12-1999

Student Development Outcomes in Service Learning for Teacher Education

Hilda A. Sramek
California State University - Long Beach

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES IN SERVICE LEARNING TRAINING FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

A THESIS

Presented to the College of Education

California State University, Long Beach

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

By

Hilda A. Sramek

December 1999

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE,

HAVE APPROVED THIS THESIS

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES

IN SERVICE LEARNING TRAINING

FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

By

Hilda A. Sramek

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Dawn R. Person, Ed.D. (Chair)	Educational Psychology, Administration, and Counseling
Jennifer Coots, Ph.D.	Educational Psychology, Administration, and Counseling
Marquita Grenot-Scheyer, Ph.D.	Educational Psychology, Administration, and Counseling
Candace Kaye, Ph.D.	Teacher Education

ACCEPTED AND APPROVED ON BEHALF OF THE UNIVERSITY

Jean Houck, Ed.D.
Dean, College of Education

California State University, Long Beach

December 1999

ABSTRACT

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES

IN SERVICE LEARNING TRAINING

FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

By

Hilda A. Sramek

December 1999

Students in the Liberal Studies Track I program for teacher preparation at California State University, Long Beach, are required to participate in service learning. The SERVE (Service Experiences to ReVitalize Education) Program provides training for the students. The purpose of this study was to develop a mechanism for infusing Chickering's psychosocial development model into the training. Two questions were asked: (a) given instruction in the model and support, are students able to apply the model to further their personal and professional development? and (b) what is the best way to implement the model in service learning training? Qualitative methodology was used.

The results showed that by gaining awareness of areas of development through the model, students were able to apply the student development theory to their personal lives and field of study. Recommendations for implementing the model, and for the fields of teacher education and student affairs are offered.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study is dedicated to the students and to the faculty member who participated in the study, who gave of themselves to make it happen: seventeen students and Deborah Hamm, all of them my teachers and heartbeat of this work. These pages relating our experiences are like a pocket-sized mirror reflecting the radiance of the sun: in reality there is so much more . . . I thank Deborah and the students for their brilliance and generosity.

Capturing and translating that brilliance was a tremendous undertaking. The professors who gave of their knowledge, wisdom, and spirit to bring it about are Dr. Dawn R. Person, Dr. Jennifer Coots, Dr. Marquita Grenot-Scheyer and Dr. Candace Kaye. It was the ultimate honor to work with these leaders in education who are passionate about their work and guardians of humanity, equity, and respect for all. They are bigger than life to me. I thank them for their selfless contributions, for their gentleness, for their excellence, and for showing me the beauty of true scholars working together.

From conception to completion, this work was supported by the College of Education and its Center for Collaboration in Education, where the SERVE Program is housed. To Dr. Jean Houck, Dean of the College, who gave life to the SERVE Program,

I give thanks for her vision, for valuing the student voice, and for providing support for this study. I am also greatly indebted to Dr. Kathryn E. Goddard, Director of the center, for first introducing me to the field of student affairs and then opening the doors of the SERVE office to my learning and our work with the students and faculty, and I thank her dearly.

In addition to the contributions of students, faculty members and leaders of our College, this work contains a part of many talented colleagues, family and friends. Among them is Meri Beckham, who was a recorder, reader, and friend, always available for consultation and with great ideas. Tom To was a facilitator, recorder and encourager. Dora Lee was a recorder, excellent in every way. Deby McGill assisted in contacting students and scheduling rooms for our group sessions. Ana Meckes assisted with formatting the pages that follow and with continuous offers of support. Alex Sramek was my resident technical assistant. Carla Sramek was my inspiration. Carl Sramek read the roughest drafts and sustained me. To each of them, to my cohort of the Student Development in Higher Education Program, and to my extended family I am very grateful for standing by me to the end.

Finally, as a gift to the reader, I offer these beautiful words from my Thesis Committee Chair, who walked every step of this path with me: "Know yourself, be true to yourself, and surround yourself with colleagues who complete the picture" (D. Person, personal communication, September 1998).

CONTENTS

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Education in the late 90s is a politically charged topic with federal, state, and local issues in the spotlight. Low achievement scores on national exams by U.S. students (Viadero, 1998; Sanchez, 1998), low state literacy rates (Sweet, 1998), and violence in the schools (Los Angeles Unified School District, 1998) are among the issues currently before educators and administrators. In 1994, the federal government enacted the Goals 2000 Educate America Act to provide a national framework for education reform (Goals 2000, 1998). The content represents an effort to increase school readiness, high school graduation rates, competency of students, adult literacy, parental involvement, knowledge and skills of teachers, and school safety. The Act defines responsibilities for education at every level to ensure that all students have an equal educational opportunity to succeed.

In California, the challenges in education are even more pronounced through current changes in demographics, the economy, social conditions, and political agendas. Bilingual education, whole-language curriculum versus phonics instruction, class size reduction, inclusion, school vouchers and charter schools, curriculum standards, and a severe teacher shortage are all issues that demand attention. A major development in relation to this first issue is that on October 9, 1998, the State Board of Education proposed permanent regulations on English Language Education prompted by the passage

of Proposition 227 in 1997 which requires all students to be taught in English in California's schools. The passage of this bill meant an end to bilingual education as it had been implemented in California. In the November 3, 1998, general election, voters passed the Class Size Reduction Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act which provided nine billion two hundred million dollars in funding for education facilities and permanent class size reduction funding for districts establishing parent-teacher councils. This created an immediate need for more teachers. Voters rejected Proposition 8, a comprehensive education reform measure that also created a new Chief Inspector's Office.

The pressure felt by schools to comply with such mandates and accountability measures within the severe teacher shortage naturally feeds into the higher education system for teacher preparation (Souviney, 1998). Randall Souviney (1998), Co-Chair of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) Committee on Accreditation (COA) stated,

> This will be a challenging time for teacher education in California. New legislation will provide a new structure for teacher preparation and support. Class-size reduction and increased population will keep pressure on IHE's (Institutions of Higher Education) to increase their new teacher output. The COA will need to be diligent in its effort to maintain high professional standards for all institutions who prepare new teachers over the next few years. We welcome the challenge. (p. 1)

In addition to class-size reduction and increased population, public school teacher retirements add to the drastic increase in the need for new teachers. The CCTC (1998) projects that by the year 2000, two to three hundred thousand new teachers will be needed in California. CCTC's Mission Statement reads in part, "The increasing diversity of

students presents exciting new challenges and opportunities for professional educators in California. It is essential that teachers and other educators create environments that foster the growth and education of all students."

Higher education, and especially teacher education, has a role in the growth and education of all students. Colleges and universities must pay attention to the underlying conditions of the urban community that give rise to the problems affecting students of urban classrooms and consequently teachers as well (Burstein & Sears, 1998). Violence in the home and on the streets, substance abuse, racism, crime, poverty, unemployment, premature pregnancies and illiteracy are among the elements that contribute to the rising numbers of students at risk and with disabilities (Morgan, 1996; Moon, 1994). Additionally, the urban student population is increasingly diverse in ethnic backgrounds and socioeconomic levels. Burstein and Sears (1998) state that "failure to retain teachers has been attributed to the challenges teachers face in urban schools" (p. 48), with new teachers being particularly vulnerable. Teachers must be prepared to take on the challenges of California's classrooms (Root, 1994) and be empowered to continue their own personal and professional development for a fruitful and rewarding career.

One Family in Los Angeles County

In one of a series of articles in education in the Los Angeles Times, the story of Ruben, a third grader in the Los Angeles Unified School District, is reported (Sahagun, 1998). This story is used as an example of the issues of equity and social justice that educators must face in educating students.

Ruben and his family of nine live in a converted garage. His youngest brother has disabilities. The family lives on public assistance. Ruben is considered a student at risk: "He is among the thousands of third-graders in Southern California who cannot read at grade level and are in danger of falling hopelessly behind in school. And like many of those children, he is poor" (p. A1). Over 650,000 children live in poverty in Los Angeles County alone. This represents a third of all school-age children in the county. Nationwide, the number of children who will be living in poverty in the year 2000 is projected to be one in four (Cummins, 1996).

Sadly, the Goals 2000 document does not address the effect of poverty on educational failure or the disparate funding of schools in different neighborhoods (Cummins, 1996). Rendón and Hope (1996) repeated the challenges in teacher preparation:

> Instead of inner-city schools getting the best-prepared teachers, most get the opposite. Having few resources, poor school districts are unable to attract outstanding teachers . . . consequently, minority children often have the least-qualified and least-experienced teachers. Moreover, teacher preparation programs in colleges and universities have largely been lax in preparing teachers to work with multicultural students in urban settings. (p. 18)

Sue Shannon, coordinator of instruction for Los Angeles Unified School District, describes the situation as follows: "We were always very successful academically when our kids were coming from middle-class families. What we need to do now is learn to be successful with children who are coming from lower economic areas, because that's the kind of children we have today" (Sahagun, 1998, p. 34).

Ruben and his family are struggling. The parents attended a year-long domestic violence class. Both are unemployed. The oldest of the Rocha boys is "trying to stay away from the gang life." Spanish is spoken at home, but Ruben cannot read proficiently in Spanish nor in English. He doesn't do his homework and is not an active participant in class.

Since passage of Proposition 227, immigrant school children in California who are not proficient in English are known as "English learners" who may be placed in a structured English immersion program, an English language mainstream classroom, and/or receive Community Based English Tutoring at a local educational agency. Parents may file Exception Waivers with the school district if they do not agree with the placement of their child in the English immersion program; the principal and educational staff act upon the waivers by offering learning experiences in the student's primary language (English Language Education for Immigrant Children, 1998).

Ruben's teacher recognizes her student's potential and the benefits of personal attention. She notices that when he stays after class with her, Ruben does much better at his lessons: his writing is clearer, he recognizes words easier and answers basic questions with certainty. At Ruben's school, 86% of the third graders could not read at grade level as measured by a standardized test last spring, yet only about a dozen first graders per year are able to receive tutoring services.

School officials have recommended a special education class for Ruben. Ruben's parents are trying to keep him in regular education classes for "fear that their son would be stigmatized" and because "it didn't help with three other sons who have been placed in

special education classes" (p. A34). The school psychologist believes that if Ruben doesn't get special help he will lose interest in schoolwork altogether.

"There are tons of Rubens in this city" (p. A34), the psychologist said, and she is seeking greater parent involvement. This is a common problem according to Rendón and Hope (1996), as many minority parents who speak little or no English or who have not graduated from high school do not feel empowered to participate in school functions. In the community where Ruben lives, only 13% of the parents have high school diplomas and 44% of all residents live below the poverty level. These families have limited experience with today's education system and very meager resources to support their children in school.

Parental involvement is meaningful and productive when it is facilitated in such a way as to honor and strengthen the culture of the home (Cummins, 1996). However, this is not always the approach taken by educators. For example, the fact that the parents are not proficient in English is seen as an obstacle to their children's educational performance by the director of studies and programs at the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies at the University of California, San Diego (Sahagun, 1998). In Ruben's case, the father reflects this view. He said, "I can't read English. So I can't help any of them with reading" (p. A34).

School districts should consider new ways to involve parents, such as sending home materials and books in the primary language spoken in the home (Cummins, 1996). The educational structures either encourage or limit interactions among educators,

students, and families. Educational structures are represented in language/culture incorporation, community participation, pedagogy, and assessment.

Ruben's parents were eager to participate in their son's education, anxious to try new strategies to support him, as reported in the article on November 1, 1998. In a follow-up article that appeared June 30, 1999, Ruben's progress in reading was termed "painfully slow" (Sahagun, 1999). Ruben was "teamed up with tutors and role models, given several shelves' worth of books and kept after school for hours on end," (p. A18) yet finding new ways to involve his parents remains a "daunting challenge."

Partnerships and Service Learning

The educational reform movement proposes many initiatives to improve education for all children, including those like Ruben. Some of these are cooperative learning, school-to-career experiences, integrated curriculum, and Goals 2000 projects (Erickson & Anderson, 1997). Another focus of educational reform is the formation of new relationships or partnerships between school teachers and college faculty (Simpson & Keith, 1996) whereby local school districts and classroom teachers participate in teacher education. Specific examples of partnerships are: (a) the partnership between Alverno College and Milwaukee Public Schools in which middle and high school teachers collaborate with college faculty to implement best teaching practices (Stoffels & Sneed, 1996); and (b) the collaboration among Carson-Newman College, the Foxfire Fund, Inc. and teachers from preschool to 12th grade in carrying out a learner-centered approach to education (Teets & Midkiff, 1996). Another form of partnership is involving local school districts with teacher education through service learning.

Service learning by definition is an educational program that 1) integrates service with academic study, 2) operates from a social justice framework, and 3) combines reflection, action, and analysis (Varlotta, 1996). Service learning serves the need of our time, and nowhere better than in urban settings of colleges and universities (Hamm, Dowell, & Houck, 1998). In teacher education, preservice teachers are able to spend time in urban classrooms as part of their academic study while providing a service to the community as tutors and role models. Although the evidence to support positive outcomes of service learning in higher education is just emerging (Kendrick, 1996), it is the fastest growing and most prominent movement in higher education (Price & Martello, 1996). Service learning is one strategy that can connect the educational shifts taking place in K-12 education and teacher training programs (Moon, 1994).

Service learning is being integrated into the college curriculum of teacher education programs to respond to the needs of all learners and the challenges facing schools as were described earlier. Schools and colleges have become partners in an effort to create programs that will benefit students at both institutions, as well as the community in which they live. Partnerships are formed and designed based on the needs of the participating members (Warren, 1996).

Service learning is one way the university prepares future teachers for today's urban classrooms. The students preparing to be teachers today may be the ones who teach Ruben's infant brother who has disabilities in their general education classroom tomorrow, and so they need the skills to address these needs. Educators are being commissioned to design new programs to meet the needs of all children. (CCTC, 1998)

At California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) a multi-faceted program named SERVE–Service Experiences for Re Vitalizing Education–was initiated in 1996 in partnership with Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD) to address some of these needs. The mission statement of the SERVE Program reads:

> The mission of the CSULB/LBUSD SERVE Program is to create an opportunity for undergraduate students, particularly those considering a career in K-12 education, to learn about the realities of urban classrooms and the needs of diverse K-12 school student populations. Through direct involvement with children, individually and in small instructional groups providing achievement support activities, role-modeling, and achievement coaching relationships, CSULB students will be able to assess their own values, knowledge, and readiness related to their career goals and they will be able to provide direct service to students, K-12 school classrooms and their communities.

This combination of service and academic study is known as service learning.

Persons & Lisman (1996) emphasize that service learning demands academically sound, anchored partnerships. The idea for the SERVE (Service Experiences for Re Vitalizing Education) Program at CSULB originated with the Long Beach Community Partnership, a non-profit community organization that focuses on economic development, public safety and public education. What spearheaded the creation of the SERVE Program was the observations by the leaders of Long Beach Unified School District that new teachers from CSULB seemed unprepared to teach in their schools. What they were lacking, according to the school district leaders, were field experiences in multicultural, urban school settings. A partnership between the College of Education at CSULB and Long Beach Unified School District was formed to provide the school district with support for students at risk and the university teaching candidates with field experiences in urban classrooms (Hamm et al., 1998).

The service learning graduation requirement for students majoring in Liberal Studies was therefore introduced in 1996. Students contemplating a career in teaching serve as tutors and instructional aides in urban classrooms. The college students receive training in literacy skills and active participation strategies. At the school site they are exposed to the realities of urban classrooms and to the cultural and social backgrounds of diverse populations. These experiences address the theory to practice gap that was observed by the educators in Long Beach.

Learning in College

Learning at all levels of education is undergoing a shift from students being passive receivers of information provided by an instructor to becoming active learners along with their instructor, thereby creating a "community of learners." Barr (1998) describes this shift on the college level as a two-dimensional shift from the Instruction Paradigm to the Learning Paradigm. The first dimension of the Learning Paradigm is the mission of teaching shifting to "producing student learning" rather than providing instruction. The second is adapted from organizational learning theory, and involves the shift of the institution to "operating as a learning organization." The continuous change to meet student needs moves the institution to become continuously more effective and efficient in educating students.

A Learning Paradigm-governed college, according to Barr, must satisfy five conditions:

1. It must have identified its intended learning outcomes in detail.

2. It must have developed a system for measuring the achievements of these outcomes.

3. Its curriculum must have been built backward from the intended outcomes and must be developmental.

4. It must provide a wide range of powerful options for achieving required learning outcomes.

5. It must continually and systematically investigate alternative methods for empowering students to learn.

Peter Ewell (1997) suggests that one of the reasons that we have had "limited success in actually improving collegiate learning" (p. 3) is a lack of understanding of what collegiate learning actually means and what circumstances and strategies will likely promote it. He includes out-of-classroom learning, reflection, and active learning as situations where learning occurs best, and suggests approaches to promote learning. One of those approaches focuses on curriculum, having both integrated (horizontal) learning plans whereby key skills are applied in different contexts, and sequential (vertical) vectors of development.

The SERVE program exemplifies this shift in learning. The focus of the SERVE program is on student learning rather than providing instruction. The training portion of the program emphasizes experiential learning, preparing the student to "step out" and have the opportunity to apply their skills in the field of the profession they are considering as their own. The central point of this research study is to empower the students to learn and grow by making overt the intentions of the program and providing research findings and

theory that the students can use to further their development. It is hoped that students will extend their learning along vectors of personal development and become more personally engaged in the design of their learning environment.

Student Development Theory

College student development is the process by which college students grow. Pascarella & Terenzini (1991) see student development not only as growth but also as potential for growth "toward maturity, toward greater complexity through differentiation and integration, valued and pursued as a desirable psychological and educational end, perhaps even as a moral end" (p. 16). The early research on college students was generally descriptive and served as the groundwork for theories that would emerge in the 1960s and 70s (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998; Terenzini, 1987) which brought order and meaning to the large body of information gathered up to that time. Today these theories serve as the basis for the practice of student affairs and are evaluated for cross-cultural applications, integration of women's views, and application to social constructs and overall systems (Komives & Woodard, 1996). They are used by student affairs professionals to understand individuals, groups and institutions, and to create meaningful, intentional programs to promote student development.

Student development theories provide information on college student behavior and fall into four predominant categories (Evans et al., 1998). They are: cognitive or intellectual theories; psychosocial theories; typology theories; and person-environment interaction models. Cognitive or intellectual theories interpret how people perceive or make meaning of the world around them intellectually. These are based on Piagetian

psychology and stress the role of heredity and the environment in cognitive development. Psychosocial theories address the tension that exists between what is happening societally and what is happening with the individual psychologically. These are largely built on Erik Erikson's (1980) theory of developmental tasks or stages of development created by an individual's personal changes and social demands. Typology theories focus on innate personal differences in how people relate to the world. These include personality types, learning styles and personal interests. Person-environment interaction models incorporate environmental factors that influence individual development (Evans et al.). The theories address the characteristics, composition, and processes of individual human growth; the models identify variables that influence change in students (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Like books on a shelf, theories and models are available to the practitioner to clarify and simplify, to make situations meaningful, manageable, and productive.

Terenzini (1987) reviewed selected theoretical models of student development that are useful in the design of programs, academic and non-academic, and services intended to facilitate student development. The models reviewed had five process commonalities for developmental movement. However, Terenzini singled out Arthur Chickering's model as the one that holds identity as the central concern, "and his seven vectors are intended to give greater specificity to that concept" (p. 10).

Psychosocial theories are commonly used to examine issues and policies that relate to students and to develop programs in higher education. Arthur Chickering, a psychosocial theorist, proposed his seven vectors of development to understand what student development looks like and how to foster it, and to serve as maps to visualize

where college students are developmentally and where they are bound. (Chickering, 1969). The vectors are: (a) Developing Competence; (b) Managing Emotions; (c) Moving through Autonomy toward Interdependence; (d) Establishing Identity; (e) Developing Mature Interpersonal Relationships; (f) Developing Purpose; and (g) Developing Integrity (Appendix A). An educationally powerful environment, according to Chickering & Reisser (1993), promotes human development along the seven vectors and mixes the interdependent parts of institutional objectives, student-faculty relationships, curriculum, teaching, friendships and student communities, and student development programs and services. They advise us to integrate work and learning, to recognize and respect individual differences, and to remember that significant learning and development comes about as a result of challenge and response, differentiation and integration, disequilibrium and regained equilibrium.

Problem Statement

Through participant observation, anecdotal data, and information kept on phone logs in the SERVE office, it became apparent that students participating in the program were involved in significant experiences that related directly to self-understanding. However, the students did not possess the language or tools to understand how to make meaning of their experience. The challenge became how to address the dissonance and assist the students in their personal and professional development.

The search for a descriptive theory related to identity and self-understanding originated this project. It was necessary to determine which student development theory would address the problems being encountered by students in the SERVE program. How

to bring theory into practice in the SERVE program, consistent with the College of Education mission to engage in research and scholarly activity which informs and improves practice, is the nature of this study.

Purpose of the Study

The urban classroom presents many challenges to beginning teachers who are implementing new teaching methods with students at risk, students with disabilities, and students from a variety of ethnic backgrounds and socioeconomic levels. The college student is at developmental stages in which she is coming to awareness of competencies, emotions, values, purpose and identity. The students participating in the SERVE program are in need of support in combining personal and professional areas of development. The institution is in a position to respond to those needs by combining academic affairs and student affairs in a service learning experience.

Chickering's vectors serve as a theoretical model on which the support can be built for students in the SERVE program. Chickering's seven vectors of development allowed for the preliminary data collected in the SERVE office to fall within a logical framework. The SERVE office was able to offer explanations to students on complex issues related to identity in a simple way that was easy for them to follow. Application of the vectors as predetermined themes to available information directed attention to other more definitive vectors as well.

Widick, Parker, and Knefelkamp (1978) state that "development along the vectors is not a simple maturational unfolding but requires stimulation . . . the role of the environment provides the challenges or stimulation which encourages new responses and

ultimately brings about developmental changes" (p. 21). The purpose of this study is to develop an effective mechanism for infusing Chickering's psychosocial development model into the SERVE training program and to ascertain if students are able to apply the vectors to foster their own development and deepen their personal understanding of the experience.

Questions of the Study

For the purpose of this study, questions asked are: (a) given training in the model, are students able to apply Chickering's vectors to further their personal and professional development? and (b) what is the best way to implement the model in teacher education in addition to the SERVE training currently offered?

Definition of Terms

The definitions of the following terms will be used in this study:

1. Service learning: students in the community performing service work which is attached to an academic program–and reflecting upon their work as it relates to their learning.

2. K-12 education: the education of students from Kindergarten through 12th grade.

3. Preservice teachers: college students in training for the teaching profession.

4. Teacher preparation programs: programs of study that prepare a student to become a teacher.

5. Partnerships: agreements between colleges or universities and school districts for the purpose of furthering the education of students at both institutions.

6. Student development: the process of bringing out the capabilities or possibilities of students to be more effective participants in their education.

7. Personal development: the natural growth and maturation of an individual along patterns of thinking, feeling, and behaving.

8. Vector: one of seven areas of personal development in the college student: developing competence, managing emotions, moving through autonomy toward interdependence, establishing identity, developing mature interpersonal relationships, developing purpose and developing integrity.

9. Professional development: the acquisition of skills, knowledge, information and new ways of thinking that can be applied to one's profession.

Assumptions

The assumptions that underlie this study are:

1. Students participating in the study are healthy individuals, over the age of 18, and without learning disabilities, as self-reported. This is the students' first experience with service learning in an urban classroom.

2. Students have no prior knowledge of Chickering's vectors, as self-reported.

3. Chickering's vectors can be used for college students of any age and any background, as an adult development model.

4. A state of dissonance exists in all students during their first experience in the SERVE Program.

Delimitations of the Study

Number of Participants

Participants self-selected to participate in this study without any benefits offered to them other than the suggestion of furthering their personal and professional development. For the pilot study, four students participated.

Student Volunteers

Students were not coerced in any way to participate nor were they contacted other than to inform them of the location of the working sessions of this study.

What the Reader Can Expect

Chapter 2 will cover a review of the literature in the following areas: (a) preparing teachers for cultural diversity; (b) application of service learning to programs in teacher preparation, including the SERVE Program at CSULB; and (c) student development theories. Support for using Chickering's Vectors and for the methodology used will be presented in the final sections. Chapter 3 will contain the methodology, description of the intentionally structured groups, member selection, program plan and its evolution, and formative and summative evaluation procedures. Results and interpretation of findings will be given in Chapter 4, and summary, discussion, and recommendations in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The mission statement for California State University, Long Beach (CSULB), Vision 2001, is:

> In the year 2001, California State University, Long Beach, has its students as its highest priority. CSULB places primary emphasis on the education of the whole person for living and working in a multicultural world. The university achieves this through relevant instructional programs and facilitative environments.

For students preparing to be teachers, a major issue that they will be facing in their profession is the cultural diversity in the classroom (Goodwin, 1997). One of the programs at CSULB that contributes to the preparation of students to become effective teachers living and working in a multicultural world is the SERVE (Service Experiences to ReVitalize Education) Program (Hamm et al., 1998).

This chapter is divided into five major sections: (a) Preparing Teachers for Cultural Diversity; (b) Application of Service Learning to Programs in Teacher Preparation, which includes the SERVE Program at CSULB; (c) Student Development Theories; (d) Support for Using Chickering's Vectors; (e) and Support for Methodology . The first section provides a review on the need for multicultural education in teacher preparation programs and efforts that have been made in that area. An abbreviated overview of service learning follows in the second section, with emphasis on Dewey's

approach to knowledge production and examples of programs in service learning partnerships. For a more extensive review of the history of service learning, the reader is directed to Kraft (1996) and Erickson and Anderson (1997). A report of the SERVE program at CSULB is offered. In the third section, the clusters of student development theories are explained–cognitive, typology, person-environment, and psychosocial. An evaluation of Arthur Chickering's Seven Vectors of Development and Nevitt Sanford's Theory of Challenge and Support is given. The last two sections present support for using Chickering's Vectors and for the methodology selected.

Preparing Teachers for Cultural Diversity

In 1973, The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) Commission on Multicultural Education included the following excerpt in its statement, "No One Model American":

> Multicultural education programs for teachers are more than special courses or special learning experiences grafted onto the standard program. The commitment to cultural pluralism must permeate all areas of the educational experience provided for prospective teachers
> (p. 264).

To meet the commitment of this statement, goals and curricula for multicultural teacher education were designed by teacher educators. The main components incorporated in the majority of the programs were: (a) knowledge about ethnic group experiences; (b) attitudes and feelings of teachers towards ethnic, racial and cultural differences; and (c) skills to put their knowledge and sensitivity into practice. (Goodwin, 1997). The Bilingual Education Act, the Ethnic Heritage Act, and the Individuals with

Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) made funds available for programs, conferences and material development for multicultural education. By 1979, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards included multicultural education in the curriculum for professional education programs. However, criticism arose on the quality of the modifications that were implemented to meet the NCATE standards, and the topic of multicultural teacher education, amidst political and economic disorder in our country at that time, took on a negative tone (Goodwin). Divisiveness among educators with different perspectives on what multicultural education should look like further weakened its progress. Some proposed separate courses emphasizing the major racial and ethnic groups in America; others believed that the content of all the courses should represent the diversity of our nation (Rendón & Hope, 1996).

In 1983, the U.S. Department of Education published A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education) a report which began the educational reform period that continues to this day. Initially concentrating on curriculum, the movement is now focusing on teacher preparation and teacher quality, emphasizing teachers' self-knowledge about their own culture and that of others (Goodwin, 1997).

The Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life presented its report, One-Third of a Nation in 1988. The "one third of a nation" of whom the report speaks are Americans who constitute our minority population: Blacks, Hispanics, American Indians, and Asian Americans. In spite of the increase in projected minority school-age population (33% by the year 2000, and 39% by the year 2020) the Commission reported that fewer minority students were pursuing teaching careers–from

13.4% first-year students majoring in education in historically black colleges and universities in 1977, to 8.7% in 1986. The loss is great for minority students who see teachers as role models and also for majority students who will not be exposed to teachers from other ethnic groups.

Among the strategies identified by the Commission for making progress towards achieving equality for all citizens in our nation, two focus directly on education. The first one centers on increased efforts from institutions of higher education in recruitment, retention and graduation of minority students; the second one emphasizes improved coordination and cooperation among all levels and systems of education. The latter challenge called for "leaders at all levels of education [to] recognize their interdependence and decide that attention to the total system is among their highest priorities" (p. 29).

Eight years later, Rendón and Hope (1996) wrote that while colleges and universities "have been largely lax in preparing teachers to work with multicultural students in urban settings," (p. 18) the urgency now comes from the increasing numbers of students from various ethnic backgrounds who are not achieving at the same level as white students and who are taught by white teachers. The predicted increase in the minority student population and decreasing numbers of minority students in teacher preparation programs places us in the crisis that had been foreseen for our nation (Darling-Hammond, 1994; Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life, 1988).

Su (1998) indicates that "because the majority of people in the teaching profession are still from the mainstream group, it is very important to develop strategies to help them

become social justice educators who genuinely care for children from poor and minority backgrounds" (p. 195). Teachers must understand children of other racial and ethnic groups, their ways of knowing, how they access information, and how they make sense of the world. Teachers will then be able to teach in a way that promotes greater equity and social justice in schools (Cummins, 1996).

In a study undertaken to find out what preservice teachers thought about multicultural education, only 9% of the 120 respondents indicated that multicultural education should focus on achieving social change (Goodwin, 1994). Instead, multicultural education was perceived as teaching of cultural content, materials, or celebrations. This perception is externally driven, dependent on procedural or technical competencies required in specific circumstances, in contrast to being internally driven, with an intent to achieve social change. The students in this study did not place themselves in the multicultural equation. In her work with preservice teachers, Hollins (1997) likewise observed problems with their understanding the importance of culture in people's daily lives or with linking culture to teaching and learning in school.

Curricular and Instructional Strategies

In preparing future teachers to teach culturally diverse students, involving the preservice teacher in the realities of different cultures is more desirable than studying about cultures. Self-knowledge, cultural knowledge, case-based instruction, and field experiences should be emphasized. Self-knowledge enables the preservice teachers to see themselves as members of a diverse society and to value cultures different from their own. Cultural knowledge acquired through immersion programs gives the students firsthand

experiences in other cultures. Case-based instruction allows for analysis of complex issues of teaching students of different cultures; however, this strategy is effective only if it is guided by teacher educators who are culturally sensitive. Field experience in schools with a culturally diverse population remains the most common strategy in multicultural education. However, the field experience alone does not guarantee that students will develop the cultural consciousness and intercultural competence needed for teaching diverse learners (Garcia, 1997; Melnick & Zeichner, 1997).

As one approach to develop cultural consciousness, Hollins (1997) suggests a developmental process for teacher education which requires coordination of teacher educators, their collaboration, and application of research findings on effective teaching and educating teachers for cultural diversity. The process could apply to four interrelated components: (a) constructing an operating knowledge base for productive teaching, (b) preparing for student teaching, (c) experiencing teaching, and (d) synthesizing and integrating knowledge about teaching. It is the wide knowledge base that supports the rest of the stages of the model. It includes defining culture, self-understanding, understanding the diversity of others, examining the cultural basis of school practices, and observing productive teaching and learning. This wide operating knowledge base can then be applied as needed in the classroom.

Another model to prepare teachers for critical thought and action is given by Dillard (1997), emphasizing participatory learning through cooperative group projects, discussions and seminars. Garcia (1997) on the other hand, questions the faculty's experience with regard to cultural knowledge and their abilities to guide students in

discussions and self-narrative reflective inquiry. She urges teacher educators to first take a look at their personal role as change agents and then work towards incorporating reflective inquiry into teacher preparation.

Reflective inquiry can be used to gain a different perspective (McGraw, 1999). The filters through which we view our world are a by-product of our learning history and cultural background, and it is through reflective inquiry that we learn different perspectives. Darling-Hammond (1997) explains how this applies to teaching:

> Training in inquiry helps teachers learn how to look at the world from multiple perspectives, including the perspectives of students whose experiences are quite different from the teachers' own, and to use this knowledge in developing pedagogies that can reach diverse learners. (p. 322)

To illustrate the magnitude of our responsibility to educating all students, if a whole program needs to be changed to bring about a true understanding of cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic differences in our schools, then that is exactly what has to happen, according to Peretti (1997). While settings and students differ from institution to institution, the standards for preparation of future teachers are the same. With an understanding of the needs of their students, their community, and their institution's mission, educators must design programs that will bring about fairness and equal opportunities for all children in schools.

Application of Service Learning to Programs in Teacher Preparation

Teachers today are entrusted with a "reculturing" of education "to more fully meet the needs of individual students and resolve societal problems" (Erickson & Anderson, 1997, p. 1). One approach that has been recommended to prepare new teachers to be

successful in today's schools and as leaders in K-12 education is to incorporate service learning in teacher preparation programs (Erickson & Anderson). Service learning incorporates the basic principles of the developmental process, participatory learning, and reflective inquiry.

The movement that has led service learning to its present form began in the 1960s when student activists and progressive educators brought attention to an educational system that did not include a growing population of diverse learners, and when communities experienced urban uprisings and a focus on poverty (Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999). In the 70s a series of national reports which pointed to reforms needed in education were published (Kraft, 1996). Among the recommendations made by the various committees were service graduation requirements, service programs, and experience-based learning. However, not until the publication of A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) and One-Third of a Nation (Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life, 1988) were any actual reform measures implemented. Service learning was also supported in the 80s by educators (Goodlad, 1984) and in reports by working groups of the Carnegie Foundation (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989).

The movement today can be seen as having different orientations, each with a distinct theoretical base: (a) experiential learning, (b) transformational or social reconstructionist theory, (c) multicultural education approaches, (d) critical reflection, and (e) education as preparation for civic responsibility (Erickson & Anderson, 1997). However, each of these orientations is grounded in Dewey's traditional experiential

learning theory (Erickson & Anderson, 1997; Giles & Eyler, 1994; Saltmarsh, 1996; Varlotta, 1996).

Dewey wrote in 1932 that great movements are not often great in their beginnings, and that it is only after a long period of time, when we look back and realize what has become of those beginnings, that we realize their importance (Saltmarsh, 1996). Realizing the importance that John Dewey's propositions have had on the present design and understanding of service learning and education for all students, a reexamination of the ideas found in two of his volumes, Democracy and Education (1916) and Experience and Education (1938), follows.

Democracy and Education

The beginning of a society is the community. More than just a group of individuals in proximity, in a community the group has a common purpose–a focus in which all members are interested, and for which all members will regulate their activities. Communication is of vital importance in a community, to reaffirm their purpose and keep the group informed of their progress. For communication to be effective in a community, it must have freedom of expression; when cast in a mold or made routine, communication loses its educative power.

Members of a community seek to communicate what they have learned to improve the community. Therefore, learning has meaning when it is recognized and allowed to fill a social need, and when separated from that necessity, learning is meaningless. A true educational experience, then, is connected to the interests, purposes and ideas current in the community which are important to communicate.

Beliefs and attitudes towards the focus of a community cannot be forced. The community brings about a certain system of behavior by creating an environment in which the individuals see and feel one thing rather than another. But the environment is more than just immediate surroundings; it is the planned, continuous influence of the environment that moves the group towards its purpose and promotes learning. The elements involved in the activity of creating an environment is what differentiates training from educative teaching. Educators are responsible for setting up conditions which stimulate certain visible and tangible ways of acting–the environment–and for making the students partners in the learning activity. Students must be emotionally involved and be aware of the means employed to reach the goals of the community.

The environment, then, plays a major role in education. The student experiences a certain environment through his immediate family and surroundings in the home. The broader environment in the U.S. involves a variety of races, ethnic groups, religious affiliations, and socioeconomic levels. Whether chance or intentional, the school environment must provide the opportunity for the student to break through the limitations of the social group into which he or she was born and come in contact with the broader environment. The school must facilitate the acculturation of each individual as he leaves his home environment and encounters the diverse influences of the various social situations to which he is exposed.

Education can be seen as providing direction in the situations in which the students take part. This direction constitutes control in the nature of the situations, bringing focus, order and continuity to the experiences, not in exercising power over the students'

learning. If a student is forced to follow someone else's goals for his learning, he will be thrown out of balance. Students are in balance and gain an internal control over their learning by being interested in the subject and understanding its relevance to their lives. By actively partaking in constructing their learning objectives, students acquire a social sense of their own power and an understanding of the materials used. Consequently, education can be viewed from two different positions: personal growth and preparation in formal disciplines.

When viewed as personal growth, education takes the form of initiative and thinking how to apply new skills to new goals. The goals are not imposed from the outside, but originate with the student. Setting goals and being intentional about learning, according to Dewey, "signifies that an activity has become intelligent" (p. 129). It requires an effort in transformation and demands attention and endurance. The aim of education, then, is to allow the students to receive the rewards from learning which is meeting their goals and recognizing their continued capacity for growth. This will enable them to become lifelong learners.

When education is viewed as preparation in formal disciplines, educators must consider and protect the present needs and possibilities of the students and not sacrifice those domains in the name of training for the future. Excessive emphasis on training and specialized skills could interfere with initiative, inventiveness, application and readaptability, particularly if the material presented is isolated from connections with the present environment. In such a case, instruction actually rivals learning. Education actually must be seen as a "continuous reconstruction of experience" (p. 93).

How education is viewed also varies with the social system in which it dwells. Dewey defines a democratic society as "a society which makes provision for participation in its good for all its members on equal terms and which secures flexible readjustment of its institutions through interaction of the different forms of associated life" (p. 115). In a democratic society individuals have a personal interest in social relationships and are empowered to bring about social changes without introducing disorder. A key factor to empowerment is experiences coupled with thinking.

Experience is the connection that exists between doing or trying something and its consequences. It has an active doing phase and a passive undergoing phase. Thinking brings about the intentional connections between what is done and the consequences, thereby changing the quality of the experience–it becomes reflective. Reflection is the individual's acceptance of responsibility for the consequences of his activity. This empowers him to continue learning and to induce social change .

Another method to enhance the meaning of the experience is to bring connections to consciousness. "Any experience, however trivial in its first appearance, is capable of assuming an indefinite richness of significance by extending its range of perceived connections" (p. 255). The simplest way a connection is made is through communication with others, which in itself furthers an individual's development. The value of communicating with others who have a common interest in learning far outweighs the benefit of taking a test, for example. A third way to bring to fruition the cognitive factors of an experience is through the scientific method: searching for the sources, the grounds,

and consequences of a belief surpasses a mere statement about the experience. It results in knowledge which has been tested and is rich in meaning.

The growth of a progressive society, Dewey asserts, lies in the diversity of its members. "Hence, a democratic society must, in consistency with its ideal, allow for intellectual freedom and the play of diverse gifts and interests in its educational measures" (p. 357). To be happy, its members must have a purpose and be free to engage in a continuous discovery of capacity and aptitude and development of skills towards a social aim.

Experience and Education

The fundamental idea of experience as it relates to education is that an "intimate and necessary" relationship exists between the two. The problem for the learner is to discover the connection within the experience between past achievements and the present happenings. When the activities in the schools are relevant to the students' lives, the connection results in the acquisition of knowledge. In contrast, a "mis-educative" experience can not only prevent a person from getting the most out of an experience or from making significant contributions, it can also arrest growth.

There are two main criteria for an experience to be educative–or worthwhile educationally–as opposed to mis-educative. First there must be an experiential continuum. The continuum refers to the ongoing formation of attitudes, contribution to society, and personal growth. Attitudes are formed on an intellectual and emotional level: something from the past should be taken to improve the future, namely the quality of the human experience. As this type of activity continues it becomes a habit, and so conditions for

further growth are created. The key element to bring about the intellectual and emotional involvement of the student is reflection. Reflection is what enables the learner to understand what he has been through and to learn from his experience.

Any given experience will set up a preference or aversion for further experiences. Therefore, the educator's role in facilitating worthwhile experiences is crucial, in both the conditions of the experience and the reflection. The educator must be "intimately acquainted with the conditions of the local community in order to utilize them as educational resources" (p. 36) in setting up the experience. A worthwhile experience will strengthen the learner, arouse his curiosity, and clarify his purpose such that he will be empowered to continue learning. On the emotional level, the educator must judge what attitudes are being formed that are conducive to further growth, and guide the student accordingly.

The second criteria for an educative experience is that the interaction that takes place between an individual and his environment gives equal rights to objective (external facts) and subjective (internal) conditions. An ideal environment provides the conditions that correlate ready-made truths with the personal needs, desires, purposes and capacities of the individual so that he can create his own knowledge. The educator must intentionally structure and regulate the situations whereby such transactions can take place between the individual and his environment.

Continuity and interaction intercept and unite to create the process of lifelong learning and growth. The knowledge and skills that an individual gains in one situation become his "instruments of understanding" for dealing effectively with the next one.

Through each experience, the individual's world either expands or contracts. Therefore, attentive care must be devoted to the conditions which make each experience meaningful to the present and important in preparation for future experiences with deeper and broader issues.

Programs in Service Learning Partnerships

One strategy identified by the Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life (1988) to achieve equality in education is cooperation among all levels and systems in education. Service learning partnerships from Kindergarten to higher education engage educators and learners from schools and universities in activities that are mutually beneficial (Myers & Pickeral, 1997). A school-university collaborative partnership in teacher education involves (a) the school teachers, (b) the elementary and secondary students, (c) the college students also known as preservice teachers, (d) the university faculty, and (e) the administrators from both institutions.

Service learning partnerships have been designed primarily to improve teacher education. The design of each model is dependent on the goals of the partnership. Each has its own mission, focus, and scope. The first four models described in this section illustrate a specific component deemed important in preparing future teachers. The components are (a) professional development of the college student, (b) collaboration between the university and school, (c) relationships among participants in service learning, and (d) transition for the college student to classroom teacher. The remaining examples illustrate specific goals within a preparation program, such as diversity training, recruiting

bilingual candidates, and using technology to facilitate connections among institutions and participants.

John Carroll University. The Professional Education Model seeks to prepare and develop professional educators at John Carroll University in Ohio (Manning & Jorgenson, 1996). Partnerships exist with South Euclid-Lyndhurst School District, Orchard Elementary School, Hawken Lower School and Saint Ignatius High School. Students in the alternative teacher certification program receive a Master's of Education degree plus an elementary or secondary teacher certification. The program includes a full year of immersion in teaching, attending classes on site and at the university. Interns are selected by both university and site personnel.

A faculty member serves as program administrator, and full-time faculty advisors are available to the interns. Upon requests from interns, Professional Development Workshops on Classroom Behavior and Management, Ethics in Teaching, and Assessment have been offered. Faculty are available for conversations with interns; career advisement services and employment networking is also offered. Providing these services has increased demand for faculty time and other resources. Collaboration is also time consuming, as "meetings that provide opportunity for sharing must occur on a regular basis" (p. 98).

Kentucky Wesleyan College. The partnership between Kentucky Wesleyan College and Cravens Elementary School focuses on collaboration and its benefits in the preparation of preservice teachers (Tennison & Hawes, 1996). While education students

experienced working with children in authentic environments, these same students brought new ways of learning to the children and faculty of the urban school.

Every class in the Teacher Education Program at Wesleyan has a field requirement, totaling 150 hours upon completion of all classes. This takes place before student teaching begins. Students identify their own learning needs based on their classes, field experiences, and the state's "New Teacher Standards." They discuss their progress through self-evaluations, reflective journals, and feedback obtained from mentor teachers, faculty and peers.

The site coordinator matches the college student's needs with a teacher who can "provide the desired experiences." At the beginning, classroom teachers and college students were not sure of their roles in the program. The most critical element to its success became identifying the needs/goals of the college student and having both the student and classroom teacher as responsible parties toward the attainment of the goals. Additionally, "professors hold on-site discussions with their classes immediately following field experiences to help students reflect and make meaning from their experiences" (Tennison & Hawes, 1996, p. 103). Monies from a Goals 2000 grant are used to hire floating substitute teachers to allow mentor teachers to join in the discussion. This collaboration is said to have changed the climate of the school, where success is measured by each participant's gain in the partnership, where the good of the group and of the individual is valued and celebrated.

Berry College. The relationships among participants in the Berry College partnership project in Georgia are a central component in the education of preservice

teachers (Hausfather, Outlaw, & Strehle, 1996). Field experiences in the teacher education program required that students be exposed to diverse multicultural, rural, and suburban environments at a variety of grade levels with supervision by both college personnel and classroom teachers. Supervision of students in the field by the professors of this small college greatly limited placement possibilities.

The first decision in facing the placement challenges was to place students in pairs. This provided for feedback from a peer, mutual support, and opportunity for collegial reflection. The second area of focus, the classroom teacher's role, became the critical element of the program: "The relationships between the college faculty and cooperating teachers have resulted in a desire to empower the classroom teacher to share in the responsibility of educating the preservice teachers" (Hausfather et al., p. 39). A "Developmental Flow of Field Experience" table was developed with input from the classroom teachers to describe the service that the college student would provide to the classroom; a rubric for observations by teachers or fellow students was presented; teachers keep a "conversation" notebook with the interns regarding their field experiences. In addition, students reflect on their field experiences daily through journal entries focusing on analysis of significant episodes.

These early field placements provide ongoing supervision, guidance, and guided reflection on their experiences to the college students. They are to be in continuous conversations with their college instructor and with the cooperating teacher. However, after two years that the program has been in place, time and opportunities for

communication are now the biggest challenges and the primary focus of attention to ensure continued success and participation of all partners.

Linfield College. Educators at Linfield College addressed the problem of transition for the college student from the role of student to the role of professional. "There is no planned, gradual transition from classroom practice to active participation in the new professional role: one minute they're students, the next they're teachers" (Campbell & Ross, 1996, p. 108). The case of a model student unable to adapt to the teacher's role in a student teaching experience began the conversation on the acculturation of preservice teachers to the realities of urban schools prior to their student teaching experience. While the program included courses with observation/aiding requirements, what was lacking was clear integration of coursework and fieldwork experience. Students were participating in the clerical duties of teaching rather than being engaged in the art of teaching. Linfield's goal was to have secondary preservice teachers in conversation with expert teachers in their subject fields, making connections between subject, method, and students, using examples from classroom experiences where both are co-participants.

The Site-Based Secondary Methods model moved the secondary methods block–a two-period block–to a high school five days a week, with a portion of that time for students to work in the classrooms and meet with cooperating teachers. The content-area methods courses are taught by Lindfield's adjunct faculty–the best high school teachers in each department. These faculty members are part of the team that plans the methods curriculum, cover classes for the high school teachers when these are guest lecturers for

the college students down the hall, and coordinate the discussions and management of the field experiences.

Linfield students are immersed in the culture and climate of the high school. They have access to the resources there, such as library, computer lab, and ESL and handicapped resource rooms. The Linfield-McMinnville High School team intentionally couple student characteristics, curriculum, teaching methods and activities to create a seamless experience for the college student to assume the role of teacher.

Increasing enrollment in the successful Linfield program has caused strain on MHS teaching and administrative staff. Future plans include expanding the program to two middle schools in addition to the high school of McMinnville public schools.

Other Programs. Specific challenges and visions have driven other partnership programs. Following are some examples.

The Willamette University School of Education in Oregon teamed with the Salem-Keizer School District SMART (Salem-Keizer Multicultural Resource Team) to introduce diversity training in school reform (Biffle, 1996), to address the interrelationship of culture and instructional practice. California's College of Notre Dame and the Ravenswood City School District became partners in attracting bilingual candidates for the teaching profession, and subsequently training and certifying bilingual teachers (Guay, 1996).

Houghton College in New York is a rural college with a very homogeneous population. Through technology and a partnership with King Urban Life Center and School #90, the Houghton College education department is preparing teachers with multicultural and multiethnic understanding (Massey & Massey, 1996). Technology also

provided the connection in the partnership between Balwuin-Wallace College in Ohio and Berea City Schools (Conroy, Jensen, Bainbridge, & Catron, 1996).

For additional models of programs with courses that employ service learning the reader is directed to Erickson and Anderson (1997). The models described therein not only give examples of service learning experiences attached to courses, but also ways to present service learning as a philosophy and teaching method and to prepare teachers to use service learning as an instructional approach within K-12 classrooms.

The SERVE Program at CSULB

The idea for the SERVE Program originated in 1994 based on the concern of Long Beach Unified School District leaders that the teachers graduating from the local university, California State University, Long Beach, seemed unprepared for teaching in the culturally diverse Long Beach schools (Hamm et al., 1998). Seeking to provide early field experiences in multicultural, urban class settings, representatives from both institutions, from the City of Long Beach, and from the Long Beach Community Partnership designed a pilot service learning program which was formally instituted as a requirement for graduation in the Liberal Studies program in 1996.

The program aligns with one of the models of service learning described by Myers and Pickeral (1997) in which college students perform as tutors/mentors to K-12 students. In this model, preservice teachers test the theories they have learned in the classroom, explore specific strategies, assess if teaching is the right career for them, and determine their future in education. In addition, the SERVE Program operates based on a "theory of change" which seeks to improve the preparation of teachers for cultural diversity.

There are long-term and short-term goals for the SERVE Program. The long-term goals are to prepare teachers who: (a) possess skills to respond to students' individual needs and differences (such as first language, gender, race and ethnicity, socioeconomic class, personality, and parental education); and (b) possess knowledge of the realities of public school classrooms and skills to adapt to these realities (Hamm et al., 1998). An exposure to the realities of urban classrooms, development of sensitivity and understanding of social, cultural and economic factors that have an effect on the education of children, and providing support in the classroom constitute the short-term goals of the program. The program requires 120 hours of service learning over three semester periods, or 40 hours per semester.

Students are trained, placed, and supported through the SERVE Program which is housed in the Center for Collaboration in Education in the College of Education. Training includes "strategies for giving praise, guided reading, reading prompts, asking effective questions, management techniques, active participation and a powerful simulation experience teaching them how it feels to be a learning impaired or excluded student" (Hamm et al., 1998, p. 198) in one four-hour session. The model calls for students to keep an interactive journal with the classroom teacher also known as service learning instructor (SLI) and to use it during the biweekly sessions with their SLI.

While the partnership exists between CSULB and Long Beach Unified School District, placements have been extended to twenty five additional school districts throughout Los Angeles and Orange Counties, in response to college students' requests. Placements outside Long Beach are arranged on an individual basis to meet the needs of

individual students. Support is offered through the classroom teacher and the SERVE coordinators. The SERVE Program Coordinator is a counseling intern, and the Faculty Coordinator is a faculty member from the College of Education.

During the 1997-98 school year a study was conducted with 187 students in the SERVE Program who were placed in Long Beach schools (students placed in other districts were not included in the study). Ninety percent of the students in the study were women and the average age was 23 years; fifty percent had no prior experience as volunteers in public schools. Results from pre- and post-tests showed that the students gained in their awareness of individual and social characteristics which influence the educational development of children (Hamm et al., 1998).

While those results indicate that students have gained in the awareness of characteristics that have an effect on the children's development, the model does not make overt the personal development of the college student. Working under the auspices of theory to practice, a theory on student development could serve as a framework to address, promote, support and encourage the personal development of the teacher in training.

Student Development Theories

Multiple components such as identity, competence, emotions, relationships, experiences, personal characteristics, and environmental factors influence the development of a college student. While student affairs professionals study and become experts in many of these areas, no one person is an authority in all of them. Student development theories are accessible to understand individuals, groups, and institutions. They are used

by professionals "to make the many complex facets of [the college] experience manageable, understandable, meaningful, and consistent rather than random" (McEwen, Roper, Bryant & Langa, 1990, p. 148).

In the late 70s Knefelkamp, Widick, and Parker (1978) set out to create a comprehensive theory of student development. Instead, they confirmed the value of having clusters of theories, each cluster looking at the college student from a different perspective. The clusters that will be discussed here are cognitive, typology, person-environment, and psychosocial theories. Support for application of Arthur Chickering's and Nevitt Sanford's theories to this study will be given.

Cognitive Theories

Cognitive theories describe how students make meaning out of their world: how they perceive intellectually what they are learning and experiencing, how they reason. They are built on the work of Piaget (1952) on moral development. The leading architects of cognitive theories are Kohlberg, Gilligan, Perry, and Belenky.

Kohlberg's work in 1958 was an expansion of Piaget's study of moral development of children. That work resulted in a hierarchical and sequential explanation of "the individual's relationship with the rules of society" (Evans, 1996). He named six stages of development arranged in three levels, Preconventional, Conventional and Postconventional. Movement toward higher levels of moral development is achieved through experiences and situations that deal with moral issues. Since its inception, Kohlberg's theory has been examined and supported by subsequent research and applied in moral education programs in schools and universities (Evans).

In 1977, Gilligan proposed an alternative theory of moral development for women. It consists of three levels: orientation to individual survival; goodness as self-sacrifice; and the morality of nonviolence. The transition stages between levels deal with the woman's sense of responsibility to care for others, and to take care of herself as well as others, respectively. The research that followed Gilligan's work showed that while both men and women use both styles of moral reasoning–based on justice and rights as described by Kohlberg, and based on care and responsibility as described by Gilligan–men favor the former and women the latter (Gilligan, 1982).

Perry's (1968) study was the first look at intellectual development of college students. He proposed nine stages of cognitive development divided into four groups which he named Dualism, Multiplicity, Relativism, and Commitment in Relativism. The student's perception of knowledge and truth is defined in each stage. Perry's focus on development was the adaptation and adjustment that the individual makes when faced with challenges, rather than the process of development taking place (Evans, 1996).

Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1996) were the team of researchers who in the late 70s sought to understand why women often doubted their intellectual competence. They noticed the learning that women acquire through relationships, friendships, and community involvement. They presented their findings as five major perspectives on knowledge from women's point of view, and these they named "silence," "received knowledge," "subjective knowledge," "procedural knowledge," and "constructed knowledge." These perspectives emerged from women of different ages, circumstances, and outlooks. The authors' significant contribution to higher education is

promoting "connected teaching" which emphasizes collaborative work, firsthand experiences, and new modes of assessment (Evans et al., 1998).

Other theories of cognitive development exist that build upon the ones presented here. Among them are Baxter Magolda's Model of Epistemological Reflection which contains four stages with gender-related patterns in the first three; King and Kitchener's Reflective Judgment Model with seven stages on assumptions about knowledge and the process of acquiring knowledge (Evans et al., 1998); and Loevinger's Theory of Ego Development which considers moral growth, interpersonal relations and cognitive development in one framework (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

Typology Theories

Differences among individuals are addressed in typology theories. These theories do not have stages or processes and do not serve to evaluate. Instead, they explain, provide information, and increase our understanding of the innate differences among individuals, specifically among college students (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). The differences are in the way they learn, the way they communicate, how they take in and process information, what interests they have, how they spend their time, and what experiences they have in college. Given a set of challenges, a new situation, or environmental factors, individuals will respond differently based on their type. Typology is the framework for cognitive and psychosocial development, because students approach development in accordance to their type (Evans et al., 1998). The major contributors to typology are Kolb, Holland, and Myers-Briggs.

Kolb maintains that the learning process has four components, which are "concrete experience," "reflective observation," "abstract conceptualization," and "active experimentation." The first and third components–concrete experience and abstract conceptualization–both deal with the way an individual takes in information; the second and fourth components–reflective observation and active experimentation–are ways an individual makes information meaningful.

Individuals must choose which components they will use each time they are in a learning situation. It is from these preferences that learning styles emerge. In order for students to have equal access to education, different learning styles must be considered in methods of instruction, assessment, and delivery of service to students (Evans et al., 1998).

Holland first proposed his Theory of Vocational Personalities and Environments in 1985 (Evans et al., 1998). It incorporates four parameters: personality type, environments, the fit between the personality type and the environment, and the persons interacting in the environment. Different personality types are defined by interests, behaviors, and attitudes, and a person with diverse strengths and interests may identify with more than one type. The types are: (a) Realistic, (b) Investigative, (c) Artistic, (d) Social, (e) Enterprising, and (f) Conventional.

Each personality profile has a matching environmental model, according to Holland, because persons create their environment according to who they are. Additionally, persons seek out environments that allow them to use their talents, thereby strengthening the person-environment definition (Evans et al., 1998). Holland continued

his studies of personality types and with his colleagues created assessment instruments to assist individuals in making vocational choices.

The Myers-Briggs mother-daughter team based their work on that of Carl Jung related to mental functioning (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Their typology theory states that differences in personality are reflected in ways that persons prefer to receive information–the perception functions–and ways that they reach conclusions or make decisions–the judgment functions. Within each of these functions are two preference areas, and all are governed by attitudes or orientations.

The first attitude describes an individual's source of energy and how he or she interacts with the world–Extroversion (E) or Introversion (I). The perception functions refer to the kind of information an individual naturally notices–Sensing (S) or by Intuition (N). The judgment functions describe how an individual makes decisions–Thinking (T) or Feeling (F). And the individual's preferences in interacting with the outside world can be Judgment (J) or Perception (P). According to these preferences and their possible combinations sixteen different personality types arise (i.e., ISTJ, ISFJ, ENTP, etc.). The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is an instrument that is widely used to assess personality types.

The wide use of typology theory and corresponding assessment instruments attest to their value in gaining understanding of individuals. The guiding force of these is that all types are equally valued and necessary in our society.

Person-Environment Theories

Person environment theories are not developmental theories in the pure sense, but they are important to student development because the models provide another backdrop for understanding the college student and the effects of the environment on the college experience. The models are defined according to the main influence of the environment being analyzed, such as physical models, human aggregate models, perceptual models, and structural organizational models, and have been summarized by Pascarella and Terenzini (1991).

Physical models can represent the actual buildings, the larger setting or locality, or the participants. Barker's theory of behavior settings is an example of physical models. Human aggregate models take on the characteristics of groups of people in the environment, such as values, attitudes, goals and socio-demographic similarities. Holland's work on vocational choice and the environment described under Typology Theories is also an example of human aggregate models. In perceptual models the individual's perception of the world defines the environment. Lewin and Murray are the pioneers of this area of study. And lastly, structural organizational models that explain the behavior of people in particular types of organizations are interpreted by Strange and King.

Psychosocial Theories

Psychosocial theories give us an insight into college students' growth through the way they manage or achieve particular developmental tasks. These theories had their beginnings in the 1960s with the work of Erik Erikson and Nevitt Sanford. Erikson's

epigenetic principle of the relation between biological and psychological changes, the crises that result when these changes interact with sociocultural demands, and his identification of identity confusion in college students laid the groundwork for psychosocial theories (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

Sanford (1967) studied the effects of new situations and demands placed on college students. He valued the research from the 60s which showed that flexibility of thinking, range of interests, autonomy and integrity were among the traits that differentiated the most and least creative people in architecture, literature, mathematics, and engineering. Chickering is another psychosocial theorist whose theory integrates the work of Erickson, Sanford, and volumes of work and information on college student development into one model (Chickering, 1969).

Some psychosocial theory models examine the experiences of women and diverse populations, such as Marcia's Model of Ego Identity Status; Cross's Model of Black Identity Formation; Heath's Maturity Model (Evans et al., 1998). From all the existing psychosocial models, it is the work of Chickering and Sanford that will be reviewed in this section for their theories' direct application to this study.

Chickering's Seven Vectors of Development

Chickering created the vectors of development on the belief "that colleges and universities should be concerned about students' personal values, ways of thinking, modes of learning, and interpersonal and intercultural skills" (Chickering & Reisser, 1993, p. xi). While his theory was not embraced by faculty when it was first published in 1969, the present focus on socially responsible citizenry emerging from higher education is very

much in line with the theory of student development as described by Chickering and Reisser (1993). This theory and ensuing recommendations are an update of Chickering's original work, incorporating additional research on higher education, particularly the work of Pascarella and Terenzini (1991). The updated version of Chickering's Vectors is what follows.

Developing Competence. The college student gains competence in three major areas: intellectual competence, physical and manual skills, and interpersonal competence. The most apparent gains are in subject matter knowledge and academic skills of a major. Just as significant are critical thinking, cultural understanding and aesthetic sophistication. How students make sense of their experience and develop new points of view add to their cognitive skills.

Physical and manual skills develop through involvement in athletics, fitness programs, and creative projects. Students learn about teamwork and competition, self-discipline, self-care, wellness, courage, adaptability and flexibility. Tangible creations provide evidence of manual skills.

Interpersonal competence involves skills in listening, responding, decision-making, giving feedback, and acquiring sensitivity. These are significant for mentoring, managing, leading, negotiating, instructing, supervising, consulting, persuading, and communicating in private, public, personal and professional settings. These are the skills that employers look for in college graduates.

While a student's sense of competence in these areas is subjective, that sense plays a major role in maintaining a balance in college life, in solving problems, and in

persistence. Students compare themselves to other students through the feedback they receive. With an increased trust in their abilities, students take greater risks, give more worth to their accomplishments, and have a healthy self-concept.

Managing Emotions. Emotions permeate the lives of students of all ages: age does not correlate with emotional maturity. Students experience toxic feelings over tests, academic stressors, relationships, and finances. Managing feelings such as these signifies identifying, accepting, and thereby increasing an awareness of emotions, which leads to exercising flexible control over them.

Learning a broader repertoire of responses and appropriate expression of feelings is what this vector is about. Learning in this area includes behavior modification, problem solving, assertiveness training, perspective taking and responding. Equally important to professional educators, Chickering notes, is to emphasize, to bring out and nurture positive emotions, optimism and caring in all students.

Moving Through Autonomy Toward Interdependence. Development in this area brings about greater understanding for other points of view. Achieving autonomy through emotional and instrumental independence allows the student to accept interdependence with others. Emotional independence means having the freedom from needing reassurance from others. The student entering college relies temporarily on someone else (i.e., counselor, professor) while he or she is learning the skills to function independently. Instrumental independence refers to self-sufficiency in any environment, being able to leave one place and function well in another. A student needs strong cognitive skills to have this independence, to set goals and take risks.

When independence is achieved, interdependence, the capstone of autonomy, is possible. Interdependence is about reciprocity, compromise, sacrifice, consensus, commitment to the welfare of the community, respect, give and take, and friendships. In other words, this is about becoming different and making and maintaining connections.

Developing Mature Interpersonal Relationships. Mature relationships is defined by Chickering as accepting persons for who they are, appreciating their differences, talents and flaws, and having a greater capacity for intimacy, sharing and reciprocity. This shift in the quality of relationships makes for deeper connections, romance, collaboration, partnerships, and friendships. These relationships endure crises, distance, and separation. Eventually such depth of connections will expand from the circle of friends, colleagues and partners, to the community and beyond.

Much can be done by professionals to achieve movement in this vector. Some examples are: (a) restructuring curricula to break down ethnocentric attitudes, eliminate labels, and put a stop to the negative interpretation of others; (b) providing opportunities to learn about different cultures, social classes, and abilities; and (c) acting as role models.

Establishing Identity. Establishing identity encompasses all the vectors, since it includes the student's awareness of competencies, emotions, values, standing alone, bonding with others, going from intolerance to openness, and self-esteem. "Identity" defines who the student is: body and appearance, gender and sexual orientation, social and cultural heritage, roles and lifestyle. Acceptance and appreciation of all these solidifies the student's sense of self and brings about greater integration of body, mind, feelings, beliefs and values.

A sense of self in a social, historical and cultural context is necessary for the student to locate herself in context first before being able to appreciate other groups. Students are able to update their self-concepts based on information from others, provided the feedback is consistent and specific. Acknowledgment of weaknesses and acceptance of criticism as well as increasing faith in their own abilities, feeling useful to others, and knowing their valuable qualities leads to stability and integration.

Developing Purpose. Sharpening priorities in personal and professional areas result in greater commitment to goals, termed by Chickering as "developing purpose." Students have a greater opportunity to clarify personal interests in college, especially if they go from being passive to purposeful learners. This is achieved through setting their own learning goals. Therefore, goal clarification should be a high priority for college personnel.

With greater clarification of personal interests comes greater stability, increase in time spent studying, and greater commitment. College requires personal commitment, sacrifice, and greater intentionality, which translates to having meaningful goals, greater focus and depth in studies, full involvement, motivation and persistence. Having a strong purpose leads to integrity, the final vector.

Developing Integrity. Integrity refers to a person's core values and beliefs. Humanizing those values, personalizing them and being congruent leads to development in this vector. Humanizing values is living them out through greater humanitarianism, involvement in politics, and support for individual rights. Owning up to those values and articulating them provides greater clarity, making it possible to reframe beliefs based on

ethical principles, logic, and evidence. College staff can play a major role in encouraging students to find their own way by providing opportunities for reflection, personal dialogue, and greater involvement with others.

Being genuine, aligning behavior with personal values in socially acceptable ways makes a person "congruent." A person who is congruent "walks the talk" by accurately matching experiences, awareness and communication. A person who is congruent continues to develop integrity through relationships, evaluating and tempering rigid beliefs, remaining open to other interpretations, weighing evidence and experiences, and remaining true to a meaningful set of principles.

Factors that Influence Development

Having proposed these vectors, Chickering identified factors he calls "key influences on student development." They are: (a) institutional objectives; (b) institutional size; (c) student-faculty relationships; (d) curriculum; (e) teaching; (f) friendships and student communities; and (g) student development programs and services. They are described here because of their relevance to the experiences of students participating in this study.

Institutional Objectives. Clear institutional objectives defined by members of the college community and used as guides bring consistency to policies, programs, practices, and behaviors. Such consistency brings focus to the college community and reinforces one another's work. This produces higher motivation in students and moves them along their development: clarity and consistency determines development.

Institutional Size. Small colleges offer greater opportunity for student involvement, for students to get to know each other, for relationships to form, for leadership skills to be developed. The less participation opportunities available, the less self-discovery and development of identity. In larger institutions, the self-evaluation of the student shifts from criterion-referenced evaluation (tasks and responsibilities) to norm-referenced evaluation (comparison with peers). This competition is hard on developing competence; sense of competence increases with the variety of tasks performed and level of cooperation employed. Therefore, smaller human-scale units should be created in large institutions to foster student development.

Student-Faculty Relationships. Peers are the number one influence in students' lives; faculty are number two. Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) report that "the influence of interpersonal interaction with these groups is manifest in intellectual outcomes as well as in change in attitudes, values, aspirations, and a number of psychosocial characteristics" (p. 620) and "the most influential interactions appear to be those that focus on ideas or intellectual matters, thereby extending and reinforcing the intellectual goals of the academic program" (p. 620).

Student-faculty interaction has been shown to develop competence and sense of competence in students by faculty modeling how they use their minds. High quality, early, informal out-of-class contact with faculty influences students' career aspirations and clarity of purpose. Faculty can provide the temporary support that leads to autonomy. Through modeling humanizing of values and ethical behavior, faculty move students to integrity.

For positive student-faculty relationships to take place, faculty must be accessible, congruent, knowledgeable on human development, and able to communicate with students. The latter component refers to listening skills, being able to enter the student's frame of reference, having positive regard, being able to focus on the student's strengths, being able to get to the issue that is of concern to the student, and having respect for the student.

Curriculum. While volumes can and have been written about curriculum and student development, a major point that must be made is that the curriculum affects how a student establishes identity. Chickering suggests four areas of examination regarding general education requirements: (a) is the content relevant to the student's background and prior experiences? (b) does the content recognize significant individual differences among students? (c) does the curriculum create encounters that challenge existing values? (d) does the curriculum provide activities that integrate what the student is learning? In addition, how the curriculum is presented can make the difference between active learning and minimum academic preparation.

Teaching. The conditions for learning affect student development. Chickering offers his principles of good practice in teaching. Good practice encourages:

1. student-faculty contact in and out of class, sharing experiences, knowing students by name, mentoring students;

2. cooperation among students through study groups, sharing about their background, evaluating each other's work, establishing learning communities;

3. active learning through classroom discussions applying the lesson to their own lives, team projects, outside events related to course work, planned activities;

4. prompt feedback to students with suggestions for improvement and reflection, detailed evaluations, conferences, written comments, keeping a log of students' progress;

5. time on task, communicated high expectations, setting challenging goals, suggesting additional reading, calling attention to students' performance; and

6. diverse talents and ways of learning, using diverse teaching methods, matching activities to students' backgrounds, integrating new knowledge.

Faculty should continuously seek new ways to be more effective and engage in personal renewal.

Friendships and Student Communities. Relationships among students foster development along all seven vectors. With friends students learn to communicate, empathize, argue, and reflect. Spending time in dialogue with friends, students clarify values and purpose. By sharing feelings and revelations of biases and histories students develop greater understanding of each other and integrity. Student communities are socializing agents for identity development.

The institutional culture determines the student culture. An institution that fosters community encourages regular interactions with opportunity to share interests and face common problems together. In a large institution, a more personalized environment for students through the creation of smaller units facilitates relationships with peers, faculty and advisors. For commuter students, the challenge is greater to build a community and

form friendships. Programs, retreats, professional meetings and other activities can be intentionally planned to promote involvement for all students.

Student Development Programs and Services. Collaboration among student development professionals, faculty and other campus educators fosters the development of the student as co-curricular and academic successes build on each other. This can be viewed through three service clusters: entering services, support services, and culminating services.

Entering services include preadmissions, recruitment, admissions, financial aid, employment, orientation, educational planning, academic skills assessment, prior learning assessment, and registration. Support services enrich the class experiences with developmental cocurricular activities such as academic support services, career development, personal and life counseling, educational programming, recreational, athletic and cultural activities, health services and wellness programs, student government and organizations, residential life, child care, support groups, and developmental mentoring. Culminating services include practica and internships, academic review and graduation assessment, job search, resume writing, interviewing, placement services, and development transcript review.

"The most critical task of higher education for the twenty-first century is to create and maintain educationally powerful environments" (Chickering & Reisser, 1993, p. 454). Such environments will move students along the seven vectors of development. Specifically, they (a) integrate work and learning, (b) recognize and respect individual differences, and (c) consider that significant learning and development move in cycles of

challenge and response, differentiation and integration, disequilibrium and regained equilibrium.

Nevitt Sanford's Challenge and Support

The core of Sanford's work is based on the premise that significant learning comes in cycles of challenge and response. "Prior to Sanford's work, no developmental theory other than Erik Erikson's was available to describe the changing patterns of thinking, feeling, and behaving in college-age students. Sanford set the stage for a new level of thinking about student development, proposing that colleges should foster development by providing an empowering balance of challenge and support" (Chickering & Reisser, 1993, p. 1).

Sanford's purpose in writing Self and Society (1966) was to provide a base of information to professionals working with people in need of further development, to be used for planned action for groups and individuals. For college students, Sanford maintains that the institution must have a clear picture of the students entering and the individuals they wish to emerge. The change that comes about during a person's years in college depends on the programs and experiences offered at the institution. Personal and professional growth happens when an individual encounters a situation that he cannot manage with his existing repertoire of skills. The institution must therefore present the student with challenges that will stimulate new responses, and in so doing add to her competencies.

Most students possess the necessary skills to master content, according to Sanford. It is the instructor's job to challenge students to new ways of thinking that will generate

new perspectives and "systems of response." Intentionally planned actions, placing students in situations that are new to them and forcing new responses, promote learning. A weekend seminar is likely to produce more learning than a semester of attending classes in a routine fashion. Critical incidents for students, when attended to by professionals on campus, can become learning opportunities, change perspectives, or influence retention.

The degree to which a student is challenged is a delicate matter and always carries some risk. Sanford (1966) found many students feeling overly stressed. In consideration of that fact, Sanford stated that "the most effective college might well be one in which half of the people were working at challenging the student and the other half at seeing that these challenges did not become overwhelming" (p. 45). Professionals must determine how much to challenge a student to effect growth yet maintain the individual mentally healthy, which is the balance of challenge and support.

Support for Using Chickering's Vectors

Students in the SERVE Program are challenged to learn in a setting that is new for them, the urban classroom. Nierstheimer, Hopkins, and Dillon (1998), state that "we must provide opportunities for undergraduate students [in teacher preparation programs] to try on the role of the teacher, have successful experiences, and begin to see themselves as teachers" and that "just as we teach and encourage prospective teachers to treat children as individuals, we must also address the individual needs of our students at the university level" (p. 23). Student development theories provide a way to understand the needs of our university students and to create programs that will result in successful

experiences, that are suitable to their development and that will encourage and support their growth (Evans, 1996).

Student development theories that explain growth are usually presented as stages, such as the stages of cognitive development described by Kohlberg and Erikson's epigenetic principle. However, Chickering's vectors do not have the hierarchy or sequentiality of stage theories, and can be applied to whichever area of growth (intellectual, interpersonal, emotional, etc.) the student is focusing. "Education must provide for the different paces at which such development proceeds, and for the many forms it may take" (Sanford, 1966, p. 27), and the vectors are useful in examining those various forms whenever and wherever they occur.

The Seven Vectors of development can be considered as having magnitude and direction. The direction is the form or area of development, and the magnitude is the degree of transformation taking place in the student. The vectors have been used to study a wide range of experiences of college students as they relate to developmental characteristics with students from various subpopulations like: freshman students (Thieke, 1994; Martin, 1998; Tennant, 1990; Olthoff, 1991; Della Valle, 1986); traditional age (Martin; Depauw, 1980) and nontraditional age students (Butler & Markley, 1993; Thompson, 1993; Klimkowski, 1983; MacFarlane, 1991); African-American students (Young, 1993; Marcy, 1986; Gibson, 1995); women athletes (Lienau, 1989); students with learning disabilities (Olthoff, 1991); and nursing students (Thompson; Siccardi, 1998). The issues that have been examined by way of the vectors include social relationships (Sottile, 1995); environmental influences (Thieke; Martin); classroom

experiences (Thompson); instruction (Tennant); academic performance (Gibson; Young); counseling styles (Scholl, 1998; Depauw); student involvement (Murphy, 1985); and identity (MacFarlane, 1991).

The validity of Chickering's vectors has been examined (Widick et al., 1978; White & Hood, 1989; Thieke, 1994). Since criticism has befallen on the vectors for being too general, for the lack of justification for change along the vectors (Widick et al.), and for the difficulty in validating all seven vectors (White & Hood), the model has been accepted as being descriptive and explanatory on areas of change, not on how change occurs. Chickering himself accepted the criticisms and explained that his intent in writing Education and Identity was to improve practice, not to further theory (Thomas & Chickering, 1984). Chickering has been open to updating the information in the vectors with the passing of time and the changes taking place in higher education with new student populations and technology (Chickering, 1980; Chickering & Reisser, 1993). However, there are those who believe that it may be difficult to incorporate factors unique to the development of minority students into the vectors (McEwen et al., 1990).

Thieke (1994) conducted an in-depth analysis of Chickering's model and its history, and examined the environmental factors that Chickering (1969) considered the most important in influencing development. He found that faculty-student interactions, interactions with peers, and participation in intentionally structured activities with peers were related with positive changes in development along the vectors. This was the first time that supposed causes of development were validated. Thieke recommended that

further research be conducted on the interaction between intellectual and affective developmental growth.

The Student Developmental Task and Lifestyle Inventory (SDTLI)–revised version of the Student Developmental Task Inventory–is an instrument used to measure Chickering's psychosocial developmental concepts (Winston & Miller, 1987). Subscales include establishing and clarifying purpose, educational involvement, career planning, lifestyle planning, life management, cultural participation, mature interpersonal relationships, peer relationships, tolerance, emotional autonomy, academic autonomy, salubrious lifestyles and intimacy. While the SDTLI has been validated and used for measuring developmental characteristics with traditional age students of the dominant culture (Vick, 1989) , it has also been used to study other populations such as nontraditional aged students (Butler & Markley, 1993), African American students (Gibson, 1995), and students with disabilities (Olthoff, 1991).

Theory to Practice

Chickering's developmental model has been used in different ways in higher education, for example: as an assessment tool (Lienau, 1989); a programming tool for residence halls (Warner, 1988); for leadership training (Della Valle, 1986); and as a basis for program and curriculum development (Siccardi, 1998; Beaman, 1993; Little, 1997). In this study, the model is offered to the students as a tool for reflection and as a framework for personal and professional development.

Applying the model to students in the SERVE Program who are in urban schools for their service learning, the effect of changing roles that they experiences is directly

related to "establishing identity"; how students handle the anxiety of entering a new environment or the uncertainty of expectations can be associated with "managing emotions" and "developing competence." The new interactions taking place among SERVE students and classroom teachers and their pupils can be supported through the principles in "developing mature interpersonal relationships." While some vectors are more immediately applicable than others, they all connect to some degree to the experiences of our students.

The Study

The latest results of the annual Freshman Survey (CIRP–Cooperative Institutional Research Program) conducted by UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute show the growing stress experienced by women in higher education who are overwhelmed by pressure to succeed, relationships, financing their education, body image, and less confidence in their abilities (Weiss, 1999). Sanford proposed in 1967 that people develop when the stress is "great enough to challenge their prior modes of adaptation, but not so great as to induce defensive reactions" (p. 52). Therefore, we must balance the level of challenge with proper support. Just as students are challenged to perform their service in a setting that is new to them, they must be supported in this endeavor in the program that sends them forth.

Sanford (1967) wrote that "it makes little sense for institutions to recruit creative talent without providing a setting in which it can flourish" (p. 52). It is difficult to argue with that stance even as we approach the end of the century. With this belief, the foundational theoretical notion for this study is that development is not sequential and that

it is the duty of the institution of higher education to provide the conditions to encourage and promote the development of the student in the manner and direction that he or she chooses within the framework of the institution.

We propose to do this by (a) being overt in the use of theory so the students can be intentional in their growth and (b) involving the students in the design of their personal goals and in the program that will support them in reaching those goals.

Support for Methodology

Goodlad (1994) suggests that only through new alliances among liberal arts faculty, teacher education faculty, and teachers in schools committed to renewal will we be able to refocus and renew our efforts to bring about schooling that is responsive to its original purposes within our social and political democracy. This study seeks to broaden the alliance to include student development counselors and educators to sustain, nourish and guide preservice teachers to a greater understanding of their lives and their chosen profession. The model presented in this study in which personal and professional development workshops are facilitated by professionals in education in education and in counseling, with participation of preservice teachers having experiences in urban classrooms, is one response to education renewal.

The Practice-to-Theory-to-Practice (PTP) Model

The Practice-to-Theory-to-Practice (PTP) model provided a structure to implement the study, directing organized attention to the needs of the students entering the SERVE Program and the desired outcomes. The PTP method in student development operates on the belief that given a context of practice in student development, application

of formal theories combined with procedural process models results in a more professional practice (Miller & Winston, 1991). The Practice-to-Theory-to Practice (PTP) model was presented by Knefelkamp, Golec and Wells (1985) and consists of five components: Practice, Description, Translation, Prescription, and Practice.

"Practice" is an effort to identify concerns that need to be addressed and establish desired goals and outcomes. This is followed by "Description" in which relevant theories are examined and the characteristics of the students and the environment are analyzed from the perspective of the theories. "Translation" involves the identification of potential sources of challenge and support. The PTP model then re-examines the goals and the design of an intervention method in order to achieve those goals in the "Prescription" section. The last section, "Practice," is the implementation of the intervention, examination of outcomes and redesign of the intervention if necessary. Chapter 3 discusses a specific outline of steps taken to design the sessions that were the basis for this study.

The PTP model provided the base for selecting relevant theories, specifically Chickering's (1993) developmental vectors and Sanford's (1966) challenge and support. The process was guided by qualitative research practices in education and the use of intentionally structured groups (Winston, Bonney, Miller, & Dagley, 1988) in student development work.

An intentionally structured group (ISG) can be defined as an intervention designed to promote specified goals for the group and individual behavior change (Winston et al., 1988). The ISG usually lasts from four to thirty hours over one academic term. According to Winston et al. (1988) the tasks and activities of an ISG may allow its

members to (a) examine attitudes and feelings, (b) acquire new information, (c) develop and practice skills, (d) receive feedback in a supportive climate, and (e) integrate knowledge with affect to form personally meaningful and useful constructs. While the group has a structure or framework from which to operate, it takes place in a social environment and there is enough flexibility to allow the members to contribute to the shaping of the process.

Qualitative Methods in Education

Marshall and Rossman (1995) propose that "successful qualitative studies depend primarily on the interpersonal skills of the researcher" (p. 64) for building trust, maintaining good relations, respecting norms of reciprocity and considering ethical issues. This idea, as well as Marshall and Rossman's suggestion that participants may have to be taught what the researchers' role is, describing "their activities while in the setting, what they are interested in learning about, the possible uses of information, and how the participants can engage in the research" (p. 65) were both taken into consideration and applied in the work with the group.

Portraiture. As the study evolved, the researcher began to "get a picture" of the students in the style of social science portraiture, where data is magnificently enriched by the awe-inspiring lives and experiences of the subjects. Thus, this study became framed by portraiture as described by Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997), "a method of qualitative research that blurs the boundaries of aesthetics and empiricism in an effort to capture the complexity, dynamics, and subtlety of human experience and organizational life" (p. xv).

The crossing of boundaries from scientific concepts to the intricacies and delicacies of reality has been documented since the turn of the century. Dewey (1938) was concerned with recording educational experiences in a way that would be true to their texture and richness. Anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1973) acknowledged the researcher's creative contributions to painting a likeness, which he calls "thick description" and precedes theory building. Thick description can be defined as "description that goes beyond the mere or bare reporting of an act, but describes and probes the intentions, motives, meanings, contexts, situations and circumstances of action" (Denzin 1988, p. 39).

In portraiture, the identity, character, and history of the researcher are considered critical to the way the story is composed (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997). How the researcher listens, selects stories, and interprets what is happening depends on who she is, and the work becomes a co-construction of meaning among the producers and the perceiver of a work of art. The relationships in co-construction are between the artist-researcher and subjects; the artist-researcher and the work; the perceiver and the work; and the perceiver and the subject of the work. The reader is the perceiver who will construct her own meaning.

The method of portraiture set forth by Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997) serves as the foundation of this study. The following concepts will be woven in: context and setting; subjects, facilitators and researcher; point of view and climate. The story of the group is discussed, with emergent themes and discerning observations in portraiture terms. In selection of themes to be included in the results, the two questions important in portraiture (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis) will be considered. First, do the themes

resonate through the students' language and institutional culture, and do they illuminate dissonant threads? And second, are the themes useful in interpretation?

Significance of Results

The significance of the results of this study are inherent in applied research efforts, which focus on practical applications to programs and practices (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). This work can be considered as practitioner research, in which the investigator is the coordinator of the service learning program for preservice teachers. The purpose of practitioner research is "to promote individual or group change through education" (p. 212).

Participatory action research was chosen to involve the students, a faculty member, and a staff member in the process of obtaining and providing information that affects the teacher education program. Action research can be used to change existing practices by (a) providing information, understanding and facts for making decisions; (b) allowing people to understand themselves better, increasing their awareness of problems and raising their commitment; (c) getting people involved around a particular issue; and (d) developing confidence in designing new goals (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). These are the areas that this study touched. This work took on the theoretical perspective of qualitative research in which all people are seen as having the potential to be "active in shaping and changing the 'real world'" (Bodgan & Biklen, p. 233).

Conclusion

This review of the literature has involved aspects of multicultural education in teacher preparation programs and service learning, literature on student development

theory, the PTP model, and qualitative research. Chapter 3 discusses the methodology used to infuse Chickering's vectors into service learning in this study.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

The purpose of this study is to develop an effective mechanism for infusing Chickering's psychosocial development model into training for service learning in teacher education. The questions are: (a) given instruction in the model and support, are students able to apply the model to further their personal and professional development?; and (b) what is the best way to implement the model in service learning training? Sanford's (1966) theory of challenge and support and Chickering's (1993) developmental vectors serve as the underlying theories for this descriptive study. The Practice-to-Theory-to-Practice (PTP) Model proposed by Knefelkamp, Golec and Wells (1985) guided the design of the intervention, and Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis's (1997) method of portraiture guided the methodology. This chapter will outline the design of the intervention, procedure used, and methodology for data analysis.

Design of Intervention

The Practice-to-Theory-to-Practice model was employed to develop a theory-based study involving students in the teacher preparation program at CSULB. The model provided the framework for developing the intervention for this study, allowing the researcher to use a theoretical developmental approach to challenging and supporting students in their professional identity development. An intervention was designed by

following the PTP model and implemented in the pilot. After its implementation, the outcomes were evaluated and changes were made. The redesigned intervention was then used in the research study.

Pilot Design

Following is a specific outline of steps that were taken to design the intervention used in the pilot. It also includes implementation, evaluation, and information that was gained to redesign the intervention that was then used in the study.

Practice: Step 1. Identifying pragmatic concerns. Students in the teacher preparation program at CSULB participating in the SERVE Program were in a service learning experience that was new for them. This was their first experience in urban classrooms as tutors to children at risk. This experience required that the students learn new skills for their chosen profession and adopt an identity that was new to them. The concerns were how to support students in their personal development and at the same time provide them with professional development to maximize their learning in their field assignment.

Step 2. Determining educational goals. The goal was to make overt information known about college students' development, to see if students would gain an understanding of themselves and apply the vectors to their own development. A second goal was to find a way to infuse the vectors into the training for service learning in the teacher preparation program.

Description: Step 3. Investigating Theories. Preliminary data gathered through the SERVE Program exposed student development issues in the experiences of students in

the program. After considering all the family clusters of student development theory, Sanford's theory of challenge and support and Chickering's Seven Vectors of Development were selected.

Sanford's theory of challenge and support receives primary consideration in this study because SERVE students were in crisis situations. Sanford proposes that critical incidents for students can become learning opportunities and change perspectives when attended to by professionals on campus. As challenges became overwhelming to some students as observed by the researcher working in the SERVE office, this naturally pointed to a need for support.

The issues that the students were dealing with are addressed within Chickering's seven vectors of development: Developing Competence, Managing Emotions, Moving Through Autonomy Toward Interdependence, Developing Mature Interpersonal Relationships, Establishing Identity, Developing Purpose, and Developing Integrity. Students in the service learning program at public schools experience the effect that changing roles has on establishing identity. All of the vectors have identity as a central theme.

Step 4. Analyzing student characteristics in context of theory. Students come into the SERVE Program concentrating on their requirements for graduation. Increasingly, students in the teacher-preparation program are first-generation college students who have not had exposure to professionals in education. Some did not attend elementary school in this country. Others are returning adult students for whom the classroom is vastly different than they remember. With a variety of backgrounds and cultures among our

students, for many it is unclear what are best practices for the classroom, and very little is being done to reinforce whether what they are doing is considered right or wrong. Therefore, the college tutors are being overly challenged without support.

The students in the SERVE program are unique in that they share a common purpose, which is that they want to become excellent teachers, and yet they bring many different perspectives on what that means and how to get there. Many come into the program unclear about how much is expected of a teacher, how to manage their emotions or develop interpersonal skills. For them, the realities of today's urban classroom, the impersonal nature of a large urban university, and the complexity of their personal lives becomes overwhelming.

Most students in the program are successful in their course work and are accustomed to receiving feedback from others on their performance. In the field, however, they do not receive feedback on their work on a regular basis. Upon completion of forty hours of work in the field over a ten-week period, students receive an evaluation by the classroom teacher (Appendix B). Students perform their work individually and have no opportunities to come together with peers or professionals in a structured way.

Sanford's theory tells us that there needs to be a balance in challenge and support for learning to occur. The theory suggests that not having any kind of feedback and support–as in the case of the students in the SERVE program–is not the best condition for learning. Students who were struggling, as observed by the researcher, were being overly challenged and not receiving enough support. This constituted analyzing the characteristics of students in context of theory.

Step 5. Analyzing environmental characteristics. Students in the SERVE Program receive four hours of training on literacy strategies and active participation strategies. They are then placed in schools to work as tutors to children at risk in neighborhoods that are new to them; they are expected to interact with site coordinators, school children and classroom teachers. While there exists an office where the SERVE Program is housed at CSULB, and the students are encouraged to seek help with any issues or concerns, there is no additional planned contact with the students. At or near the end of the semester the students come to the office to bring a record of the hours they have worked, to be entered in their records.

Translation: Step 6. Identifying potential sources of challenge and support. The challenge to the students is to function in a professional way in a new environment in a new role. The only apparent support is the initial training and the availability of the staff at the SERVE office during daytime working hours and of the training faculty member, by appointment. A potential source of support is the students' ongoing supervision and connection with both the site supervisor and the institution, with the students and the supervising classroom teacher, and with the students and faculty members or coordinators of the SERVE program. Additionally, peer contact and support is greatly needed.

Prescription: Step 7. Reexamining the goal. The goal was re-examined to include professional development in addition to personal development: discussions on student development vectors should be framed within the context of teacher preparation and vice versa. Thought was also given to the creation of a learning community among the students within a facilitative process, where peers, faculty members and coordinators from

the SERVE office would get to know each other and possibly become a source of support to each other.

Step 8. Designing the intervention. The question became how to have personal development as well as professional development in an intervention. One way to achieve that is by creating a program that allows the students to create their own sense of community and support for each other while addressing issues related to their lives as college students and to their field of study.

The design of the intervention therefore became intentionally structured group (ISG) experiences. The activities in ISG's are generally of two types: structured tasks or exercises and relatively unstructured or informal activities (Winston et al., 1988). The structured exercises that were used were (a) an interactive survey of the vectors, (b) a journal-writing lab and (c) a goal-setting lab. The informal activities were sharing perceptions, feelings or reactions to issues in education that students were experiencing.

In ISG's the facilitators are responsible for keeping the group focused on the stated purposes, for selecting the content addressed and the process utilized. In addition, the learning that takes place is influenced by the interactions among group members and by the group dynamics (Winston et al., 1988). In the examination of the vectors, the discussion was facilitated by the SERVE coordinators (the faculty coordinator and researcher), modeling application of the vectors to real-life situations so students might begin to see how they might do this for themselves.

A journal-writing lab was developed to encourage reflection; the journal also served as a data source. A goal-setting lab was used to maximize student learning, to

guide them in writing personal goals in an area of development within the vectors, and to challenge them to write goals in a supportive environment. Every activity was intended to provide the students with another tool to be used in their development while focusing attention on the purpose of the study.

The intentionally structured groups were specifically planned to expose the students to Chickering's vectors, to encourage their application and amplify student learning through participation, to determine progress made on goals, to address concerns and share experiences. The group was used as a support for one another and to accomplish goals.

Practice: Step 9. Implementing the pilot. The pilot was implemented in the fall 1998 semester. During the SERVE training session at the beginning of the semester the students were introduced to Chickering's Vectors of Development and were invited to participate in the pilot which, they were told, would consist of one workshop and two discussion sessions during the fall semester. Of 90 students who attended training, 37 students expressed interest in participating in the study: four attended the first workshop (three female, one male) and two continued to the end of the third session (one female, one male). Their participation and feedback helped shape the study conducted in the Spring '99 semester.

Facilitators for the ISG were the faculty coordinator and trainer for the SERVE Program, a male graduate student from the Student Development in Higher Education (SDHE) Program, and the researcher, also a student in SDHE and coordinator of the SERVE Program. The goal of the ISG was tying together personal and professional

development with content area, as well as the application of vectors and creation of community.

During the first group session, Chickering's vectors were re-introduced with an ongoing exchange among everyone present. The faculty member intentionally applied the theory to relate the students' personal experiences to the vectors and pointed out their connection and importance to teaching.

In the journal-writing lab, it was explained that journals were for student use and data collection, and would be kept confidential. Students were asked to write a journal entry incorporating their questions, observations, and concerns. Information in the journal was used as a basis for writing personal goals. The goal-writing lab was presented as a discussion, involving the students. Students were free to take as much time as they wanted to write their goals.

The students kept their journal and were asked to hand it in at the end of the next session for feedback. It was explained that the journal was not intended to be a diary of daily events, but to be used to focus explicitly on their personal goals.

The group met two more times for three hours each time. Three weeks elapsed between sessions. The last two sessions were relatively nonstructured and focused on discussion of the students' current experiences and their significance in relation to developmental vectors, and the students' progress towards the realization of their goals.

Step 10. Evaluating the pilot. Formative evaluations were passed out at the end of the workshop and the first discussion session (Appendix C), and a summative evaluation at the end of the third session (Appendix D). Formative evaluations are

obtained during the course of a program to elicit feedback which can be used to improve an ongoing program, while a summative evaluation is completed at the end of an experience. (Bogdan & Biklin, 1998).

Step 11. Redesigning the intervention. The pilot program provided information that was used in the design of the study conducted in the Spring '99 semester. As a result of the evaluation, the following changes were incorporated in the design of the study:

1. Students from the pilot program shared their experiences with new students when the invitation was made during training to join the study.

2. Materials on Chickering's Seven Vectors were made more concise by concentrating the material from a handbook to a pamphlet style for easy reference.

3. The journal-writing lab preceded the goal-setting lab.

4. Discussion sessions were guided with more direct questions to be addressed by the group.

5. Graduate students were used as recorders for discussions in groups not to exceed six student participants.

The next section outlines the procedure used in the study.

Procedure

All subjects of this research were CSU Long Beach undergraduates in the Liberal Studies Track I Program who were participating in the SERVE Program. Students self-selected to participate in the study. The study was announced at the two SERVE training sessions in January, 1999. Of the two students who participated in the pilot, each spoke at one of the training sessions about their experiences in the pilot. All students present at the

training received a card with the following information printed on the front: "Personal and Professional Development, SERVE Program, February 12 & 19, 12:30-3:00 p.m., Main Library, 5th Floor."

Group Sessions

The initial session was offered on two dates to accommodate the students' scheduling needs. Interested students were asked to take two cards: one to keep as a reminder, and one to turn in with their name printed on the back and the date of the session they intended to attend circled on the face of the card. Twenty seven students expressed interest in the February 12 session, and nineteen in the February 19 session. A letter describing the goals of the study and a description of the students' participation, including the initial date and time of the activities involved, was sent to all students who submitted a card. A telephone call reminding students about the session was made three days prior to each session. Students were not coerced in any way to volunteer for the study. Ten students attended the first session on February 12 and seven on February 19 in a conference room at the main campus library. All sessions were video taped. Seven posters, one for each vector, with a graphic and key phrases describing each vector, were displayed around the room during each session.

Session Number One. Lunch was offered. The first 30 minutes were devoted to introductions and getting to know something about each other. Facilitators for the sessions were the faculty coordinator and the researcher. On February 12, a male graduate student from the SDHE Program also joined as co-facilitator. In a go-around, students identified their place of service learning work and facilitators their place of work.

Students received a packet of materials developed by the researcher: two consent agreements, a pamphlet on Chickering's vectors, a goal-setting information packet, goal-writing forms, a journal-writing information packet, a copy of De Acosta's (1995) journal article, "Journal writing in service-learning: Lessons from a mentoring project," a notebook to be used as a journal, and a session evaluation form. The researcher explained nature of the study, purpose of the group, and the issue of confidentiality. The participants filled out the two consent agreements (Appendix E), one to turn in to the researcher and one to keep. The facilitators then led a discussion on the vectors. Throughout, examples of personal experiences were given, first by facilitators modeling and weaving in issues of teacher education and student development, then by contributions of the group members. The journal-writing lab set up the issues to be used for goal-setting. The goal-setting lab focused the issues on the vectors. At the end of the session, a formative evaluation was passed out and completed forms gathered. Both groups agreed on March 12 as a date for the next (joint) session.

Session Number Two. Every student who attended Session Number One received a reminder telephone call. The groups from the two previous sessions were joined. A total of 12 students attended the second session, held at the same location as the first. Lunch was provided as before, and participants had an opportunity to re-group and share thoughts. A brief overview of the session was given to the whole group, answering immediate questions, comments, and introducing two graduate students from the SDHE Program as recorders. Discussion groups were not to exceed six members per group, one graduate student recorder per group. Students placed themselves in two groups. The

goal for the session was to teach the students how to apply the vectors to their lives, to help them make the connections. While students were to work in small groups, the facilitators were available for help when needed, when asked.

Norms were set among members of the whole group. In the first 20-minute segment, students were asked to discuss the following: (a) as a student [or as a teacher in training] I've learned . . . ; and (b) as a student [or as a teacher in training] I still need to learn . . . When the facilitators became aware that students neared completion on the discussion, the discussion was opened to the whole group to share individual voices or group summaries. In the next 20 minute segment the students were asked to apply what they had just discussed to the vectors. A second whole-group discussion followed, and as that concluded, students were asked to write in their journals and complete a formative evaluation. Students were asked to leave their journals with the researcher, who would respond to them and have them available to be picked up at the SERVE office the following Monday.

A note was sent to each of the five students from Session Number One who did not attend the second session to summarize the activities of March 12 and inform them of the third session on April 16. Students were offered the opportunity to attend a make-up session on March 26 for the one they missed. None of the students elected to attend a make-up session.

Session Number Three. Lunch was served as in the previous two sessions. The session was held in the East Wing of the Library, in a Conference Room. It was set up as a culminating experience, 10 weeks into the semester. The group requested to meet as

one whole group, and one recorder was present in addition to the researcher and faculty facilitator. Participants had lunch and conversed among themselves. The session began with time set aside for journal writing. The central point of the discussion was the students' goals, with dialogue on (a) experiences setting goals and working on objectives, (b) application to the vectors, (c) which vectors were in question most often, and (d) what that meant to them. Students were given an opportunity to give final reflections on how they could apply what they learned and in their development as a teacher. The final question posed to the students was what they would like to see happen next with the group. The session concluded with a written summative evaluation and a celebration with a raffle, group picture, and parting mementos from the researcher–a CSULB pen, phone card, and certificate of participation. The faculty member presented the researcher with a book as a remembrance of the group experience. Students were asked to leave their journals as the previous time, to be picked up at the SERVE office the following Monday.

The students were invited to participate in individual interviews during the final session. Of those invited, four participated in individual interviews (Appendix F).

Data Analysis

The lens used for considering data in this study was that of student development. Each of the readers was either familiar with Chickering's vectors or received a copy of the pamphlet on the vectors used in the sessions.

Multiple data collection methods, also known as triangulation (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992) were used to contribute to the trustworthiness of the data. The following sources of data were compiled into a three-ring binder: (a) video tape transcripts of all the

workshops, including the pilot; (b) copies of journal entries; (c) audio tape transcripts of interviews; (d) written evaluations of the sessions; and (e) a copy of each student's SERVE Program Application form for demographic information. Each of five readers received a complete data set and instructions for data handling. In addition, readers looked for emerging themes. The readers were (a) a faculty member and thesis Chair; (b) a faculty member and thesis Committee Member; (c) the faculty facilitator of the groups; (d) the female graduate student who was a recorder for the second workshop; and (e) the researcher.

The original instructions to readers is in Appendix G. This set of instructions for handling the data interfered with the readers' freedom to look for emerging themes and think of the data as evidence of a journey. As each one tried to comply, the "art" of portraiture was being sacrificed. It was tedious and they became uncomfortable. When the readers were allowed to identify the themes of the experiences before them in the data, they were re-energized and felt better about their contribution. At that point there was agreement on the emergent themes among the readers.

From each of the data sources, data identified by the readers as emerging themes and as pertinent to the research questions–(a) are students able to apply the vectors to their own development in the field, in the classroom, and in their personal development? and, (b) what process can be used to infuse the vectors into teacher preparation training– were included for analysis. There was agreement on the themes by all the readers.

A folder was used for each of the themes that had been identified by the readers, and each piece of data was placed in the folder with a corresponding theme. This was the first attempt at bringing order to the insights of the readers.

In the analysis, attention was given to the participants, sorting for demographics and watching for differences in the data that might be attributed to characteristics such as age, gender, and ethnic background. The researcher was able to know who said what at any time by the coding system. There were no themes that emerged specific to a certain subpopulation. Themes are discussed in Chapter 4.

The initial structured classification system and the subsequent emerging patterns became categories of meaning. To get a clearer picture, two questions were considered (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997): (a) do the themes resonate through the students' language and institutional culture and do they illuminate dissonant threads? and (b) are the themes useful in interpretation?

The students' own words named the themes. To determine which themes to include in the whole, two additional questions were asked: what will the inclusion of this theme add to the whole; and how does this theme relate to and inform the other themes? Exclusion of a theme also occurred based on empirical grounds–lack of resonance with the language and culture of the students or lack of corroboration through triangulation.

The relationship among themes is important in portraiture to present a true and "flowing" picture with unity and balance. Unity is achieved when there are no indispensable parts: removing one will hurt the whole. Balance is achieved when each theme has equal resonance and sufficient evidence. And the "flow" is achieved through

what is called "scaffolding" or thematic structure on which the story can be built. To check on the truthfulness of the picture, a "member check" was performed: participants in the study were asked about the accuracy of the researcher's interpretations during the last group session. An answer of "yes, of course," was essential. Interpretations receiving a "Yes, but . . ." response were not included. Throughout the data analysis, attention was paid to the discrepancies and the deviant voice.

Conclusion

This study involves an intentionally structured group of fourteen students in the teacher preparation program at California State University, Long Beach. What transpired during three group meetings was recorded. Additional data collection–journal entries, interviews, and observations–took place with the same subjects during the same academic term, the spring 1999 semester. The results of the study are presented in Chapter 4. The chapter has three sections: (a) Framing the Terrain, which gives the context of the study; (b) Themes; and (c) Discussion on Limitations and Exclusions.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Spending time with an intentionally structured group of students participating in the SERVE Program at California State University, Long Beach during the 1998-99 academic year is the basis for the understanding gained about student development application in a liberal studies service learning program. Much as it was intended to create space for students to find their way, it also provided a new direction for the work of the facilitators.

Students in the Liberal Studies Track I program are required to complete 120 hours of service learning in elementary and middle school classrooms prior to graduation. The SERVE Program provides training for the college students who will be working in the schools, and placement for them in the classrooms. The students receive training in literacy skills and active participation strategies. It is this training that was host to this research study.

The purpose of this study was to develop an effective mechanism for infusing Chickering's psychosocial development model into training for service learning in teacher education. The study was conducted to ascertain (a) if students are able to apply the model to further their personal and professional development and (b) the best way to implement the model in teacher education training. A component using Chickering's

model was introduced into the training. Qualitative methodology including observations, participant observation, evaluations, journals, and interviews was used.

This style of reporting is based on Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis's (1997) method of portraiture. It consists of the following sections: Framing the Terrain, Themes, and Discussion on Limitations and Exclusions. Throughout, the intent was to give not just a description of an intervention and its results, but a valid expression of the group experience.

Framing the Terrain

The College of Education

The College of Education's mission statement is as follows:

> The College or Education's main purpose is to create and nurture a learning and teaching community committed to excellence in education across the life span. We fulfill our purpose by:
> - preparing professionals to be socially responsible leaders;
> - engaging in research and scholarly activity which informs and improves practice;
> - valuing diversity as we work to achieve common goals;
> - serving and collaborating with schools, agencies, the community, and each other;
> - engaging in an inclusive process for planning, communicating, working, and assessing our progress toward our goals.

The College of Education has a Strategic Planning Committee with seven Strategic Priorities centered on the preparation of high quality professionals as guided by the mission statement. In addition, the College is paying attention to the changing needs of its students. In the Spring of 1998 the Dean of the College wrote,

> The College of Education has experienced a great deal of change over the past two years. These changes have resulted in new and redesigned programs, new roles and responsibilities for faculty and staff, and a significant increase in the number of faculty and staff. In order for a dynamic organization to be effective, it is

> important and healthy to regularly evaluate ourselves and our progress. Therefore, I am forming an ad hoc committee to review the organization of the College and prepare a recommendation for the structure of the College.

The committee focused on "Service to Students" as the theme to guide their work. This was a time of assessment, of gathering information and open discussions, of physical and organizational redesign to create new settings for student learning; to accommodate, welcome and support our new undergraduates, graduate students, faculty and staff.

The Center for Collaboration in Education in the College of Education was created in 1998 to provide a home base for students and members of partnership projects and also to serve as a central office for issues on student development and programs requiring collaboration. In addition, the Liberal Studies Program was incorporated into the College this past year, for the first time bringing in undergraduate students to the College. The face and faces of the College are changing, with more contributors, more demands, more opportunities to work together for a common cause, which is to improve what we do in this field called education.

The Researcher

This segment is provided for the reader to understand the researcher's point of view in conducting this study and analyzing results. It includes philosophy on education, personal history and role in the graduate program in which this study was conducted.

One fundamental assumption to my thinking is that education is the passageway to a fruitful life. I align myself closest to the existential approach, believing that each person has the freedom to choose how to respond to life's circumstances. Through reflection a

person can recognize the range of alternatives and choose a path that is meaningful and fulfilling. In essence, this describes purposeful living.

Education is essential to purposeful living. Education is achieved through formal or informal instruction, training and personal development, acquiring knowledge and skills through meaningful experiences. This means taking responsibility for one's own learning and becoming the architect of one's life. As a person discovers her own way and who she sees herself becoming, this frees her to the process of learning and making meaning. Understanding the truths of one's reality, releasing the inner self and connecting with the outside world is my interpretation of "the truth shall set you free." With that freedom comes growth, a desire to learn, to be congruent, and experience life to the fullest.

Two beliefs to which I adhere are (a) the victim stance is not conducive to growth and (b) experiences that have no meaning are invalid. While there are very real environmental forces such as discrimination that can work against a person's freedom to reach her desire for a fruitful life, she must not stop reaching for it and finding new ways to break down those forces. Educators and counselors are responsible to work for social equity and to continuously question the purpose for experiences offered to students. Throughout my experiences as a learner and as a consumer I've seen many resources and talent wasted because people did not ask the fundamental questions, "Why?" "What do you need?" "What works for you?" "What is important to you?" and then work with that information to design meaningful goals.

As a parent of a child with disabilities who was being educated in a segregated classroom and further segregated on the playground in a small triangular area (sectioned

off by chain-linked fencing just for her in the name of safety), I could not make sense of the kind of education she was receiving. Away from our neighborhood school, her experiences were disconnected from the community, and lessons that were not applied to her life were meaningless to her. She was not meeting her educational goals and the school administrators were recommending placement to a yet more segregated environment, to another school district. We as parents sought help from a source of knowledge on education: university professors. With their assistance we worked with the district administrators to introduce the first inclusion program in the school district so our daughter could attend her neighborhood school. Finally free to learn among her peers and a teacher who was herself a lifelong learner–and who actually requested a change of grade to have the opportunity to be our daughter's teacher–our daughter met all her educational goals midway through the school year.

The program in Student Development in Higher Education (SDHE) fulfilled my needs to be in an environment where learning, personal development, diversity, and community were not only topics of discussion, but also modeled, taught, expected, and fostered. In my view, the principles of human development taught in the program were not restricted to higher education. I found that I could transfer what I was learning to my personal life. What I was learning was also providing me with insights on education and vocabulary to use in communicating with school personnel as we continued collaborating on the inclusion program.

As a student returning to my campus twenty years after graduating from the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, I felt awkward and unsure in my new field

of study. Figuring out how to fit in was a daily preoccupation for me. In the introductory class of the SDHE program I was exposed for the first time to student development theories, among them Chickering's developmental vectors. With the awareness of the vectors I understood what I was experiencing as an adult student, and how my identity was changing from scientist to student to counselor. By applying my experiences to the vectors I could make meaning of what was happening to me, and with that understanding I could move on to learn and develop in areas that were important to me. I was able to apply the design of the SDHE program in a purposeful way to achieve my personal goals. In other words, I was using the program for my education, and I was a peace with myself.

In the second year of the program I began a two-year internship position coordinating the SERVE Program in the College of Education as part of the Protégé Program. The Protégé Program offers half-time staff positions to students in the SDHE Program at various locations on college campuses. Protégés are both staff members and students with an Intentional Learning Plan. During the first year in an office, the protégé is there working, learning and observing, watching for a way to make a substantive contribution during the second year in the program. It was during this period that I began taking notes and observing the students in the SERVE Program. The SERVE Program was then in its third year of operation, serving over 500 students.

In my first few months in the SERVE office I noticed that while some students accepted their placement as tutors in public schools and continued with their service learning position in what seemed like a smooth and comfortable manner, others struggled and postponed their starting date at the schools. One critical incident happened with a

student who was reassigned three different times to different schools, and then asked to be released from her commitment to SERVE until the following semester. When she returned, confident and articulate, she shared with me what she had been experiencing. She told me that she had been afraid of going into a "mainstream school," that after giving up her third SERVE placement she had gone to a school with a large Korean population where her friend is a teacher–also Korean–to volunteer in her classroom. She explained,

> Since we live in very diversity society, people like me [are] kind of scared to go into the mainstream, main schools, so I was more comfortable working with Korean-Americans. Since I had that experience I'm not any more scared of mainstream or working with other ethnic groups.

I asked the student why she didn't tell us that she needed a school with a population of students with a cultural background similar to hers, and she said that she didn't know herself at that time what was causing her fear. This incident was critical to all of us in the program because we thought we were already being supportive and sensitive to our students' needs–yet something was still missing.

The following semester I enrolled in a course on qualitative research methods. One of the requirements for the course was an ethnographic study that included field notes, interviews and observational data obtained in an office. Since I was already working in an office with access to students, I chose the SERVE office for the study. As I observed and listened to the students, their words resonated with me around Chickering's developmental model. I had had success in my own journey as a student by using Chickering's vectors, and it had become my own orientation, so it was on my mind. I interviewed the most vocal students who came into the office, since I felt they would be

willing to talk some more, and as they did so I realized that what they said did fit into the areas of the vectors. I coded the data using pre-assigned codes based on the vectors (Appendix H).

As a result of that project I focused attention on the personal development of students. I had read about the benefits of service learning and the positive outcomes for the children who were paired with a tutor, but more was happening with the college students with respect to their personal development. What caught my attention was the connection of this phenomenon to the call put out to institutions to increase levels of personal development as well as student learning (Kuh, Douglas, Lund, & Ramin-Gyurnek, 1998), and particularly to student affairs practitioners to begin influencing curricular and co-curricular learning (Enders, 1998). All of this pointed to a new parameter in service learning, that of personal development. I began to investigate how the SERVE training could be expanded to contain a student development segment.

The Co-Facilitator

I talked to Deborah, the Faculty Coordinator of the SERVE Program, about the idea of introducing student development into the training model. She agreed without hesitation. I thought it was unusual that someone would be so eager to add a new segment to an existing piece of work. After our work for the study was completed I asked her about it, and she said,

> Part of it was that you believed in it so strongly, part of it was I believed in you, in what you needed to do for your thesis, and our students . . . our students definitely needed something. It wasn't going to hurt anybody. It could only help, and I thought it would help the students. We didn't know the format or how it was

> going to work, but the key thing was that here was a chance to do something that was different: there were no grades attached, no one was required to be there, and so it was a chance to interact with students in a more human, more personal level.

Deborah's background of working with new teachers, student teachers, and emergency teachers had already given her experience with the emotional aspect of teaching. As the new professionals struggle with their beliefs on issues of inclusion, inequality, equity in the schools, and the realization that a teacher makes a difference in these issues, it becomes very emotional for them. As a field supervisor, Deborah held seminars in her home with the students she supervised. As she reflected on the things the students were struggling with, it seemed to her that they should have had opportunities to struggle with some of that earlier than when they were in student teaching positions. That was in part why the SERVE Program was started, and Deborah was one of the founding members. She recalled,

> SERVE was doing some good things, but the students were still left alone to struggle, and I never liked that. We had seminars, office hours, and a few would come by, but I knew that we probably needed more of an outreach . . . then you came in, and you had this idea, so it made perfect sense.

The idea for personal development made perfect sense to Deborah because she was already providing a safe place for student teachers to talk about their experiences at her home. As she guided them in discussions, it bothered her that while she was there to facilitate their exploration, students were not able to do that for themselves. In the vectors she saw a way that students could do that: "The vectors is a way to classify dissonance and make it okay."

Who Deborah is as a person has had a great influence on the outcome of this study. She describes herself as a pure constructivist who works "way too much on instinct." The instinct is that of a gifted teacher who loves to be creative in her work. In facilitating the intentionally structured group she was a natural at creating links between their personal exploration and their professional development: "That's part of the messiness that I love. They're all making different leaps at different times in all different directions, and I'm not the one to control that. I shouldn't control that."

Her respect for all persons, all students and their learning was nurtured in her childhood home. Her father was a warrant officer in the army. Her mother was a college-educated teacher. Growing up in a military family in a union town she experienced at the same time discrimination from the townspeople and life in a mixed neighborhood in the army base. "My dad said, 'You treat everyone with respect: Black, White, Red, Green, Private or General, you treat people with respect.' And that made sense to me."

What didn't make sense to her was the exclusion, and that has affected her walk in life. To this day Deborah says she resists any activity that to her seems exclusive, such as sororities, groups that limit memberships, or church. In her first teaching position she noticed some bungalows across the playground that neither she nor her students knew why they were there. When she found out it was for students who were deaf, she invited those students to her classroom during the periods of art and P.E. That was twenty-four years ago when inclusion did not have a name. Later when she taught 5th and 6th grade in South Central Los Angeles, the students in her class "said thank you to the cafeteria lady,

got awards for helping each other, and they learned . . . they had been in other classes and had been in trouble, and they weren't in trouble any more, and that bothered me."

Respect, high expectations for all students, congruence and community are values that drive Deborah. Even before she had children, in teaching she knew that all children are different and that all have different strengths. She saw her job as "finding out how they could all shine." Deborah's oldest child is in a special education program and her daughter is deaf. "People treat her differently and that's not right. And it's almost worse for [her older brother] because he looks normal, and he's just a different kid." He has been treated badly at school. At home,

> they are each treated as unique individuals. I believe in the concept of fairness, everyone gets what they need. And [my children] will respect the fact that people have different needs at different times. They will respect that. Otherwise, how will we survive as a society? I don't know another way.

With this study, for which she received no monetary compensation, she put all of herself and her beliefs into it. She was totally devoted to the group and thrilled at the way that the students were interacting with each other. As she got to know them, she knew what to watch for in each one, waiting to see if so-and-so would speak, if another one would listen, if they would support one another and challenge themselves and each other.

> I was having my brain working first to hear what they were saying . . . once I get a sense of it, the brain turns off and the heart goes into overdrive: how does it feel? So it's almost a physical way of changing to hear what is going on. Sometimes I don't look . . . I listen differently to what they're saying.

Working with the group was fun and very hard work, requiring complete concentration and being one step ahead of what was happening. With a different faculty facilitator the sessions will undoubtedly go a different way: it won't look the same, and that is okay, as

long as the goal remains to help the students to clarify their own needs, goals, and objectives. The facilitator does not have to have the answers, but the questions to move them along.

Long Beach

Long Beach is a city that offers K-18 public education to students of many different ethnicites, cultures and languages. The city is home to the largest population of migrant workers in California. The Long Beach Unified School District has a new majority population of 82% with the following ethnic backgrounds reported in 1998-99: Hispanic, 43%; Black, not of Hispanic origin, 20%; White, not of Hispanic origin, 18%; Asian, 13%; Filipino, 3%; Pacific Islander, 2%; and American Indian or Alaskan Native, .4%. Enrollment has exceeded the 90,000 mark. The task to educate is great, indeed. The cross-cultural richness is rarely matched.

California State University, Long Beach

California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) is largely a commuter urban university with over 30,000 students. When CSULB was officially authorized in 1949 it was called Los Angeles-Orange County State College and was recommended for funding to serve Orange County and Southeastern Los Angeles County. Students in teacher education come primarily from these two regions. Within these regions there are very affluent areas, areas of poverty, and those that fall in between; some have neighborhoods with a mixture of many cultures and others are very homogeneous.

Students that enter the teacher preparation program come from many different places, and so they bring with them a variety of experiences, outlooks and attitudes

towards education and life itself. Almost all of the college students who set foot in a public school classroom today express surprise at the changes in education from the time they were in elementary school. Many have never interacted with a 3rd grader that reads below grade level, a child for whom English is a foreign language, or a student with disabilities. Their service learning work in Long Beach schools allows the college students to walk for a while with today's urban children and gain insights that contribute to their higher learning.

To find out what kinds of experiences have an impact on our college students, as they finished their service assignment we asked them to voluntarily share one memorable incident with us (Appendix I). The responses reflected deep caring for the children with whom our students worked, and first-hand awareness of situations that affect the education of a child. For example, our students had experiences relating to socioeconomic status, family structure, a child's need for attention, English learners, and students with disabilities:

> There was no grass or field to play in. It is all just black top. You even had to cross the street to get to the cafeteria. All the classes are in bungalows. I don't think I would have wanted a child of mine to go to this school. But the children and teachers that I met were wonderful.
>
> A six-year-old African American boy came up to me and gave me a hug. He said, "Thanks, daddy." The fact is that I'm a Vietnamese and he's Black. It touched me when I found out that he only lives with his mom.
>
> . . . she walked up to me with the same book in her hand. She was a very quiet, shy girl, and I thought it was interesting that she hardly spoke to me or interacted much, but just wanted to spend time with me so I could read to her!
>
> . . . the child did not understand or speak English . . . At that moment I understood how important it is to put biases aside and expect children to learn the same as

other children regardless of their mastering in the language that the class is being taught.

. . . a student in the class had some brain damage from [a near-] drowning as a preschooler . . . Usually . . . he would be unresponsive or would not be able to grasp the point. I was having my usual lack of success with my explanations, however, I kept trying different methods of instruction. Suddenly, the light went on in his head, and he breezed through the project. I learned that determination and persistence pays great rewards for both the facilitator and the student. We must never give up when working with children.

In every case the student learned a lesson that complements what is taught in the college classroom from a very personal vantage point. A neighborhood, a family, a mentor, a language, a disability–these, among others, became extremely real factors to our students in relation to learning. Some students also learned about the qualities they value in a teacher such as having high expectations for all and the determination to reach every student.

Subjects of the Study

The subjects of this study are students in the Liberal Studies Program who self-selected to participate. Seventeen in all, they unveiled their knowledge, feelings, insights and wisdom through their interactions in the group sessions, their reflections both in person and through the journals, and their interpretation of what was happening within and around them. They became our guides, authorities, and knowledge bearers on the needs of a group of teachers in training.

Of the seventeen subjects (Appendix J), fifteen were female, two were male. Twelve were traditional-age students (19-24 years old), one of them a male. Five were adult students (29-48 years old), and also one of them was male. Of the traditional age

students, six described their ethnic background as Caucasian or White, one as European, three as Hispanic, one as Dutch/Indo- African American, and one as White/Filipino. Of the adult students, four described their background as Caucasian and one as Mexican.

The class standing for the subjects was as follows: 4 Sophomores, 8 Juniors, and 5 Seniors. When asked to indicate knowledge of languages other than English, one student indicated Spanish, two indicated "minimum" Spanish, and one wrote "two semesters of sign language." The remaining students reported "none." None of the students indicated having disabilities. The permanent addresses of all the students were within a 25-mile radius of the University: twelve in Los Angeles County, six in Orange County.

The students in the study received four hours of training consisting of literacy skills and active participation strategies through the SERVE Program to be tutors to students at risk. They were expected to provide academic support and serve as role models to students with diverse cultural and social backgrounds. Sixteen were placed to work in classrooms in Long Beach public schools. One student requested to work in a nearby city, close to his home. These students will be more fully depicted as the emergent themes are described.

Themes

This line of investigation informs the developing portrait of the teacher in training by intentionally involving the students in creating the portrait. In the group sessions the students were free to lead the discussions in the direction they wanted to go. We the facilitators danced "the dance of vigilance and improvisation." We subscribed to the idea

of the "messy and unpredictable times" when students open their hearts and minds in processing and making meaning (Walsh, 1999). We experienced, as Walsh did, that "breakthrough came when we asked students to report on moments of meaning."

These results represent the students on a journey. The themes emerged based on the students' experiences: their needs, their struggles, the relationships formed, the significance and/or usefulness of the vectors. Everything that transpired was centered on one underlying issue: their identity as students and rising new professionals.

Students self-selected to come together to promote their personal and professional development. During the first session they received an overview of Chickering's vectors, a journal-writing lab and a goal-setting lab. Through these planned activities students obtained information about college students, about the participants of the study, and the purpose of the group, which was to promote their own learning. Chickering's vectors were the framework for all the activities, planned and informal discussions. The informal discussions informed us on the students' journey.

Using the qualitative process, the following themes emerged: (a) Dealing With Emotions in Multiple Environments, (b) A Sense of Community, (c) The Vectors as a Tool, and (d) Ownership of the Process.

"It's real important for me to manage my emotions": Dealing with Emotions in Multiple Environments

Each of the students in the study came with some kind of anxiety that through the sessions they came to "deal with." They came in overwhelmed and stressed. The emerging themes focused on emotions related to being college students in general, being

involved in the service learning environment, and struggling with their level of competence as teachers in training. The emotions were high as a result of the many obligations that are part of a college student's life and the dissonance that is caused by exposure to new ideas and situations encountered in service learning.

Emotions saturated all the themes. Students were frustrated over not having enough time to take care of all their responsibilities. They were afraid to make wrong decisions that could have lasting effects. They were concerned about balancing personal lives and college life. They were worried about money and relationships. They were overwhelmed at the thought of embarking on a professional career. They talked about feeling anxious and incompetent. All of the emotions focused on their identity–who they were, who they wanted to become, and who they were becoming.

Emotions Felt Being a College Student. The students told us very clearly what it's like to be a college student: "There simply is too much to do." Working, course deadlines, taking care of a family, social time, running errands, service learning–there simply are not enough hours in a week for students to take care of it all in an unhurried way. Students accustomed to earning excellent grades were in the position of not having enough time to devote to their studies. As students spoke one by one in the group, others nodded: they were feeling the same way. They were flushing out emotions among their peers. Following is a representative contribution:

> My emotions get so high–I've got to study for this test, I've got to go to this job, and I get to the point sometimes where I get so frustrated . . . the previous two weeks I was to the point where I wanted to give up. So it's real important for me to manage my emotions. I guess a lot of it is anxiety and feeling incompetent.

The students wrote about it in their journals, providing more information and disclosing more about themselves early on. Whether it was a new place to live, a new school, a new job, a new role, a new reality, a new boyfriend, or a new identity, there was the common thread of something different that had been added to their lives that caused a feeling, an emotion. "I've been trying to figure out just where I fit in here," wrote one student. In one way or another, so were the other students in the group.

Chickering (1996) identified categories of feelings: (a) fear and anxiety; (b) anger leading to aggression; (c) depression, guilt and shame; and (d) dysfunctional sexual or romantic attraction. The feelings expressed by the students in this study correspond to the first category, with fear of the unknown and anxiety over things like tests, academic stressors, relationships, and finances. Although Chickering pointed out that gender differences exist in managing emotions, all the students in this study were sensitive and susceptible to emotional involvement.

Emotions Felt Being in the Classroom. While every student recognized the stress and anxiety of being a college student, some wondered at the beginning of our sessions how being in the service learning classroom could become emotional. As the semester progressed and they participated in the service learning environment, students witnessed some realities of urban classrooms that tugged at their hearts. They saw children with great needs and realized their own limitations to help them: "How do you differentiate who needs help, and how much time to give to one child while all the others need your time?"

The students witnessed situations in which teachers were involved that they had not thought about previously. One case related to a parent's custody of the child, and "both teachers locked the classroom doors."

Emotions were also stirred in taking on a new role in the classroom. This had to do with the students' identity and with the relationships that they developed with the classroom teacher and the elementary students. How they were received and treated by the teacher, how they were accepted by the students, and how they perceived themselves evoked emotions. They talked about not being comfortable in the classroom, feeling that they didn't fit in. One student put it this way, "I found it very hard to become comfortable in the classroom environment. I still don't know where things are or what the students are like, or how to help them."

As the semester progressed, however, most students became more comfortable in this area and enjoyed their work and interactions in the classroom. Whether it was related to what they witnessed or how they fit in the classroom, being in the classroom was emotional for the students.

Emotions Felt Over Competence. Students revealed their emotions related to their sense of competence repeatedly. They worried not only about their performance in their service learning work in the classroom, but also about their performance in the future in their own classrooms. They felt the responsibility of having children entrusted to them. Some were frustrated that they hadn't yet learned all the skills that they recognized in the classroom teachers with whom they were working. One student expressed the sentiment of the group:

> I feel like we're all feeling the same thing. It's just so much work, the responsibility . . . because they don't teach that in school. And in three or four years, will I be ready for it? People do this every day . . . it's just overwhelming to me. It's just me and them, and they're so wonderful.

The sharing of experiences brought new perspectives to the students about themselves and what they were feeling. The faculty facilitator added to their learning by bringing to their attention that becoming a teacher is a process: "And guess what? we're not prepared. That's why we take baby steps. That's why we look and take something back to the classroom from our coursework."

The portrait could not have begun without the background of emotions expressed by the students every time we came together. The categories were presented from the general view of a college student's life to those specific to service learning in education. None of the students in this study felt neutral about their circumstances as a college student. All had strong feelings about what they were experiencing and how much was expected of them. Working with children at risk in a classroom naturally evoked strong feelings of care and concern, which, coupled with the newness of their service learning work put the students in an emotional state.

"It was very calming to know you're not the only one": A Sense of Community

A major outcome of the students coming together was their realization that they shared a similar competence level and experiences specific to the vectors. This identification and connection through the vectors framework is what was calming and moved the students toward interdependence and developing mature interpersonal relationships. Three factors emerged around the sense of community that by the

conclusion of the study were saturating the data from all the sources . They are (a) similar experiences, (b) a safe place to be, and (c) people who care.

Community Through Similar Experiences. Students began to realize that they had something in common early in the sessions as they talked about their feelings and experiences. As they identified with each other they made connections–"Oh my gosh!! You understand!!!!"–which promoted collaboration and interdependence. Interdependence, according to Chickering (1996), is about reciprocity, compromise, commitment to the welfare of the community, respect, give and take, and friendships. There was definite reciprocity and respect, and relationships began to be built. One student summarized a session in her journal that illustrates the spirit of community of the group:

> Today we met in small groups. This was really helpful. We helped each other figure out some problems we were having in the classroom and learned some tips that might help us get the most out of our SERVE hours. One of the biggest things I felt was that we were all going through basically the same emotions, problems, role confusion–just to name a few.

While students shared similar experiences, they were at different places in their development, with different philosophies on education and different anchor points that define who they are. Students respected each other and appreciated the perspectives of their peers and of the facilitators. Interdependence is also about becoming different and maintaining a connection (Chickering, 1969). In this way an individual grows and develops her own talents, and at the same time strengthens the group. The following two quotes illustrate how students associated their learning to that of others in the group: "It was really helpful to know that other people felt the same way about some of these

experiences, but at the same time it was also interesting to see what stages different people are at," and

> It was very calming, you know, to know you're not the only one . . . to know that people are going through the same thing . . . and just to see how they handled it, their perspective on life and experiences they're having . . . and to be able to put that and say, "Oh, you know, let me try that, see if it works for me," or just listen and say, "All right, I feel better, because we're all going through the same thing."

Interdependence involves sharing and the appreciation of the uniqueness of others and the contributions they bring to the group (Chickering, 1969). The group acted out an interchange that was open, nurturing, and that led to relationships that formed a community.

Community in a Safe Place. The realization that the other members of the group were undergoing similar experiences furthered our goal of creating a safe place where students could explore personal issues and goals. By identifying with their peers, students moved toward greater self-disclosure with each progressive session. The sessions were non-evaluative and in locations away from the education buildings, in areas of the library designated for workshops. The group norms included no judgment nor negative interpretation of others. Students appreciated the format and a sense of community learning developed:

> It feels really good to have a group of people to talk to. I thought I would feel awkward, but then I realized that we're all in the same boat together. No one here is judgmental or critical when we are discussing things. I found myself having a lot in common with everyone else.

It is important to note that in every session the vectors provided the framework for the discussion. Posters with a written and graphic representation of each vector were

displayed during the sessions, and all of the vectors were invoked during one time or another. Students would point to the posters as they conversed, with positive effects, "looking for goodness" towards development. The following two quotes are representative of how students themselves described their interactions as enjoyable, open, and together in their journey: "We were talking about the vector Moving Through Autonomy and into Interdependence. We were talking about how we enjoy getting together and sharing our experiences and feeling like we're not alone," and

> We would all be open and we would talk about things that . . . I remember, especially on the last one, we pointed it out on the wall, 'Hey, remember, this is the vector.' I think as we went through them, you know, we were staying together, and someone would say something and we'd say, 'Oh, that's that [vector].'

Community Among People Who Care. The community is built around the way that people relate to one another. Clearly the way students regarded one another was the primary element of the community. They listened, responded, challenged, supported, encouraged, and gave feedback in a positive, respectful, and honest way. In addition to bonding with their peers, some students expressed that knowing there are people who care about them in the College is important to them: "It's a good feeling that there's people who care about me and are there to help. I know that when I get some skills and am more ready, I'll be able to give back to someone else."

The idea of giving back to someone else is consistent with a caring community. As the students appreciated the opportunity to first connect and then bond with other teachers in training, they looked beyond the present to a time when they could support someone else. The loyalty that began with the group was extended to the College of Education,

with students expressing interest in supporting new students, offering to speak at SERVE trainings, and participating in future research being conducted in the College.

"The vectors were right on the mark": The Vectors as a Tool

Chickering's Developmental Vectors represent a great body of research on students in higher education. In addition to having a secure place among psychosocial developmental theories, the vectors can be used in an overt way to promote growth. For students in this study, the vectors became a tool to gain awareness about themselves and to keep things in perspective, to apply to themselves and issues in their lives, and to use as a framework for professional development.

The Vectors as a Tool for Awareness. It was in the second group session that we asked the students to consider whether or not the issues they had been discussing fit into the areas of development as outlined in the vectors. They gained a new awareness by being guided in this effort. They discovered that all of the issues that they had been discussing had a place within the vectors. The following quote was selected because it illustrates a student's first cognizance of all that is incorporated in the vectors: "I am amazed at how everything we discussed fit into the vectors and that we covered all of them in our discussion."

Students told us in different ways during the interviews what the encounter with the vectors did for them: the vectors provided a framework for their questions, for keeping things in perspective, to anticipate what might come up in the future, for narrowing things down and categorizing experiences, to clarify and give definition to feelings. Students told us, "It seemed that the vectors were right on the mark, as far as

understanding where we were coming from, the questions we had . . . they were very helpful in terms of keeping things in perspective, which is something that I try to work on all the time." Also, ". . . it helped clarify and give definition to some things . . . we want to know what we're talking about, and with feelings it's not always clear," and, "Everything sort of came together and I could just relax and know it made sense."

This theme around awareness emerged as the students who had come into the group feeling anxious and overwhelmed felt the pressure diminish by simply understanding what caused their feelings. Having a way to sort and express what they were going through, and being backed up by human development theory validated their struggles.

The Vectors as a Tool for Application. Once students realized that the vectors were not only valid in themselves but that they also affirmed their present experiences, personal application began to take place. In the latter half of the second workshop the students began using the vocabulary provided by the vectors. Whether identity, emotions, competence, integrity, or interdependence, students became more comfortable and natural in their conversations pertaining to their development. The next quotes were selected because they show how students used the vectors in interactions with peers. In the first quote, a student is assisting a peer in clarifying an issue by using the vectors: "I think you're also struggling with identity. You were talking about your role, you weren't sure about your role." In the second quote, a student describes her telephone conversation with her girlfriend on moving through autonomy toward interdependence:

> Last night I was talking to one of my girlfriends just about, you know how you just talk about everything, and we just started talking about that, moving through autonomy toward interdependence. We talked about how at this age it's kind of hard, we want to be so independent, our main goal is to be independent, but we

> want to be able to hang on to people still. I was telling her, "Well, yeah, you know, I have this meeting, I talk to them a lot . . . and I finally feel myself just moving past just wanting to do everything on my own with no help. Now I can do it on my own, but I need to get help, too."

Peers have the greatest impact on the development of college students (Chickering, 1969). Therefore, to have the vectors used in conversation among students is of considerable significance to student development educators. When we asked the students directly in the interviews if they used the vectors in their personal and professional development we received more information. Application for them had to do with relevance to their service learning work, gauging their development, breaking things down and classifying experiences, self-assessment, sharing, self-understanding, and being free to put whatever they wanted into it. Of the following two quotes, the first one represents a student's view of the vectors in the big picture of his life, and the second one a student's application of the vectors to a particular area of her life, her spirituality.

> It's not specific to education, it's about self-knowledge and applicable to any part of life. I think that's a big thing because it's central to a person's development no matter what they do. I think it's very, very excellent. It involves a lot of self-assessment and allows people to share.

> To me spirituality is part of my life altogether, every day, every minute, so I think using the vectors in the way that they were set up, for me they were right on . . . and so, even though it wasn't said, "Here's your spiritual side," I was able to put what I wanted into it.

A student who has important issues to resolve and finds clarity through the vectors can be viewed as putting practice to theory. A student who applies the vectors in a productive way such as setting personal goals represents theory put to practice. Students in this study have experienced practice to theory to practice in their own development.

The Vectors as a Tool for Professional Development: Vectors II Was Born.

During our final workshop we asked the students what else they would like to see take place with the group. They wanted the group to continue. As one student put it, ". . . we already have this group relationship, we've already shared some of our struggles and some of our goals and accomplishments. Everyone's ideas really helps . . . everyone wants something positive . . . it's really helpful." They discussed how often to meet, creating a phone list, and who would host the meetings. We offered support from the SERVE office with scheduling and communication. The students already considered the SERVE office as their home base. They had fun thinking of a name for the group and focusing on a higher level of professional development:

> There could be a Vectors I workshop where you kind of see the same problems popping up over and over again, and you could have a Vectors II where it's more . . . on your career. Where you've gotten over that uncertain period, and you already have your base set up . . . since you've already developed your competence, and you've learned the base of how to handle your emotions, and learned the basis of the vectors, then you could apply [them] to problems that we have later in the field of education.

The students wanted to continue meeting with their peers to work on their personal and professional development. Chickering (1969) states that friendships and student communities foster development along all seven vectors. A student's most important teacher is often another student, and through relationships students learn to communicate, empathize, argue, and reflect. Together they build respect and integrity, share feelings and have revelations of biases, clarify values and purpose, and develop mutual interests and plans. The group becomes an anchor and reference point, according to Chickering. This has been the outcome for the group in this study as well.

The students also requested the facilitators to be a part of Vectors II. This is in accordance with Chickering and Reisser's (1996) assertions that relationships with peers, faculty and advisors in small units allow for maximum participation and interaction, and therefore learning. A good fit in a group provides support and involvement which leads to less stress, conflict, and powerlessness. In addition, commuter students and students who have greater family responsibilities, like some in this study, have greater challenges to build a community and form friendships. That is what the intentionally structured groups have facilitated for them.

Ownership of the Process

One of the questions of this study focused the process of infusing the vectors into teacher preparation. What was the students' reaction to the process? Were they satisfied? Were they happy to be there? Were they actively participating? What was the effect of the group, the usefulness of the journals, the benefit of setting goals?

Process: The Effect of the Group. The intentionally structured group affected the students in various ways. The most obvious is the camaraderie among the students and the understanding that the facilitators provided. Equally as important to the students was the feedback they received from their peers and the facilitators and the links they made between their service experiences and their college courses. The group challenged the members to take responsibility for their learning and supported them in their efforts. The quotes that follow were chosen for the representative voice on the benefits of the group: ". . . to actually make acquaintances or friends," and ". . . to have someone who understands the background so you don't have to explain all that." "The feedback is so

important, that's why I came back," and ". . . I just started focusing on taking what I needed to learn out of the class . . . This helps you to learn what you want and form your own career."

The purpose of the group was to create conditions for learning. Chickering's Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education (Chickering & Reisser, 1993) include student-faculty contact, cooperation among students, active learning, prompt feedback, time on task, high expectations, and respect for diverse talents and ways of learning. Each of these principles were purposefully incorporated into the sessions and contributed to these students' development and learning.

Process: Usefulness of the Journal. Journals are used in the reflection component of service learning. The journal in this study was intended as a tool for monitoring students' self-awareness and for them to keep track of the progress they made on their goals. Additionally, the journal provided another place for the students to express their feelings and emotions of what they were experiencing. All students opened their hearts in their journals. They praised themselves, acknowledged mistakes, argued back and forth and resolved some dilemmas. Their entries showed us that they wrestled with competence, relationships, autonomy, and identity. There were "aha" moments and changes of attitude, humor and self-forgiveness, and appreciation of their peers. The spirit of discovery permeated every entry–irrespective of emotion, depth or seriousness–as students put into words something previously unseen, unknown or unspoken. Here is one example:

> Growing up is a scary thing. Especially trying to figure out just exactly what I'm going to do with my life–be an elementary teacher or an O&M instructor. My

ultimate goal is to be an O&M instructor. I guess time will only tell. Actually now that I think about it, I could combine the two and teach at blind schools. I think I've always known this.

Through the journals students were able to see the changes taking place in themselves: "I think I am going to be ok!!!" They had a place to record that unforgettable, spontaneous success that reinforced their feeling of competence or that incident that assured them that teaching is the right profession for them. For some, journal writing was a comfortable task and they could write with ease; others struggled. All the students agreed that the journal-writing lab was useful, and that having time set aside during the sessions to write was important, as that assured them of a minimum of three entries over one semester: "It was useful because I'm not a journal or diary person at all. I want to be, but I'm not." Whether "journal person" or not, all students recognized the value of reflecting on their experiences and writing about them.

Process: Goal-Writing. Goal-writing is such a personal and individualized activity, both in style and scope, that every student handled it differently. None of the students had ever participated in a guided activity for writing goals before coming to the workshops, and not one came in knowing how to write goals and objectives. All students were in agreement on the value of setting goals, and goals were at the heart of every workshop. For some students, goals represented a road map in the personal development process: "It's showing where you want to go." For others, goals had a motivational effect: "Something to prepare for," "Something to look forward to." For some students, goals moved them to becoming more intentional in their learning: "It also has changed my focus of observation, so when I look at the classroom I try to see as much as I can all the

different perspectives that [the teacher] has to control, and try to think, 'What would I do?'"

Students began with a description of their current performance in one or more vectors and defined the level of change they desired. This led to defining and sequencing objectives. Following is a representative example:

> I chose the vectors interdependence, interpersonal relationships, and managing emotions . . . I feel really lost . . . with my courseload I haven't taken the time to meet people on campus . . . this is the first time I've taken to get into activities and that sort of thing . . . my goal is by the end of the semester to have a support network and resources to provide help when it's needed. My objective is to try and meet other people in similar situations as myself by coming to workshops . . . and another objective is to find teachers to serve as role models and mentors through the SERVE Program.

One of the advantages of goal-setting for the students was gaining clarity about themselves and their needs. With that knowledge came purposeful training, "knowing inside what I was working on," and sorting out the important from the unimportant, "I haven't been stressing as much." Whether employed as a formal commitment or a way to focus, setting goals encouraged discriminating behavior and growth.

The community that was created by this group of learners became a meaningful part of life for each of us. At the start of the third session, one student summarized it like this:

> This meeting will hopefully wrap up all of the other meetings, ideas and hopes. These meetings have been very beneficial to my growth as a student and person. My schedule has been very hectic and full and yet I still make time for these meetings. During my week I look forward to these meetings. The best way to describe [them] is to say they are like a sigh after a long day. It is necessary and important but also rejuvenating and it just feels good.

The important outcome of the process is that the participants and the facilitators considered themselves part of a new community of learners. We all came together to learn by personal choice. One student commented, "I think it would ruin it if there were people here who did not want to be here. The best thing about this is that everyone takes time out and wants it." And as we learned from and with each other, we added to our interpersonal and professional skills. The faculty facilitator pointed out, "the fact that you were all interacting so honestly and openly was absolutely amazing. I hope you felt as good as we felt watching you all."

Often there were no answers to the questions. In fact, more questions were raised. So the students wanted more time together, desired more exploration, and brought up possibilities for further discussion. They found within themselves a new appreciation for the depth of the teaching profession and excitement in the process of becoming a teacher.

Limitations and Exclusions

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study that must be taken into consideration. First is the fact that students self-selected to participate in the research. Therefore, one could argue that these students were already looking for a way to enhance their development and were predisposed to do so.

A second limitation is related to the demographics of the teacher preparation program: representation of students from different class status was not intentionally pursued. The group formed on its own and issues related to age, cultural influences, class

standing, and gender were allowed to surface naturally and addressed as presented in the discussions.

Another potential limitation are the effects of this time in history. The end of the millennium might contribute to increased reflection and questions of integrity and purpose among students. Likewise, the changes taking place in the field of education and specifically in the College of Education may have had an influence on the students to be more aware, more inquisitive about issues, and more involved in their education.

A fourth potential limitation is that all of the data are self-reported. While we have no reason to believe that students were not honest in their responses or participation in the sessions, in their journals or in the interviews, individuals naturally have different points of reference from which they respond.

A fifth limitation is not knowing the reasons that three students participated only in the first session. The students were contacted by mail and two did not respond. One of them sent a note to the SERVE Office indicating her interest to rejoin the group the following semester; however, she did not attend the first session of the Fall '99 semester. All of the students were invited to continue with the group.

Exclusions

In deciding what to exclude from this portrait the major consideration was how the parts contributed to the research questions. The question was, "What will the inclusion of this theme add to the whole that is not already apparent from the themes selected?" Data was excluded when it didn't add to the story or when there was insufficient student voice, such as information on learning styles or personality types.

Conclusion

This chapter contains the results of the study in the style of portraiture. In the first section, the foundation is framed with information on the College of Education, on the researcher and the faculty facilitator, on the school and university environment in which the students work and learn, and on the subjects of the study. The second section presents the themes from data gathered with the subjects in an intentionally structured group. The themes are: (a) Dealing with Emotions in Multiple Environments; (b) A Sense of Community; (c) The Vectors as a Tool; and (d) Ownership of the Process. The final section consists of a discussion on limitations and exclusions.

Chapter 5 is a discussion of the findings of this study. A brief overview of the purpose of the study and the questions asked is given, followed by a discussion of the results as response to the questions. Implications for teacher education and student affairs are discussed and recommendations for the professions of student affairs and teacher education as well as for the SERVE Program offered. Ideas for further research are given.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The results of this study showed how a group of preservice teachers, given guidance and support in the areas of student development, proceeded to make meaning of their experiences and manage particular developmental tasks. Their journey adds to our investigation of how students' psychosocial development contributes to their ability to live and work in a multicultural world. This chapter will seek to discuss the findings of this study. Implications for teacher education and student affairs will be discussed and recommendations for the professions of student affairs and teacher education, and for the SERVE Program will be offered. The chapter will conclude with ideas for further research.

The Study and Questions Asked

The purpose of this study was to develop an effective mechanism for infusing Chickering's (1966) psychosocial development model into training for service learning in teacher education. The idea was to make available to students a body of knowledge that had been gathered about the development of students in higher education and see if they would be able to apply that information to further their own development. Along with that challenge it was important to provide support. Therefore, students were invited to become a part of an intentionally structured group in which they would have the

opportunity to interact with peers and find guidance from professionals in education and student affairs.

The questions that were asked were: given training in Chickering's developmental vectors and support from peers and professionals, (a) are students able to apply the model to further their personal and professional development? and (b) what is the best way to implement the model in teacher education training?

Answers to Research Questions and Other Findings

This section will address the questions of the study. The steps the students go through as they enter the SERVE Program will be discussed first. Because of the researcher's orientation in student development and the focus of this study on Chickering's developmental vectors, their experiences were considered through this lens. Answers to the research questions will follow.

Students entering the SERVE Program are seeking to develop competence in the service learning classroom. This produces strong emotions, as they struggle with their identity as students and emerging new professionals. They feel they should know how to behave in the urban classroom and take care of situations on their own, they are afraid to approach the classroom teacher for direction, they struggle with their role of student or teacher or both, and question the relevance of the "extra work" of service learning to their goal of graduating. The issues in the SERVE students' lives are addressed in Chickering's vectors of development: developing competence, managing emotions, moving through autonomy toward interdependence, developing mature interpersonal relationships, establishing identity, developing purpose, and developing integrity.

Each of the students in the study gave evidence of the first category of feelings identified by Chickering for college students. These are fear of the unknown and anxiety over things like tests, academic stressors, relationships and finances. In addition, these pre-service teachers were placed in urban classrooms for that "intimate and necessary" relationship between experience and education. Their service learning was intentionally designed to affect their formation of attitudes, contribution to society, and personal growth, and it required intellectual and emotional involvement.

When the students entered the urban classrooms they were in situations that were new to them. They struggled in their responses with their existing repertoire of skills. An intentionally structured group was formed to support the reflective component of service learning. The purpose of the group was to facilitate the students' understanding, learning and growth through these experiences and to prepare them for future experiences with deeper and broader issues.

Students' Application of Chickering's Developmental Vectors

What evolved first in the group sessions was a flushing out of emotions centered on identity. These were emotions the subjects felt being college students, being in the service learning classroom, and also over their competence. Students were overwhelmed. The facilitators acknowledged the students' feelings and were overt in the learning process, asking students to apply their experiences to Chickering's developmental vectors and simultaneously relating them to the teaching profession.

As students began to notice and as it was pointed out to them that they were not alone in their feelings, a sense of community began to form. They came to realize that

they shared a similar competence level and experiences specific to the vectors. This to them was very calming and moved the students towards interdependence and developing relationships, which furthered our goal of creating a safe place for exploration and reflection. A caring community was built.

The vectors were central to all the group sessions and discussions through the guidance of the facilitators. By the second session the students discovered that all of the issues they had been discussing had a place within the vectors. With that awareness, students began to use the vectors as a framework: (a) for their questions, (b) for keeping issues in perspective, (c) to anticipate what might come up in the future, (d) to classify their experiences, and (e) to clarify their feelings. The theory validated their struggles and the pressures they had been feeling began to diminish.

With affirmation from the vectors and from the group, the students began applying the vectors to their experiences. They used the vocabulary provided by the vectors in conversations within and outside the group. They challenged and supported each other in areas outlined in the vectors. They used the vectors for reflection to gauge their development and make meaning of their service learning work. They proposed continuing to use the vectors framework in their professional development and named the group "Vectors II," planning to address future experiences in their preparation program.

By gaining awareness of areas that needed to be addressed in their lives through the knowledge of the vectors, students in this study were able to apply the vectors to their personal lives and their field of study. Students went from passive to purposeful learners

by using the vectors as a framework for reflection, for setting personal goals, and for supporting each other.

The interaction with others within a student development framework was key in the development of the students. The safe environment allowed for growth and change to take place. As students felt free to express their feelings, interpersonal communication increased, as did their capacities for passion and commitment to their purpose.

Implementing the Model in Teacher Education

The rapid changes taking place in education and continual learning and shifting that is expected of teachers is a challenge that requires attention and support. In teacher education at CSULB, service learning is designed to prepare students for the challenges of the profession and to move them along their development as socially responsible leaders. As discussed above, students were able to apply Chickering's (1963) psychosocial development model to their own development with guidance and support from their peers and professionals in education. The results showed that personal contact, self-exploration in a non-evaluative setting, and sharing experiences in a community of learners was key to the students' growth. Creating intentionally structured groups where students are able to address their needs in a safe environment is one way of implementing the model in teacher education training.

The safe environment of an intentionally structured group where group norms include confidentiality made it possible for students to grow. The first effect of the group was bonding with peers and professionals. The students were able to share experiences and obtain feedback, link them to college courses, and think about their (the students')

purpose. Members of the group–the subjects of this study–challenged each other to take responsibility for their learning and supported one another in their efforts. Conditions for learning that were intentionally created include student-faculty contact, cooperation among students, active learning, feedback, time on task, high expectations and respect for diverse talents and ways of learning.

Students kept an interactive journal with the researcher. The journal provided place for reflection and feedback. It was a tool for discovery as students put into words something previously unseen, unknown or unspoken. Through the journals students could follow and appreciate their growth.

None of the students had previously received guidance in writing personal goals and objectives, although they had been asked to do so at some point as part of their course work. Students used their goals–written to stimulate development in one or more areas of the vectors–as a personal road map, for motivation, and for a focus to their learning. The process of goal-writing gave them clarity about themselves and their needs, and encouraged intentionality in their actions.

Students who participated in the study came to attain a sense of belonging in the College, for fellowship among peers, for student-faculty contact, for support and for personal growth. The intentionally structured groups provided the means to (a) create a smaller human-scale unit in a large institution for student involvement and participation, (b) for a faculty member to give attention and be a role model to the students, and (c) for addressing personal development issues.

Other Findings

Of the many lessons learned through this study, the following stand out: (a) for out-of-classroom learning to take place, allowing students to develop their own structure worked; (b) students value the student-affairs-academic affairs team approach; and (c) a project that has student success as its focus promotes collaboration. In order for students to be free to explore, interact, reflect and thereby learn, they must be allowed to do just that. Students expressed that if ours had been sessions with timed restrictions or regulated discussions they would not have continued their participation. These sessions were worthwhile to them because they were theirs to lead in whichever direction they found it meaningful. Our student affairs-academic affairs team expanded the students' learning opportunities as personal and professional development themes and issues were woven into the discussions. The students specifically told us that this "faculty-counselor mixture" was important in their group experience. And finally, the fact that other faculty members and professionals in the College of Education were interested in contributing their ideas to this study points to their willingness to collaborate in an "activity which informs and improves practice."

Implications for Teacher Education and Student Affairs

Implications for Teacher Education

People affect people, and peers and faculty are the top two influences in a college student's life (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Students in this study have demonstrated that they will invest extra time in their education, take responsibility for their learning, and go out of their way to interact with peers and faculty. Out-of-classroom learning is

monumental to students being challenged in service learning. By being supported in constructing meaning individually and in groups, students in this study went from passive to purposeful learners and worked towards fulfilling their needs for development. If we hope to graduate students having a broad perspective of the teaching profession to handle the realities of today's classrooms, the sessions that have been described here provide one way to work toward that goal. We should not expect that all students will be able to do this on their own.

The results also show that students have fears and anxieties over their identity and pre-professional preparation. Knowing what emotions can be predicted can assist educators in creating conditions for learning, both in and out of the classroom. This is one example of how student development theory can be applied to enhance learning.

Implications for Student Affairs

Student development educators have a role in out-of-classroom learning in teacher education. In service learning training there exists the opportunity to promote personal development in the education of the whole person and to draw in the interdependent parts of institutional objectives, student-faculty relationships, the curriculum, teaching, communities, student development programs and services, and educationally meaningful environments. Our field is rich with knowledge and wisdom in all of these areas and doors are opening for student affairs professionals to make salient contributions to the education of the whole student in partnership with faculty.

In this study, working alongside a faculty member has taught me the importance of constructivism, the impact that best practices in teaching have on student development,

and how combining the different styles and training of two different professionals enlarges the whole. When two persons who have expertise in a different but related field in education combine their knowledge, personalities, and talents they can: (a) learn about another field of study, (b) increase their repertoire of skills, (c) inform one another on new ways of thinking, (d) become "reflection partners," (e) model collaboration, (f) support one another emotionally, (g) share responsibilities, (h) capture moments of learning that the other person might have missed, (i) see the same issue through another lens, (j) double the number of people who know the same students personally and are available to the students outside the classroom, (k) challenge each other to learn, (l) present at conferences together, (m) create a new program/lesson/intervention like it's never been done before, and, (n) have a friend. Of course the list can go on. The potential that a student affairs-academic affairs team has is magnificent: we challenged each other to do more, learn more, and become better at what we do.

This study also shows that intentionally structured groups can be powerful in connecting classroom learning and field experiences to student development. The significance lies in the intentionality of the group, the fact that there is a goal for the group as well as personal goals for each member. Just knowing about a theory does not guarantee application by either the professional or the student. If we want students to take responsibility for their learning and their development we must do our share to guide them–to build layer upon layer, using proven strategies and always remaining grounded in theory.

Making overt the theories we use in an educational setting to the students has two effects: (a) it empowers the students and (b) it gives them information about our role in higher education. The students in this study were not only empowered to use the vectors as a tool in their development, they also moved in their development by creating "Vectors II", their idea of the next steps in personal and professional growth of the original group members. In Fall '99, one semester after the completion of this study, sessions for "Vectors I" (for new students) and "Vectors II" (for continuing ISG members) are taking place at the request of the students. Also at their bidding continues the faculty-student affairs professional team of facilitators. The original ISG members speak about their experiences and learning at service learning training sessions and among their peers, and so the nature of our work becomes recognizable and intriguing to others. This should lead to increased cross-functional collaborative partnerships and continued student participation.

Recommendations

Recommendations will be given for student affairs professionals, for the field of education, and for the SERVE Program.

Recommendations for Student Affairs Professionals

Taking an active role in shaping educationally meaningful environments is the job of student affairs professionals. They should be overt about what they do and why, to engage students and collaborate with others in creating a "learning organization." Through collaboration the message goes forth that no one has all the answers and that

working together professionals learn with and from each other. Collaboration builds community into the process.

When designing an intervention, program or service that affects students, the student voice in the planning stages is essential: students are the experts on their needs. Listening to the faculty voice provides student affairs professionals with another perspective on the characteristics of academic programs and the classroom environment.

Student affairs professionals should have an understanding of the impact of teaching on student development and vice versa as they partake in the education of the whole student–both the intellectual and affective areas of her life. They gain that understanding from collaborating with faculty and involving the students.

Their role as collaborators with faculty is to identify areas where they can be partners. While recognizing the importance of intellectual and emotional maturity, student affairs professionals may be doing little to "integrate student development into the educational experience." They must take the lead in providing opportunities to work with faculty, to create avenues of learning together, where theories, models, strategies and interventions that exist to promote student success may be shared. Just as affective and cognitive development are undeniably linked and work to enhance each other, so are the professions of student affairs and academic affairs.

Intentionally structured groups serve as one example of ways to work together with faculty. Groups that are focused on a particular professional field such as teaching should have at least one member of the facilitating team from that field. The faculty member is the person who connects the issues to the field, while the student development

educator addresses the interdependent parts of curricular and co-curricular learning. An outcome of such a partnership may be faculty members finding ways to apply student development theories to their teaching.

Recommendations for the Field of Education

The results of this study point to two recommendations, that from a student development view would transform students' lives and thereby contribute to the greater good. The first recommendation is to institutionalize "valuing the student," meaning building into the curriculum, into student programs, and services within the field, the elements that promote student success, that pay attention to the individual needs of students, and that purposefully develop socially responsible leaders. It is clear from the results of this study that some students need and want guidance and assistance in their personal and professional development.

The second recommendation partially fulfills the first, and that is teaching from the heart: the kind of teaching that the faculty facilitator modeled, where "the brain turns off and the heart goes into overdrive," where the instructor is so in tune with the students' learning that "it's almost a physical way of changing to hear what is going on" and she asks herself, "How does this feel?" Teaching from the heart goes in the direction that the student is learning, not down the page of pre-typed notes. Teaching from the heart takes courage, hard work, knowledge of students, regard, active listening and responding, and not having the answers but the questions to move students to a higher level of thinking and learning.

Entering into both the intellectual and affective areas of the students' lives and encouraging human development in the process of being a teacher is the challenge to teacher educators. This involves listening to developmental perspectives and collaborating with student affairs professionals to integrate student development competencies into academic programs and courses. It also means enhancing personal knowledge and competencies in student development.

Recommendations for the SERVE Program

Based on the data from this study, the following recommendations are made to promote the SERVE Program's orientation in student development.

Training. The SERVE training was originally designed to challenge the students' belief system, to bring up issues of identity, and to confront the emotions evoked by the experience. Chickering's vectors of development provide a framework for such a training. The vectors should be incorporated into the training. In addition, students who have gone through the program should participate in the training to contribute what they have learned through the experience.

Placement. Students should be assigned in pairs for their service learning placement. Having one peer who sees the same environment from a different perspective would enrich the experience for both: they could discuss their experiences and enhance their learning. Students' individual requests for special placement in schools of their choosing should be considered from a student development perspective: how will this benefit the student?

Support. Students should be supported in a planned manner during the semester. At least one opportunity to meet with peers and faculty should be offered to all. Additional faculty-student development facilitator teams should be trained and available as needed.

The SERVE Program office should be run to promote the development of the students and to meet their needs (i.e., knowing that students are overwhelmed and anxious as they begin their service learning, adjustments should be made in the SERVE Program office as needed to facilitate communication, services and attention to students). All staff in the office should receive training based on student development principles and have an opportunity to review and discuss the results of this study.

Collaborative Partnership. School teachers participating in the SERVE Program partnership should receive information on Chickering's vectors and how they relate to the college students to whom they are mentors.

Advisory Group. A group consisting of students, faculty members, teachers and student affairs professionals should be formed to guide the program with consideration to multiple perspectives.

Future Research

Service learning, partnerships, and education offer endless opportunities for research. Questions for further research suggested by this study include:

1. Case study of one student: what are her experiences, from service learning to classroom teacher?

2. Longitudinal study on the subjects of this study focusing on their personal and professional development: what kind of teachers/leaders/mentors did they become?

3. Large scale study: will similar results be obtained with a larger sample of students? with students who are required to participate in such an intervention? with students across multiple teacher training programs?

4. How do student development educators set their own learning goals and objectives?

5. What personal or professional attributes of faculty members contribute to collaboration with student development professionals?

6. What are other possible partnership models for student affairs-academic affairs professionals?

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CHICKERING'S SEVEN VECTORS OF DEVELOPMENT

CHICKERING'S (1969) SEVEN VECTORS OF DEVELOPMENT

1. DEVELOPING COMPETENCE

   Increase in intellectual, physical and manual skills as well as interpersonal skills.

2. MANAGING EMOTIONS

   Acknowledging feelings, including positive feelings; exercising self-regulation.

3. MOVING THROUGH AUTONOMY TOWARD INTERDEPENDENCE

   Problem solving and self-sufficiency; responsibility in emotional and instrumental acceptance; recognition and acceptance of interdependence.

4. ESTABLISHING IDENTITY

   Seeing self in historical context, self through roles, self through others; gaining self-acceptance (body, gender) and personal stability.

5. DEVELOPING MATURE INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

   Tolerance and appreciation of differences and capacity for intimacy.

6. DEVELOPING PURPOSE

   Establishing vocational plans, personal interests, and commitments to family and others.

7. DEVELOPING INTEGRITY

   Humanizing and personalizing values and developing congruence.

Developed by: Hilda Sramek

APPENDIX B

COLLEGE INTERN EVALUATION FORM

CSU Long Beach SERVE Program
(Service Experiences for Re-Vitalizing Education)
A CSULB-LBUSD Educational Partnership

COLLEGE INTERN EVALUATION FORM

Last Name _____ First Name _____

CSULB Program _____ School Site _____
(Eng. 309/SERVE)

Reporting Period: (F/Sp/Summer) _____ Total Hours Completed: 1-40 __ 41-80 __ 81+ __

NOTE TO TEACHERS: Please read the information concerning the basis of evaluation before completing this form. Please rank the intern according to the following scale: (5) Superior (4) Strong (3) Good (2) Fair (1) Unsatisfactory.

		5	4	3	2	1
1)	Quality of Work					
2)	Quantity of Work					
3)	Work Habits					
4)	Work Attitudes					
5)	Relationships with Others					
6)	Personal Qualities					
7)	Attendance and Punctuality					
8)	Increase in Knowledge and Understanding of the Teaching Profession					
9)	Level of Literacy Support Provided to Students by Intern					
10)	Potential as a Future Educator					
11)	Benefit to Students					

What percentage of intern's time was devoted to literacy support activities?
15% or Less _____ 25% _____ 50% _____ 75% or More _____

Total Hours Completed this Semester: _____ hrs. Teacher's Signature _____

Intern's Signature _____

Classroom Teacher's Name:_____ Date: _____

Site Principal's Name: _____ Site Coordinator's Name: _____

CSULB Professor's Name: _____

Signatures on this form indicate that the contents of this evaluation have been discussed with the SERVE intern. The intern's signature does not indicate agreement with the ratings. Interns must return completed forms to CSULB instructor or to the SERVE Office on campus.

APPENDIX C

FORMATIVE EVALUATION

Was this session helpful to you?

What would you change?

APPENDIX D

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION

Name: _____

1. What does "developing competence" mean to you?

   Were you able to do that this semester? If yes, how? If not, why not?

2. What does "managing emotions" mean to you?

   Were you able to do that this semester? If yes, how? If not, why not?

3. How did you see yourself – in what role – at the beginning of this program?

   How do you see yourself now?

4. Were the workshops helpful to you? If yes, how?

   What would you change?

5. Thinking of future students in the SERVE Program, what would be helpful to offer to them?

   What would you want to say to them?

APPENDIX E

CONSENT AGREEMENT

CONSENT AGREEMENT

My name is Hilda Sramek. I'm a graduate student at California State University, Long Beach, and I am conducting a study for my thesis. The purpose of the study is to develop an effective mechanism for infusing personal development into service learning for teacher education.

As a student in the SERVE Program you are a candidate to participate in the study. Through this study, you will receive tools to enhance your personal and professional development. You will also have an opportunity to contribute to the design of the training program for future students in the College of Education. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to attend three group sessions: a workshop during the 9th week of classes, a follow-up discussion during the 12th week, and a debriefing session during the 15th week. Students selected at random will receive invitations to participate in individual interviews at the end of the semester. Following is a description of the activities mentioned.

The workshop will last 2 hours and consist of three parts: a teaching segment on Arthur Chickering's model of college student development, a lab on goal-setting and a lab on journal writing. At the end of the workshop, you will be asked to respond to: Was this program helpful to you? If yes, how? What would you change?

The follow-up discussion will be used to review your goals and objectives, your work in progress, and experiences or issues related to service learning that you and your fellow students would like to discuss. At the end of the session you will be asked to respond to: was this program helpful to you? If yes, how? What would you change? This session will last 1-2 hours.

The debriefing session will follow the same format as the follow-up discussion for the first hour. During the second hour you will be asked to respond to:

- What does "developing competence" mean to you? Were you able to do that this semester? If yes, how? If not, why not?
- What does "managing emotions" mean to you? Were you able to do that this semester? If yes, how? If not, why not?
- How did you see yourself – in what role – at the beginning of this program? How do you see yourself now?
- Was the program helpful to you? What would you change?
- Thinking of future students in the SERVE Program, what would be helpful to offer to them? What would you want to say to them?

This research has been approved by the Dean of the College of Education, Dr. Jean Houck. The only risk to you as a participant that I can identify is that you may go through a temporary questioning of your own competence as you listen to other students' contributions during the sessions. Please feel free to contact me for a personal consultation

at any time, especially if such questioning should occur. In addition, for questions or issues that arise that are beyond the scope of my training, I will recommend services available to you on our campus through the University Counseling Center and the Student Health Service.

The benefits to you as a participant in the study are learning about Arthur Chickering's developmental model, having an opportunity to apply it to your life, to set goals for yourself, and to advance in your journal writing. You will be able to participate in discussions focused around your experiences in service learning and to give input on the design of the training program for future students.

Although I hope that you will give answers to the questions asked at the end of the sessions and actively participate in the discussions and through your journal writing, your participation and input is strictly voluntary and will be kept confidential. The sessions will be videotaped for my exclusive use for data collection purposes, and I will be under the guidance of my thesis committee in the processing of the data. I will keep all data gathered, and present results as general research results which will be available to you.

Only the chair of my thesis committee and I will have access to the data, consent forms, and tapes. All of these will be stored in a locked box in my residence and transported in the same box for use with the thesis chair. I will keep the tapes, data, and consent forms for three years after the study is completed before destroying them. No information gathered in this study will become part of your class file.

If you agree to participate, you are completely free to discontinue participation at any time. Agreeing or refusing to participate will have no effect on your position, status, or role within the SERVE Program.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study or to request results after its completion, please contact me at (562)596-6198 or Dr. Dawn Person, my thesis advisor, at (562)985-8026. For questions regarding your rights as research participant you may call the CSULB Office of University Research at (562)985-5314. Thank you.

Please complete the following information:

I am 18 years of age or older and I agree to participate in the research described.

Name Printed	Signature	Date

APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Warm-up Questions: I will be asking you some questions related to your experiences in the SERVE Program. Tell me a little about your background ... what is your major, your class standing, how many hours of service learning have you completed?

Main Questions:

1. Before you came to the SERVE Program, what did you anticipate for service learning?

   Describe your first service learning experience.

2. When you first went out into the field you had received in the training an overview of Chickering's vectors.

   In what way was that helpful or not helpful as you started to work in the field?

3. You came back to participate in the workshop.

   In what ways were the goal-setting and journal-writing labs useful or not useful? After the workshop, did you use the vectors to help you in your personal and professional development? If yes, in what ways did you use them? If not, why not?

4. With the whole training experience, were you able to use Chickering's vectors in thinking about yourself and your progress towards a career in teaching? If yes, in what ways were you able to use them? If not, why not?

5. What else would have been helpful to you in terms of training to support your service learning?

Wrap-up: What do you envision for your next service learning experience?

APPENDIX G

DATA HANDLING INSTRUCTIONS

DATA HANDLING

Research Questions:

1. Are students able to apply Chickering's vectors to further their personal and professional development?
2. What is the best way to implement the vectors in teacher education training?

STEPS:

1. Read text completely
2. Read again
3. Make a list of themes
4. Mark text where themes appear

- Is student applying vectors in the field (elementary classroom)? RED

  MARK yes or Y (e.g. student is feeling confident as a result of writing goals based on vectors)

  MARK no or N (e.g. student is feeling lost and confused)

- Is student applying vectors to his/her college work? GREEN

  MARK yes or Y (e.g. student is focusing on what he/she wants to learn as a result of writing goals based on vectors)

  MARK no or N (e.g. student is feeling overwhelmed)

- Is student applying vectors to his/her personal development? BLUE

  MARK yes or Y (e.g. student finds that vectors describe his/her experiences and those of his/her peers)

  MARK no or N (e.g. student feels alone in a big university)

APPENDIX H

RESULTS OF ORIGINAL ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY ON STUDENTS' SERVICE LEARNING EXPERIENCES AND CHICKERING'S VECTORS

Results Of Original Ethnographic Study

On Students' Service Learning Experiences and Chickering's Vectors

Chickering's Vectors	Experiences of Students	
	Observation	Interview
Developing Competence	Desire to increase intellectual skills	Desire to increase teaching and interpersonal skills
Managing Emotions	Acknowledging fear of the unknown	Overwhelmed, unsure of role
Moving Through Autonomy to Interdependence	Problem-solving on placement	Problem-solving with classroom teacher
Establishing Identity	Seeing self in the role of a college student	Seeing self as a future teacher
Developing Mature Interpersonal Relationships		
Developing Purpose		Establishing vocational plans; commitment to others
Developing Integrity		Behavior consistent with personal values

APPENDIX I

MEMORABLE INCIDENT SHEET

Would you share with us a particular incident that has stayed on your mind regarding your service learning experience to be used in the training sessions? Please do not give identifying information such as your name, school name, or name of the student. Thank you!

APPENDIX J

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

OF SUBJECTS OF THE STUDY

Demographic Characteristics of Subjects of the Study

Student No.	Age	Gender	Class Standing	Ethnic Background	Language Other Than English
1	22	Female	Junior	Caucasian	Sign Language
2	20	Male	Junior	Hispanic	Minimum Spanish
3	19	Female	Sophomore	European	None
4	22	Female	Junior	Hispanic	None
5	20	Female	Sophomore	Caucasian	None
6	24	Female	Junior	Dutch/Indo-African American	None
7	43	Female	Senior	Caucasian	None
8	41	Female	Senior	Caucasian	None
9	48	Male	Junior	Caucasian	Minimum Spanish
10	29	Female	Senior	Caucasian	None
11	34	Female	Sophomore	Mexican	Spanish
12	24	Female	Junior	Caucasian	None
13	24	Female	Junior	Caucasian	None
14	20	Female	Junior	White/Filipino	None
15	20	Female	Sophomore	Hispanic	None
16	22	Female	Senior	White	None
17	24	Female	Senior	Caucasian	None

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

AACTE Commission on Multicultural Education. (1973). No none model American. Journal for Teacher Education, 24, 264-265.

Barr, R.B. (1998, September-October). Obstacles to implementing the learning paradigm: What it takes to overcome them. About Campus, 18-25.

Beaman, R.A. (1993). A model and training program for improving post-secondary teaching effectiveness using student-development theory. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University.

Belenky, M.F., Clinchy, B.M., Goldberger, N.R., & Tarule, J.M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice and mind. New York: Basic Books.

Biffle, R.L. (1996). Race, culture and power: A collaborative approach in diversity training and educational reform. In T. Warren (Ed.), Partnerships in teacher education: Schools and colleges working together (pp. 161-168). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Bogdan, R.C. & Biklen, S.K. (1998). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Butler, E.R. & Markley, H.D. (1993). Developmental characteristics of nontraditional aged students. Paper presented at the meeting of the American College Personnel Association on Educating for the Common Good: An Uncommon Agenda, Kansas City, MO.

Burstein, N.D. & Sears, S. (1998). Preparing on-the-job teachers for urban schools: Implications for teacher training. Teacher education and special education, 21, 47-62.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) (1998). Available: http://www.cctc.ca.gov/aboutcctc/mission.html

Campbell, K. & F.D. Ross. (1996). Pre-service education in a community of practice: Site-based secondary methods. In T. Warren (Ed.), Partnerships in teacher

education: Schools and colleges working together (pp. 108-115). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1989). Eighty fourth annual report for the year ended June 30, 1989. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation.

Chickering, A. (1969). Education and identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chickering, A.W. (1980). Adult development: A workable vision for higher education. Current Issues in Higher Education, October: 6-16. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Chickering, A.W. & Reisser, L. (1993). Education and identity. (2nd. ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life. (1988). One-third of a nation. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Conroy, M.C., Jensen, L.C. Bainbridge, P., & Catron, R. (1996). Enhancing teacher education through collaboration: The electronic highway connects college and partner schools. In T. Warren (Ed.), Partnerships in teacher education: Schools and colleges working together (pp. 14-20). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Cummins, J. (1996). Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society. Ontario, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). Beyond the Commission reports: The coming crisis in teaching. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). The right to learn: A blueprint for creating schools that work. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

De Acosta, M. (1995). Journal writing in service learning: Lessons from a mentoring project. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, Fall, 141-149.

Della Valle, J.A. (1986). The impact of freshmen leadership training on personal and leadership development, and participation in student activities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.

Denzin, N. (1988). The research act. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Depauw, M.E. (1980). The impact of goal-setting counseling procedure upon client satisfaction and judged outcome effectiveness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education. New York: The Free Press.

Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Dillard, C.B. (1997). Placing student language, literacy, and culture at the center of teacher education reform. In J.E. King, E.R. Hollins, & W.C. Hayman (Eds.), Preparing teachers for cultural diversity (pp. 85-96). NY: Teachers College Press.

Enders, S.C., Newton, F.B, & Caple, R.B. (1998). Contributing to learning: The role of student affairs. New directions for student services, No. 75. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

English Language Education for Immigrant Children – Proposition 227 Regulations. (1998). Available: http://www.cde.ca.gov/prop227.html

Erikson, E.H. (1980). Identity and the life cycle. New York: Norton.

Erikson, J.A. & J.B. Anderson (Eds.) (1997). Learning with the community: Concepts and models for service-learning in teacher education. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Evans, N.J. (1996). Theories of student development. In S.R. Komives, & D.B. Woodard, Jr. (Eds.) Student services: A handbook for the profession (pp. 164-187). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Evans, N.J, Forney, D.S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Ewell, P.T. (1997). Organizing for learning: A new imperative. AAHE Bulletin. December: 3-5.

Garcia, S.S. (1997). Self-narrative inquiry in teacher development: Living and working in just institutions. In J.E. King, E.R. Hollins, & W.C. Hayman (Eds.), Preparing teachers for cultural diversity (pp. 146-155). NY: Teachers College Press.

Gibson, G.E. (1995). Chickering's model of student development and the academic performance of African-American college students on a predominantly white campus. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University.

Giles, D.E. Jr., & Eyler, J. (1994). The theoretical roots of service-learning in John Dewey. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1, 77-85.

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

Glesne, C. & Peshkin, A. (1992). Becoming qualitative researchers. New York: Longman.

Goals 2000. (1998). Available: http://www.stateboard.com/goals200.html

Goodlad, J.I. (1994). Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodwin, A.L. (1994). Making the transition from self to other: What do preservice teachers really think about multicultural education? Journal of Teacher Education, 45, 119-130.

Goodwin, A.L. (1997). Historical and contemporary perspectives on multicultural teacher education. In J.E. King, E.R. Hollins, & W.C. Hayman (Eds.), Preparing teachers for cultural diversity (pp. 5-21). NY: Teachers College Press.

Guay, D. A. (1996). A collaborative program to train and certify bilingual teachers. In T. Warren (Ed.), Partnerships in teacher education: Schools and colleges working together (pp. 51-57). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Hamm, D., Dowell, Dl, & Houck, J. (1998). Service learning as a strategy to prepare candidates for contemporary diverse classrooms. Education, 119, 196-204.

Hausfather, S.J., Outlaw, M.E., & Strehle, E.L. (1996). Relationships as a foundation: Emerging field experiences within multiple college-school partnerships. In T. Warren (Ed.), Partnerships in teacher education: Schools and colleges working together (pp. 51-57). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Hollins, E.R. (1997). Directed inquiry in preservice teacher education: A developmental process model. In J.E. King, E.R. Hollins, & W.C. Hayman (Eds.), Preparing teachers for cultural diversity (pp. 97-110). NY: Teachers College Press.

Kendrick, J.R., Jr. (1996). Outcomes of service-learning in an introduction to sociology course. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3, 72-81.

Klimkowski, A.F. (1983). Perceived educational needs related to developmental stages of a select group of adults. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Toledo.

Knefelkamp, L.L., Golec, R.R., & Wells, E.A. (1985). The practice-to-theory-to-practice model. Unpublished manuscript, University of Maryland, College Park.

Knefelkamp, L., Widick, C., & Parker, C.A. (Eds.) Applying New Developmental Findings: New Directions for Student Services 4. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Komives, S.R. & Woodard, D.B. Jr. (1996). Student services: A handbook for the profession. (3rd. ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kraft, R.J. (1996). Service Learning: An introduction to its theory, practice, and effects. Education and Urban Society, 28, 131-159.

Kuh, G.D., Douglas, K.B., Lund, J.P., & Ramin-Gyurnek, J. (1998). Student learning outside the classroom: Transcending artificial boundaries. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 8. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Lawrence-Lightfoot, S., & Davis, J.H. (1977). The art and science of portraiture. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lienau, M.K. (1989). The metamorphosis of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women at the University of Iowa, 1974-1984. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa.

Little, J.C.M. (1997). Influences on overall student development at the undergraduate level: A panel study conducted at the University of Guelph. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Guelph, Ontario, Canada.

Los Angeles Unified School District: Inner-City Teacher Blues. (1998). Available: http://www.rjgeib.com/biography/inner-city-blues/innerblu.html

MacFarlane, P. (1991). The adult learner in law school: An exploration of motivation, experience, interaction, and commitment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Canada.

Manning, K.M. & Jorgenson, G.W. (1996). The Professional Education Model as a catalyst for reform and renewal of a school-based program. In T. Warren (Ed.), Partnerships in teacher education: Schools and colleges working together (pp. 90-98). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Marcy, M.B. (1986). Involvement and development of the black student: The role of the cocurricular. Campus activities programming. (December:34-38). Columbia, SC: NACA Educational Foundation.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G.B. (1995). Designing qualitative research (Second Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Martin, L.M. (1998). Development change in college students: A study based on Chickering's model of student development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, New York.

Massey, C.E. & Massey, C.P. (1996). Houghton College and the King Center School. In T. Warren (Ed.), Partnerships in teacher education: Schools and colleges working together (pp. 81-89). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

McEwen, M., Roper, L, Bryant, D. & Langa, M. (1990). Incorporating the development of African American students into psychosocial theories of student development. Journal of College Student Development, 31: 429-436.

McGraw, P.C. (1999). Life strategies: Doing what works, doing what matters. New York: Hyperion.

Melnick, S.L. & Zeichner, K.M. (1997). Enhancing the capacity of teacher education institutions to address diversity issues. In J.E. King, E.R. Hollins, & W.C. Hayman (Eds.), Preparing teachers for cultural diversity (pp. 23-39). NY: Teachers College Press.

Miller, T.K. & Winston, R.B. Jr. (Eds.) (1991). Administration and leadership in student affairs: Actualizing student development in higher education. Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development.

Moon, A. (1994). Teaching excellence: The role of service learning. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning 1, 115-120.

Morgan, L. (1996). Institutional support for service learning. Journal for Research and Development in Education, 29, 220-225.

Murphy, D.M. (1985). The influence of participation in intramural sports on the development of Chickering's vector of identity. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

Myers, C. & Pickeral, T. (1997). Service learning: An essential process for preparing teachers as transformational leaders in the reform of public education. In Erickson, J.A. & Anderson, J.B. (Eds), Learning with the community: Concepts and models for service-learning in teacher education (pp. 13-41). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1990). Standards, procedures, and policies for the accreditation of professional education units. Washington, DC: Author.

Nierstheimer, S.L., Hopkins, C.J., & Dillon, D.R. (1998). Perceptions of self as teacher: Case studies of three preservice literacy teachers. In D.J. McIntyre & D.M. Byrd (Eds.), Strategies for career-long teacher education (pp. 11-40). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Olthoff, N.A.W. (1991). Psychosocial developmental levels of freshman urban university students with learning disabilities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Old Dominion University.

Pascarella, E.T. & Terenzini, P.T. (1991). How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Peretti, D. (1997). Redesigning field experiences: From exposure to engagement. In J.E. King, E.R. Hollins, & W.C. Hayman (Eds.), Preparing teachers for cultural diversity (pp. 5-21). N.Y.: Teachers College Press.

Perry, W.G., Jr. (1968). Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Persons, M.H. & Lisman, D. (1996). Promoting community renewal through civic literacy and service learning. New Directions in Community Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Piaget, J. (1952). The origins of intelligence in children. New York: International Universities Press.

Price, J.R. III & Martello, J.S. (1996). Naming and framing service learning: A taxonomy and four levels of value. Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum,7, 11-23.

Rendón, L.I., & Hope, R.O. (1996). Educating a new majority: Transforming America's educational system for diversity. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Robinson, M. (1995). The federalization of education. Investor's Business Daily. November 21. Available: http://www.stateboard.com/goals200.htm

Root, S. (1994). Service learning in teacher education: A third rationale. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1, 94-97.

Sahagun, L. (1998). Facing the poverty factor. Los Angeles Times, November 1, A1.

Sahagun, L. (1999). Despite help, boy's progress in reading is painfully slow. Los Angeles Times, June 30, A1.

Saltmarsh, J. (1996). Education for critical citizenship: John Dewey's contribution to the pedagogy of community service learning. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3, 13-21.

Sanchez, R. (1998). A world of catching up to do – U.S. high school seniors nearly last in math, science exam. Washington Post. February 24. Available: http://www.stateboard.com/math.htm

Sanford, N. (1966). Self and society: Social change and individual development. New York: Atherton.

Sanford, N. (1967). Where colleges fail: A study of the student as a person. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scholl, M.B. (1998). College students' preferences for counselor role: Differences as a function of selected young adult identity development factors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Siccardi, A.B.H. (1998). The perceptions of student in an accelerated baccalaureate nursing program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

Simpson, T.L. & Keith, M.J. (1996). Maryville College and secondary educators: Linking theory with practice. In T. Warren (Ed.), Partnerships in teacher education: Schools and colleges working together (pp.125-134). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Sottile, J.M. Jr. (1995). First year experiences of female college students: A qualitative investigation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University.

Souviney, R. (1998). CTC Newsletter. Available: http://www.ctc.ca.gov

Stanton, T.K., Giles, D.E.Jr., & Cruz, N.I. (1999). Service learning: A movement's pioneers reflect on its origins, practice, and future. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stoffels, J. & Sneed, M. (1996). The assessing learning project: Uniting teacher effectiveness and student learning. In T. Warren (Ed.), Partnerships in teacher

education: Schools and colleges working together (pp. 1- 13). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Su, Z. (1998). Becoming teachers: Minority candidates' perceptions of teaching as a profession and as a career. In D.J. McIntyre & D.M. Byrd (Eds.), Strategies for career-long teacher education (pp. 179-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Sweet, R.W. Jr. (1997). Illiteracy: An incurable disease or education malpractice? Available: http://www.stateboard.com/reading.htm

Teets, S.T. & Midkiff, R.G. (1996). Foxfire: Lighting the way for collaboration in teacher education. In T. Warren (Ed.), Partnerships in teacher education: Schools and colleges working together (pp. 125-134). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Tennant, S.B. (1990). Personal and moral development: A developmental curriculum intervention for liberal arts freshmen. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University.

Tennison, J.M. & Hawes, J. (1996). The Kentucky Wesleyan College and Cravens Elementary School partnership: A work in progress. In T. Warren (Ed.), Partnerships in teacher education: Schools and colleges working together (pp. 99-107). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Terenzini, P.T. (1987). A review of selected theoretical models of student development and collegiate impact. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Baltimore, MD. November 21-24: 2-38.

Thieke, W.S. (1994). A model of developmental change in freshman students: Confirming Chickering's theory of student development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University.

Thomas, R. & Chickering, A. (1984). Education and Identity revisited. The Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 392-339.

Thompson, C. (1993). Best and worst classroom learning experiences as perceived by adult undergraduates in baccalaureate nursing programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Connecticut.

Varlotta, L.E. (1996). Service-learning: A catalyst for constructing democratic progressive communities. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3, 22-30.

Viadero, D. (1998). U.S. seniors near bottom in world math, science tests. Education Week. March 4. Available: http://www.stateboard.com/math.htm

Vick, D.S. (1989). The impact of full-time, semester-long internships on college students' psychosocial development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University.

Walsh, D.C. (1999). The academic calling: Creating spaces for spirit. Change. July-August, 18-23.

Warner, M.J. (1988). The effects of human development programming models on university residence hall students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia.

Warren, T. (1996). Partnerships in education. Maryland: University Press of America.

Weiss, K.R. (1999). Women feeling more stress in college. Los Angeles Times. Jan. 23 p.A3.

White, D.B. & Hood, A.B. (1989). An assessment of the validity of Chickering's theory of student development. Journal of College Student Development 30, 354-61.

Widick, C., Parker, C.A. & Knefelkamp, L.L. (1978). Arthur Chickering's vectors of development. In L. Knefelkamp, C. Widick, C.A. Parker (Eds.) Applying New Developmental Findings: New Directions for Student Services 4, (p.19-34). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Winston, R.B. Jr., Bonney, W.C., Miller, T.K., and Dagley, J.C. (1988). Promoting student development through intentionally structured groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Winston, R.B. & Miller, T.K. (1987). The Student Development Task and Lifestyle Inventory Manual. Athens, GA: Student Development Associates.

Young, K.G. (1993). The role of identity in college success: A case study of five African American women. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma.