication that higher education needs to examine outcomes for community members and the concept of reciprocity, both as research but more importantly, as practice.

The work of Jones and Hill (2001) supports the significant role that relationships play in the service dynamic which was one of the categories of the key category of service in the grounded theory. Jones and Hill stated, "findings suggest the importance of relationships that are developed initially through finding common ground and then strengthened as efficacy is enhanced and empathy and compassion
are nurtured" (p. 204). Service also helped students to "place themselves in the shoes of those receiving services" which helped the students to see what they have in common with the community members as well as how they were unique and different (Jones & Hill, p. 209). This finding related closely to the outcome of deepening relationships in the grounded theory.

There was also a strong relationship between this work and the grounded theory catalyst of level of conscious awareness. From their naturalistic inquiry, Jones and Hill (2001) found that,

Initially, student learning was other-directed with a focus on those with whom they came into contact. After time and continued dialogue, some students began to make a connection between understanding others and understanding oneself. This process involved an awareness of their advantages and privileges. (p. 207)

This quote also highlights the importance of relationships for the servers as tools of learning, particularly in terms of diversity. As students spent time at the community service site, "their commitment to developing knowledge and understanding grew" just as the grounded theory participants discussed as outcomes of personal and intellectual development (Jones & Hill, p. 212). The time spent serving also had implications regarding diversity. According to Jones and Hill, "Increased contact, in the context of service-learning, appeared to decrease stereotyping and promote greater understanding and appreciation of diversity and multiple perspectives" (p. 213). This statement is similar to the emerging theory where the students did not directly address diversity but discussed it instead in terms of the relationships, privilege, and an understanding of social issues. Finally, the work of Jones and Hill supports the implication of the grounded theory on the role of educators in that,
Understanding of diversity and relationship building will remain tenuous at best without purposeful interventions from faculty, student affairs educators, and students themselves for such learning to continue. Such interventions might include course clustering or living-learning programs that work with the same community service partner over a sustained period of time. (p. 214)

Service can be used to help students understand communities and their relationship to the community whether that is in regards to social issues, diversity, and personal development. As one can see, all of the literature about outcomes played some role in examining the emerging theory.

Service and Social and Civic Responsibility

The original intent of this research was to examine the outcomes for college students of their involvement in community service with a particular emphasis on understanding social and civic responsibility. As the words of the participants shaped the emerging theory, it became obvious that social and civic responsibility were not significant components for the participants. Instead, they were more driven to serve based on a sense of personal responsibility and a connection to others and to social issues. While they understood the role and importance of social responsibility, they were not motivated by it nor did the participants believe that it was an outcome of service for them. To help delineate the concepts and the words, the relationship between the emerging theory and the literature review is explored.

Conrad and Hedin (1981) described civic and social responsibility as including responsible attitudes toward social welfare and personal duty, a sense of efficacy about the ability to fulfill social responsibilities, competence to take responsibility, and the concept that their actions and services are responsible tasks (p. 12). This definition by Conrad and Hedin is fairly close to the participants'
definition of personal responsibility because it includes self-efficacy, belief that one can make a difference, and a connection to social issues. Where the definitions differed was in the concept about personal duty that may be implied to come from others. Other views of social and civic responsibility in the literature are more externally focused. In the section on Implications for Educators, the discrepancy will be discussed between how educators view social and civic responsibility and how students define these concepts and personal responsibility. Leary (1994) conducted a study to examine the effects of academic service-learning on moral judgment, commitment to civic and social responsibility, and mastery of academic course content. Leary found no significant differences in any of the categories, but it seems that only 25 hours of service over one semester may have contributed to the minimal effects.

Smith (1994) undertook another study of citizenship and civic responsibility as desired outcomes of service. Smith first examined national level documents and distilled that enhanced civic participation was the main intended outcome of service for students. Upon discussion with university leadership and students at one institution, Smith found that none of these parties mentioned civic responsibility or citizenship as outcomes of service. Instead, the university administration focused more on social responsibility and moral development. The students, however, discussed outcomes of personal connections, a desire to confront social issues, and create social change. These findings were congruent with the emerging theory that did not find social and civic responsibility to be meaningful for the students. Similar to the Smith study, the participants in the grounded theory study reflected on outcomes of deepening relationships, moral and intellectual development, connection to social issues, and personal responsibility as well as some additional outcomes. Both studies seem to support that an internal connection to social issues and a
personal responsibility are outcomes in the words of the people performing the service instead of social and civic responsibility as defined by national and educational leaders.

Olney and Grande (1995) sought to develop and validate the Scale of Service Learning Involvement (SSLI) as an instrument to measure social responsibility related to service. They found the instrument to be statistically significant. The SSLI offers some promise, with possible revision, as a quantitative measure of responsibility that might enlighten or back the findings of the emerging theory. Olney and Grande discovered that as students' involvement in service increased, their social responsibility increased. Although this study was preliminary, the findings are supportive of the emerging theory that students who have performed substantial service have an outcome of personal responsibility, similar to the Olney and Grande outcome of social responsibility. A later study by Vogelgesang (2000) showed that “participation in community service is the strongest predictor of commitment to activism” (p. 64). Vogelgesang used a large database to conduct her study. She utilized entering student data from the Student Information Form on the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), sponsored by the American Council on Education and the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California, Los Angeles. The follow-up data were obtained using the College Student Survey.

Tenley (1997) also studied responsibility as she used the revised version of the SSLI, called the Scale of Social Responsibility Development (SSRD) to study the relationship between belief in a just world and social responsibility for college students. Tenley found that students who performed service on a more regular basis have higher scores on the Internalization subscale of the SSRD; this Internalization subscale represents "a stage of development where students consider the
implications of their life decisions on others, look for root causes behind social problems of concern, and think in a more complex manner about their service and community commitments" (p. 89). This study supports the emerging theory of development from involvement in community service, particularly in regards to identity as a service provider, connection to social issues, personal responsibility and responsibility to self, responsibility to others, personal development, and intellectual development.

Giles and Eyler (1994a) also sought to examine the impact of service for college students involved in a service-learning course in terms of personal, social, and cognitive outcomes. Although minimal impacts were found, there were significant differences found for some of the pre-post measures of efficacy and social responsibility. These significant findings were: work for equal opportunity, misfortunes due to circumstance, community involvement importance, become a community leader, should give time, important/influence politics, and possible to impact the world (Giles eyler). The overlap of these findings to the grounded theory was in the areas of intellectual development, sense of responsibility, leadership and motivating others to serve, and responsibility to others. Despite the possible connection, the instrument utilized by Giles and Eyler needs to be examined further to judge its reliability and validity. Similarly, it was difficult to determine if the findings were solely about outcomes or about expected or desired outcomes.

Astin and Astin (1996) also examined the relationship between involvement in service and civic responsibility by studying service participants and nonparticipants. They found that the students who served scored higher in "commitment to serving the community, planning to conduct volunteer work in the near future, commitment to participating in community action programs, and satisfaction with the opportunities for community service provided by the college"
Astin and Astin (p. 49) also found that the service participants were more committed to "influencing social values, helping others in difficulty, promoting racial understanding, influencing the political structure, and getting involved in environmental cleanup" (p. 49). Even though some of the concepts were more specific than the outcomes in the grounded theory study, there was significant overlap. The emerging theory found that the participants developed an identity as a service provider and planned to continue with service, had a connection to social issues, had personal responsibility as well as a responsibility to others. Some of the outcomes of personal development, intellectual development, deepening relationships, and leadership related to the results of Astin and Astin. Some of the concepts of Astin and Astin briefly were mentioned by the grounded theory participants but these concepts did not emerge as significant on their own and others were not mentioned; these include satisfaction with the volunteer opportunities provided by the college, promoting racial understanding, influencing the political structure, and getting involved in an environmental cleanup. Promoting racial understanding was discussed as a part of the participants' service but not as an action that they took outside of service. With the limited information available about the Astin and Astin study, it is difficult to know whether promoting racial understanding only referred to the service or whether it pertained to all facets of the service participants' lives. The other concept that was different was influencing the political structure. Overall, the participants in the grounded theory study did not discuss the political structure with the exception of Vincent, Suzanne, and Christina who described how political systems kept the poor and disenfranchised from getting adequate service and from being able to change their place in society. Astin and Astin described these twelve measures of civic responsibility without explaining how they came to the conclusion that they measure civic responsibility or even defining
civic responsibility. Many of the measures were shared with the participants in the grounded theory as outcomes or categories of personalization and responsibility; however, the participants were clear that civic responsibility did not have meaning for them. This contrast around civic responsibility for the two studies makes it clear that the terms of social and civic responsibility need to be further explored both qualitatively and quantitatively.

A study by Rhoads (1998) was designed to learn about college students who “through participation in community service explore their own identities and what it means to contribute to something larger than their individual lives” (p. 277). This author described the haziness that exists around the relationship between social responsibility and service. He states, “Although it is hard to argue with calls to foster social responsibility among our students, our future leaders, there also is a tremendous need for clarification” (Rhoads, 278). Rhoads utilized naturalistic inquiry with the goal being “to better understand the context of community service and how such activities might challenge students’ understandings of citizenship and the social good” (p. 285). Three main themes were identified in this study; they were self-exploration, understanding others, and the social good. A strong overlap exists between these findings and the grounded theory study. These students described getting to know themselves leading to identity clarification. In the grounded theory, the participants described a kind of self-knowledge and an understanding of that which they believe. The second theme of the Rhoads study was understanding others which related closely to awareness of social issues, relationships, and a level of personalization from the service helix. Rhoads summarized that “students were able to put faces and names with the alarming statistics and endless policy debate about homelessness as well as rural and urban policy” (p. 287). Although an understanding of diversity was embedded in several
categories of the service helix, it was also a significant component of understanding others in Rhoads study. Finally, the social good was described as a caring for others similar to personalization and responsibility in the service helix. In words similar to the grounded theory participants, a student in Rhoads study said,

> There are a lot of people in this country who need help to make ends meet. You can choose to help them or you can turn your back on them. I want to help people, and I want those who choose not to help to know that there are consequences for walking away. (p. 290)

Rhoads described what he saw to be the interactional context between the three themes. The one problem with the study is that he basically overlooked some sense of guilt expressed by the students and their concern that they get more from the service than they give. These concepts should have been explored in greater depth without needing to put them only in a positive light. Rhoads does address this in his implications for structuring community service, but it is unclear whether he fully explored it with the students. In very comparable terms to the grounded theory, the researcher described mutuality, reflection, and personalization as components of community service that may advance citizenship (Rhoads). Mutuality related to a sense of reciprocity and the “structure of the relationship between service provider and community members who may receive a specific service” (Rhoads, p. 292). Reflection referred to a range of activities designed to have students process and make meaning of the service experiences. Personalization was the third component. Rhoads stated,

> Perhaps the most significant aspect of community service that I found to contribute to caring is what may be called the personalization of service. For community service to be challenging to a student’s sense of self, it seems most beneficial for service to involve opportunities for meaningful interaction
with those individuals to be served. Time and time again students discussed how significant it was for them to have the opportunity to interact with individuals and families on a personal basis. (p. 293)

Finally, Rhoads' work supported the key concept of personalization and responsibility from the grounded theory service helix.

There was a strong relationship between the emerging theory and the work of Levine (1998) in When Hope and Fear Collide such that relationships are important and that students feel a connection to their community and the issues facing it. Both works support the idea that students want to make a difference in small ways in their own communities because they view this as the way to create change and address social issues.

Battistoni (1997) explored the concept of service learning as civic learning and found that there is growing evidence that service and citizenship are not necessarily connected. "In fact, many students actively involved in community service say that they have chosen service as an antidote to politics;" however, "there is evidence that when accompanied by proper preparation and reflection, service learning can be a potent civic educator" (Battistoni, p. 32). Battistoni posited that there are some distinct differences with today's students and that they do not have a concept of themselves as citizens but that they see service as a "personal act of caring" that has replaced citizenship, "a public expression of values" (p. 33). He contends that the "monolithic assumptions about the meaning and language of citizenship" are a major part of the problem (Battistoni, p. 33). This stance is very similar to what the participants described. The students in the grounded theory discussed how social and civic responsibility have little meaning for them; however, the reasons that they described serving and their description of personalization and
personal responsibility all appeared to be very similar to more traditional definitions of social and civic responsibility or citizenship.

Battistoni offers models or different descriptions of citizenship that he has gleaned from student reflections on community service connected to a civic education-based curriculum. He describes four themes:

Theme 1: Citizenship as better knowledge of the community of which the institution of higher education is a part
Theme 2: Citizenship as self in relationship with others, “community”
Theme 3: Identity, diversity, pluralistic citizenship
Theme 4: Democratic citizenship and the service learning classroom itself.

(Battistoni, pp. 35, 38, 40, 42)

Theme 2 parallels the participants’ words in the grounded theory about the role of relationships and seeing themselves as responsible and connected to others. Theme 3 addresses the importance of understanding social issues and the diversity in society similar to the catalysts and outcomes in the grounded theory. Themes 1 and 4 have more indirect connections to the emerging theory, but they do relate to some of the implications from the grounded theory. Battistoni also described some concrete civic skills that evolved from service; these are “intellectual understanding, communication and public problem solving, and the development of civic attitudes of judgment and imagination” (p. 44). These three civic skills are similar to the grounded theory outcomes of intellectual development, personal development, and sense of responsibility. Battistoni closed with two points: “The first is that we must assume a diversity of perspectives about what it means to be a democratic citizen” and “The second point is that service alone does not automatically lead to engaged citizenship; only if we consciously construct our programs with the education of democratic citizens—in the broadest sense—in mind can service learning be the vehicle by which
we educate for citizenship and reinvigorate our rapidly deteriorating public life” (p. 48-49). His closing reiterates that the words and the meaning of citizenship and civic responsibility are important to consider when working with college students and that campuses should be more actively engaged in this pursuit.

Eyler and Giles (1999) also examined learning outcomes of service and then linked some of these outcomes as a “means to the end of citizenship” (p. 156). They propose that the personal, interpersonal, and intellectual development outcomes can be combined to prepare students for citizenship. Their framework shows how the outcomes are combined “to provide the essential elements for social responsibility and effective participation” (Eyler & Giles, p. 157). Eyler and Giles break it down as follows:

- **Values** “I ought to do.”
- **Knowledge** “I know what I ought to do and why.”
- **Skills** “I know how to do.”
- **Efficacy** “I can do, and it makes a difference.”
- **Commitment** “I must and will do.” (p. 157)

They define values to be “feeling a sense of social responsibility is the first step in participatory citizenship” (Eyler & Giles, p. 157). They believe that students must feel connected to the community to get involved. While the wording is similar to personal responsibility as a category of personalization and responsibility in the grounded theory, the participants described this concept more complexly. They went beyond the idea that they should do something to an internalization of the responsibility to do something, more like Eyler and Giles’ term “commitment.”

Second, knowledge was composed of understanding social problems and cognitive development (Eyler & Giles). Knowledge related to the intellectual development outcome of the grounded theory and to the catalyst of social issues and the
personalization category of connection to social issues. The participants in the grounded theory described critically analyzing social issues as they progressed in the service helix and that they could then more accurately address the issues and provide effective service. The third concept was skills such that, “One of the particular strengths of service-learning is in helping students acquire practical experience for community action, as well as the interpersonal skills that make people effective” (Eyler & Giles, p. 160). The students in the grounded theory described these same characteristics as outcomes of service in the terminology of deepening relationships, identity as a service provider, and personal development. Efficacy was the fourth component of the model, and it was comprised of a willingness to take the risk of involvement and personal self-confidence. A desire to help others and a belief that one can make a difference, categories of catalysts, were fairly parallel concepts. Finally, commitment was the final component of the Eyler and Giles model. They described that “the ultimate test for the impact of service-learning on citizenship is behavior—what college graduates do in their community” (Eyler & Giles, p. 162). Commitment appears to be a suggested state that is not yet tested. For the students in the grounded theory study, they define this commitment in terms of an identity as a service provider (personalization) and a sense of responsibility (outcome).

At this point, it may become obvious that the outcomes described by Eyler and Giles (1999) are comparable to the emerging theory from the words of the participants. The big discrepancy lies in the conceptual framework of the relationship between these outcomes. Eyler and Giles lay out a framework that they define as the essential elements of social responsibility with levels of importance for the five components. In examining their regression tables, the support for the framework is difficult to determine. For the participants, they describe a different process. As is seen in the service helix, they define an internalization or personalization of the
responsibility to serve as critical in their development. In the words of the participants, this is greater than the idea of Eyler and Giles that one "ought to do" service. The study participants see it as central to their identity. In the evolution of the service helix, their level of commitment to the social issue, the community or relationship, or to service itself increases. All of this is accompanied by the development of knowledge, skills, and efficacy. Therefore, there is much commonality between the work of Eyler and Giles and the emerging theory. The organization of the components is one way in which the two models differ. This discrepancy offers great opportunity for further exploration of the development of citizenship and responsibility.

The emerging theory has strong relationships to many of the studies that were covered in the original literature review as well as to new works that were discussed to explore concepts further that emerged in the coding of the grounded theory. These relationships indicate that the emerging theory has commonalties with previous works; however, the uniqueness of the emerging theory also indicates strong implications for practice and for future research.

**Implications and Recommendations for Educators**

The emerging theory of the service helix offers a rich tapestry for understanding college students' movement and development through involvement in community service. With the five key categories and respective categories that comprise them, many recommendations emanate for educators and other practitioners. These implications are organized by the key category though there may be some overlap between the implications.
Background

Assuming that one of the goals of a college or university is to engage its students in community service both as an institutional commitment to the surrounding community and as a developmental opportunity for students, then creating an environment that values and supports service is key. The valuing of service can be explicit such as in admissions materials, university mission statements, and in major speeches as well as more sedate such as including the service involvements of faculty and staff in brochures and in introductions. Educators can create this environment where involvement in service is valued by making community service and service-learning easily accessible and available in many facets of university life. Community service can occur in residence halls, student organizations, pre-orientation or orientation programs as well as in first-year experience courses or other core classes, not just for first year students, but at all levels. Tying service to the students' major or courses so they gain an intellectual framework and have a process for meaning making in readings and discussions can assist in development of the background categories of environment, social support, and education.

Another implication for educators is to learn about the background and identity of students and who may have participated in community service prior to college. There is a large drop-off in service participation between high school and college, so this appears to be an opportune time for reconnecting students to community service (Astin & Sax, 1998). Finally, educators should create a social support for students so that they have mentors who perform community service and who can assist them in their process.
Catalysts

Catalysts serve as an instigation for students to perform community service. These catalysts can be either challenges or supports, depending on what is needed for the population or for that moment (Sanford, 1962). Catalysts should be readily available to both students who are currently performing service and those who may be contemplating service. In addition, required service for academic courses, residence halls, orientation programs, or student organizations provides another form of catalyst for students who may be less likely to begin community service originally.

One of the first ways to provide catalysts for service is to help develop a level of conscious awareness about social issues, inequity, and the students' connection to these problems. This can occur through academic courses, workshops, programs in the residence halls, and peer education. The depth of the materials should vary with the age and developmental level of the students. Educators can teach about privilege, racism, sexism, homophobia and other related issues; this education ideally would be experiential as well as more academic. Along with this, educators can discuss the responsibility of knowledge and of a college education. The last piece of education as meaning making is to discuss scholarship in action and how students can take what they are learning in the classroom and test it through community service. This makes them engaged learners who are taking ownership for meaning making.

Educators also can play an active role in developing a desire to help others and a belief that one can make a difference. Role modeling and teaching about the steps involved in community service and the continuum of ways to be involved in communities help students decide at what level they may be able to contribute. Additionally, educators really should explore what issues or communities the students feel connected to because this is a critical step in involvement and continuation with service, both as a catalyst and as a component of personalization.
and responsibility. Educators also should recognize that roadblocks occur and that students will "step out" of the service cycle and then need catalysts to return to service. Departments, fellow students, and institutions can set up some systematic ways to encourage students to return to service. Finally, institutions and departments should reward students who perform service with academic credit for internships or service-learning classes, certificates, scholarships, and the like. If an institution and individual educators have a commitment to service and to their communities, developing a strong network of catalysts should happen both to initiate student service and continually to re-engage students in service.

Service

The majority of professional literature on community service and effective programs relates to suggestions on how to create and maintain meaningful service. Much that emerged from this study supported the previous writings. One of the first implications is to have active discussions about the service and learning goals for everyone involved (Honnet & Poulsen, 1989). These discussions also should include conversations about students' motivations and intentions for serving and how they may affect their service. The goal of the implication should be about aiding in students' development as well as ensuring that quality service is provided that involves the community. A second implication is to teach students the framework and tools of service and to share models such as PARE, that many of the participants discussed (Maryland Student Service Alliance, 1994). By providing a model or framework, students can move through steps like preparation, action, reflection, and evaluation in a structured manner provided by the school or service site or by themselves as individuals. The majority of the participants discussed how this process really helped them critically analyze their service and what things they could
do to improve the service for the community and for themselves. Reflection also has other benefits as described by Battistoni (1997), "Service learning programs that employ appropriate and varied reflection strategies heighten students' communicative skills" (p. 45). The importance of reflection and group processing for meaning making should not be overlooked. There are many resources currently available that offer a range of suggestions for reflection to suit different learning styles and to fit different situations. Educators should develop a plethora of options for reflection so that different opportunity points can exist for different students.

Another suggestion that emerges from this study is to get students committed to a semester of service since time on task seems to be important for fully understanding the issues and for developing a commitment to service that may lead to an internalization or development of personal responsibility. Similarly, care should be taken in the placement of students into service sites. The participants in this study tended to continue serving once they found an issue they were passionate about; hence, educators should help students determine where they want to get involved and make a difference. Finally, this study supported that "an effective program includes training, supervision, monitoring, support, recognition, and evaluation to meet service and learning goals" (Honnet & Poulsen, 1989, pp. 1-4). Campus programs also can offer "an environment that is conducive to serious reflection on the question of what it means to be in relationship with others, to be a good neighbor" (Battistoni, 1997, p. 38). Educators should make sure that the university offers these steps if the service sites are not doing this.

Personalization

Several significant implications exist related to the key category of personalization and responsibility. Much of the push in higher education related to
community service and service learning has been about the development of citizens and social and civic responsibility. This grounded theory study indicated that for these students and likely for others, social and civic responsibility as terms do not have much meaning. Instead, the university and educators should consider discussing personal responsibility and commitment to social issues and/or communities. The language may seem to be a fine distinction, but it was critical in the discussion of service for the students. As educators, it is important to understand the culture of the students and use language that has meaning for them. Educators may want to do a better job of defining social and, in particular, civic responsibility so that students can be invested in these constructs as outcomes of a college education. Some of this education for civic engagement should begin early, before students even enter high school. Public schools need to commit themselves to teaching citizenship if this is to remain a desired outcome of education. Teachers must be very explicit about what social and civic responsibility means and how it is displayed, or they must embrace the language of the students and teach from this framework. In particular, faculty and student affairs professionals must help students see themselves as change agents while also linking their campus education to the care of the community. To assist in moving students on the service helix or at least in their development of personal responsibility, educators should work with students to explore power and privilege and how the students might share these resources. As universities are called to produce citizens prepared to care for the democracy, they first must define what this means and get students to become committed to this outcome – service can help achieve this.

Additionally, institutions need to structure ways for individuals to build personal responsibility. This may occur by helping students see their plight as connected to others, exploring privilege and the responsibilities of a college
education, and assisting in developing relationships with community members or service agencies. The participants explored how their relationships to fellow servers and to community members was crucial in their development of a responsibility to others. Educators can create these steps in arenas such as orientation, first year seminars, service-learning courses, community service organizations, and residence halls.

It could be hypothesized that the difference between the participants in this study who have completed large amounts of service and other students who may serve but have not made a larger commitment is that they have yet to move through the key category of personalization and responsibility. They may be moving directly from the key category of service to outcomes (Figure 5). The point is to be intentional about creating dialogues and experiences where students can begin to make meaning and personalize community service and social issues into their identity and develop a sense of responsibility.

Educators should also consider factors like privilege, time, and opportunity to serve in order to broaden the spectrum of students who have an opportunity to serve and explore their opportunity in this manner. Students who have to work or who do not have the privilege of time to serve may not develop their identity through service. Educators can work to create opportunities for service connected to the classroom and broader college education that develop personalization and a sense of responsibility.
Outcomes

Outcomes for the person serving are one of the obvious goals of community service, in addition to positive social change and growth for the people and community being served. Many of the participants in this study remarked on how they had not intentionally thought about ways that they had changed from their involvement in community service until their interviews and the focus groups. They all found this time to think and reflect incredibly valuable and discussed how they would have liked to have times like this built into their college experience. With this in mind, educators from many areas of campus should set up times to meet with
students and "interview" them about ways they have changed from their involvement in service. This model could be utilized more broadly to interview students about their college experience such as what Marcia Baxter Magolda (1998) does as exit interviews at Miami University.

A second implication is to have these conversations in groups. Intentional focus groups to help students begin to think about how they might be different because of their involvement in community service might be one strategy. This is a point where they may develop some level of consciousness (or not) about one's movement and growth. Their ability to see their changes and outcomes lies in their self-awareness and is linked to their development. In Common Fire, the authors discuss how this process of meaning making occurs and what might be some of the outcomes: "Through successive transformations of the ways we make meaning of ourselves and our world, our sphere of trust and agency is continually enlarged" (Daloz, et al., 1996, p. 32).

A third implication is to pay greater attention to the development of relationships and the critical roles of respect and reciprocity. This emotional intelligence can be taught in workshops, leadership opportunities, and in the classroom. Educators can work with students who are serving to develop leadership and to motivate other students to serve. The strong effect of peers encouraging peers to perform service should not be overlooked.

A final implication is that educators can work with students to help them develop self-authorship—"the ability to collect, interpret and analyze information and reflect on one's own beliefs in order to make judgments" (Baxter Magolda, 1998, p. 143). The participants in this study have started to make meaning of their experiences, but they do not yet seem to have mastered self-authorship. This is consistent to what Baxter Magolda (2002) found in that, "By the time they graduate
from college, most students still have not achieved the kind of self-authorship that would allow them to think independently, make choices, and pursue their dreams" (p. 2). Service may be one step in students’ journeys to develop self-authorship. In particular, personal authority seems to have the most direct application at this point. Personal authority as a part of self-authorship was described by the participants in Baxter Magolda’s (1998) study as “a way of making meaning of one’s experiences from inside oneself” (p. 152). Faculty and student affairs professionals can help students see the complexity in the world around them through service and through classroom activities or co-curricular conversations and experiences that encourage students to make meaning and develop knowledge themselves. Educators need to help students develop a confidence in their ability to construct knowledge as well as help them see the moral and ethical components of their knowledge. The service experiences of the students can illustrate the complexity of the world. Educators should actively use research such as Marcia Baxter Magolda’s work to become better teachers and learners so that they can empower students to make meaning of their service and to examine their outcomes of service.

As has been illustrated, this study offers some new data and reinforces some other research that can help universities better serve their students and their communities. This study offers new language that is potentially more meaningful for students. Educators and researchers must examine previous studies and literature with the words of these participants in mind. This study also stresses the importance of the journey and not the outcomes in terms of development. Educators must not focus solely on outcomes of service but instead must give attention to all of the key categories. Some simple steps and some more systemic changes can create environments that support and challenge students to get involved in service and begin their movement in the service helix.
Implications for Development of Theory

The service helix model offers a new developmental model to complement the Service-Learning Model. The service helix recognizes that service may not occur in the context of a group and that students may need to step out or retreat a little before a catalyst serves as the impetus for them to return to community service. This grounded theory also postulates that students return to the same basic key categories, just at increasing levels of development. These core differences may affect the way educators proceed in working with students who perform community service as well as suggest new ways to test this grounded theory of the service helix through future research.

Implications for Future Research

The grounded theory of the service helix creates exciting opportunities for continued research. One of the first possible studies should examine the difference between students who develop the key category personalization and responsibility and those who do not. The study would need to be methodologically sound to assure that one could differentiate between students who serve and have a level of personalization and students who serve but do not have a level of personalization and responsibility. A second implication for research is to explore the critical things that lead to personalization and responsibility. Similarly, research should be conducted that examines whether the study participants, as well as other college students who perform service, continue serving after college and whether they continue in their movement through the service helix. On a similar vein, future research should look at the potential causal relationship between sense of responsibility and service. From this study, it appeared that the students' experience with service lead them to develop a sense of responsibility; however, it may have been that these students naturally
were predisposed to serve because of some level of responsibility of which they may not have even been cognizant.

The participants in this study touched on the role of social issues and -isms; however, there was not adequate time to explore this in depth since it did not appear to be a major component on its own. This topic occurred in conjunction with other categories. More could be learned through both quantitative and qualitative research about the relationship between an understanding and respect for diversity and involvement in community service. In the spirit of respect and reciprocity, research needs to occur that studies the communities and individuals served and examines things like outcomes and personal responsibility such as the model illustrates. It would be interesting to discover whether there is a comparable cycle for the community members who are served. Other intriguing findings of this study that merit further research in regards to service involvement include the belief that one can make a difference, level of conscious awareness, identity as a service provider, connection to social issues, and the role of relationships. Finally, this emerging theory and other recent studies seem to be beginning to explore the development and role of responsibility, whether personal, social or civic, and the relationship to service.

Strengths of the Study

One of the strengths of the study is the diversity of the participants in terms of academic major, type of service, gender, race/ethnicity, religious background, and variety of service experiences and issues of interest. This range of participants added depth to the study and helped explore the phenomenon of development and outcomes from service. The depth of the interviews also gave credibility to the study. With three interviews and a focus group, the concepts emerged and grounded theory hung
together. The amount of interview time also helped to explore some possible themes that were discounted in earlier studies that had less interview time. During the interviews, the idea of outcomes of service for the participants was really explored as well as finding out how individuals integrated service into their life and identity.

The focus group was another important component of the study because it created the opportunity for comparison and conversation among the participants themselves. The researcher also was able to check the emerging theory, the coding, and a few of the concepts such as guilt and roadblocks during the focus group, hence making it a stronger study. The study also focused on the critical concept of responsibility and why the students have committed extensive time and energy to service and to their communities. This focus has strong applications for higher education. Finally, the use of member checking, an inquiry auditor, and peer debriefers helped insure a true research process and that the researcher as instrument was being consistent with the words and their context for the participants.

Limitations of the Study

Though the study was designed to handle many of the intricacies of the topic and of the research question, some subtleties were likely overlooked even though peer debriefers and inquiry auditors were used. Similarly, other limitations existed just because of the parameters of the study. First of all, it was difficult to reach redundancy in the interviews and to cover all negative cases. Some of this was because of the time frame, and some related to the great diversity of student experiences. The students in this study were all enrolled at a large public university, so the results and implications may have less applicability to other students. The responsibility of applying the results remains with the reader, not with the researcher. Even though this is not critical to grounded theory, the limitation still existed that the
participants may not have had experiences and outcomes that match all those of students involved in service. The participants might not have represented a true diversity of students, partially because the panel of experts may have been biased in whom they recommended or just limited in whom they know. None of the participants nominated had taken a service-learning course which also excluded a type of service experience. This limitation is likely to be due to the small number of service-learning courses taught at the institution. An attempt was made to use a variety of experts, but this step may not have been enough. Because of the limited sample size for the type of research methodology, it was difficult to represent the diversity of the outcomes of service, the diversity of the experiences, and the diversity of the students involved in service.

Other limitations of the study related more to the meaning given by the students. It may have been difficult for some of the students to recognize their development and the outcomes because they may not be self-aware or because of their level of student development. In the study, the students could only discuss their development through and process of involvement in community service to the level of their own self-understanding and awareness. The participants discussed how they had not often thought distinctly about how they had changed or developed because of their service. Some of their meaning making took time for them to discern their outcomes and other findings; therefore, the fact that the participants were only interviewed over a semester may be a limitation. Additional information may be gained by a more extended engagement or by asking the participants similar questions after their graduation. As was said, student development and outcomes may require a longer time frame than was possible for this study. To account for this, future studies might want to use alumni who were involved in service as college students to discuss what they perceive as the outcomes from their service. Alumni
might distinguish the thought and action components of social and civic responsibility differently from the participants.

Another challenge was negotiating the multiple meanings of certain words to gather what the participants were trying to say. Still, there was a challenge in dealing with the jargon, both from the students and related to the field of community service and service-learning. Finally, even though grounded theory recognizes the complexity of the information, it was difficult to separate some of the themes and to gain the full richness from the depth of information gathered. Despite the limitations, the grounded theory that emerged still added to the field and to the understanding of the development and outcomes of service for college students.

Another limitation of the study may be the idea of self-selection in that the students who have this strong, positive development from service are already predisposed to growth, particularly based on their initiative to serve. To think more broadly about how the study can be used to encourage the development of personalization and responsibility in other students, one needs to consider the idea of self-selection. These students' propensity for personalization and responsibility may be greater and their extended time in service may have just increased this. Future studies and the careful utilization of this grounded theory on other campuses can help further explore these limitations.

Conclusion

Community service and service-learning have been widely lauded as experiences that contribute to college students' learning and development. At a time when responsibility and citizenship are expected outcomes of a college education, this study took a critical step toward exploring the role of service and its implications toward a sense of responsibility as well as other outcomes from this involvement.
Despite the focus on service, the experiences of the participants could not be solely isolated to this one factor. Instead, this grounded theory study recognizes that nothing occurs in isolation; therefore, the role of background, catalysts, the service experience, personalization, and outcomes all factored into the service helix. This study offers insight into the importance of service for students to better understand their humanity and their connection to others and to social issues. The results also articulated a deeper understanding of responsibility and personalization as well as the importance of one's belief that he or she can make a difference. In describing grounded theory methodology, Strauss and Corbin (1990) said, "While in the end you may come to the same conclusions as those in the literature, your theoretical explanations will be far more dense because your questions took you away from the standard ways of thinking, and allowed explorations of other avenues of thought and hopefully gave new insights into the problem" (p. 90).

The study indeed did this; the service helix is a powerful analogy of the growth and movement for the college students involved in service. The service helix recognized the variation in rate of development and components of the key categories for different participants; this has strong implications to other college students involved in community service and service learning. In Common Fire, Daloz, Keen, Keen, & Parks (1996) describe this movement:

The metaphor of journey is both powerful and limited. True, life may be seen as a consequence of departures and arrivals; sometimes we do leave important places and relationships behind. But more often they undergo transformation. It is closer to the truth to say that over time some parts of us remain constant and some change. Patterns woven into our sense of self in one environment often remain a part of the tapestry of our inner life even as we change. We never leave home entirely behind. We grow and become
both by letting go and holding on, leaving and staying, journeying and
abiding. A good life is a balance of home and pilgrimage. (p. 31)

This quote is a strong illustration of what emerged from this study. The participants
both changed and stayed the same through their experiences with community service.
The service helix models the growth and development that occurs systematically
through involvement in service. This grounded theory helps articulate the ways that
service can be utilized as a learning method to achieve some of the ideals of a college
educated citizen.

Each time a man stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lots of others,
or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and
crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring
those ripples build a current which can sweep down the mightiest walls of
oppression and resistance. (Robert F. Kennedy, as cited in Chambliss et al.,
1991, p. 11)
I served as the Inquiry Auditor for Mary Kay Schneider's dissertation research. In this role, I met with her to discuss my responsibilities as an Inquiry Auditor. We agreed that serving as the inquiry auditor I would perform the following roles:

Meet regularly to discuss the findings from the data as Mary Kay made meaning of her interviews with participants in her study;

Read every transcript of every interview she conducted and discuss with her the themes that she identified as emerging from the study;

I also reviewed the data trail and confirmed the observations, categories, and grounded theory that Mary Kay developed from the data that respond to her central research questions. Throughout the process, I served as a distant impartial observer, so that I could remain objective to Mary Kay's research.

Finally, I am verifying that Mary Kay completed the above.
APPENDIX B: Letter to Nominators

January 22, 1998

Dear ____________:

I am a doctoral student in the College Student Personnel program and work in the Office of Campus Programs with leadership development. I am doing a qualitative dissertation about the outcomes of community service and service-learning, and I am asking for your assistance. I am currently at the stage of obtaining 8-12 student participants for this study. In order to identify students who have been involved in a significant amount of service (approximately 100 hours or more) and/or who may have a strong commitment to service, I am asking faculty and staff to nominate a student(s) to participate. Because of your close connection with and commitment to students, I am considering you an expert and thought you might be aware of one student (or more) who is or was involved in community service. The students will participate in interviews during the spring semester if they agree to participate. Since I'm using snowball sampling, you can also forward this message to another faculty or staff member who you think can nominate students.

I would appreciate it if you would take a few minutes and nominate a student who you think fits this profile. You may complete as much or as little of the information that you have regarding the student. If you have any questions, you may email me or call me at 314-7169. If possible, please nominate the student by Mon., Feb. 2.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Mary Kay Schneider
APPENDIX C: Nomination Form

Nomination Form for Student Participant for a Study on the Outcomes of Community Service and Service-Learning

Name:

Local Address:

Phone:

Email:

Reason for nominating him/her:

Type of involvement in service:

Other information that you think is relevant:

Would you like your name to be given to the student as the nominator? Yes No

THANKS AGAIN!
APPENDIX D: Letter to Nominated Participants

February 10, 1998

Dear ________:

You have been nominated to participate in a study about the college student experience with community service and service learning. This study is being conducted as a dissertation in the College Student Personnel program. You were recommended because of your substantial experience with service. This study is designed to use predominantly interviews to learn more about service.

I will be contacting you by Monday, February 16 in order to further explain the study and see if you are interested in participating. Participation will include approximately three interviews of about one hour each. Following each interview, you will be asked to review the notes from the interview to see if you want to make changes or explore some other areas. There will also be approximately 9 other students participating in the same process. At the end of the interviews, you will be asked to meet together as a group to review the findings. This step will be optional. Others students who have participated in similar studies have enjoyed the process of jointly learning about an important experience.

The study will last most of spring semester though your participation will be in small blocks. In order to complete the richest study, it is hoped that you will participate throughout the whole process. If you have any doubts about this, please let me know this when I contact you. Your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. All information collected during this study will be confidential, and your name will not be identified at any time. For your participation, you will receive a $25 gift certificate to the location of your choice or $25 will be donated in your name to the charity of your choice.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration. I sincerely hope that you will participate. You will hear from me by Monday, February 16; however, if you have any questions before that, please feel free to contact me at (301) 314-7169, (202) 226-3253, or mkschnei@umdstu.umd.edu.

Sincerely,

Mary Kay Schneider
APPENDIX E: Participant Information Sheet

Grounded Theory of the Outcomes of Community Service
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Name: ________________________________________________________________

Address: ______________________________________________________________

Phone: ________________________________________________________________

Email: _________________________________________________________________

Best times to reach you by phone: ________________________________________

What types of service have you been involved with? __________________________

If necessary, will you be available during May? (Please circle) YES NO
during June? YES NO
APPENDIX F: Informed Consent

Grounded Theory of the Outcomes of Community Service
Research Consent Form

I state that I am over 18 years of age and wish to participate in a program of research being conducted by University of Maryland at College Park College Student Personnel doctoral student, Mary Kay Schneider. The purpose of this research is to understand the nature of the undergraduate student experience with community service at the University of Maryland. All information collected in this study is confidential, and my name will not be identified at any time, unless I so choose. I understand that there are no risks involved by participating in this research.

I understand that the research involves the audio-taping of the interviews. I also understand that the open-ended questions will focus on my experience with and outcomes from community service. In addition to the interviews, I will have the opportunity to participate in a focus group toward the end of the study to examine the emerging findings.

Interviews will be conducted by Mary Kay Schneider and will last approximately 1 – 1 1/2 hours. I also understand that I will be given copies of my interview transcripts for my review and comment. I understand that if appropriate, subsequent interviews will be conducted.

I understand that I am free to ask questions, that my participation is voluntary, and that I am free to withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.

Mary Kay Schneider
Researcher
1135 Stamp Student Union
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
(301) 314-7169 (work)
mkschnei@umdstu.umd.edu
or
311
O'Neill HOB
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 226-3253 (home)

Signature of Researcher __________________ Signature of Participant __________________ Date __________
March 3, 1998

Dear ______:

Thank you so much for participating in my study. I really enjoyed our first interview and found it extremely helpful. As I mentioned at our meeting, I am enclosing a copy of the transcript of our interview for you to review. Please read it carefully. If there is something that I missed, please let me know. As you read the transcript and reflect on it, please record your thoughts, ideas, and insights. You may write them in the borders or on a separate page. Please feel free to write down other topics that were triggered for our next conversation.

When you have finished reviewing the transcript, please call or email me so that we can arrange a time to get back together to discuss your comments and to further discuss potential outcomes of your community service. If possible, could you please review the transcript by Wed., March 11 or earlier? Also, it would be helpful if you could return the transcript and comments to me. It is probably easiest if you send it to me at: 1135 Stamp Student Union, College Park, MD 20742.

If you have any questions about this process, please contact me. Once again, thank you for your participation in my study. I look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Mary Kay Schneider
Doctoral Candidate
College Student Personnel Program
University of Maryland, College Park
APPENDIX H: Interview Questions

1. How would you define community service?
2. Describe your experience with service.
3. Have you taken any service-learning courses?
4. How do you think/feel about community service?
5. How would you describe your experiences with service?
6. What have been some critical incidents in your community service? Why?
7. Who or what motivated(s) you to get involved in service?
8. When did you first become involved in service? Why?
9. What currently motivates you to be involved with community service?
10. What are the primary reasons you are involved with community service?
11. What about community service is meaningful for you?
12. What is the frequency of your community service?
13. Has your involvement in community service been ongoing and consistent or otherwise? What factors affect this?
14. Has the frequency changed?
15. If so, what do you think are the reasons?
16. What role, if any, does community service play in your life?
17. What were critical things for you to decide to perform community service as a part of your life?
18. What are roadblocks or detriments to you performing community service?
19. How would you describe your relationship with the people you are serving?
20. If you serve with a group, how would you describe your relationship with the people you service with?
21. What do you come away with from your service?

22. Has service changed you in any way? If so, in what ways? What have you learned through your involvement in service?

23. How might you have grown or changed through and from your service?

24. How do you think you are different now from before your service experiences?

25. What would you describe as the outcomes of service for you?

26. How might these outcomes and changes be connected with anything else?

27. What role, if any, does community service play in your identity?

28. Do you feel a sense of responsibility for others or for your community? If so, in what ways?

29. What words and experiences best describe this responsibility for you? What are the components of social and civic responsibility in your meaning making?

30. How is your sense of responsibility connected to your service? What service experiences have been pivotal in your exploration of social and civic responsibility?

31. What other factors may have contributed to your social responsibility and/or commitment to community?
APPENDIX I: Participant Identification Agreement Form

Dissertation Participant Identification Agreement Form

In signing this form, I am acknowledging that Mary Kay Schneider and I discussed the way in which I will be named and identified in any written materials associated with this study.

I recognize that I may also choose to be identified with my given name.

In particular, I have asked to be identified with the following name:

________________________________________________________________________

Other identifying information that I would like included in the written text follows:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

I understand that these more precise identifiers may make my identity more readily known. Given this, I am in agreement with their use in the text of Mary Kay Schneider's study.

Signature

Date

As an incentive to participate in this study, you are offered a $25 gift certificate to the location of your choice or to be donated to a charity or cause, in your name. I would like this money to be from or for:

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX J: Categories

1. Intentions/motivations
2. Catalysts/incentives/building blocks
3. Service as a need
4. Belief that one can make a difference
5. Desire to help others
6. Awareness
7. Privilege
8. Guilt
9. Environment/background
10. Academic study/knowledge
11. Service experience
12. Components of service
13. Phases/stages of service
14. Levels of service
15. Reciprocity
16. Process of development
17. Focus of service
18. Level of involvement (one-time, ongoing, indirect, direct)
19. Time/timing
20. Meaning of community
21. Idea of community as "other than" or off-campus
22. Social problems/issues/focus of service – where serving
23. Resources
24. Importance of language
25. Education regarding service
26. Attitude
27. Roadblocks
28. Personalization
29. Responsibility
30. Processing of service/reflection
31. Motivating others to serve/leadership
32. Understanding of service dynamics
33. Outcomes/benefits/rewards
  • Personal development
  • Community development
34. Self-knowledge
35. Service as a priority/value
36. Relationships
37. Commitment/dedication to service or an issue
38. Effects of service
39. Identify and understand needs
40. Identity as a service provider
APPENDIX K: Key Categories and Core Category

**Key Categories**

1. Background
2. Catalysts
3. Service
4. Personalization and Responsibility
5. Outcomes

**Core Category**

Service Helix
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