NSU Florida
NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY

Experiential Learning & Teaching in Higher Education

Volume 2 | Number 2 Article 1

1-2020

Full Issue

Follow this and additional works at: https://nsuworks.nova.edu/elthe

 Part of the Educational Methods Commons, and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons

Recommended Citation

(2020) "Full Issue," *Experiential Learning & Teaching in Higher Education*: Vol. 2 : No. 2 , Article 1.
Available at: https://nsuworks.nova.edu/elthe/vol2/iss2/1

This Full Issue is brought to you for free and open access by NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Experiential Learning & Teaching in Higher Education by an authorized editor of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.

Experiential Learning & Teaching in Higher Education
A Journal for Engaged Educators

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 2
January 2020

Editors

Editor-in-Chief — **KEVIN DVORAK**, *Nova Southeastern University*

Managing Editor — **MARIO D'AGOSTINO**, *Nova Southeastern University*

Production Manager — **ERIC MASON**, *Nova Southeastern University*

Editorial Board

CHERYL CATES — *University of Cincinnati*
KATIE GAEBEL — *Oregon State University*
ABIGAIL LOCHTEFELD — *Southern Utah University*
EARL MULDERINK — *Southern Utah University*
GEORGE PACHECO, JR. — *West Texas A&M University*
MERITH WEISMAN — *Sonoma State University*
THEDA WREDE — *Dixie State University*

ELTHE: A JOURNAL FOR ENGAGED EDUCATORS is published semi-annually by NSUWorks in cooperation with the Experiential Learning Leadership Institute (ELLI) and the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) with support from Nova Southeastern University, Davie, FL.

© 2020, NSUWorks
ISSN 2474-3410 (print) ISSN 2474-3429 (online)

Experiential Learning & Teaching in Higher Education
A Journal for Engaged Educators

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 2
January 2020

Contents

COVER IMAGE: A quilt representing diversity was on display at the Salem Conference Center. Image used under a CC BY 2.0 license from the Oregon Department of Transportation.

Editor's Note

MARIO D'AGOSTINO
Nova Southeastern University

When I first learned that my institution, Nova Southeastern University (NSU), was acquiring *Experiential Learning & Teaching in Higher Education* (*ELTHE*), I was immediately struck by two seemingly disparate emotions: elation and apprehension. On one hand, I was grateful for the opportunity to join the journal as Managing Editor, especially since I revel in overseeing a prospective author's writing process. It is such an amazing experience assisting authors with their ideas and watching as an initial node of thought materializes on the page, enduring and withstanding countless drafting, revising, and editing suggestions, before finally arriving at its final form. Indeed, this was an exciting time for those of us involved in the journal's transition from Southern Utah University (SUU) to NSU. Beyond the excitement many of us felt, I personally could not evade my sense of apprehension. As someone familiar with *ELTHE*'s catalogue and the important voices that have graced the pages of this journal, my concern regarded *how* we would rise to the occasion and sustain the incredible foundation laid by the editors, reviewers, and authors that came before us. After all, the journal's inaugural Editor, Kurt Harris, did not shy away from setting a grand objective for the journal in his "A Note from the Editor," writing that: "[the goal of *ELTHE*] is to build an internationally recognized and oft-cited journal" that is "dedicated to the promotion of experiential learning and teaching specifically in higher education." ("A Note," 2017). With Harris' mandate in mind, Dr. Kevin Dvorak—the journal's incoming Editor-in-Chief—and I immediately got to work laying out a plan for how we would push *ELTHE* into the future.

We are so excited to have *ELTHE* at NSU. During its time at SUU, *ELTHE* established itself as a vital space for experiential practitioners in all disciplines to share their best practices for teaching and learning in higher education. Now that we are situated at this critical juncture amid the COVID-19 pandemic, we understand that there is an enormous demand for mobilizing and circulating the ideas of experiential educators, especially as many of us perform the looming, lumbering work of moving programs to exclusively online or hybrid teaching models for fall 2020. In recogniz-

ing the appetite for this scholarship—and in keeping with Harris' directive above—*ELTHE* at NSU wishes to extend its readership to all members of the National Society for Experiential Educators (NSEE). Beyond simply strengthening our audience and readership, though, we want *ELTHE* to be *the* preeminent repository for the many diverse disciplines, distinct voices, and dialogic viewpoints that permeate our field.

While Volume 2, Issue 2 is shorter than subsequent issues due to the journal's transition, we are proud of the articles that follow. Taken together, these articles are principally concerned with community-based pedagogies in experiential spaces. Maureen Snow Andrade and Jonathan Westover research student motivation for enrolling in service-learning courses, as well as examine the likelihood for course and program completion among millennial students in "Engaging Millennial Students through Community-Engaged Experiential Learning." Alternatively, Carolyn Casale and C. Adrainne Thomas investigate interactive field-based experiential learning activities designed to understand and strengthened ties with various community stakeholders in "Community Engagement through Interactive Field-Based Activities." It was an absolute pleasure reading through these submissions as we prepared them for publication; I can only hope that within them, our readership will find deeper perspectives on the topics discussed, sparking their curiosity and motivating them to further engage with the publishing process (for more information on *ELTHE*, or if you are interested in submitting to, or reviewing for, the journal, visit our new website at https://nsuworks.nova.edu/elthe/).

As we move forward with *ELTHE* at NSU, I want to extend our sincerest gratitude to SUU and all the editors who devoted their time to the journal (Kurt Harris, Tammy Buehler, Abigail Lochtefeld, and Earl Mulderink). I also want to thank the journal's current Editor-in-Chief, Kevin Dvorak, for his patience and much needed guidance during the journal's transition; the journal's current Production Manager, Dr. Eric Mason, who laid out the journal and who reviewed each article with lapidary precision; Gena Meroth who manages and oversees the journal's website on NSUWorks; and Drs. Martha Snyder and Teri Williams for their consultation during the transition process. Finally, a special thank you to Dr. Marianna Savoca and NSEE for their enduring and dedicated support to the field of experiential education and, most especially, for their endorsement of this journal.

Onward and upward.

References

Harris, K. (2017). A note from the editor. *Experiential Learning & Teaching in Higher Education, 1*(1), 5-6.

Community Engagement through Interactive Field-Based Activities

CAROLYN CASALE AND C. ADRAINNE THOMAS
Adams State University *Virginia State University*

Abstract. This qualitative case study consisted of social justice interactive field-based experiential learning activities designed to understand community partnerships between a university and local public school. The research question was: How can interactive field-based activities build closer community ties? The theoretical foundation incorporated Ken Zeichner's "hybrid spaces" with the premise of field-based interactive experiences. The findings indicated the need for further activities that create partnerships between teacher education programs and neighboring public schools.

This qualitative case study reflects the results of a community-based field experience that served to build community and racial harmony. The theoretical frameworks that inform this study are: (a) hybrid spaces (Zeichner, 2010; Zeichner, Payne, & Brayko, 2015), (b) experiential learning (Dewey, 1933), and (c) culturally responsive teaching strategies (Howard, 2003). The main objectives of the activities were to promote social justice and civil engagement across diverse communities; and develop closer partnership ties between a college of education and local schools. This study explored how a public teacher education college can develop community ties with neighboring secondary and primary schools. High school participants explored and redefined the concept of community. The main research question was: How can interactive, experiential-learning activities build closer community ties?

Introduction

This research takes place in the Mississippi Delta. This is an area stricken by poverty and inequality compounded by a lack of empathetic awareness. The Mississippi Delta has historically experienced high rates of poverty and inequality, particularly for African Americans. In contrast, the university in focus is often referred to as a "white" institution. This has led to undertones of a disconnect. The demographic difference between

the university faculty (overwhelmingly white) and the community (predominantly African American) is stark. In fact, cultural artifacts (such as a plantation mascot) subtly and directly reinforce an unwelcome atmosphere for African Americans. However, public school teachers held strong beliefs in experiential learning with an emphasis on interactive learning. To touch on these community concerns and promote interactive activities, a university professor of teacher education and a high school social studies teacher discussed ways to promote social justice and build closer community ties. These individuals conceived this project with the research question as the focal point. This focus on learning about and building closer community ties is a growing emphasis in teacher education preservice courses. For preservice teachers (who are predominantly white females) there is a need to consciously reflect on and learn about communities they will be working in, particularly those which are culturally and/or linguistically different.

Two social justice field trips were arranged to the WWII Japanese American Internment Museum in McGehee, Arkansas, and the National Civil Rights Museum in Memphis, Tennessee. These trip locations were purposefully selected to highlight injustices that have occurred in United States history. At both locations, the teachers and faculty requested guided tours that told the stories of injustices and those who protested those inequalities. The trips were intentionally planned to engage and promote social justice awareness. During the field trips students engaged in interactive activities surrounding the internment of Japanese Americans and the plight of African Americans during the civil rights era. In addition, participants engaged in various interactive community-building exercises. These activities included asking participants to reflect on a museum exhibit and share their reflection with another participant who they did not know. Faculty from the university and high school encouraged participants to go outside their comfort area and connect with people who they perceive as different from themselves, particularly from university to high school and vice versa. The participants were eleventh- and twelfth-grade social studies students from a public high school, and university students majoring in social science and/or secondary education.

The significance of this research was in understanding the multi-layered components of developing community ties between colleges of education and public schools surrounding social justice themes. Further, this research sought to build third or hybrid spaces (Zeichner, 2010) to promote discussions surrounding issues relevant to the student body. Another objective of the project was to expose high school students from low socio-economic communities to information and places outside their communities, and particularly in the field of social justice.

Theoretical Framework

This study incorporated an integrated theoretical frame that consisted of (a) hybrid spaces (Zeichner, 2010; Zeichner et al. 2015), (b) experiential learning (Dewey, 1933), and (c) culturally responsive teaching strategies (Howard, 2003) with an emphasis on interactive learning strategies within a community-centered field trip. The main premise was that educational field-based experiences can provide transformative change in society. Teachers and students are transformation agents and engagement in experiential learning is an essential component of that transformation. Dewey (1933) posited that:

I believe, finally, that the teacher is engaged, not simply in the training of individuals, but in the formation of the proper social life. . . . I believe that every teacher should realize the dignity of his calling; that he is a social servant set apart for the maintenance of proper social order and the securing of the right social growth. (p. 80)

Zeichner (2010) suggested the solution to the disconnect between universities and public education involves creating third or hybrid spaces for an "equal and more dialectical relationship between academic and practitioner knowledge in support of student teacher learning" (p. 92). The authors of this article argued that authentic community partnerships require critical reflection on characteristics of race, class, gender, and other significant contextual concerns.

Solving societal problems requires recognition that the problems exist; are a part of complex society systems; and affect universities and community systems (Fitzgerald et al., 2016). Efforts to solve societal problems require new approaches to knowledge generation within the context of partnerships, collaboration, exchange of ideas, and co-creation of solutions. Universities can contribute to developing constructivist spaces through community engagement and play a central role in conducting the activities required to enable individuals to become civically engaged as citizens. The authors further argued that universities serve to promote "democratizing knowledge through cocreation and authentic partnerships" (p. 247). Checkoway (2015) contended that universities should view research as "a process which builds community" (p. 139) and utilize its resources to support research and other community-building activities. This research study represents an effort towards community building.

Reflective & Culturally Relevant Practices

Dewey (1933) describes reflective thought as an active, persistent, and

careful consideration of any belief or form of knowledge with regard to the grounds that support it, and conclusions drawn. He further equated reflective thought to intellectual thinking. Self-reflection and cultural critical consciousness are essential to improving the educational opportunities and outcomes for students from diverse backgrounds (Gay & Kirkland, 2003). Both involve thorough analysis and careful monitoring of personal beliefs and instructional behaviors about the value of cultural diversity, and the most effective ways to teach racially and ethnically diverse students. In order to engage in these continuous analyses and efforts to make teaching more relevant to diverse students, teachers must not only have a thorough understanding of their own cultures and the cultures of different ethnic groups, but also have an understanding of how this engagement affects teaching and learning behaviors. Howard (2003) posited that critical reflection is crucial to the concept of culturally relevant pedagogy. Further, the notion of "reflective action" is what Dewey (1933) referred to as the active component of behavioral intervention. Once cognitive processing is complete, reflective action can serve as a more useful tool for addressing social and emotional issues, such as those pertaining to race and culture.

Howard further stated that critical reflection should include an examination of how race, culture, and social class shape students' thinking, learning, and various understandings of the world. To support this, Howard (2003) suggested three areas that are essential to the development of culturally relevant teaching practices:

> First, teachers must acknowledge how deficit-based notions of diverse students continue to permeate traditional school thinking, practices, and placement, and critique their own thoughts and practices to ensure they do not reinforce prejudice behavior. Second, culturally relevant pedagogy recognizes the explicit connection between culture and learning, and sees students' cultural capital as an asset and not a detriment to their school success. Third, culturally relevant teaching is mindful of how traditional teaching practices reflect middle-class, European American cultural values, and thus seeks to incorporate a wider range of dynamic and fluid teaching practices.
>
> Effective reflection of race within a diverse cultural context requires teachers to engage in one of the more difficult processes for all individuals—honest self-reflection and critique of their own thoughts and behaviors. (Howard, 2003, pp. 197–198)

Moreover, critical reflection requires educators to explore deeper levels of self-knowledge, and to recognize the impact of one's own world view on students' perceptions of themselves. Critical teacher reflection is an essential component of culturally relevant pedagogy because it can, in effect, measure an educator's level of concern for the well-being of their students. The willingness to ask tough questions about his or her own attitudes

toward diverse students can reflect the true commitment an educator has toward their students' academic success and emotional well-being.

Finally, culturally relevant pedagogical strategies combined with interactive activities can foster learning. Dewey (1933) argued that experiential learning was based on the premise that field experiences are relevant to the learning process. Further, the activities should be interactive and include participant reflections on the experiences of the day, on their background, and on those with whom they interacted. The purpose of the interactive activities was for participants to mingle among one another and develop closer ties.

Community Literature

In conducting partnership research, Noel (2010) stated the importance of critically reflecting on positions of privilege. Noel (2010) stated, "I must consistently consider how people in the neighborhoods may take a racially, economically, and educationally marked view of me, marking me as an 'other' while still assigning me with privilege" (p. 210). Noel (2011) argued that to develop authentic community engagement there needs to be three essential components:

> (1) being physically located at the school or community site in order to build trust and become integrated into the life of the school or community, (2) conducting community studies in order to learn about and understand the lives of community members, and (3) becoming involved in community engagement activities. (p. 31)

In the above quote, Noel outlined the elements to developing partnerships between universities and schools. The development takes place over time through the demonstrated commitment to, and real involvement in, the community. In this study, race and geography played a significant role in this process. For example, the first researcher was a middle-class White northern woman and the community was predominantly African American, lower income and from the South. When this researcher spoke, the Northern accent made it clear that was she was not from the community and a common assumption was that she would not stay. This led to challenges in demonstrating a commitment, particularly to the public schools. This commitment was partly demonstrated by the researcher sending her child to a local public school when, often, middle-class White southerners send their children to private schools that are predominantly white.

Authentic community partnerships require critical reflection of characteristics of race, class, gender, and other significant contextual concerns

(in this case, geographical considerations). Geographic roots played a role in how this researcher was perceived within the community by different groups. Again, having a distinctive Northern accent led local African-American stakeholders to believe our views were aligned, but long-term commitment was questioned. To paraphrase one administrator: 'your people are good, but you don't stay.' In contrast, Southern Whites often avoided discussions on social justice or community. The second author was an African American from the north and did not attend the field trips nor interact directly with the participants nor the stakeholders. Her role was to provide an objective view of the data, and a neutral tone in the data analysis and thematic organization.

Noel (2011) posited the need for reflection on the types of partnership activities and roles of various players, and suggested that there needs to be a move away from a "university-led focus" that may often sustain "an inequality of roles, with university programs and faculty members setting the tone for interactions" (p. 32). When considering the day-to-day components of this project, the first researcher was consciously aware of the perceived privileged space of being from the university. An effort was made to emphasize the knowledge base and contributions of community members. As Noel (2011) argued, an authentic community partnership involves "shared goals, procedures, and beliefs" (p. 36). In this research, the coordinating university faculty member and high school teacher had a shared vision to expand their students' understanding through a field experience. Noel (2011) stated that trust is an essential element in developing engaged communities.

Similar to Noel (2011), Haddix (2015) drew attention to "the danger in simply requiring curriculum or field experiences in diverse settings, yet failing to uncover and address issues of racism and social and educational inequities" (p. 64). She contended that this might lead teacher candidates to "deficit ways" of thinking about low-income communities (p. 64); but community-engaged field experiences could lead to "consciousness-raising experiences that hold great potential for affecting the teachers they become" (p. 69). She further argued that preservice teachers need information on the "realities of teaching and learning" and that this can be accomplished through "incorporating opportunities for community engagement beyond classroom walls" (p. 63).

Guillen and Zeichner (2018) focused on the positive effects of university-community partnerships in developing teacher educators. A significant benefit is the ability to "access the expertise within families and communities" (p. 140). Drawing on the concept of democratizing teacher educa-

tion (Zeichner, 2015), Guillen and Zeichner (2018) suggested the "idea of partnering with families and communities to create more democratic, less hierarchical teacher education programs" (p. 141). They further emphasized building partnerships through shared responsibility. Implicit in this is building trust through addressing concerns surrounding social justice. However, they noted difficulties in the "development of trusting relationships" (p. 142).

Evans-Andris et al. (2014) postulated that (a) research connects the importance of community engagement to teacher accreditation bodies, and (b) the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards emphasize a shift in teacher education toward engaged clinical experiences. Specifically, "Standard 2 focuses on partnerships for clinical preparation, clinical educators, and clinical experiences" (Evans-Andris et al., 2014, p. 466). Evans-Andris et al. (2014) argued the need for community stakeholders to share the workload and that "Over time, the liaison's role expanded as she gained acceptance from the principal and teachers" (p. 469). Further, they stated, "This side-by-side working together reinforced the core value that partners share responsibility for the support and improvement of teaching and learning, and the subsequent results" (p. 469).

This was true of my role as an unofficial liaison. In my first year, I supervised student's clinical experiences in the field. In this capacity I listened, observed, and learned. I thought about which teachers would want to create a meaningful partnership that would positively affect our students. In my second year, I co-taught a series of lessons with another faculty member in a district high school. From these interactions over time, I was able to develop a positive rapport and demonstrate my commitment to improving academic performance. This directly led to co-designing the field trips in my third year as a faculty member.

Reischl, Khasnabis, and Karr (2017) contended that partnerships take time and include a shift in emphasis from the university setting to the school setting. They also noted that "partnering deepens and changes over time" (p. 52), and provided an array of questions for the various components in the cascade of partnership activities. They further argued that positive change happens "through highly contextualized, thoughtful participation of key players in joint productive activity in schools" (p. 52).

Research Design & Methodology

Merriam and Grenier (2002) argued that the purpose of qualitative research is, "to understand the meaning people have constructed about their world and their experiences" (p. 5). This is relevant to "making sense" with

how participants interpret their environments (Merriam & Grenier, 2002). This qualitative research study sought to answer the following research question: How can interactive experiential-learning activities build closer community ties? Data consisted of qualitative responses from pre- and post-questionnaires based upon interactive community-building activities.

The superintendent of the district, the principal and the teachers were highly interested in this university-school partnership. The idea originated with a social studies teacher and a faculty member in the school of education. After four ongoing discussions, they agreed on two trips: the National Civil Rights Museum in Memphis, Tennessee, and the WWII Japanese American Internment Museum at the Rohwer Heritage Site in McGehee, Arkansas. The belief was that the high school students would be intrinsically motivated to attend because many had not traveled outside of their region. U.S. History was a required course and the trip was a means of experiencing elements of the course firsthand. In addition, secondary education social science preservice teachers from the university were able to acquire practical experience working with the population they planned to work with in the future.

This study was Internal Review Board-approved and received funding from internal university diversity committees and faculty grants. The funds covered the costs of transportation, food, and t-shirts for participants. The t-shirts were a means of identifying participants in an unfamiliar setting and served to identify the participants as part of a university-high school partnership. The t-shirts were all the same color and bore the logos from both the university and high school.

Research Participants

Eight-eight participants completed this study—51 high school juniors and seniors, and 37 secondary level preservice teachers. Nine of the participants went on both trips but only completed one pre- and post-questionnaire. One-hundred percent of the participants completed the pre-questionnaire and 98.8 percent (87/88) completed the post-questionnaire. The high rates of completion on the pre- and post-questionnaire are attributed to participants' verbal commitment to participate in the various interactive activities as a pre-condition to attend the trip. Thereafter, participants had the option to remove their names from the study, but all committed to complete the trip activities.

The data collection took place on the two trips in February, 2018. The data consisted of responses to a pre- and post-trip questionnaire with reflective prompts designed to elicit rich data on ideas surrounding commu-

nity and social justice issues. Throughout the two trips, students engaged in interactive activities that encouraged them to think outside their comfort zone. Participants were paired with someone they did not know, and, at the beginning and conclusion of each field experience, they completed a pre- and post-questionnaire (Appendix B and C, respectively). The data for the 9 participants who attended both trips consisted of the pre-questionnaire from the first trip and the post-questionnaire from the second trip. The trips were about two weeks apart.

Findings

Three major themes emerged from the analysis of the data: the importance of community, an expanded view of community, and the role of community in social justice. The post-questionnaire question three asked, "What did you learn about community on this trip?". Eighty-five of the 88 participants responses fell into three main categories: the importance of building community (33 participants); community is larger than they thought (35 participants); and the importance of community in fighting for social justice (17 participants). Three responses did not fit into any one particular thematic category.

The Importance of Community

The importance of building community also had a sub-theme that included meeting new people, such as in these responses: "coming together is important" (participant 85); "That community is stronger that we think" (participant 31). Eleven of the 33 participants in this category mentioned meeting new people from different backgrounds. For example, Participant 73 commented, "There are more perspectives than just the people that I normally surround myself with. It is easy for me to keep contact with just the people I am comfortable with." For example, Participant 18 noted separations in community. Participant 18 stated, "After this experience I see my community as weaker than before. We are not together as one. We are coming together, but there is a lot of separation." This response is significant because Participant 18 attended both trips. Another participant, number 21, stated that their view had changed, but that, "I still see cliques amongst us."

Expanded View of Community

Seventy-one of the 88 participants defined community as "a group of people who live in the same area as you" (participant 3). Summarizing this, Participant 22 stated, "community is a group of people living in the same

[area] with common characteristics and interests." From these 71 participants there was variation in who was in their community. The answers ranged from localities to state, national and international. Adding a different dimension, seventeen participants defined community as people with the interest to make a "change" (participant 31) or "willing to make [it] a better place" (participant 32).

The 19 participants consistently remarked that their definition of community is larger than their immediate surroundings. For example, participant 86 stated, "I learned a community consists of a huge diverse population." Similarly, participant 27 stated, "I learned your community can be stretched far and wide." Participants grouped in this thematic category emphasized their view of an expansive definition of community. In contrast, in the post-questionnaire, the definition of who was in the community was more expanded. The post-questionnaire asked, "Is your community more than what you thought it was?". From the 87 participants who completed the questionnaire, 28 did not respond, and 4 already had a world view of their community. For example, Participant 37 stated, " I have always felt a broader sense of community." Similarly, Participant 14 explained that this trip did not expand their definition of community. In contrast, 45 responded yes, their view of community has changed by expanding who is in their community. An example of this is in Participant 3's response. Participant 3 responded, ". . . I still see my community the same [I] just am more aware of how big it actually is." Interestingly, Participant 46 concluded that after this trip, the belief is that "community can be created." Similarly, Participant 33 stated, "I hope [my community] continues to grow."

The Role of Community in Social Justice

Seventeen of the participants connected the importance of community to fighting for social justice. For example: "It takes a village to raise a child, but it only takes a community of people to make a small change. It does matter. Every comment, every thought, every opportunity matters" (participant 17); "I learned that you can't survive though hard times without [community]" (participant 18); "I learned that a community can bond over a hardship . . . that they have to ban together to overcome" (participant 46).

The trips encompassed the theme of community through interactive exercises and through looking at historical injustices, specifically the struggles of African Americans (at the National Civil Rights Museum) and Japanese Americans (at the WWII Japanese American Internment Museum). The fourth question on the post-questionnaire asked participants, "what did you learn/experience that defined your day?". The intention of this question

was to create a space for participants to express their thoughts about the day. Their responses varied.

The responses that noted historical information consisted of those that listed specific things they learned about history from the exhibits in the museum. The next largest category of 36 participants' responses connected the events they learned to their personal lives. These participants discussed a variety of reactions or lessons learned from the day. For example, Participant 2 stated, "I learned greater perspective of my privilege as a white man"; Participant 13 stated, "everyone is connected"; Participant 12, "I learned patience"; Participant 14, "being aware of your surroundings"; and participant 20 stated, " . . . I want to stand up and help all I can, help the helpless and the voiceless."

Interestingly, three of those who personally connected also linked their personal experience to the role of government in systematic discrimination. For example, Participant 60 stated, "I learned that the U.S. government can set into motion anything they vote on, even things that could be harmful or violate morals and rules." Similarly, Participant 78 stated, "I learned that tyranny knows no bounds. You can be willing to die for your country and you might still be persecuted."

Three participants connected the factual exhibits to their lives. For example, Participant 17 stated, "the slideshows of videos inside the dinner area that showed demonstrations of how to prepare yourself for a sit-in. Their freedom to eat was jeopardized and in the hands of someone else. It awakens a deep sadness and opens a window of understanding."

They also delved into the inequalities within their community. For example, five students independently expressed a connection between the National Civil Rights Museum and the Farmers Market. At the international Farmers Market, students observed that there was a wide diversity of products at a cheaper price than in their community. Specifically, these five students expressed amazement at the cheaper prices for better quality fresh produce found at the Memphis Farmers Market. All five of these students expressed frustration with the lack of options in rural communities and expressed that this represented an inequality.

One participant's response was unreadable and ten participants discussed unexpected topics ranging from our stop at an international market, to the lunch, to being "no longer afraid to cross a river bridge" (participant 85).

Limitations

Within the larger community, there were negative comments from the high school teachers concerning a university decision that affected their community. The university broke with a locally owned business that had been a mainstay within the university, particularly in the past ten years. The switch to a nationally recognized competitor provoked community displeasure with the university. Although this was beyond the control of the College of Education, the actions of the university led to disparaging remarks on this community-driven initiative.

A limitation in this study was the lack of support from the administration. Although the College of Education was supportive, the Provost did not permit an excused absence for the university students to attend the trips (three faculty in three different colleges requested excused absences). That means the students may have been penalized for work missed due to attending the field trips, or may not have attended out of fear of such penalty. Therefore, it is possible that the lack of upper administrative support, implicitly devalued the community-engagement activities. Evans-Andris, et al. (2014) argued the importance of "university support for faculty who embed their teaching, research, and service endeavors in a clinical model of teacher education, especially those aiming toward tenure and promotion" (p. 475). Although the emphasis here is on evaluation standards for faculty in tenure and promotion criteria, upper university administrative support needs to be in place for successful community partnerships as well.

Lastly, another limitation is that the participant data did not delineate participants' school affiliation; therefore, the distinction between university and high school participants blurred on the forms collected. The aggregated data, therefore, could not be used to discuss how this project specifically impacted the college students who participated. The researchers encouraged participants to mix with different groups of people, but did not have them mark their school affiliation on any of the data. The intention was to remove labels. With this noted, the researchers observed the participants mix and ask questions to those outside their school affiliation. In fact, prior to the trip, the faculty from the university and high school remarked how participants were interested to meet high school/university students.

Discussion

The main research question posited was: How can interactive field-based activities build closer community ties? The findings indicate that interactive field-based activities expand participants' view of community

and that can bring about closer community ties. Building closer connections between the university, schools, and community-at-large is a multi-step and ongoing process. This research is a foundational start in that process. According to Casapulla and Hess (2016), schools are central institutions in many rural communities, whose primary functions are to educate future decision-makers in the community, and to provide opportunities for the engagement and participation of its community members. Further, schools should offer students opportunities to understand their local communities as well as support and foster their development as citizens.

The literature supports the idea that students should be more engaged in their communities and that pedagogical interventions can impact the engagement level. This research modeled an experiential interactive multi-leveled service activity that promoted community engagement surrounding social justice. Further research is needed to understand how a college of education can build greater community connections that foster meaningful partnerships. The findings indicated that this particular community (high school and university participants) were eager to learn about one another. The field trip, along with the interactive activities, expanded their views of community. It would be in the interest of the university to invest in these types of community-engaged field-based activities. This is in alignment with Casapulla and Hess' (2016) assertion that engagement education needs to be "place-focused, project-based, asset-driven, and democratically oriented" (p. 42), as well as other scholars who "challenged colleges and universities to become more engaged with the most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems in communities, and with public education in particular" (Daniels, 2013, p. 40). This aligned thematically with the role of community in social justice that emerged in this study.

However, university faculty and staff face "multi-dimensional ethical responsibilities across a networked community and university context" (Danley & Christiansen, 2019, p. 8). Universities struggle to fulfill their ethical responsibilities to a variety of local stakeholders, including university students, parents, municipalities, nonprofits, and others. Ethical activity within community partnerships is not simply the outcome of actions mandated by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) , such as consent and minimizing risk, but requires attention to conflicting responsibilities on both the individual and university level. We agree with Danley and Christiansen's (2019) recommendation that universities incorporate community advisory boards to ensure attention to these complex ethical challenges that frequently happen outside the purview of IRB. Such boards require further study but have the potential to incorporate community voices in ways that

help ensure the community is treated ethically across the university. This is of critical importance in a networked system with multi-dimensional and conflicting ethical responsibilities.

Finally, when schools play a vital role in the community, they're able to provide "decentralized, democratic, community-based responses to ever-changing community problems" (Lester, Kronick & Benson, 2012, p. 45). Colleges and universities can assist local schools and communities by creating sustainable, mutually beneficial, and democratic partnerships.

References

Casapulla, S. & Hess, M. E. (2016). Engagement education: A model of community-youth engagement in rural Appalachia. *Journal of Community Engagement & Scholarship, 9*(2), 42–52.

Checkoway, B. (2015). Research as community-building: Perspectives on the scholarship of engagement. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement, 8*, 139–149.

Daniels, G. (2013). A five-step model for "unconventional engagement." *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship, 6*(1), 39–44.

Danley, S., & Christiansen, G. (2019). Conflicting responsibilities: The multi-dimensional ethics of university/community partnerships. *Journal of Community Engagement & Scholarship, 11*(2), 1–11.

Dewey, J. (1933). How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process. Heath and Co.

Evans-Andris, M., Kyle, D. W., Larson, A. E., Buecker, H., Haselton, W. B., Howell, P., Sheffield, C., Sherretz, C., & Weiland, I. (2014). Clinical preparation of teachers in the context of a university-wide community engagement emphasis. *Peabody Journal of Education, 89*(4), 466–481.

Fitzgerald, H. E., Bruns, K., Sonka, S. T., Furco, A., & Swanson, L. (2016). The centrality of engagement in higher education: Reflections and future directions. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 20*(1), 245–253.

Gay, G., & Kirkland, K. (2003). Developing cultural critical consciousness and self-reflection in preservice teacher education. *Theory into Practice, 42*(3), 181–187.

Guillen, L., & Zeichner, K. (2018). A university-community partnership in

teacher education from the perspectives of community-based teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education, 69*(2), 140–153.

Haddix, M. (2015). Preparing community-engaged teachers. *Theory into Practice, 54*(1), 63–70.

Howard T. C. (2003). Teacher reflection and race in cultural contexts. *Theory into Practice, 42*(3), 195–202.

Lester, J. N., Kronick, R., & Benson, M. (2012, March). A university joins the community. *Phi Delta Kappan, 93*(6), 42–45.

Merriam, S. B., & Grenier, R. S. (2002). Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Noel, J. (2010). A critical interrogation of privilege, race, class, and power in a university faculty-urban community relationship. *Urban Review: Issues and Ideas in Public Education, 42*(3), 210–220.

Noel, J. (2011). Striving for authentic community engagement: A process model from urban teacher education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 15*(1), 31–52.

Reischl, C. H., Khasnabis, D., & Karr, K. (2017, May). Cultivating a school-university partnership for teacher learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 98*(8) 48–53. https://www.kappanonline.org/reischl-khasnabis-karr-cultivating-school-university-partnership-teacher-learning/

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connection between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education, *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1-2), 89–99.

Zeichner, K., Payne, K. A,. & Brayko, K. (2015). Democratizing teacher education, *Journal of Teacher Education, 66*(2), 122–135.

Appendix A

[NOTE: Response lines truncated for ease of reproduction.]

In Museum

YOUR NAME_____

1. Find an exhibit in the museum that you think is important. Take a picture of it. Describe the artifact. What is it? Why did you select this? Write 2-3 paragraphs on why you think that artifact is important.

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Find someone on our trip that you do not know and explain why you selected this artifact. Have that person write their name. Ask that person to comment and reflect on the exhibit you selected.

NAME of TRIP MATE_____

Trip mate's comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix B

[NOTE: Response lines truncated for ease of reproduction.]

Pre-Questionnaire

YOUR NAME_____

1. How do you define community? Please include who is in your community.

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. What do you expect to learn about community on this field experience?

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Do you think you will meet someone different from you? How do you define different?

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Do you expect to experience/learn anything different today?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix C

[NOTE: Response lines truncated for ease of reproduction.]

Post-Questionnaire

YOUR NAME_____

1. How do you define community? Please include who is in your community. After this experience, do you see your community differently? Is your community more than what you thought it was?

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. What did you learn about community on this field trip?

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Write about someone new you met on this trip who is part of your community.

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. What did you learn/experience that defined your day?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Engaging Millennial Students through Community-Engaged Experiential Learning

MAUREEN SNOW ANDRADE AND JONATHAN H. WESTOVER
Utah Valley University *Utah Valley University*

Abstract: Millennial students and workers are high-achieving, have a strong desire for ongoing personal and professional development, and tend to be invested in making a sustainable impact on society and in the communities in which they live and work. One avenue to engage these students is community-engaged experiential learning (or service learning). While service learning is not new, this "civically-engaged" pedagogy has increased in popularity and usage. It provides meaningful community-service opportunities that simultaneously teach civic responsibility and encourage life-long civic engagement, while also providing significant real-life, hands-on learning of important skills and vital social understanding. This quantitative study examines the connections between students' motivations for enrolling in service-learning courses and their perceived likelihood for course and program completion. It also connects student motivations for enrolling in service-learning courses to the literature on millennial students and preparing students for the future workforce. Findings not only identify gains in service-learning motivations overall, but also specific volunteerism motivations that contribute to students' expressions of intent for course and program completion. The findings also demonstrate that study participants exhibited typical characteristics associated with the millennial generation and that these are strengthened through service-learning participation

Keywords: Service learning, high-impact practices, learning outcomes, completion, millennial students

Service learning is a type of experiential-education pedagogy that consists of specifically designed learning activities that address community needs, and benefit both the student providing the service and the community recipient (Jacoby, 1996). Institutions of higher education are increasingly embracing service learning and similar pedagogical strategies to help students develop the essential learning outcomes valued by employers. These skills include problem solving, critical thinking, communication, teamwork, valuing diversity and the application of knowledge in real-life

contexts (Hart Research Associates, 2015). Service learning and engaged learning also positively impact retention and graduation (Bringle, Hatcher & Muthiah, 2010; Gallini & Moely, 2003; Lockeman & Pelco, 2013; Reed, Rosenberg, Statham, & Rosing, 2015), which is of primary importance for institutions of higher education

This pedagogical approach is particularly appropriate for millennial students, who are high-achieving, have a strong desire for ongoing personal and professional development, and tend to be seriously invested in making a marked sustainable impact on society and in the communities in which they live and work. Service learning provides meaningful opportunities that teach civic responsibility and encourage life-long civic engagement, while also providing opportunities for significant real-life, hands-on learning of important skills and vital social understanding.

Institutions officially recognized with Carnegie's elective Community Engagement Classification have established a commitment to and success in partnering with their communities to create mutually beneficial learning experiences (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2015). This success has been widely documented in terms of student learning, particularly in the areas of personal development, social outcomes, leadership skills , academic knowledge, and academic skills (Fairfield, 2010; Litzky, Godshalk, & Walton-Bongers, 2010; Madsen, 2004; McCrea, 2010; McGoldrick, Battle, & Gallagher, 2000; Munter, 2002) (see Table 1). As institutions strive to improve and provide evidence of student learning and increase completion rates, they must consider and adopt curricular and co-curricular practices with the greatest impact. This helps address concerns regarding return on investment and decreasing funding for higher education. Educational paradigms and programming with the most impact on student learning, and on persistence to graduation, must be identified and prioritized. The primary purpose of this study is to connect student attitudes about volunteerism and civic engagement to service learning-enrolled students' perceived likelihood for course and program completion. Additionally, this study connects student motivation for enrolling in service-learning courses to the literature on millennial students and preparing students for the future workforce.

Literature Review

Service learning is situated within the framework of high impact practices (HIPs). HIPs are characterized by eight underlying components: expectations for high performance, investment of time and effort, interactions with faculty and peers about learning, diversity experiences, timely and

frequent feedback, reflection, real-world application, and public demonstration of competence (Kuh & O'Donnell, 2013). HIPs include first-year seminars and experiences, common intellectual experiences, learning communities, writing- and inquiry-intensive courses, collaborative assignments and projects, undergraduate research, diversity/global learning, service learning and community-based learning, internships and field experiences, capstone courses and projects, and ePortfolio, which was added as the 11th HIP in 2017 (Kuh, 2008; Kuh, O'Donnell, & Schneider, 2017). The literature on service learning and engaged learning has identified extensive positive outcomes for students, faculty, institutions and communities. We review each of these, followed by a brief discussion of millennial students.

Impact on Students

Service learning and engaged learning undeniably impact student learning. This holds true across a variety of studies and measures (Novak, Markey, & Allen, 2007; Warren, 2012). Due to the extensive research in this area, we summarize the key findings in Table 1.

Table 1

Impact of service learning and engaged learning on students

Personal development
• Personal satisfaction and fulfillment (Fairfield, 2010; Rehling, 2000)
• Increased personal and social development (Fairfield, 2010; Simons & Cleary, 2006)
• Exploration of personal attitudes and values (Fairfield, 2010; Madsen, 2004; Madsen & Turnbull, 2006; McGoldrick, Battle, & Gallagher, 2000; Rhee & Sigler, 2010)
• Self-efficacy (Fairfield, 2010; Weber, Weber, & Young, 2010; Tucker & McCarthy, 2001; Madsen & Turnbull, 2006)
• Confidence (Fairfield, 2010; Konwerski & Nashman, 2002; Rhee & Sigler, 2010)
• Consequences of decisions (Larson & Drexler, 2010; McCrea, 2010; Waddock & Post, 2000)

Table 1 (cont.)
Impact of service learning and engaged learning on students

Social outcomes & leadership skills

- Increased social capital (D'Agostino, 2010; Fairfield, 2010)
- Social responsibility (Bowman, Brandenberger, Mick, & Smedley, 2010; Kolenko, Porter, Wheatley, & Marvelle, 1996; Westover, 2012)
- Cultural awareness and diversity (Keen & Hall, 2009; Robinson, 1999; Simons & Foster, 2002)
- Organizational strategy (Larson & Drexler, 2010; McCrea, 2010; Madsen & Turnbull, 2006; Rehling, 2000; Robinson, Sherwood, & DePaolo, 2010)
- Conflict resolution and leadership skills (Kenworthy-U'Ren, 2010; Madsen & Turnbull, 2006; Thomas & Landau, 2002)
- Desire to continue volunteerism (Butin, 2010; Bush-Bacelis, 1998; Weber et al., 2010); Civic engagement (Butin, 2010; Godfrey ,1999; Rama, Ravenscroft, Walcott, & Zlotkowski, 2000; Weber et al., 2010)

Academic and essential learning outcomes

- Course content and technical concepts (Larson &Drexler, 2010; McCrea, 2010; Robinson et al, 2010; Tucker &McCarthy, 2001)
- Teamwork; interaction, interpersonal, and communication skills (Madsen & Turnbull, 2006; Michaelsen, Kenderdine, Hobbs, & Frueh, 2000; Rehling, 2000; Tucker, McCarthy, Hoxmeier, & Lenk, 1998)
- Analysis, synthesis, and evaluation (Litzky et al., 2010; McCrea 2010; McGoldrick, Battle, & Gallagher, 2000)
- Professional and real-world work experiences (Gujarathi and McQuade, 2002; Larson & Drexler, 2010; Madsen, 2004; McCrea, 2010; Rhee & Sigler, 2010; Robinson et al, 2010)
- Effective communication skills (Kenworthy-U'Ren, 2000; McCrea, 2010)
- Problem-solving (Madsen & Turnbull, 2006; Robinson, Sherwood, & DePaolo, 2010; Zlotkowski, 1996)

Academic strategies & skills

- Motivation to learn (Fairfield, 2010; Madsen, 2004; Munter, 2002)
- Learning how to learn (Westover, 2012; Munter, 2002)
- Time management and networking skills (Litzky et al., 2010; Tucker et al., 1998)
- Career exploration (Fairfield, 2010; Robinson, 1999; Vroman, Simmons, & Knight, 2010)

Impact on Faculty

According to research summarized by the Center for Community Engagement at Sonoma State University ("Impact," n.d.):

Research shows that faculty find that service-learning provides:

- Increased satisfaction with quality of student learning
- Increased commitment to research

- Motivation to increasingly integrate service-learning more deeply into more courses
- More lively class discussions and increased student participation
- Increased student retention of course material
- Increased student awareness of community and "real world" issues
- Increase in innovative approaches to classroom instruction
- Increased opportunities for research and publication
- Increase in faculty awareness of community issues (para. 5)

Although faculty may be intrinsically motivated to improve student learning and also extrinsically motivated by rewards such as tenure and promotion, institutions may not value teaching activities such as service learning, or weight it as heavily as scholarship, thus creating a gap between policy and practice (Hou & Wilder, 2015). Other issues such as the need to re-design courses, lack of resources, increased workload, and limited institutional support may also impact the successful adoption of service learning (Tucker et al., 2013).

Impact on Institutions and Communities

Enrollment in service-learning courses, full-time enrollment, and GPA are better predictors of continuation at an institution than age, gender, or race (Reed et al., 2015). Students in service-learning courses feel more encouraged to continue their education (Bringle et. al, 2010; Gallini & Moely, 2003), demonstrate higher re-enrollment behaviors, and graduate at higher rates than those in non-service-learning courses (Bringle et al., 2010; Lockeman & Pelco, 2013). These findings support Tinto's (1993) model of student retention in that participation in service learning facilitates social and academic integration. Students develop meaningful connections as they interact with peers, faculty, and community partners, which furthers commitment to the institution and the goal of graduation (Braxton, Sullivan, & Johnson, 1997; Eyler, Giles, Stenson, & Gray, 2001). As such, both students and universities benefit from service learning. Institutions wanting to improve retention and graduation would do well to extend opportunities for service learning and engaged learning.

Although research unequivocally supports the benefits of service learning for students, fewer studies have measured reciprocity outcomes for community partners and educational institutions (Harrington, 2014). Community members sometimes do not understand the academic definition of service learning, but do identify positive benefits such as economic, transfer of knowledge, productivity, and intercultural exchange (Harrington, 2014). They may also find that service learning creates additional work and is challenged by issues such as sustainability of a project beyond the time

that students are available, the lack of continuity of short-term projects that frequently change, communication problems between the university and the community, and failure to see resulting research (Harrington, 2014).

Millennial Students and Workers

The term "millennials" refers to the 71 million individuals born from 1981-1996 (Fry, 2018). Millennials are civic-minded with a strong sense of local and global communities (Strauss & Howe, 1997). Seven basic traits describe them: special, sheltered, confident, team-oriented, conventional, pressured, and achieving (Strauss & Howe, 1997). The millennial generation is characterized by a cautiously optimistic outlook on life, and what some have termed a poor work ethic due to millennials' likelihood to change jobs every 2-4 years, and a preference for flexible work schedules to maintain work/life balance (e.g., dislike of traditional work hours, preference to work remotely, and a desire for an extended break every 8-10 years) (Brack & Kelly, 2012; Myers, 2010; Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2000).

Millennials have been using computers since before kindergarten and, as such, are likely to be e-learners in a constant state of partial attention and used to instant communication (Myers, 2010). They communicate through social media, do well on time-sensitive projects, and are good at outside the box tasks and gathering information from multiple sources (Myers, 2010). They expect and give direct and constant feedback (consider product reviews, online ratings, "likes," and digital badging) (Myers, 2010). They are also accustomed to diversity and have an inclusive approach to relationships (Zemke et al., 2000). They are oriented towards collective action, teamwork, and collaborative projects (Brack & Kelly, 2012; Myers, 2010). They do not respect authority based on position; rather, respect must be earned (Myers, 2010).

In 2014, the workforce consisted of approximately 34% millennials. By 2020, this percentage will be 46% (Brack & Kelly, 2012). Consistent with the characteristics identified earlier related to millennials' work philosophies, a hopscotch-like career approach is replacing linear career paths (Myers, 2010). As of 2017:

- 21% switched jobs in the past year (more than 3x higher than non-millennials)
- 60% are open to different job opportunities
- 50% would consider taking a job with a different company for a raise of 20% or less
- Millennial turnover costs the U.S. economy $30.5 billion annually (Gallup, 2017)

Given these attributes and preferences, millennials are well-situated to benefit from community-engaged learning where they can collaborate, use technology, work in diverse environments, and identify creative solutions to challenging problems. In such environments, millennials also benefit from interaction with those from other generations who have different perspectives, habits, and skills. These experiences and encounters together will prepare them well for future careers.

Methodology

Institutional Context and Sample

The context for this study is a large, regional, public university in the Intermountain West. The institution received elective Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in 2008. This was renewed in 2015. Service learning is viewed as an engaged teaching and learning strategy in which students participate in structured academic service-learning activities that meet community needs, enhance discipline-based knowledge and skills, and strengthen their sense of civic responsibility and community engagement in keeping with both the goals of service learning and HIPs.

The sample for this project included 12 faculty members from six departments and three colleges/schools teaching 16 total service-learning designated sections (565 total enrolled students). Each faculty member first participated in a 6-week Service-Learning Faculty Fellowship training (a combination of 6 one-hour workshops, complemented by a series of online modules and assignments, culminating in course redesign and service-learning designation) and was partnered with an experienced service-learning faculty mentor. Nearly half of the enrolled students were freshman or sophomores and just over half were juniors or seniors. Courses included student leadership and success, introduction to business, business presentations, statistics, organizational behavior, marketing, writing, and psychology.

Operationalization of Study Variables

At the beginning of each service-learning course, students voluntarily participated in a 35-item community volunteerism and civic attitude pre-test survey (adapted from Clary et al., 1998; Mabry, 1998) to record baseline student attitudes at the beginning of the semester. Upon completion of each 16-week service-learning course, students again participated in the same survey, this time as a post-test, to capture potential changes in attitude after completion of the service-learning project and course. More specif-

ically, to measure the goal of promoting positive volunteerism attitudes, the pre/post-test assessment incorporated the Volunteer Functions Inventory developed by Clary et al. (1998). The Volunteer Functions Inventory consists of 30 Likert-scale items, each rated on a 7-point scale, which result in six motivators for volunteerism (e.g., protective, values, career, social, understanding, and enhancement [see Appendix A for pre/post-test survey instrument]). Additionally, to measure the goal of promoting positive civic attitudes, the pre/post-test assessment incorporated the Civic Attitudes Scale developed by Mabry (1998) that consists of five Likert-scale items (each are rated on a 5-point scale [see Appendix A for pre/post-test survey instrument]). Finally, four questions were asked regarding the students' perceived likelihood to complete their degree at the university, the projected length of time still needed to complete the degree, the perceived likelihood of course completion, and the perceived likelihood of program completion (see Appendix B and Cfor pre/post-test survey instrument).

Statistical Methodology

To begin, we performed a descriptive statistical analysis of the pre/post-test data on student motivations of volunteerism and civic attitudes. These bivariate and multivariate analyses include correlations, ANOVA and ANCOVA procedures, cross-tabulations, and confirmatory factor analysis for the Volunteer Functions Inventory scale (due to space limitations, these descriptive analyses are available upon request). Second, we utilized Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression to test two models examining the impact of changing motivations of volunteerism and civic attitudes: (1) on students' perceived likelihood of course completion and (2) on students' perceived likelihood of program completion.

Results

Descriptive Results

In both the pre- and post-tests, students were asked to rate 30 different reasons for volunteerism, which then resulted in six motivators of volunteerism scales: protective, values, career, social, understanding, enhancement (e.g., "Please indicate how important or accurate each of the following possible reasons for volunteering is for you"). As can be seen in Table 2 below, the scale averages and percentage change between pre- and post-tests are presented for the three different colleges/schools and for all three combined. While there is some variation in the extent of change between

pre- and post-tests, protective, social, and enhancement scales each had statistically significant positive changes in student attitudes between the administration of the pre-test and post-test, while values, career, and understanding scales were not significantly different.

Table 2

Pre-/Post-Test Motivators of Volunteerism Scales by College/School

Volunteerism Scales	All		UC		WSB		CHSS	
	Avg.	% Change	Avg.	% Change	Avg.	% Change	Avg.	% Change
Protective	18.9	7.6%	19.1	1.9%	18.8	8.0%	19.0	8.4%
Values	21.8	1.2%	22.8	0.0%	21.5	0.6%	22.6	1.5%
Career	20.7	2.2%	20.7	-0.3%	20.6	2.7%	20.9	-0.5%
Social	18.6	8.9%	18.9	8.8%	18.7	8.7%	18.3	12.1%
Understanding	21.3	1.1%	22.2	-0.5%	21.0	0.8%	21.9	0.7%
Enhancement	20.3	5.1%	21.6	5.9%	20.1	4.5%	20.2	6.8%

OLS Regression Results

While only three of the motivation of volunteerism scales showed significant attitudinal change between the pre-test and post-test, individual items within the three non-significant scales did show statistically significant change. For this reason, all volunteerism and civic attitude variables were initially included in the OLS regression models looking at the likelihood of course completion and program completion. After further testing the parameters of the independent variables included in the initial model, seven volunteerism and civic attitude variables remained significant in looking at the likelihood of course completion and eight volunteerism and civic attitude variables remained significant in looking at the likelihood of program completion. Additionally, we included a control variable for whether the course was an upper or lower division class and dummy variables for the colleges/schools when looking at the models with all colleges/schools combined.

As can be seen in Table 3 below, all seven study variables were statistically significant in the model including all three colleges/schools, while there was some variation when looking at statistical significance and coefficient strength of the variables across the colleges/schools. Generating employment opportunities, expressing genuine concern for those in the community, creating opportunities for career exploration, and increasing one's personal comfort with diversity were the strongest student motivators and had the biggest impact on the students' perceived likelihood to

complete the course. Additionally, the adjusted r-squared for each college/school model, as well as the combined model, demonstrate that the motivators of volunteerism and civic attitudes predict anywhere between 29% and nearly 43% of the variation in students' perceived likelihood to complete the course (depending on the college/school).

Table 3

OLS Regression Results of Study Variables on Likelihood of Course Completion by College/School

	UC		WSB		CHSS		All	
Variable	Beta Coef.	Stand. Error	Beta Coef.	Stand. Error	Beta Coef.	Stand. Error	Beta Coef.	Stand. Error
Employment Opportunities	**-0.195**	0.175	**0.252******	0.089	**-0.150**	0.134	**0.154*****	0.069
Genuine Concern	**0.384***	0.137	**0.186*****	0.076	**0.078**	0.226	**0.195******	0.065
Career Exploration	**0.438****	0.135	**0.069**	0.090	**0.593*****	0.205	**0.152****	0.074
Comfort with Diversity	**0.383****	0.180	**0.064**	0.106	**0.359****	0.228	**0.143****	0.085
Feel Needed	**-0.125**	0.123	**0.169****	0.078	**-0.106**	0.173	**0.101***	0.064
Build Resume	**-0.069**	0.142	**-0.094**	0.096	**-0.269***	0.177	**-0.105***	0.075
Make a Difference	**0.243***	0.145	**0.089**	0.086	**0.015**	0.158	**0.083***	0.068
College/School	—	—	—	—	—	—	**-0.084***	0.094
Lower/Upper Division Class	—	—	**-0.107****	0.150	—	—	**-0.113****	0.098
N	**37**		**238**		**51**		**326**	
Adjusted R-square	**0.428**		**0.290**		**0.334**		**0.295**	
F	**4.84******		**13.11******		**4.59******		**16.13******	

Level of significance: * = p < .1; ** = p < .05; *** = p < .01, **** = p < .001

As can be seen in Table 4 below, all eight study variables were statistically significant in the model including all three colleges/schools, while there was some variation when looking at statistical significance and coefficient strength of the variables across the colleges/schools. Similar to the likelihood of the course completion model, generating employment opportunities, expressing genuine concern for those in the community, and increasing one's personal comfort with diversity all remained highly significant predictors of one's perceived likelihood to complete their program of study. However, creating opportunities for career exploration, while still statistically significant, had a weaker predictive effect in this model. In contrast to the previous model, having the chance to feel needed, the opportunity to make a difference, and the opportunity to help others without pay all also proved to be strong student motivators and had a large impact on the students' perceived likelihood to complete their program of study. Additionally, the adjusted r-squared for each college/school model, as well as the combined model, demonstrate that the motivators of volunteerism and civic attitudes predict anywhere between 31% and nearly 41% of the variation in students' perceived likelihood to complete the course (depending on the college/school).

Table 4

OLS Regression Results of Study Variables on Likelihood of Program Completion by College/School

Variable	UC		WSB		CHSS		All	
	Beta Coef.	Stand. Error	Beta Coef.	Stand. Error	Beta Coef.	Stand. Error	Beta Coef.	Stand. Error
Employment Opportunities	**0.207**	0.195	**0.267******	0.094	**0.139**	0.154	**0.266******	0.072
Genuine Concern	**0.229**	0.167	**0.171*****	0.079	**0.089**	0.223	**0.166*****	0.067
Career Exploration	**0.226**	0.164	**0.034**	0.095	**0.591*****	0.246	**0.111***	0.078
Comfort with Diversity	**0.046**	0.150	**0.203*****	0.082	**0.092**	0.197	**0.150****	0.067
Feel Needed	**-0.312***	0.198	**-0.109**	0.099	**-0.394****	0.199	**-0.163****	0.079
Build Resume	**0.246**	0.224	**0.147***	0.115	**-0.016**	0.218	**0.150****	0.089
Make a Difference	**0.327****	0.174	**0.108***	0.095	**0.139**	0.177	**0.144*****	0.075
Help Others without Pay	**-0.063**	0.223	**-0.124***	0.113	**0.000**	0.347	**-0.112****	0.096
College/School	—	—	—	—	—	—	**-0.036**	0.098
Lower/Upper Division Class	—	—	**-0.039**	0.155	—	—	**-0.023**	0.103
N	**37**		**238**		**51**		**326**	
Adjusted R-square	**0.405**		**0.311**		**0.307**		**0.323**	
F	**4.06*****		**12.86*****		**3.77*****		**16.490**	

Level of significance: * = p < .1; ** = p < .05; *** = p < .01, **** = p < .001

Limitations

There are two main limitations to this current study. First (and most importantly), due to unforeseen difficulties in working with the University's institutional research office, we were unable to link student responses to student control variables, such as race/ethnicity, gender, age, socio-economic status, etc. Extensive research has demonstrated the importance of demographic variables on outcomes for course and program completion. As such, not being able to include these variables in the OLS models represents both a challenge and an opportunity for future research. Based on what has been previously noted in the service-learning literature, we suspect that the addition of these demographic control variables would only enhance and strengthen the impact and overall predictability of the models presented here. Second, the pre- and post-test assessments were administered only 3.5 months apart, after only one service-learning experience. Ideally, the instrument would be administered at greater intervals, such as at the beginning and end of an academic year or, better yet, at the beginning and end of the students' university experience, when they have had the opportunity to engage in multiple community-engagement and service-learning experiences.

Discussion

This study examined the connection between students' attitudes toward volunteerism and civic engagement and their intentions for course and program completion as well as how their motivations reflect the characteristics of millennial students. The pre- and post-survey findings demonstrated that

students' experiences in service-learning courses—across six departments and three colleges/schools—resulted in significant increases on three specific scales (e.g., protective, social, and enhancement). Increases were also realized on the other three scales (e.g., values, careers, and understanding), but were not statistically significant.

Individual items on these latter three scales, however, had a significant impact on students' course completion intentions. Specifically, generating employment opportunities, expressing genuine concern for those in the community, creating opportunities for career exploration, increasing one's personal comfort with diversity, feeling needed, building a resume, and making a difference were the strongest motivators and had the biggest impact on students' perceived intent for course completion. Further, eight volunteerism and civic attitude variables were significantly related to the likelihood of program completion. These included the same variables for course completion but with the addition of the opportunity to help others without pay.

All the variables associated with the instrument scales have been previously identified as outcomes of service learning outlined below. As such, the findings provide further support for these personal, social, and academic learning gains.

- *Protective*: Motivations related to feeling better about oneself, less lonely, and having the increased ability to resolve personal problems.

  Personal development outcomes such as personal satisfaction (Fairfield, 2010; Rehling, 2000), exploration of personal attitudes and values (Fairfield, 2010; Madsen, 2004; Madsen & Turnbull, 2006; McGoldrick, Battle, & Gallagher, 2000; Rhee & Sigler, 2010), and problem-solving (Madsen & Turnbull, 2006; Robinson et al, 2010; Zlotkowski, 1996) are outcomes of service learning.

- *Social*: Motivations for social adjustment and adaptation.
  The social benefits of service learning include teamwork, interaction, interpersonal skills, and communication skills (Kenworthy-U'Ren, 2000; Madsen & Turnbull, 2006; McCrea, 2010; Michaelsen et al., 2000; Rehling, 2000; Tucker et al., 1998).

- *Enhancement*: Motivations centered on self-knowledge, self-development, and positive feelings about oneself.

Service learning increases confidence (Fairfield, 2010; Konwerski & Nashman, 2002; Rhee & Sigler, 2010), personal satisfaction, and fulfillment (Fairfield, 2010; Rehling, 2000).

- *Values*: Motivation related to the expression of values reflecting altruistic or humanitarian issues.

  Research has demonstrated outcomes such as the desire to continue volunteerism (Butin, 2010; Bush-Bacelis, 1998; Weber et al., 2010); civic engagement (Butin, 2010; Godfrey, 1999; Rama et al., 2000; Weber et al., 2010); social responsibility (Bowman et al., 2010; Kolenko et al., 1996; Westover, 2012); and exploration of personal attitudes and values (Fairfield, 2010; Madsen, 2004; Madsen and Turnbull, 2006; McGoldrick, Battle, & Gallagher, 2000; Rhee & Sigler, 2010).

- *Understanding*: Motivations focused on the acquisition of knowledge and skills.

  Gains in course content, technical concepts (Larson & Drexler, 2010; McCrea, 2010; Robinson et al, 2010; Tucker & McCarthy, 2001), and problem-solving (Madsen & Turnbull, 2006; Robinson et al, 2010; Zlotkowski, 1996) have been previously identified.

- *Career*: Motivation to enhance knowledge in a specific area related to professional and academic development.

  Academic strategies and skills such as motivation to learn (Fairfield, 2010; Madsen, 2004; Munter, 2002) and career exploration (Fairfield, 2010; Robinson, 1999; Vroman et al., 2010) are outcomes of service learning.

Course and Program Completion

In addition to demonstrating the enhancement of specific skills and attributes, the study contributes new understanding to the benefits of service learning in terms of outcomes that impact student intentions for course and program completion. Once again, although service-learning courses have been shown to predict continuation and graduation (Bringle et al., 2010; Gallini & Moely, 2003; Lockeman & Pelco, 2013; Reed et al., 2015),

this study identifies specific variables that lead to completion intentions.

On the practical side, generating employment opportunities, building a resume, and creating opportunities for career exploration might be fairly straightforward ways for students to recognize what lies ahead for them and motivate them to continue their education. The other items related to completion intentions were more altruistic: genuine concern for those in the community, increasing one's personal comfort with diversity, feeling needed, making a difference, and helping others without pay (the latter was connected to program completion rather than course completion). These findings represent an encouraging mix of both practical and socially responsible motivations for service-learning involvement on the part of students and provide strong support for the benefits of service learning for institutions. The increased commitment to graduation (e.g., see Tinto, 1993) on the part of students as a result of participating in service learning provides strong rationale to continue and strengthen these opportunities.

The Millennial Generation

An additional contribution of this study is looking at the findings in light of the characteristics of millennial students. In doing so, we see that several millennial generation characteristics are evident and were strengthened from student participation in service-learning. We examine a few key attributes:

1. Millennials are civic-minded with a strong sense of local and global communities (Strauss & Howe, 1997). These characteristics were evident among the population studied and increased due to participation in service learning. Consider, in particular, increases in the values scale related to altruistic or humanitarian concerns. The scale includes items such as concern for others, compassion, wanting to help others, and contributing to a cause.

2. Millennials are accustomed to diversity and have an inclusive approach to relationships (Zemke et al., 2000). This item related to the instrument's understanding scale, on which study participants showed an increase, although not statistically significant. Understanding involves learning about a cause, gaining new perspectives, learning through hands-on experience, learning how to deal with a variety of people, and making new friends. All of these are relevant to millennial students.

3. Millennials are oriented toward collective action, teamwork, and collaborative projects (Brack & Kelly, 2012; Myers, 2010). The findings of this study indicated increases on the social scale, which includes items such as associating with other volunteers who are interested in community ser-

vice and value community service, and being encouraged by close associates to volunteer. Thus, once again, the findings show evidence of millennial generation characteristics.

4. Millennial students and workers are high-achieving, have a strong desire for ongoing personal and professional development, and tend to be invested in making a sustainable impact on society and in the communities in which they live and work (Strauss & Howe, 1997). Findings indicate that study participants had motivations related to career development (e.g., generating employment opportunities, building a resume, and creating opportunities for career exploration) as well as making an impact (e.g., genuine concern for those in the community and desire to help others).

This analysis indicates a close connection between the characteristics of millennial students and the outcomes of service learning. In particular, the study demonstrates that service learning is not only particularly relevant for millennials, but strengthens generational characteristics, which are connected to service-learning outcomes. This is a significant and new contribution to the service-learning literature.

Conclusion

This quantitative study examined the motivations of students in service-learning courses across six departments in three colleges/schools, to determine if service-learning participation increased specific attitudes, areas of learning, and behaviors, as well as if the experience increased students' intentions for course and program completion. Additionally, the study considered the possible impact of millennial generation characteristics on motivations for participating in service learning. Findings indicate a statistically significant increase in motivations for service learning from the beginning to the end of the semester in three specific outcome categories (e.g., protective, social, and enhancement) as well as increases in three additional categories (e.g., values, careers, and understanding). Individual items in the latter three categories did not increase by statistically significant amounts.

Generating employment opportunities, expressing genuine concern for those in the community, creating opportunities for career exploration, increasing one's personal comfort with diversity, feeling needed, building a resume, and making a difference were the strongest motivators and had the most impact on students' perceptions that they would persist to graduation. Program completion was also connected to an additional variable (e.g., the opportunity to help others without pay). The findings were also viewed through the lens of millennial generation characteristics. The result of this analysis was that motivations for service learning reflect the characteristics

of millennial students and that these characteristics are strengthened by participating in service learning.

This study contributes to existing research by demonstrating new connections between specific motivation variables for service-learning participation and course and program completion, as well as the relationship of millennial generation characteristics and service-learning outcomes. Future research might involve examining the impact of demographic variables as well as the impact of multiple service-learning experiences on the outcomes identified. Additionally, study participants might be tracked to determine if, indeed, their intentions to complete come to fruition.

References

Batchelder, T. H., & Root, S. (1994). Effects of an undergraduate program to integrate academic learning and service: Cognitive prosocial and identity outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence, 17*, 341–356.

Boss, J. A. (1994). The effect of community service and work on the moral development of college ethnic students. *Journal of Moral Education, 23*(2), 183–198.

Bowman, N. A., Brandenberger, J. W., Mick, C. S., & Smedley, C. T. (2010). Sustained immersion courses and student orientations to equality, justice, and social responsibility: The role of short-term service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 17*(1), 20–31.

Brack, J., & Kelly, K. (2012). Maximizing millennials in the workplace. UNC Kenan-Flagler. http://execdev.kenan-flagler.unc.edu/hubfs/White%20Papers/Maximizing%20Millennials%20in%20the%20Workplace%20-%20Final.pdf

Braxton, J. M., Shaw Sullivan, A. V., & Johnson, R. M. (1997). Appraising Tinto's theory of college student departure. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 107–159). Springer.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., & Muthiah, R. N. (2010). The role of service-learning on the retention of first-year students to second year. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 16*, 38–49.

Bush-Bacelis, J. L. (1998). Innovative pedagogy: Academic service-learning for business communication. *Business Communication Quarterly, 61*(3), 20–34.

Butin, D. W. (2010). *Service-learning in theory and practice: The future of community*

engagement in higher education. Palgrave Macmillan.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2015). Carnegie selects colleges and universities for 2015 Community Engagement Classification. https://www.carnegiefoundation.org/newsroom/news-releases/carnegie-selects-colleges-universities-2015-community-engagement-classification/

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1516–1530.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1991). School-based community service: What we know from research and theory. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*, 743–749.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among the five traditions*. Sage Publications.

D'Agostino, M. J. (2010). Measuring social capital as an outcome of service learning. *Innovative Higher Education, 35*(5), 313–328.

Eyler, J. S., Giles, D. W., Stenson, C. M., & Gray, C. J. (2001). *At a glance: What we know about the effects of service-learning on college students, faculty, institutions, and communities, 1993-2000* (3rd ed.). Corporation for National and Community Service. http://www.compact.org/wp-content/uploads/resources/downloads/aag.pdf

Fairfield, K. D. (2010). Growing up and growing out: Emerging adults learn management through service-learning. *Journal of Management Education, 34*(1), 113–141.

Fry, R. (2018). *Millennials projected to overtake baby boomers as America's largest generation*. Pew Research Center. http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/03/01/millennials-overtake-baby-boomers/

Gallini, S. M., & Moely, B. E. (2003). Service-learning and engagement, academic challenge, and retention. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 10*(1), 5–14.

Gallup. (2017). *State of the American workplace*. https://cloc.umd.edu/library/research/State%20of%20the%20American%20Workplace%202017.pdf

Godfrey, P. C. (1999). Service-learning and management education: A call to action. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 8*, 363–379.

Gujarathi, M. R., & McQuade, R. J. (2002). Service-learning in business schools: A case study in an intermediate accounting course. *Journal of Education for Business, 77*(3), 144–151.

Harrington, K. (2014). *Addressing the impacts of service-learning on communities: A recommendation report*. https://servicelearning.uga.edu/sites/default/files/harrington_costa_rica_recommendation_report_2014.pdf

Hart Research Associates. (2015). *Falling short? College learning and career success*. https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/2015employerstudentsurvey.pdf

Hou, S. I., & Wilder, S. (2015). Changing pedagogy: Faculty adoption of service-learning: Motivations, barriers, and strategies among service-learning faculty at a public research institution. *Sage Open, 5*(1), 1–7.

Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (1997). *The fourth turning: What the cycles of history tell us about America's next rendezvous with destiny*. Broadway Books.

Impact of service-learning. (n.d.). Center for Community Engagement at Sonoma State University. https://cce.sonoma.edu/faculty/impact-service-learning

Jacoby, B. (1996). *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices*. Jossey-Bass.

Keen, C., & Hall, K. (2009). Engaging with difference matters: Longitudinal student outcomes of co-curricular service-learning programs. *Journal of Higher Education, 80*(1), 59–79.

Kenworthy-U'Ren, A. (2000). Management students as consultants: A strategy for service-learning in management education. In P.C. Godfrey & E.T. Grasso (Eds.), *Working for the common good: Concepts and models for service-learning in management* (pp. 55-67). Stylus Publishing.

Kenworthy-U'Ren, A. (2010). Service-learning and negotiation: An educational "win-win." *Journal of Management Education, 34*(1), 62–87.

Kolenko, T. A., Porter, G., Wheatley, W., & Marvelle, C. (1996). A critique of service-learning projects in management education: Pedagogical foundations, barriers, and guidelines. *Journal of Business Ethics, 15*(1), 133–142.

Konwerski, P., & Nashman, H. (2002). Who teaches whom: The varied voices and instructional roles of community service-learning partners.

Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing, 10(2),165–186.

Kuh, G. D. (2008). High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter. Association of American Colleges and Universities. https://www.aacu.org/leap/hips

Kuh, G. D., & O'Donnell, K. (2013). Ensuring quality and taking high-impact practices to scale. Association of American Colleges and Universities. https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/publications/ensuring-quality-taking-high-impact-practices-scale

Kuh, G. D., O'Donnell, K., & Schneider, C. G. (2017). HIPs at ten. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 49*(5), 8–16.

Larson, E. L., & Drexler, J. A. (2010). Project management in real time: A service-learning project. *Journal of Management Education, 34*(4), 551–573.

Litzky, B. E., Godshalk, V. M., & Walton-Bongers, C. (2010). Social entrepreneurship and community leadership: A service-learning model for management education. *Journal of Management Education, 34*(1), 142–162.

Lockeman, K. S., & Pelco, L. E. (2013). The relationship between service-learning and degree completion. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 20*(1),18–30.

Mabry, J. B. (1998). Pedagogical variations in service-learning and student outcomes: How time, contact, and reflection matter. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 5*, 32–47.

Madsen, S. R. (2004). Academic service-learning in human resource management education. *Journal of Education for Business, 79*(6), 328–332.

Madsen, S. R., & Turnbull, O. (2006). Academic service-learning experiences of compensation and benefits course students. *Journal of Management Education, 30*(4), 724–742.

McCrea, E. A. (2010). Integrating service-learning into an introduction to entrepreneurship course. *Journal of Management Education, 34*(1), 39–61.

McGoldrick, K., Battle, A., & Gallagher, S. (2000). Service-learning and the economics course: Theory and practice. *American Economist, 44*(1), 43–53.

Michaelsen, L. K., Kenderdine, J. M., Hobbs, J., & Frueh, F. L. (2000). The Oklahoma integrated business core: Using a service-learning experience as a foundation for undergraduate business education. In P.C. Godfrey

& E.T. Grasso (Eds.), *Working for the common good: Concepts and models for service-learning in management* (pp. 149–166). Stylus Publishing.

Munter, J. (2002). Linking community and classroom in higher education: Service-learning and student empowerment. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing, 10*(2), 151–164.

Myers, K. K., & Sadaghiani, K. (2010). Millennials in the workplace: A communication perspective on millennials' organizational relationships and performance. *Journal of Business Psychology, 25*, 225–238.

Novak, J. M., Markey, M., & Allen, M. (2007). Evaluating cognitive outcomes of service-learning in higher education: A meta-analysis. *Communication Research Reports, 24*(2), 149–157.

Rama, D. V., Ravenscroft, S. P., Walcott, S. K., & Zlotkowski, E. (2000). Service-learning outcomes: Guidelines for educators and researchers. *Issues in Accounting Education, 15*, 657–693.

Rasmussen, G., & Skinner, E. (1997). *Learning communities: Getting started. Gateway Community Colleges*. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED433048.pdf

Reed, S. C., Rosenberg, H., Statham, A., & Rosing, H. (2015). The effect of community service-learning on undergraduate persistence in three institutional contexts. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 21*(2), 22–36.

Rehling, L. (2000). Doing good while doing well: Service-learning internships. *Business Communication Quarterly, 63*(1), 77–89.

Rhee, K. S., & Sigler, T. H. (2010). Developing enlightened leaders for industry and community: Executive education and service-learning. *Journal of Management Education, 34*(1), 163–181.

Robinson, D. F., Sherwood, A. L., & DePaolo, C. A. (2010). Service-learning by doing: How a student-run consulting company finds relevance and purpose in a business strategy capstone course. *Journal of Management Education, 34*(1), 88–112.

Robinson, G. (1999). Stepping into our destiny: Service-learning in community colleges. *Community College Journal, 70*(5), 8–12.

Simons, A., & Foster, L. (2002). Nonprofit agency perspectives of higher education service-learning and volunteerism. *Journal of Nonprofit & Pub-*

lic Sector Marketing, 10, 207–230.

Simons, L., & Cleary, B. (2006). The influence of service-learning on students' personal and social development. *College Teaching, 54*(4), 307–319.

Thomas, K., & Landau, H. (2002). Organizational development students as engaged learners and reflective practitioners: The role of service learning in teaching OD. *Organization Development Journal 20*(3): 88–99.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Tucker, B. G., Kasmer, D. O., Pierrakos, O., Swan, C., Bielefeldt, A. R., Paterson, K., & Soisson, A. (2013). Faculty perspectives on service-learning in engineering education: Challenges and opportunities. 2013 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition, Atlanta, GA. https://peer.asee.org/faculty-perspectives-on-service-learning-in-engineering-education-challenges-and-opportunities

Tucker, M. L., & McCarthy, A. M. (2001). Presentation self-efficacy: Increasing communication skills through service-learning. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 13*, 227–245.

Tucker, M. L., McCarthy, A. M., Hoxmeier, J. A., & Lenk, M. M. (1998). Community service-learning increases communication skills across the business curriculum. *Business Communication Quarterly, 61*(2), 88–99.

Vroman, K., Simmons, C. D., & Knight, J. (2010). Service learning can make occupation-based practice a reality: A single case study. *Occupational Therapy in Health Care, 24*(3), 249–265.

Waddock, S., & Post, J. (2000). Transforming management education: The role of service-learning. In P.C. Godfrey & E.T. Grasso (Eds.), *Working for the common good: Concepts and models for service-learning in management* (pp. 43–54). Stylus Publishing.

Warren, J. L. (2012). Does service-learning increase student learning? A meta-analysis. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 18*(2), 56–61.

Weber, J. E., Weber, P. S., & Young, M. A. (2010). Measuring service-learning outcomes: Test-retest reliability of four scales. *Psychological Reports, 107*(2), 611–616.

Westover, J. H. (2012). *Academic service-learning across disciplines: Models, outcomes, and assessment*. Common Ground Publishing.

Workman, L., & Berry, G. R. (2010). Building the five R/five stakeholder research framework: Understanding engaged learning in the business school. *The Journal of Business Inquiry, 9*(1), 127–147.

Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (2000). *Generations at work: Managing the clash of veterans, Boomers, Xers, and Nexters in your workplace*. AMACOM

Zlotkowski, E. (1996). Opportunity for all: Linking service-learning and business education. *Journal of Business Ethics, 15*(1), 5–20.

Appendix A

Volunteerism and Civic Attitudes Student Pre/Post-Test

Volunteerism Attitudes

Student Directions: You are about to participate in a service-learning class and will invest time in "volunteering" your skills toward helping a community organization or business. Using the 7-point scale below, please indicate how important or accurate each of the following possible reasons for volunteering is for you. Please place the number corresponding to how important/accurate each statement is on the line preceding the statement.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1 = Not at all important/accurate for you and
7 = Extremely important/accurate for you.

1. _____Volunteering can help me get my foot in the door at a place where I would like to work.
2. _____My friends volunteer.
3. _____I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself.
4. _____People I'm close to want me to volunteer.
5. _____Volunteering makes me feel important.
6. _____People I know share an interest in community service.
7. _____No matter how bad I've been feeling, volunteering helps me to forget about it.
8. _____I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.
9. _____By volunteering, I feel less lonely.
10. _____I can make new contacts that might help my business or career.
11. _____Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.
12. _____I can learn more about the cause for which I am working.
13. _____Volunteering increases my self-esteem.
14. _____Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.
15. _____Volunteering allows me to explore different career options.
16. _____I feel compassion toward people in need.
17. _____Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.
18. _____Volunteering lets me learn through direct "hands-on" experience.
19. _____I feel it is important to help others.
20. _____Volunteering helps me work through my own problems.
21. _____Volunteering will help me succeed in my chosen profession.
22. _____I can do something for a cause that is important to me.
23. _____Volunteering is an important activity to help the people I know the best.
24. _____Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.
25. _____I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.
26. _____Volunteering makes me feel needed.
27. _____Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.
28. _____Volunteering experience will look good on my resume.
29. _____Volunteering is a way to make new friends.
30. _____I can explore my own strengths.

Civic Attitudes

Please use the following 5-point scale to answer the following statements, placing the number corresponding to your level of agreement/disagreement on the line preceding the statement.

1 Strongly Disagree
2 Disagree somewhat
3 Neither agree nor disagree
4 Agree somewhat
5 Strongly agree

To what extent to you agree or disagree with the following statements?

1. _____Adults should give some time for the good of their community or country.
2. _____People, regardless of whether they have been successful or not, ought to help others.
3. _____Individuals have a responsibility to help solve our social problems.
4. _____I feel that I can make a difference in the world.
5. _____It is important to help others even if you don't get paid for it.

Course and Program Completion

1. How likely are you to complete your degree at UVU? (1-5 Likert-scale)
2. How many total years do you expect to take to finish your degree at UVU? (open-ended text entry)
3. How did your experience in this service and engaged learning class impact your likelihood to successfully complete the class? (1-4 Likert-scale)
4. How did your experience in this service and engaged learning class impact your overall likelihood to successfully complete your degree at UVU? (1-4 Likert-scale)