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Problem

Over the last 15 years, service-learning in first-year composition has emerged as a critical area of study. Service-learning in composition places students in writing environments within the community, encourages reading and writing about social issues, and provides the opportunity for students to participate in community projects. A significant problem with this approach is the alignment between outcomes of the discipline and those of service. Practitioners feel that a clear understanding of compatibility between the two areas of study would result in better practice and further buy-in by those who do not teach from a service-learning perspective.
Method

In service-learning literature, limited research exists to show how alignment takes place between content and service outcomes. Thus, this study sought to gather information about faculty perceptions of teacher success in aligning content and service outcomes in order to add to the body of knowledge available. An objectives-oriented program evaluation employing the use of a mixed-methods research design was used. Data were collected via a survey, interviews, and document analysis. The data collection process was divided into two phases. Phase one collected data via a survey developed from items on the Teaching Goals Inventory and the WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition. Phase two relied on interviews with service-learning faculty, and analysis of course syllabi.

Results

Participants responding to both the survey and interviews perceived themselves as being successful at integrating service-learning with composition. However, participants did not feel that alignment of outcomes was necessary, given that content and service outcomes were addressed on a case-by-case basis. Participants with 3 years or less of teaching experience at their current institutions perceived themselves to be less successful at balancing the demands of the content area and service. However, respondents reported that balance was achieved by learning to shift the emphasis onto content and/or service outcomes as the situation required. Course syllabi did not support an integrated or aligned articulation of content and service requirements. The results suggest that
alignment of content and service outcomes may not be as realistic a goal as learning how to effectively address content and service-related problems as they arise.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For the teacher of first-year college composition, teaching writing is more than communicating the rudiments of style and structure. Most first-year college composition instructors would agree that writing outcomes such as understanding the writing process, clarifying the writer's voice, and developing an awareness of audience are also important to the composition curriculum. Similarly, communicating these elements within the context of meaningful content is vital. The traditional context of writing with and about a given text—whether that text is print-based or the canvas of the students' lives—is one that is known, comfortable, and accessible.

This said, teachers of writing have long bemoaned reading student papers that seem empty, trite, or rehearsed—a far cry from what they wish to elicit from their student writers: writing that reflects thoughtful processing of the writer's ideas about self and the world in which he/she lives. For a teacher of English and composition, service-based composition offers an opportunity to involve students in a journey that is both personal—as they discover and develop their own personal writing voices—and public, as they become a part of their community. For such courses, the community becomes the text, and students participate in writing, as Tom Deans (2000) coined, for, with, and about the community.
Supporters of community-based composition programs advocate both affective and cognitive gains for the student. Students are able to take the skills encountered in composition class and apply them in a real-life setting. Tom Deans (2000), in his seminal work *Writing Partnerships: Service-learning in Composition*, notes that when students interact with the community, they begin to see themselves functioning within the community as members of the same community. Through reflective journaling, discussions, written essays and reports, students not only put a face to those within the community who need their services, but they also make a difference in the lives of those in their communities (pp. 173-182).

**Service-Learning in Composition**

National Campus Compact defines service-learning as a pedagogy used to educate students by connecting service, reflection, and classroom teaching. While this definition may seem straightforward, it is not. A long standing reality within the service-learning community is that there is no one, concrete definition for what service-learning is or what it represents. A literature survey by Kendall (1990) identified 147 varying definitions. Also, as will be discussed in the definition of terms section of this chapter, there are several ways of printing the term, each signifying where emphasis would be placed, whether on service or learning or both. Added to this is the distinction between service-learning and academic service-learning. By extension, the various definitions for this term lead to diverse portraits of what service-learning and academic service-learning look like in practice.

For this study, the definition of academic service-learning provided by Jeffery Howard (2001) serves as the foundation. According to Howard (2001) academic service-
learning is experience that connects service with academic credit, specifically to a course or area of disciplinary content, and provides opportunities for reflection. Reflection, whether oral or written, must be present in order for the experience to fit the definition.

In composition, this may take several forms. An instructor may choose to form a partnership between the course and a national, regional, or local service agency (non-profit or for-profit) that is a stakeholder within the given community. As part of the partnership, students participate in writing for that organization. They may participate in writing brochures, newsletters, or public service announcements. For example, in *Writing the Community*, Adler-Kassner, Crooks, and Watters (1997) share several examples of service-learning and composition across the United States. In the Pacific Northwest at Portland State University, students in Writing 323 spend 4 weeks in a community project or agency writing for the organization. Similarly, Indiana University offered English L240, Writing for a Better Society, which involved volunteering at a community service agency. Student writing was distributed in-house or by the agency to the public (pp. 193-200).

Another example of partnership may include working in the local K-12 school district. Students may work as tutors, mentors, or volunteers for a specific number of hours during a given semester. Along the East Coast, at George Mason University, students in English 101 and Sociology 101 were linked together. Students participated in nine 2-hour periods in which they worked in classrooms. Written field notes and reflections were used as the basis for discussion and written assignments on issues of social justice and community development (Adler-Kassner et al., 1997).
Academic service-learning in the composition classroom may even include patterning the course around reading and writing on topics of import to the given community. Students may read and write on social issues such as poverty, literacy, homelessness, substance abuse, rights and responsibilities of citizens, and so on. Their writing would then be shared with the community. In the southwestern United States, students at Arizona State University complete what is called a service-learning internship in the local school district, for which they receive a 6-hour credit. Preparation for this requirement begins in English 102 where students read, discuss, and write about issues such as tutoring, mentoring, and literacy. In English 215, students write four essays that link their research to their service-learning experience. In English 217, students further draft and revise these essays based on their experiences. Past topics include poverty, school funding, and self-esteem (Adler-Kassner et al., 1997).

From developing websites for community agencies, to putting the life stories of living war veterans into writing, the nature of academic service-learning in composition can be many things. The diverse nature of this practice offers a body of content that is rich with opportunities for personal growth. However, this diversity also poses a challenge to the curriculum of any discipline with which it is paired.

Practitioners may question, in composition as well as in other disciplines, how alignment can take place between the outcomes of the discipline and those of service, while still maintaining the academic integrity of the discipline (Adler-Kassner et al., 1997). What is the role of the teacher in ensuring alignment between course outcomes and outcomes outlined by community service partners (service organizations)? How does the instructor align the content-rich experiences of service with those of composition?
How successful do instructors perceive themselves as being in integrating service with composition? Is alignment and integration possible or necessary to the success of this pedagogy? Above all, what is being done to ensure these factors work in harmony to ensure and enhance student learning?

Questions such as these provide a challenge for the literature available in the area of academic service-learning, and create opportunities for additional research and investigation. The identification and alignment of outcomes, within the discipline and the area of service, continues to be an area of concern, along with teachers' perceptions of how this is done in the classes they teach.

Early Practice and Experimentation

During the 1960s and 1970s, early practice and experimentation in combining service and learning taught many lessons. Kendall (1990) notes that during this period, no intentional integration of service goals and university mission existed. Also, no specific measures were taken to avoid a climate of 'paternalism'—characterized by unequal relationships between students and clients—a 'them' vs. 'us' environment. While proponents in higher education agreed that service helped bring the community closer to students, they did not have a body of research available to support this view. Limited research existed to support the degree to which service experiences brought about significant learning, or resulted in effective service.

From this came two understandings. First, within service-learning there needed to be a system of reciprocity where both students and the clients they served gained from the experience. Second, there needed to be room for reflection allowing students to make
purposeful, intentional connections between what they learned during service and what took place in the classroom.

Growing Research and Support

During the 1980s Campus Compact emerged as the voice of higher education’s commitment to service, promoting social policies, community network collaborative efforts, faculty support (in terms of course design, construction, and resources), and mentoring. In 1985, National Campus Compact gained support from the university presidents of Brown, Georgetown, and Stanford. These presidents joined together holding the belief that higher education in the United States needed to promote a more positive image of college and university students to the nation and to the world. Supporters of this movement felt students were misrepresented in the media as being self-centered and lacking in social concern. This organization has expanded to include over 900 colleges and universities that promote service in some form. Presently, virtually all disciplines represented in post-secondary education have experimented with, and subsequently implemented, some form of service-learning into their curriculum. The resulting focus shifted from simply having students participate in service opportunities to a purposeful integration of service into the curriculum and academic learning. Overall, this created an understanding that the expectations for academic service-learning differed distinctly from the expectations for experiences and outcomes of volunteerism and community service.

In spite of these expectations, four common myths about academic service-learning as pedagogy persist. Howard (2001) categorizes these as the myths of terminology, conceptualization, synonymy, and marginality. The myth of terminology suggests that academic service-learning and community service or co-curricular service-
learning are the same; the myth of conceptualization suggests academic service-learning is just another name for internships; the myth of synonymy suggests experience is synonymous with learning; and, the myth of marginality suggests academic service-learning is simply an addition of community service to a traditional course model (pp. 10-11). Howard counters these myths by explaining that for academic service-learning, the service experience becomes the ‘text’ for academic and civic learning, rather than an activity that merely raises consciousness. While internships seek to provide opportunities for students to become familiar with the skills and practices of a given profession, academic service-learning emphasizes civic responsibility as a significant part of the learning experience. The presence of purposeful reflection within a course serves as a fundamental and necessary element that allows students to harvest the learning out of a given experience. Above all, “To realize service-learning’s full potential as a pedagogy, community experiences must be considered in the context of, and integrated with, the other planned learning strategies and resources in the course” (p. 11). These four myths undoubtedly characterize the concerns practitioners in most disciplines have about academic service-learning.

However, research reveals some information about the effectiveness of service and learning. Several national studies cited in Eyler (2000) have sought to confirm the impact of service-learning on students in the areas of efficacy, interpersonal skills, reduced stereotyping, social responsibility, and commitment to future service. These studies revealed a small, but nevertheless positive effect of service-learning on these outcomes (Astin & Sax, 1998; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Gray et al., 1999). Also, studies revealed that courses which provide the opportunity for reflection and create substantial
links to coursework, service, ethnic and cultural diversity, have a stronger impact on students (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Gray et al., 1999; Mabry, 1998). In addition, several studies support the view that volunteer service leads to subsequent community involvement, civic identity, and social responsibility (Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999; Youniss, McLellan, & Yates, 1997).

On the other hand, the absence of research on the effectiveness of service-learning in ensuring content mastery or academic achievement in goals specific to a given subject area suggests that the opposite may be true. Howard (2001) identifies three necessary criteria for academic service-learning: relevant and meaningful service with the community—that which meets the needs of all stakeholder participants; enhanced academic learning; and purposeful civic learning—intentional preparation for participation in a diverse, democratic society (p. 12). In the area of enhanced academic learning, Eyler (2000) notes:

The effect of service-learning on cognitive outcomes has been less well studied and relatively little attention has been given to defining learning outcomes that would be expected to be enhanced by service participation. Most of the reports of learning are based on student self reports or faculty testimony. (p. 11)

Therefore, while the research presents a general picture of positive outcomes, more attention is needed when considering the specific influence of service on learning outcomes.

Studies by Hezberg (1997), Boyle-Baise (1999), Eyler (2000), Goodwin (2002), Cushman (2002), Tutt (2001), and Ashley (2002) have attempted to define how learning outcomes are affected by integrating service into the curriculum. They provide evidence that service-learning does influence students’ ability to understand the complexity of problem-solving, identify the central problem and offer a solution, use information to
support arguments, and create practical strategies for community action. Overall, these studies measure the students' success in achieving positive gains in cognitive moral development and critical thinking (Batchelder & Root, 1994; Boss, 1994; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Eyler & Halteman, 1981).

In composition, similar outcomes have been stated as desirable for first-year students: problem solving, using information to support arguments, creating practical strategies for action—community or otherwise, and achieving positive gains in cognitive development and critical thinking. In collaboration with the Conference on College Composition and Communications (CCCC), the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA, 2000) published its *Outcomes Statement for First Year Composition*. This statement articulates, in brief terms, the common knowledge, skills, and attitudes first-year composition programs in American colleges and universities should expect from their students. Developed in 1997, the outcomes in this statement were created specifically for composition programs after the CCCC was inundated by requests for a list of outcomes (Council of Writing Program Administrators, 2000).

The statement is broken down into categories of rhetorical knowledge, critical thinking, reading and writing, processes, and knowledge of conventions. According to the WPA *Outcomes Statement*, during the first year of college composition, writing programs should emphasize outcomes such as focusing on purpose and audience, responding to different rhetorical situations, and using conventions and structure appropriate to various rhetorical situations. Additional outcomes include using appropriate voice, tone, and level of formality; using writing for inquiry; learning, thinking, and communicating; using writing as a method of thinking (cognitive process);
understanding the collaborative and social aspects of writing; and using appropriate formats, mechanics, and tone (Council of Writing Program Administrators, 2000).

While no research exists that documents the compatibility of the general composition outcomes ascribed by the Council of Writing Program Administrators and those documented by research in service-learning, there is ideological support for compatibility between the two areas. Deans (2000) suggests that some level of compatibility exists between writing and service-learning. Also, Linda Flower (1998) in *Problem-Solving Strategies for Writing in College and Community* writes in support of service-learning providing a source for community as text. This text presents writing and community as text and as a visible construct. Flower (1998) notes:

> Problem-solving is a powerful metaphor for thinking about writing: it foregrounds the importance of one’s goals, the possibility of strategic choice, and the responsibility of one’s actions. It places writing squarely in the personal, social, and rhetorical situations that pose problems for and motivate writers. (p. vi)

Flower designed the text around the principles of writing as a process of problem solving, inquiry, and vehicle of community literacy, with specific interest in reinforcing the connection between colleges and the communities in which they exist (p. vii).

According to the literature, academic departments—and by extension English and composition and rhetoric departments—interested in integrating service-learning into their curriculum may take the following steps: align composition and service outcomes; provide training and support in course design, implementation, and assessment; support ongoing assessment of teaching goals using instruments and tools that have been tested for reliability and validity (Howard, 2001). However, aligning composition and service outcomes will mean identifying those outcomes that have been supported by research. While there are works that discuss what this alignment may look like, to date, a body of
work that specifically addresses course goals and outcomes specifically for composition is not available.

Training and support is also a necessary part of any new initiative, especially in terms of course design, curricular alignment, implementation, and support for instructional methods. Howard (2001) outlines in his work, *Service-Learning Course Design Workbook*, several principles to consider when providing training and support. These include, but are not limited to, giving academic credit for learning, not for service; encouraging faculty not to compromise academic rigor; establishing clear learning objectives; establishing criteria for the selection of service placements; providing faculty with a body of knowledge on how to best evaluate the learning that comes from the community; assisting faculty in preparing students to learn in and from their community; and, preparing faculty for flexibility and less control over student outcomes (pp. 16-19).

Finally, support using trusted instruments is an important aspect of sustaining and validating programs that seek to align service and composition. Angelo and Cross's (1993) *Teaching Goals Inventory* (TGI) instrument is designed for teachers to self-assess their own performance in the areas of higher-order thinking skills, basic-academic success skills, discipline-specific knowledge and skills, liberal arts and academic values, work and career preparation, and personal development (p. 17). Ongoing assessment through Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs) and teacher self-evaluations will not only provide evidence of sustainability, but also provide opportunities for training and support of both faculty and student participants. Sigmon (1994) presented a perspective filled with hope regarding the growing interest in research on how service impacts learning. He stated:
Increasingly, I sense faculty are willing to deal openly with the powerful influence these service-to-learn and learning-to-serve experiences are having on themselves, students and citizens in a community. I sense community folk have thought deeply about their realities and seek company in facing them. Students want to make sense out of what bewilders them about the lack of connections between their academic learning and the realities they confront in the serving-to-learn and learning-to-serve experiences. (pp. 7-8)

Only as research into faculty role, instructional goal setting and assessment, and influence on departmental support continues to grow can there be a clear understanding of the degree to which service impacts learning.

**Statement of the Problem**

Service-learning in higher education has generated much discussion over the past few years. Harkavy (1993) states: “A renewed commitment to service will go a long way in responding to higher education’s critics who bemoan its ‘fortress mentality’ in isolating itself from the encroaching problems of both its local communities and the rest of the nation” (p. 45). The debate on how integrated the university should become with the community has continued since Harkavy’s writing. Much of the early debate, according to Zlotkowski (1998), revolved around the role colleges and universities should play in preparing students to serve and participate in their communities (pp. 1-14). At a time when higher education seemed to be distancing itself from the needs of a changing, diverse society, service-learning presented a seemingly much needed alternative, and provided an opportunity for colleges and universities to reclaim leadership in addressing societal problems.

Consequently, the ensuing tension between traditional and experimental objectives posed a problem for academic disciplines desirous of taking the step toward integrating community engagement and academic goals. This tension is also evident.
within composition. During the 1990s, service-learning in composition emerged as a critical area of study. Deans (2000) notes that one major objective of service-learning in composition is that students will engage in writing for, with, and about the community, participate in civic discourse, and at the same time, achieve the status of being proficient writers, in accordance with the stated outcomes of successful composition programs. The question remains, in composition as well as in other disciplines, how alignment can take place between the outcomes of the discipline and those of service, while still maintaining the academic integrity of the discipline (Adler-Kassner et al., 1997, pp. 193-200). From this perspective, a successful integrated service-learning program will align composition and service goals, provide training and support in the area of course construction, and practice continuous evaluation of teaching goals.

How, then, can the outcomes of composition and service be aligned so that the academic integrity of the discipline is not compromised? The literature responds by suggesting that the presence of support structures, realistic understanding of outcomes, and training will begin to address the issue of alignment and integrity. First, in order for alignment to occur, the support of more than one faculty member is needed. Each practice, as identified by Howard (2001), represents and requires the support of different individuals within an institution, inclusive of administrators (here he cites the importance of the university mission statement), academic deans, department chairpersons, writing program administrators, faculty, community partners, and students. Next, there must be a realistic understanding of outcomes as reported by the literature. Intentional goal setting and monitoring should also take place to ensure that alignment exists, where possible, between composition and service outcomes. Above all, training, support, and ongoing
evaluation of program goals will help in assessing and maintaining the sustainability of such initiatives. As research continues in this area and as successful programs continue to document—using quantitative and qualitative measures—their findings, both students and faculty will continue to gain and benefit from a better understanding of how service can inform practice in the area of composition.

**Purpose of Study**

The primary purpose of this study was to gather information about faculty perceptions of teacher success in teaching and ensuring that the outcomes of composition and service are achieved. A secondary purpose was to survey assessment and evaluation practices used to ensure success in service-learning composition courses. An understanding of how practitioners of this pedagogy are addressing the issues of alignment and integration of outcomes of both composition and service may reduce the level of discomfort and misunderstanding that comes from blending two content-specific areas of study. A clearer understanding of the practice will not only add to the body of literature available on this topic, but it will also provide an additional resource from which practitioners can learn and improve their practice.

**Research Questions**

The research questions for this study are based on the role of the teacher, course content objectives, service outcomes, and assessment practices within the area of service-learning in composition. The following research questions were considered:

1. What do service-learning composition courses look like?
2. What perceptions do teachers in service-learning composition programs have about their success in ensuring composition and service outcomes are achieved?

3. What perceptions do teachers in composition have about success in teaching content and service-related skills?

4. What are the differences between the practices used to assess performance in service-learning activities and those used to assess performance in other aspects of the course?

5. How do teachers evaluate whether service-learning opportunities have helped students master stated composition objectives and outcomes?

6. Do teachers perceive service goals as compatible with composition goals, or do they perceive them as separate from composition goals?

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for academic service-learning is built on the premise that the cognitive and affective gains achieved from service experiences are best evaluated and internalized through active reflection, which in turn opens the way for long-term change in the individual’s perception of himself or herself as an engaged participant in society. In an integrated service-learning approach to composition, four variables emerge as knowledge bases: learners, content objectives, service objectives, and assessment practices. These four areas are sustained by, but not limited to, the influences of pragmatic thought, theories of experiential learning, and perspectives of social action. Key theorists include John Dewey (1938), David Kolb (1984), and Paulo Freire (1970). This section summarizes how the works of these theorists support academic service-learning.
John Dewey in *Democracy and Education* (1916) supported the premise that the best learning took place when learners were able to make the connection between content knowledge and their place in society. It is suggested that at the foundation of service-learning literature is Dewey’s philosophy of bringing together the cognitive and affective, reducing the separation between academic and practical skills, with students at the center of the learning environment (Deans, 2000). By 1938 Dewey had expanded his perspective to include a six-step process of inquiry: (a) encountering a problem, (b) formulating a problem or question to be solved, (c) gathering information which suggests solutions, (d) making hypotheses, (e) testing hypotheses, and (f) making warranted assertions. This process of inquiry addressed both the experiential and the logical.

Theoretical perspectives on experiential learning support the proposition in academic service-learning that students learn best through experience, which in turn is made meaningful through reflection. Kolb’s Learning Cycle grew out of David Kolb’s (1984) understanding of and reflection on Dewey’s perspective on the process of experiential logical inquiry, and provides support for a cyclical approach to learning through experience and reflection. From Dewey’s six-step process Kolb formulated a four-stage process: concrete experiences, reflection, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. According to Cone and Harris (1996), who comment on Kolb’s use of the reflexive action between reflection and experience:

Learners are engaged in a cycle in which work in community or work settings forms the basis for written or oral reflection. Under the guidance of an instructor, reflective work is used to form abstract concepts and hypotheses are generated which then get cycled back into further concrete experiences. (p. 45)

Kolb’s theory brings to the forefront the importance of reflection as a conscious, intentional process in academic service-learning. Within the parameters of the learning
cycle, learning is supported by experience, reflection, conceptualization, and planning at both the cognitive and affective levels. From this perspective, service-learning in composition creates opportunities for students to apply academic knowledge in real life settings, expands understanding of academic knowledge through practical application, and creates a more engaged and socially aware student, one who is cognizant of community needs and active in bringing about change. Cone and Harris (1996) posit, however, that this model is porous, in that it does not provide a clear definition of ‘reflection’, leaving practitioners to generalize as to its definition within the context of academic service-learning (p. 45).

The works of Paulo Freire lend support to the proposition that participation in service opportunities engenders change in the lives of both individuals and the community. In his decisive work Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Freire (1970) provides a perspective on how social action and activism can serve as avenues for teaching and learning within a climate of academic service-learning. Freire supports informed, intentional action that would build the social capital of a given community. Learners not only begin to understand their place in a given community, but embrace their ability to build and change the given community through action and activism. While community empowerment is important, it is also important to treat community members with dignity, respect, and honor (Freire, 1970).

These three perspectives undergird the practice of academic service-learning: inquiry, reflection on experience, and activism born out of action. Much of the research on academic service-learning relies on these three theorists as the base, as does this study. It is worth considering, however, that current researchers wish to expand the theoretical
base to include theorists from other fields such as education, cognitive psychology, and sociology. Cone and Harris (1996) counter that while Dewey, Kolb, and Freire have dominated the theoretical stage in academic service-learning, there is room for the inclusion of other theories within the areas of cognition, philosophy, critical pedagogy, and postmodern theory to formulate a more comprehensive model for service-learning.

**Significance of Study**

The significance of this study is born out of service-learning’s relatively nascent status within the field of composition. Deans (2000) notes that, “the pairing of college writing instruction with community action marks a relatively new (and growing) movement in rhetoric and composition” (p. 1). Eyler (2000) notes, “The effect of service-learning on cognitive outcomes has been less studied and relatively little attention has been given to defining learning outcomes that would be expected to be enhanced by service participation” (p. 11). Also stated here is that “little attention has been paid in service learning research to testing effective ways to help students set goals, to provide appropriate cues and information for problem solving or to facilitate the development of self monitoring skills” (p. 13). This study would add to the growing body of knowledge in this area.

**Definition of Terms**

**Service-Learning**

There are several definitions for the term service-learning. National Campus Compact defines service-learning as a pedagogy used to connect service, reflection, and classroom teaching. Sigmon’s (1979) service and learning typology serves as a useful
guide for defining the role of service in a given course. The Sigmon typology defines the role of service based on the emphasis that is placed on each word, signified by capitalization and hyphenation. For example, in service-LEARNING, learning goals would serve a primary purpose, service outcomes, and a secondary purpose. In SERVICE-learning, service becomes primary and learning goals, secondary. In service-learning, service and learning goals would function separately. And, in SERVICE-LEARNING, service and learning goals would carry equal weight, each enhancing the other in terms of service to the community and learning goals (p. 2). Eyler and Giles (1999) subscribe to the latter, with the hyphen signifying the role that reflection plays in the process of learning with and from the community (p. 4).

Andrew Furco (1996) gives a visual model of this definition in his work (see Figure 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>service-LEARNING:</td>
<td>primary-learning goals; secondary-service outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE-learning:</td>
<td>primary-service outcomes; secondary-learning goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service learning:</td>
<td>service and learning goals separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE-LEARNING:</td>
<td>service and learning goals equal and reciprocal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. Sigmon’s typology.*


According to Furco (1996) Sigmon presents a revised typology not only to define service-learning, but also to differentiate between service-learning and other experiential learning programs and their impact on both the recipient of service and the one providing
the service. This typology is most effective if used to differentiate between service-
learning and other forms of experiential learning programs (see Figure 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>BENEFICIARY</th>
<th>Provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>FOCUS</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.** Service-learning versus other forms of service.


Bringle, Foos, Osgood, and Osborne (2000) define service-learning as “course-
based, credit-bearing education experience in which students (a) participate in an
organized service activity that meets identified community needs and (b) reflect on the
service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a
broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility” (p.
882). While this definition is similar to one used for academic service-learning, there are
differences, as expressed below.

**Academic Service-Learning**

Howard (2001) states that three criteria exist for academic service-learning
courses: the presence of relevant, meaningful service with the community; service
experiences that enhance student learning; and, purposeful civic learning—preparing
students to participate in society (pp. 26-27). Academic service-learning, then, comprises
service with academic credit, and is tied to course and disciplinary content.
Reflection

In academic service-learning, the term reflection is defined as that which provides the student with opportunities to make connections and assess his or her own performance. Barbara Jacoby (1996) defines reflection as opportunities for feedback and rumination, whether as a group or as an individual, oral or written. They also note that faculty members often use reflection as a predictor of student academic success, as it is often used as a measure of the student's engagement in the act of service (pp. 6, 7). An additional perspective is given by Eyler and Giles (1999) who define reflection as the "hyphen" between service and learning, the element that brings together service experiences with academic experiences (p. 171).

General Research Methods

An objectives-oriented program evaluation (Worthen, Sanders, & Fitzpatrick, 1997) employing a mixed-methods approach to data collection was used. According to Creswell (2003), "With the development and perceived legitimacy of both qualitative and quantitative research in the social and human sciences, mixed method research, employing the data collection associated with both forms of data, is expanding" (p. 208). Creswell (2003) outlines four criteria that guide the decision to use a mixed-methods approach: implementation, priority, integration, and theoretical perspective (p. 211). The implementation criterion addresses whether data collection occurred sequentially or concurrently. The priority criterion addresses the weight given to either quantitative or qualitative methods of data collection. The integration criterion identifies where, in the process of data analysis, integration of both types of data takes place. Finally, the
theoretical perspective criterion identifies whether a larger body of theory guides the study.

For this study, a concurrent triangulation strategy was employed. Using this approach both qualitative and quantitative methods were used to collect data so that the strengths and weaknesses of either approach would balance each other. Two phases of data collection took place, with quantitative data being collected first, and qualitative data being collected second. Results were then integrated, or triangulated, during the interpretation phase (see Figure 3).

Figure 3. Concurrent triangulation strategy.


However, while in theory this design approach required equal emphasis on both aspects of data collection, in reality more emphasis was placed on qualitative data collection. This concurs with Creswell (2003) who states, “Ideally, the priority would be equal between the two methods, but in practical application the priority may be given to either the quantitative or the qualitative approach” (p. 217). Integration of data took place during the data analysis phase. Triangulation of data occurred when qualitative data provided insight into quantitative responses, and vice versa. For this study, data
consisted of responses to a survey, open-ended interviews, and document analysis of submitted course syllabi. A questionnaire developed from items on the Teaching Goals Inventory (Angelo & Cross, 1993) and the WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition (Council of Writing Program Administrators, 2000) was administered to participants. During that time, open-ended interviews with service-learning faculty in composition occurred. An analysis of descriptive documents (course syllabi) from those who participated in both the survey and interview process also took place.

**Delimitations of the Study**

This study is delimited to English departments that have service-based writing courses, and faculty members who teach first-year college composition from a service-learning perspective. Examples of upper-level service-learning writing courses are presented in order to explain what service-learning looks like in composition. Upper-level service-learning courses are also mentioned in listing the types of courses instructors teach at their institutions. At the time of writing, the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) recognized 62 universities and colleges that have composition courses with a service component (Adler-Kassner et al., 1997; Deans, 2000). These universities and colleges are also members of National Campus Compact. Cross-case analyses of course syllabi came from schools in the Midwestern states, due to financial and time constraints.

**Summary**

Over the last 15 years, service-learning in composition has emerged as a critical area of study. Service-learning in the college setting is viewed as providing opportunities
for the classroom to connect with the community. Service-learning in composition, however, not only connects students with the community, but also provides students with opportunities to connect their community experiences with the academic writing requirements of the classroom. In this study, the definition of academic service-learning serves as the foundation, where students participate in service to the community, receive academic credit, and chronicle their learning through oral and written reflection papers.

A significant problem area that is open for more study is the alignment between outcomes of the discipline and those of service. Additional questions emerge about the role of the teacher in ensuring alignment takes place between course outcomes and outcomes outlined by community service partners (service organizations), and assessment of how participation in service helps students succeed in developing higher order thinking skills, cognitively and affectively, within the discipline. Further research will inform the practice, and give teachers a better understanding of how service-learning can assist students in mastering course content in the area of composition.

Outline of the Following Chapter

A literature review for this topic, organized in a chronological format, will trace the beginnings of the movement, philosophical and theoretical evolutions of thought about the subject, and emerging areas of concern within the areas of practice and assessment. Integrated service-learning composition programs, characterized by service-based writing programs and literacy programs, have secured a niche within the study of composition. However, much is still to be learned about the role of the teacher, the setting of course and student outcomes and objectives, and assessment of those objectives.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELEVANT RESEARCH LITERATURE

Introduction

The process of developing this review of literature had three steps: developing a concept map, searching databases for relevant literature, and ordering materials. The concept map for this literature review was developed in the course EDCI730 Curriculum Theory. Key areas included content-based course outcomes/objectives, the role of the teacher, student outcomes/objectives, and assessment practices. The following databases were searched: Academic Search EBSCO, Dissertation Abstracts International, World Cat, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), and Education Abstracts. Online resources included: The National Service Learning Clearinghouse, National Campus Compact, and the Edward Ginsberg Center for Community Service and Learning at the University of Michigan. In addition, the bibliographies and references used in key articles proved very helpful.

Keywords used in searching online databases included service-learning, service-learning composition, service-learning outcomes, academic service-learning, teaching goals, service-learning programs, program evaluation models, and combinations thereof. Also helpful were keywords found in the ‘subject’ category listing on each record. On more than one occasion these category listings led to additional resources in the area of
interest. Above all, the inter-library loan service provided by the James White Library at Andrews University offered the most help in the process by providing access to resources beyond the library’s holdings.

The search process led to a review of literature that will encompass four areas: an historical overview of service-learning in composition, literature on the role of the teacher and teacher success, research on course content objectives and outcomes, and assessment practices within the area of service-learning in composition.

**Historical Overview**

An historical overview of the topic reveals that service-learning within composition is a relatively new curricular endeavor. Three distinct events leading to the rise of service-learning within the undergraduate college curriculum are identified: complaints regarding the relevance of the undergraduate curriculum, seeming lack of faculty commitment to teaching, and lack of faculty and institutional concern for the communities they inhabited. These three areas brought to the forefront a need to revitalize college teaching. Kezar and Rhodes (2001) note that as early as the 1960s and 1970s there existed a push toward reinventing education, moving it from the dualistic position of academic versus practical, to one that embraced a more holistic perspective. According to Deans (1997), as early as the 1970s, Emig (1977) identified service-based writing as "modes of learning"—a way by which students could uncover themselves (p. 1). In addition, Deans (2000) and Kezar and Rhodes (2001) note in their discussion of the topic, that multiculturalism, collaborative learning, and learning communities all emerged, as did service-learning, about this time, born out of the Deweyan perspective of bringing together the theoretical and practical (Kezar & Rhodes, 2001, p. 150).
Kezar and Rhodes (2001) further cite Boyer’s 1987 work, *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*, in which the author states: “There is a disturbing gap between the college and the larger world” (Kezar & Rhodes, 2001, p. 150). Boyer suggests that undergraduate students need more opportunities to understand the relationship between what is learned in the classroom and the lives they live outside the classroom. During the 1980s organizations such as National Campus Compact and Campus Opportunity Outreach League (COOL) were formed as part of the demand for finding curricular relevance and creating meaningful undergraduate opportunities within college and university campuses.

Adler-Kassner et al. (1997) note that during 1992, a “micro-evolution” took place in college-level composition through the emergence of integrated service-learning programs (p. 1). They note:

> We call it a *revolution* because in the growing number of schools where service learning has been implemented, either on a course-by-course or programmatic basis, both faculty and student participants report radical transformation of their experiences and understandings of education and its relation to communities outside the campus. (p. 1)

Further noted, however, is that the term “micro-evolution” can also be used since, despite the observed success of these programs within the discipline, far too many teachers of English and composition remained unaware of the benefits of service-learning, or were skeptical of its influence (p. 2).

Within the area of composition studies, service-learning has a similar history to Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC). In the area of composition, Deans (1997) cites David Russell who likens the rise of service-learning in composition to the history of Writing Across the Curriculum. In his work *Writing in the Disciplines 1870-1990: A
Curricular History, Russell notes that both student writing and service have played major roles in American higher education. Most land-grant universities and others—religious, public, or philanthropic—that considered service a significant component to their existence, stated this in their mission statements (Deans, 1997, p. 31). While Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) is now standard practice in most American universities and colleges, this was not always the case. Russell suggests that WAC failed to garner initial support not because it was an insubstantial concept, but because it went against the tradition of the research university. Based on this comment, Deans (1997) surmises that WAC and service-learning writing programs fall within the same category:

Both WAC and CSL fall on the losing side of the prevailing value binaries of the modern research university: generalist knowledge vs. specialist knowledge; teaching vs. scholarship; “soft” service vs. “hard” research. As a consequence, WAC and CSL must meet with not only attitudes not always friendly—or more often, simply indifferent—to their propagation, but also promotion and tenure systems that devalue them. (p. 32)

Deans (1997) suggests that within such a system, it would be more beneficial for a faculty member to spend time writing an article that would ensure tenure or professional advancement, than to spend time re-inventing a course so students could do more writing and engage in service-learning. Like WAC, service-based writing took time to come into its own and gain acceptance within the academic community.

Role of the Teacher

Within service-learning and composition, four variables emerge as knowledge bases: the teacher, course content objectives and outcomes, service objectives and outcomes, and assessment practices. Understanding the teachers’ motivation for integrating service into the classroom, perceptions of their role in setting and evaluating...
content and service outcomes, as well as how they assess these outcomes is significant to the success of service-learning in composition.

Critical to the success of service-learning in any discipline is the role of the teacher. Driscoll (2000) writes that although the role of faculty with service-learning is heavily documented, little attention is given to motivations and attractions of faculty to service-learning; support needed by faculty in service-learning; impact or influence of service-learning on faculty; satisfaction reported by faculty; and difficulties, obstacles, and challenges faced by faculty participating in service-learning (pp. 35-41).

Also critical to the success of service-learning is the role of faculty perception on service-learning's effectiveness. Hesser (1995) surveyed, in conjunction with focus group interviews and individual face-to-face interviews, faculty from five different geographic regions, four types of colleges, and 16 different disciplines. Using purposeful sampling, he collected data from faculty at eight independent liberal arts colleges (n=27), a community college in the Southwest (n=6), a business college in the East (n=9), and a state university in the Midwest (n=6). Prior to focus groups or interviews, each faculty member was asked to complete a brief questionnaire with fixed and open-ended questions. Three hypotheses were tested. Hypothesis 1 stated that faculty, as professional assessors of learning outcomes, would conclude that both disciplinary learning and service-learning are enhanced from fieldwork associated with experimental education. Hesser (1995) found that faculty members who used course-embedded service-learning were overwhelmingly positive, based on their own respective assessment criteria for student-learning outcomes.
The second hypothesis addressed the shift in faculty perception, from skepticism to positive affirmation concerning the use of experimental methods such as service-learning. While a general summation of the data revealed that faculty supported the use of experimental methods, Hesser (1995) noted that “the selectivity of the sample among current practitioners and its lack of randomness prevent us from saying that the second hypothesis is confirmed” (p. 37). The third hypothesis stated that a pedagogical shift in higher education—a shift in favor of experiential education/service-learning—could be explained by the faculty participating in classroom research to refine their own practice. Due to the high interrelation of the 10 broad factors used to measure this hypothesis, it was retained (pp. 33-42).

Several factors influence faculty role and perception of success. Abes, Jackson, and Jones (2002) conducted a survey to determine factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. Faculty responses from over 500 surveys completed at 29 different universities were analyzed by institution type, academic discipline, faculty rank, tenure status, and gender. Drawing a sample from the members of Ohio Campus Compact ($n=43$), their results revealed that faculty professional responsibilities, institutional priorities, administrative commitment, instructional support, and outcomes of service-learning were all factors that influenced faculty use and non-use of service-learning as a pedagogy.

**Outcomes of Service**

With regard to outcomes, to date in the literature, questions pertaining to student outcomes such as empathy, good citizenship, and activism have been addressed. According to Deans and Meyers-Gonclaves (1998) many composition teachers are
attracted to service-based writing and reading programs because of the promise of engaging students into active participation and involvement with their communities, and the connection between critical thinking and ethical social activism (p. 15). While students in composition classes are expected to compose essays, narratives, analytical and research essays, reflection essays, journals, and more, within the context of service-based writing, they begin to see how these real concepts of process, development of thoughts, organization, grammar, syntax, voice, and audience come into play in real ways.

Hezberg (1997) and Boyle-Baise (1999) note, however, that other concerns deserve more study.

Questions which remain unanswered include: To what degree does community service-based writing help students to master course objectives? How can teachers effectively assess community-based work when the objectives of the community-based organization differ from those of the class? How effective are journal reflection logs, and do they really help students trace their personal journey in service? Are students in beginning writing courses really at the cognitive level to see themselves as change agents or to evaluate their own philosophical stance? Do service-based writing programs change or reinforce previously held beliefs about class, power, or privilege?

To answer these questions more research is needed. Eyler (2000) notes “the effect of service-learning on cognitive outcomes has been less well studied and relatively little attention has been given to defining learning outcomes that would be expected to be enhanced by service participation. Most of the reports of learning are based on student self-reports or faculty testimony” (p. 11). Therefore, while the research presents a
general picture of positive outcomes, more attention is needed when considering the specific influence of service on learning outcomes.

Godwin (2002) states that the lack of research data to support belief in long-term results of service in learning must be addressed (p. 17). While not debating the value of positive outcomes in service-learning and the pedagogy used within context, Godwin feels much of what has been credited to service-learning can also be credited to good, solid values instilled in the individual. Academic achievement, then, would be a result of someone having a good work ethic rather than participating in service-learning opportunities. No research exists to either confirm or deny his assumptions.

In addition, Cushman (2002) emphasizes that while much has been done in the area of designing courses, assignments, and modes of assessment, little has been done in determining how the task or exercises assigned should relate to the goals of the course. She lists lack of connection among tasks, unreasonably demanding tasks, developmentally inappropriate tasks, and empty tasks as identifiable elements in many service-learning composition courses (pp. 48-49).

Tutt (2001) designed a study to analyze the effects of service-learning on the teaching goals and role preferences of community college faculty. Thirty-two non-service-learning faculty at 17 community colleges in 13 states were studied using the Teaching Goals Inventory (TGI). Faculty group comparisons were made on the mean scores acquired for each of the 52 goal items, and six related goal clusters on the TGI. Two hypotheses were tested and differences were reported at the $p < .05$ level of significance: No statistically significant difference existed between the teaching goals of service-learning and non-service-learning community college faculty; no statistically
significant difference existed between the teaching role preferences of service-learning and non-service-learning community college faculty.

Using a t-test, Tutt tested and rejected the null-hypothesis. A statistically significant difference was found between the mean scores of service-learning and non-service-learning faculty on 13 goal items, and on three of the goal clusters on the TGI. Tutt (2001) found that participants in his study rated development of higher-order thinking skills higher than the aggregate mean. Goals related to student personal development were also highly rated. These findings corresponded with previous research in which the TGI was used. Contrary to previous research, however, this study found that goals related to student personal development outranked transmission of vocational or discipline-specific knowledge and skills for community college faculty.

Using a chi-square test for independence, the second null-hypothesis was tested. No statistically significant difference was found between the teaching role preferences of the service-learning and non-service-learning community college faculty in the study. The null-hypothesis was retained since no statistically significant difference existed between the teaching role preferences of service-learning and non-service-learning community college faculty (Tutt, 2001, pp. 174-176). Tutt states, “Service learning faculty in this study seemed to be aware that they were attempting to accomplish something different in the classroom, and their teaching goals reflected the new objectives” (p. v).

Ashley (2002) studied the paradox of access and voice in service-learning composition courses. By access and voice the author refers to students’ ability to learn and use the discourse of the academic writing community, while concurrently tapping
into their inner voices as writers. The purpose of the study was to develop a concrete tool for voice pedagogy. The written work of students in two composition courses was examined: one service-learning and one non-service-learning. Using the methodology of critical discourse analysis, the study relied on text and context to explain textual patterns found and their significance. Central features to both courses include the use of quotation, citation, and paraphrase. The researcher notes:

One of the most basic findings was that in this context the addition of service to a composition course did not get in the way of more typically articulated access conventions manifesting in the students’ texts. Clearly, this finding is in a singular context, which is unique in many ways. However, one possible objection to adding service to introductory composition courses is that a focus on service might take away from the purported access, “skills-course,” goals of composition. In this course, the service students’ texts were no less skillfully executed in terms of sentence-level or generic conventions than those in the standard course. This finding suggests that it is possible to integrate service-learning into writing courses early in the students’ university careers without necessarily jeopardizing their access. (p. 233)

This study is important because it is one of the few that directly addresses the impact of service on content-related skills. In order for integration of service-learning to be successful, however, Ashley (2002) suggests instructors look closely at reported discourses—traditional written essays, journal entries, dialogue, etc.—as a vehicle for encouraging voicing of students’ private discourse and that of disciplinary or content-related discourses (p. v).

Assessment

Kerissa Heffeman (2001) reviewed over 900 service-learning syllabi in an effort to answer faculty requests for assistance in course development, design, and construction. The resulting document is designed to provide faculty with guidance on how to effectively integrate service into their courses. As director of Campus Compact,
Heffernan (2001) encountered hundreds of syllabi and, in a cursory glance, found many “overwhelming and confusing” (p. iii). These syllabi provided no clear articulation of integrated service outcomes or outcomes for the specific discipline. The syllabi also did not clearly outline how student work in service or the content area would be assessed. Above all, there was a general lack of organization and clarity about how service would be integrated into the courses. In an effort to provide guidance, she revisited some of her own service-learning syllabi and found that they were just as vague. Objectives, assignments, and readings were often “incongruent” with course goals. Heffernan (2001) assumed that the service option would “stand alone.” She states, “I had not allowed the service to inform my course organization” (p. iii).

Heffernan (2001) affirms that the syllabus shapes the course; it presents the intended structure and foundation for the course. This structure and foundation informs the educational outcomes, and if well done, provides for students a blueprint of what they will be expected to master and how mastery will be evaluated (p. iii). With that said, she asserts:

The degree to which faculty utilize service-learning should be directly related to course goals and objectives. Thus, the syllabus must clearly explain the role of service in the course, how service connects with content, why service is the pedagogy of choice, and what the service component will entail. (p. iii)

Heffernan (2001) notes that many faculty feel conflicted between service and content objectives. However, integrating service into a course is not about what stays and what goes. She suggests, rather, “it is about identifying a pedagogy that best facilitates the acquisition of foundational knowledge that consists of specific competencies, skills, attitudes, and appreciations” (p. iv). This is the case, she posits, since many of the goals in higher education are achieved by well-integrated theory and practice, effective
application, and intentional reflection. Regardless of whether there is a service component to a course, outcomes such as learning and application of material, critical thinking and problem solving, and the changes in a student’s perspective should take place in a clearly defined and structured environment (p. i).

The decision to include service as part of a course’s structure presupposes that faculty would like their students to adopt or learn certain skills, competencies, or perspectives that are a direct result of community involvement. In this case, there must be a direct connection between service and course objectives, content, and/or outcomes that are planned and structural, not left to chance or the inherent ‘humanizing’ nature of service (p. iii).

Out of the analysis of over 900 syllabi, Heffernan (2001) identified two key areas that practitioners needed to consider when integrating service into a given course: the structure of the service component and how the service experience aligned with the course. In addressing the structure of the service component, practitioners should carefully describe the type of service required (whether an internship, an action research, or volunteer experience). Practitioners should also explain why the service experience is part of the course. This helps to put the service experience in context with the course or discipline (p. iv).

These two elements inform the four basic principles essential to a well-constructed service-learning course syllabus: preparation, service, reflection, and celebration (pp. 27-28). Preparation involves linking service to specific learning outcomes, and preparing students to perform service. For example, the syllabus should clearly outline what is expected of each student, what is to be learned. It should also state
how the work is to be done, who will be served, the social context of service, information about service site, possible/potential problems, supervision, expectations regarding placement, training, supervision, evaluation, and reflection.

The service required of the student should be challenging, engaging, and meaningful; it should address real needs. On this point Heffernan (2001) notes:

Throughout the process of gathering syllabi . . . I found many service-learning syllabi that asked students to reflect upon the conditions of poverty and inequity. These courses often placed students with populations of people challenged by various circumstances or in communities challenged by inequity and poverty. Students were often asked to provide a service to an individual (e.g. tutor a child for 10 hours) and from that brief experience, to reflect upon community issues. (p. 112)

It is important to match need with student ability. Heffernan (2001) found that by using this model, many faculty seemed able to bypass the constraints of time, resources, and institutional politics, to explore social problems by focusing on community or individual deficits – identifying what communities and individuals in the communities lacked, and preparing students to be part of the solution in bridging the gap (p. 112). This way, student participation is seen as relevant and important, either through one-to-one direct service or by becoming part of a larger already-functioning community project.

The third critical component of a service-learning syllabus is reflection. Reflection provides opportunities for students to understand the meaning and the impact of their role in the community. Reflection also provides a link between what learners have come to understand about themselves, their academic disciplines, and what they have done in service. It allows the student to question: Why am I doing this? What impact will my actions have? What am I discovering about myself that I did not know before?
The final component is one of celebration, a sharing among those involved (student and community agency). Evidence that students have been able to apply knowledge gained over the semester should be recognized and evaluated. Partnerships made with the community should be evaluated. Above all, the progress or change made over the course of the semester(s) should be named and celebrated (p. 28).

While Heffeman (2001) supports including elements such as preparation, service, reflection, and celebration in service-learning syllabi, in practice doing so is a challenge for faculty practitioners. Ellen Cushman (2002) writes about obstacles to sustaining service-learning writing programs, specifically assessing the role of the professor and assessing curricular goals. A survey was conducted of recent articles on service-learning, data gathered from a University of California, Berkeley, outreach initiative, inclusive of informal interviews, observations, and field notes. Also shared is a model for effective service-learning courses based on work done by the Richmond Community Literacy Project, including course goals, methods, assignments, and training for teachers and students.

Cushman (2002) found that problems in service-learning initiatives were similar to problems existing in service-learning scholarship, specifically in the areas of research, methods, and curricula. She found that much of the problems in assessment revolve around the un-established, unclear role of the professor in service-learning projects (pp. 40-41). Cushman (2002) suggests that the role of faculty in service-learning writing courses is essential to “the teaching, research, and overall institutional viability of these initiatives” (p. 40), and that faculty could better prolong these initiatives if an intentional,
consistent effort were made to see "the community as a place where teaching, research, and service contributed to community needs and service learning" (p. 40).

Based on these observations, Cushman (2002) asserts that while there is compatibility between service and composition, intentional practice is necessary to sustain viable programs. She states, "The goals of experiential learning, authentic writing, real world experience, engagement in civic concerns fit well with composition goals of finding voice, making meaning, and process" (p. 42). She feels that this viability is further enhanced by faculty involvement, and that research in this area has been ignored long enough. She points out that when faculty members become involved with the service initiative, they ensure the following will occur:

1. The writing and thinking done by students and scholars address community needs and writing tasks.

2. The methodologies for group processing and problem solving used by students and scholars are well-defined methodologies.

3. The course materials, discussions, workshops, assignments, observations, and volunteer time are well integrated to form a unified curriculum (p. 44).

Cushman (2002) writes about task integration in service-learning curricula. She suggests that much of the writing about service in her survey seemed to address kinds of assignments and assessment tools best suited for writing in service-learning courses. In spite of this, there was still a paucity of writing on how assignments and tasks translated into grades: "Despite the abundant publishing on curricular matters, none has considered how every exercise and task assigned to students can and should relate to the grades of the course" (p. 48).
Cushman (2002) also found that lack of professor leadership resulted in students “wandering in the dark,” confused about how to proceed on their own. From her research she advocates faculty involvement on-site at the various service locations. Faculty presence and involvement correlated with shared, authentic experiences. She notes that one of the most popular methods of assignment is the project paper that is assigned for the end of the semester. However, without guidance from the professor, or a shared experience or sense of involvement from the faculty member, students tended to throw items together. Cushman (2002) suggests the hasty presentation of a final product could lead to an inauthentic product, and later, inauthentic evidence that the course, program, or initiative worked, accomplishing what it set out to do (p. 45).

Finally, Cushman (2002) notes that as the trend toward integrating service with learning continues, the following will need to be addressed:

1. How to develop a program that is consistent, flexible, and beneficial for all (community, teachers, scholars, students)

2. How to successfully integrate research, teaching, service in an air-tight manner

3. How to structure the class curriculum to address the needs of stakeholders (p. 41).

These questions should serve as a guide for faculty in designing assignments, selecting instruction methods, and developing tools or strategies for assessment.

**Examples of Service-Learning in Composition: What Does It Look Like?**

Service-learning in composition takes many forms. Three approaches have been identified by Deans (2000): writing for the community, writing with the community, and
writing about the community. This framework encompasses a variety of approaches, depending on the instructor and the resources available to the instructor. Courses can focus on a range of topics, from addressing community needs, to participating in building literacy within the community through community partnerships, and more.

In 1997, The Service-Learning Project at Arizona State University (ASU) represented what was considered a model for composition programs engaged with service-learning. This program began when the English Department and Writing Across the Curriculum program decided to address the “empty assignment syndrome” and “students’ lack of engagement with the material” (Adler-Kassner et al., 1997, p. 193). The department connected with the local school district where, at the time, there were several students in the district scoring below the 30th percentile on standardized tests. Of the 18 schools in the district, more than 86% of the student population was considered to be at-risk. The local Salvation Army had started an after-school program which quickly expanded, increasing the need for human resources. A formal tutoring program was developed that combined the resources of the English Department and the Salvation Army to provide tutoring in various subject areas, GED classes, day care staffing, and literacy classes.

An internship program was developed in collaboration with composition courses. The program was funded by the participating school district and the community agency. Training was also provided by these entities. The courses carried 3 credit hours and students were assigned to work with two students, 8 hours each week for the semester. Children ranged in age from 3 to 14. For this course, undergraduate 100-level students wrote seven writing assignments, five based on readings done by the entire class on
topics pertaining to tutoring strategies and working with at-risk populations. These five essays led to two synthesis-writing papers: one based on a cumulative synthesis of all of the reading for the course, and the second based on acquiring additional primary and secondary sources to develop an argument for the roles schools would play in shaping self-esteem in under-performing students. Throughout the semester, students would refer to their papers and add additional information as they encountered new tutoring situations, such as students with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder or students with learning disabilities (Adler-Kassner et al., 1997, pp. 193-200).

In a collection of case studies on service-learning in higher education, Steven Madden (2000) collates several self-reports from faculty in various disciplines. Two in the area of composition provided insight into writing outside of the first-year composition framework. Elizabeth Rice (2000) shared her structure for a business writing course which included service-learning. In this course, students are trained to write memos, letters, proposals, and reports. They learn how to use multimedia and work in teams. The class is designed around one project, and each student is responsible for outlining what he/she will contribute to the project. Students are then divided into teams and from that point on work with the actual client to produce a product at the end of the semester. Products ranged from a portfolio of writing completed for the agency to completed reports and proposals (pp. 85-98). Another faculty member, Barbara Weaver (2000), shared the outline for her course in technical writing, a general writing course for undergraduates. Here, students worked with what the author referred to as an ‘authentic project’ (p. 140), which allowed students to audit the communication practices of a manufacturing plant. Students, over the course of the semester, would identify and
recommend ways to improve communication. They would peruse past documents, conduct interviews, attend and observe meetings at all levels, and in the end, provide deliverables or products to the client.

Currently, at the University of Texas at El Paso, senior English majors participate in a course titled Senior Writing Practicum. This senior-level course is designed for students to select a project, set a workable schedule, and complete professional grade writing products for an agency where they have contracted to spend a pre-determined amount of time for the semester. The course packet comes with an outline of steps the student will follow, and applicable contract forms for both the student and the agency contact. Another course designed around the service-learning framework at the same university is the Community Literacy Internship, which involves students completing an internship at a non-profit organization. In this course, students serve as writers, researchers, presenters, and in several areas having to do with writing and literacy. Students may select an agency to work with, or choose to be placed at an agency. Again, a series of steps is provided for the student to complete, along with applicable forms for both the student and agency contact (Baca, 2006).

As community needs vary, so do the approaches to addressing those needs. The schools selected as the population for this study were compiled from a list of recognized programs from National Council of Teachers of English and the American Association of Higher Education. In published lists from both organizations, the nature of service-learning in composition was abstracted for each school. In general, most courses followed a pattern of having students read from a list of selected readings on service, community, or social issue, participate in discussions, participate in tutoring experiences
or service experiences for a specified amount of time, and engage in reflection activities, either through a debriefing session, written reports, or journal entries. Written artifacts for these courses took the form of essays and formal research papers on issues pertaining to community, special projects for communities such as newsletters, oral histories, story collecting, story-telling, read-aloud programs, grant proposals, brochures, editorial letters to legislators, and more (Adler-Kassner et al., 1997, pp. 193-200).

**Summary**

This chapter provides a brief historical overview of the literature available on service-learning in composition, and the four variables that emerged as knowledge bases: the teacher, course content objectives and outcomes, service objectives and outcomes, and assessment practices. The chapter also provides examples of what service-learning in composition looks like at several colleges and universities across the United States. According to the literature, service-learning in composition is attractive to faculty because it promises to engage students in active participation and involvement in their communities, along with providing the opportunity to connect critical thinking and social activism. Yet, faculty members still demonstrate a general lack of organization and clarity about how service can be successfully integrated into a course.

**Outline of the Following Chapter**

The following chapter explains the general research methods used in this study. A description of the population sample, instrument development, data analysis, and human subject considerations are presented. Also presented is a description of the application of Creswell’s (2003) concurrent triangulation strategy.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter discusses the research design that framed this study. A description of the population sample, instrument development, data analysis, and human subject considerations are also presented.

Description of Research Design

This study utilized multiple modes of inquiry. As an objectives-oriented program evaluation, data gathering occurred in two phases employing a mixed-methods approach that incorporated a survey, open-ended interviews, and document analysis of submitted course syllabi. While both qualitative and quantitative approaches to data collection were used, more emphasis was placed on qualitative data collected. During the data collection phase, survey research and open-ended interviews with composition teachers in service-learning took place. Document analysis of course outlines of service-learning composition courses took place after surveys were collected and interviews were conducted. This section is organized according to the design description, sampling procedures, instrumentation, data analysis, and summary of research procedures.

According to McMillan and Schumacher (2001), an “objectives-oriented evaluation determines the degree to which the objectives of a practice are attained by the
target group. In other words, the evaluation measures objectives and the outcomes of the practice” (p. 533). These authors further note that the success of any practice under observation—whether a curriculum, in-service training, pedagogy, etc.—can be measured by any differences between the stated objectives and the ultimate outcomes (p. 533). Inherent in the objective-oriented program evaluation approach is its reliance on multiple sources of data. This method was selected for its ability to measure specific objectives using instruments to gather data, assess program development, monitor participant outcomes, and conduct needs assessments (Worthen et al., 1997, p. 179).

This study used a survey design to gather information on the perceptions of faculty members who teach first-year writing composition courses from a service-learning perspective. This study also used open-ended interviews with faculty members teaching first-year writing composition courses from a service-learning perspective. These interviews were ethnographic in nature, in that they sought to uncover faculty perceptions about the practice of integrating service with learning in the field of composition. Finally, this study utilized documents, in the form of course syllabi, which were measured against an evaluation matrix (see Appendix D) to gather insight into how faculty plan for and evaluate service in their composition courses.

Population

The National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), in collaboration with the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), recognized and listed 62 universities and colleges in North America that offer service-learning composition programs (N=62). These institutions are members of National Campus Compact. Organizations such as NCTE, AAHE, and National Campus Compact were contacted via
phone and email to request a list of composition teachers or programs active in service-
learning, and also to verify the currency of the programs listed in various publications.
National Campus Compact replied with official notice that while they have a listing of
over 900 universities and colleges that participate in service-learning programs, that
listing is not divided by academic content area, so they could not provide me with a
current list of participating schools. I decided to use the list of 62 schools as my
population, which would include all composition teachers at these schools who taught
courses that were designated as service-learning writing courses. The participation of
instructors teaching composition courses designated as ‘service-learning’ courses, or
writing courses where the instructor (on his or her own volition) integrated service
activities, was desired.

An Internet search was conducted to verify the existence of the 62 schools. The
search was designed to collect address, telephone, and email contact information, and
departmental listing of service-learning interests of composition faculty. Of the 62
schools 59 had an online presence that listed address, telephone, and email contact
information, along with a departmental listing of service-learning interests.

Sample

Criteria for Selecting Faculty

For this study purposeful sampling procedures were used. All 59 schools were
contacted with the request to provide the names of faculty teaching composition from a
service-learning perspective. Of the 59 schools contacted, 15 schools responded and 38
faculty were confirmed. These 15 schools became the sample from which individuals and
programs were selected for further investigation.
Thirty-eight faculty teaching first-year composition courses, designated as 'service-learning' courses, and writing courses where teachers independently integrated service activities were identified. Armed with a confirmed list of schools offering service-learning composition programs, and contact information inclusive of names (program directors/faculty), addresses, telephone and email contact, I contacted these individuals in order to confirm the presence of current, active service-learning composition programs.

According to McMillan and Schumacher (2001) purposeful sampling allows the researcher to select subjects based on "accessibility" (p. 175). This method of sampling allows the researcher to select subjects based on criteria of the population that correlate with the topic (p. 175). For this study, interest rested with faculty who teach first-year composition courses, inclusive of Basic Writing, with a service-learning component (n=38).

Criteria for Selecting Programs

Two writing programs at universities in the Midwestern states’ Campus Compact were selected to take part in open-ended interviews. The criteria used for selecting schools eligible to participate included: regional programs; a well-established record of service initiatives (signified by years in existence); faculty support systems; a service-learning center on-site; and, support for academic service-learning in composition. Based on these criteria, two universities were selected.

These programs, from this point on, will be referred to as University A and University B. University A has conducted a successful service-learning initiative for 11 years. A university brochure states, "Outreach is a form of scholarship that cuts across
teaching, research, and service. It involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions" (University A brochure, 1993). Service initiatives at University A include: outreach presentations, outreach publications, participation in national service programs such as America Reads and America Counts, and local community partnerships.

Service-learning initiatives at University B were organized in 1999, and a named center was recently added. All of the school’s service initiatives, extending back over 40 years, now function under the auspices of the center. Service initiatives include: America Reads, AmeriCorps, Community Service Corps, Project Community, and SERVE (University B brochure, 2006).

Faculty support at University B is evident in the form of web support, opportunities for research, and curricular support provided by faculty at the center. Both schools maintain an active online service-learning presence via program websites. University A offers five (5) service-learning writing courses jointly with the undergraduate arts and rhetoric departments, the service-learning center, and the writing center. This interdisciplinary approach allows the courses to service more than one academic department. University B offers nine (9) service-learning writing courses. Both schools offer faculty grants for research in service-learning, lecture series, workshops to facilitate faculty support, and opportunities for faculty to present and publish. University B publishes a national journal on topics related to service-learning.

Service requirements at the two schools exist as a result of the alliance with National Campus Compact, institution’s type, or accreditation requirements. Both
universities have a general service requirement that can be met in a variety of ways. Although some academic departments and honors programs have service requirements built in at specific times, students may elect to take a service course at anytime during their stay at the university. Faculty members may elect to teach service courses. Those who teach in departments that have a service courses built into the core curriculum may also elect to teach these courses. For example, at University A, faculty take turns teaching service-learning composition courses. They may choose to use a pre-designed course, or develop the course to suit their own perspective. Students at University A may meet their service-learning requirements by participating in a variety of placement opportunities: short-term placements (one afternoon), semester-long placements (2-6 hours a week), year-long placements, or alternative break placements (during semester breaks). They may fulfill their service at non-profit agencies/organizations, schools, hospitals, health-care facilities, government offices, public information, or with advocacy groups. They may also elect to fulfill service-learning requirements as a result of being in a specific course, academic major, or because of their own personal passion.

University B offers a similar program. However, not all academic departments offer service options. If this is the case, the university allows students to earn credit by independent study. Service at this university is different in that the service center is endowed and conducts its own research. While resources are available to faculty and personnel make themselves available for consultation, resources and personnel primarily carry out the mission of the center. The university’s commitment to service is supported by the presence of the center on the campus. The benefits associated with fellowships,
grants, and other funding sources are shared by both the center and the university. Chapter 4 will present more detail on the types of services available at each school.

In summary, both universities meet the criteria for selection to participate in in-depth interviews: regional programs, well-established service initiatives (signified by years in existence); faculty support system; service-learning center on-site; and, support for academic service-learning in composition.

Instrumentation

Survey Questionnaire

Two sources were used to develop the survey instrument for this study: Angelo and Cross's (1993) Teaching Goals Inventory and the Council for Writing Program Administrators' Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition (2000). Permission to include information from both the TGI Self-Inventory and the WPA Guidelines for First Year Composition was requested and obtained. This section outlines the research procedure used in this study:

1. Survey development
2. IRB application and approval
3. Questionnaire pilot
4. Mailing questionnaires
5. Collecting questionnaires and syllabi—returned by mail
6. Follow-up questionnaires
7. Scheduling interviews
8. Coding and analysis of questionnaire
9. Transcription and coding of interviews
10. Analysis of documents.

The survey instrument used in this study was developed using three sources: items from the TGI Self-Inventory (Angelo & Cross, 1993), the WPA Guidelines for First Year Composition, and items developed in the course EDRM604 The Design and Analysis of Educational and Psychological Surveys. Together, these items comprised the Teaching Outcomes Survey (TOS) used in this study (see Appendix A). Six research questions guided item development:

1. What do service-learning composition courses look like?
2. What perceptions do teachers in service-learning composition programs have about their success in ensuring composition and service outcomes are achieved?
3. What perceptions do teachers in composition have about success in teaching content- and service-related skills?
4. What are the differences between the practices used to assess performance in service-learning activities and those used to assess performance in other aspects of the course?
5. How do teachers evaluate whether service-learning opportunities have helped students master stated composition objectives and outcomes?
6. Do teachers perceive service goals as compatible with composition goals, or do they perceive them as separate from composition goals?

The TGI and the WPA Outcomes Statement

Angelo and Cross’s (1993) TGI Self-Inventory is designed to help teachers assess how they perceive their role in outcome achievement, and was developed after the authors found little in the literature that “asked college faculty what they wanted to teach”
For this study, permission was given to use items from goal cluster six, personal development (.86), without adaptation. This cluster of items was selected for inclusion into the survey because of similarity to service-related goals.

Construction of the TGI Self-Inventory began in 1986 and was completed in 1990. The instrument was first tested on three groups of college teachers (a total of 4,065 faculty at four and 4- and 2-year colleges and universities), peer-assessed by 85 faculty development experts, and finally tested again by 2,824 faculty members (Angelo & Cross, 1993, pp. 14-15).

Items for the TGI were developed through a comprehensive search for relevant literature to verify that nothing of its kind existed, and analysis and collection of data. These items were reviewed by experts in the field, and field tested on classroom teachers. Subsequently, two additional formal rounds of administering the TGI were conducted, providing more data for analysis. During this time, item analysis and identification of goal clusters were completed. The goal clusters were further tested through the use of cluster analysis with each of the goal cluster data sets. Q-sorting was used to balance "oversampling some dimensions of teaching goals and underrepresenting others" (Angelo & Cross, 1993, p. 16). Coefficient alpha reliabilities for each of the finalized clusters were then computed to measure the internal consistency of the goal clusters, and alpha coefficients were at the .70 level and above, which was determined to be satisfactory. Six goal clusters were identified: higher-order thinking skills (.77), basic academic success (.79), discipline-specific knowledge and skills (.71), liberal arts and academic values (.84), work and career preparation (.85), and personal development (.86) (pp. 14-17).
Items from the WPA Outcomes Statement for First Year Composition, updated in 2003 (CWPA, 2003), were also used to create this instrument. For this study, permission was obtained to use items from the statement without adaptation. These items were selected for inclusion into the survey because they clearly articulated composition goals for first-year writing students. According to the Council of Writing Program Administrators, the WPA Guidelines for First Year Composition seeks to “describe only what we [Council of Writing Program Administrators] expect to find at the end of first-year composition” (Council of Writing Program Administrators, 2003). In 1997, members of the then Council of WPA were inundated with requests for a list of outcomes for writing. This request came from a variety of sources which included, but was not limited to, instructors at universities adopting outcomes-based initiatives, and individuals at organizations that developed curriculum goals for advanced placement programs in English and CLEP.

As a result, inquiry into the need for such a document began in 1997 at the annual convention of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The Council of Writing Program Administrator’s website presents a brief history into the development of the statement (http://comppile.tamucc.edu/WPAoutcomes/continue.html). In addition, Kathleen Yancey (2001) further documents the process in her College English article (pp. 321-325). According to these sources, discussions continued at WPA conventions, and the first draft was available for peer review in 1998. In 1999 final revisions were made and the document was open for comment from national and global audiences. The statement
was first published in the Fall/Winter issue of *Writing Program Administration* and later in *College English* (Yancey, 2001, 321-325).

The goals statement divided composition goals into four basic categories: (a) Rhetorical Knowledge—students develop a repertoire of organizational strategies and discourse schemes, especially argumentative strategies and schemes; (b) Genre Knowledge—students develop knowledge of appropriate genre conventions, both local and global; (c) Writing-Reading Connections—students learn to use writing and reading as tools for learning, thinking, and communicating; and, (d) Processes—students conduct inquiry through various writing processes (this also includes revising, editing, and collaborating) (http://www.wpacouncil.org/positions/outcomes.html). For this study, the categories reflect the published headings of rhetorical knowledge, critical thinking, reading, and writing, processes, and knowledge of conventions.

**The Teaching Outcomes Survey**

To this end, both documents informed the survey instrument used in this study and comprised Parts I and II of the Teaching Outcomes Survey (TOS). Items for the final portion of the TOS, Part III, were self-developed in the course EDRM604 The Design and Analysis of Educational and Psychological Surveys. During this course, research questions were drafted and survey items were designed to address the proposed research questions. These items were peer reviewed during the summer of 2003 for alignment with research questions. The items were further tested using simple factor analysis. Two scales were identified with correlation values of 0.6 and higher. These scales were then named Writing Practices and Service Practices. Items with values lower than .6 were considered and weighed against research questions. Items that were ambiguous were...
deleted from the scale. In the summer of 2004, these items were revisited for inclusion into what would become the Teaching Outcomes Survey.

The TOS was then pre-tested on 11 composition teachers and writing program directors. Two respondents did not feel their experience was compatible with the survey's focus and declined to respond. One respondent thought more clarity was needed regarding the intended audience, specifically, whether questions pertained to those teaching courses that were entirely composition courses or courses that presented an integrated composition-service-learning approach. This respondent also paid particular attention to the conciseness of questions and made suggestions for word omissions and additions. These suggestions were heeded and implemented.

Several respondents offered suggestions on the wording of items in Part III of the TOS, paying specific attention to whether prospective respondents would have enough options available to indicate a true and complete response to these questions. These respondents suggested having an "Other" response with ample place for the respondent to explain the response if it did not match any of the prescribed options. Several responses provided feedback in the areas of clarity and format. These comments were taken into consideration and items were revised as necessary.

Two pilot respondents authored and edited, respectively, works cited in the literature review for this study. Both Tom Deans (1997, 2000) and Linda Adler-Kassner (Adler-Kassner et al., 1997) both provided valuable feedback on the content of questions pertaining to service-learning in composition. These respondents suggested a more intentional approach to asking teachers about curricular goals. Comments were made regarding the inclusion of themes such as cultural criticism, activism, advocacy, social
change, and civic engagement. Also included was the option of having teachers reveal to what degree they relied on the evaluation of community partners in assessing student work. It was suggested that teachers submit more than syllabi for their courses, and perhaps include information on specific assignments, samples of assignments, and types of community partner placements. These ideas, specifically those relating to inclusion of themes such as cultural criticism, activism, advocacy, and social change, were taken into consideration, deemed relevant to the nature of this study, and were added to the interview protocol in the form of options for selection in Part III.

These respondents also duly noted that not all composition programs would use, or be aware of, the WPA Outcomes statement, many having their own descriptions of what should be required of first-year writing programs. Also suggested was the inclusion of the paradigm shift taking place in composition, away from the traditional toward areas of writing for social advocacy, change, and civic engagement. It was suggested that a clear distinction needed to be made between service as an added component to a typical course and service as an entity by itself. The definition used for service was also queried, and I was advised to include more items that would reflect more social consciousness and awareness, in addition to the curricular and instructional approach taken. These suggestions were taken into consideration and selection options to items in Part III of the TOS were revised to reflect the language of service-learning.

Interview Protocol

Two interview protocols were developed for this study. The Faculty Interview Protocol (see Appendix B) and Program Director Interview Protocol (see Appendix C) were developed from the initial research questions and from questions asked on the
survey. Both sets of questions were designed to gain in-depth insight into composition and service-learning from the perspective of faculty members and program directors. Suggestions from pilot respondents on the nature of service-learning, whether as an added component to the course or as an entity by itself, were considered and implemented on the Faculty Interview Protocol, where respondents were asked to describe the nature of their course (see Appendix B, item 1). Also added to the faculty interview protocol were questions addressing the teacher’s motivation for participation in service-learning pedagogical practice (see Appendix B, item 6), in an effort to understand the instructors’ sense of advocacy, seeing themselves as social change agents, and determining if these beliefs influenced how they taught their courses. The qualitative software package Nvivo was used in analyzing interview transcripts.

Document Analysis Matrix

The course outlines submitted were analyzed using a Document Analysis Matrix (see Appendix D) compiled from an evaluation schedule written by Victoria Littlefield, formerly of Augsburg College, and published in Successful Service-Learning Programs, an edited work by Edward Zlotkowski (1998). Permission was granted from Zlotkowski, Littlefield, and Anker Publishing to use the information in this format.

Research Procedure

A letter requesting the assistance of each department chairperson in helping to encourage faculty to complete the surveys was sent to each program after confirmation was received that their programs still functioned. Surveys were then sent to all 38 participants in the 15 programs, accompanied by a consent form for each participant.
For phase two, contact was made with selected programs through the office of the provost for each institution. The required research protocol for each institution was followed, and permission was granted to contact the service-learning centers and faculty on each campus, with letters of permission being sent to the Office of Scholarly Research at Andrews University. With the assistance of both program directors, contact was made with faculty willing to participate in the interview process. Interviews were scheduled and on-site interviews were conducted as follows: two program directors (one from each institution); one interview in a small-group setting with three faculty members (one faculty member served as both teaching faculty and writing program director, and the other two faculty members served as instructional faculty only); and, four individual interviews with a writing program director and three faculty members. A total of seven faculty members and two program directors were interviewed. Interview questions were taken from the Faculty Interview Protocol (see Appendix B).

Document analysis of course syllabi was conducted on documents submitted by both survey participants and interview participants. Faculty completing the survey submitted course syllabi by mail, and syllabi from the faculty members interviewed were downloaded from faculty websites.

**Analysis of Data**

The mixed-methods approach taken in this study allowed for different types of analyses of the various data sources. Table 1 gives a visual overview of how each of the five research questions was treated, including the data sources that addressed each question, and the proposed method of analysis that was applied. This study employed
Table 1

*Research Question Analysis Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data/Source</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What does service-learning in composition look like?</td>
<td>Faculty Interview Protocol Item 1</td>
<td>Categorizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Director Interview Protocol Item 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What perceptions do teachers in service-learning composition programs have</td>
<td>Survey Items Part I, 1A-G, 2A-D, 3A-G, 4A-D; Part III, 6, 9, 13</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about their success in ensuring composition and service outcomes and achieved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What perceptions do teachers in composition have about success in teaching</td>
<td>Survey Items Part II, 1A-L, Part II, 2A-P, Faculty Interview Protocol Item 4</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics Categorized Interview Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content- and service-related skills?</td>
<td>Program Director Interview Protocol Item 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What are the differences between the practices used to assess performance in</td>
<td>Survey Items Part III, 1, 2, 7, Faculty Interview Protocol Items 7-10</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics Categorized Interview Responses Document Analysis Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service-learning activities and those used to assess performance in other aspects of the course?</td>
<td>Submitted Syllabi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How do teachers evaluate whether service-learning opportunities have helped</td>
<td>Survey Items Part III, 11, 14, Faculty Interview Protocol Item 2</td>
<td>Categorized Interview Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students master stated composition objectives and outcomes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do teachers perceive service goals as compatible with composition goals or do</td>
<td>Survey Items Part III, 8, 14, Interview Protocol Item 6</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics Categorized Interview Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they perceive them as separate from composition goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
three sources of data and four types of analyses. Data sources were the TOS, Interviews, and submitted course syllabi. The Table 1 format reflects the application of Creswell’s (2003) concurrent triangulation strategy.

Data analysis included the use of descriptive statistics, categorizing and coding of interview transcriptions, and document analysis. The Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used for descriptive analyses, the qualitative package NVivo was used to code interview data, and a Document Analysis Matrix was used to analyze submitted syllabi. The matrix provides a glimpse into how college teachers in service-learning composition courses perceive outcomes are being met, and also provides a picture of how this perception corresponds with insights gained from interviews and document analysis.

**Human Subjects Considerations**

The rights of subjects participating in this study were secured through obtaining informed consent, providing consent forms, and providing the opportunity for respondents to validate their responses (specifically interview responses).

Permission to conduct this study was obtained through the Institutional Resource Board (IRB) at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan. As part of this process, permission to conduct interviews at participating schools required consent from those schools. Obtaining consent at the two institutions selected required going through their respective IRB procedures. Once this process was approved by these institutions, institutional letters of consent were sent to the IRB at Andrews University, and a letter of permission to conduct research was granted (see Appendix E).
Participants completing the survey questionnaire were informed that returning the survey signified their informed consent to participate in the study. Participants taking part in the interview process signed a consent form notifying them that all responses would be recorded, and that at anytime during the process, should they feel compromised, they could withdraw from the study. They were informed that participation was voluntary and would be considered without prejudice. Respondents were also given the opportunity to validate their responses.

Summary

This chapter discusses the general research methods used for this study. A description of the research design, population and sampling procedures, instrumentation, research procedure, analysis of data, and human subject considerations is provided. As an objectives-oriented program evaluation, data gathering occurred in two phases employing a mixed-methods design that incorporated a survey questionnaire, open-ended interviews, and document analysis of submitted course syllabi. In accordance with the concurrent triangulation strategy described by Creswell (2003), Table 1 outlines how each research question is address by each data source.

Outline of the Following Chapter

The following chapter reports the findings of research question 1 gained from interview responses and field notes. Program directors and faculty members describe what service-learning looks like at their institutions and in their courses, respectively. Attention is given to a description of the atmosphere at both institutions, the role of program directors, challenges, faculty motivation, and the future of service-learning.
CHAPTER IV

INTERVIEW RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter addresses research question 1 by providing a narrative description of what service-learning looked like at University A and University B. Research question 1 asked, *What do service-learning composition courses look like?* Program Directors provided a description of service-learning on the individual campuses, and faculty members were asked to describe their courses. This was done to gain an understanding of what service-learning in composition looks like in practice. This chapter presents these responses, along with observations made through additional field notes collected.

Two schools were selected for on-site interviews: University A, a public land-grant institution, and University B, a public research institution. From these two schools, 10 individuals responded to the request for face-to-face, open-ended interviews. The service-learning program directors of the respective campuses were interviewed (n=2). Three female (n=3) and four male (n=4) faculty members participated in face-to-face interviews. Of the seven (n=7), three chose to participate in a small-group setting. The other four faculty members were interviewed individually.

Finally, both program directors interviewed held faculty rank of associate professor. Of the faculty members interviewed, four were associate professors, and three
were assistant professors. One respondent was not included in that he was a teaching assistant, and at the conclusion of the data collection timeframe for this research, had yet to teach a course of this nature. For this study, then, nine were used. All seven faculty participants were engaged in teaching composition with a service-learning component, or from an integrated service-learning perspective. Interviews were conducted during the months of April, May, and July of 2006.

**Program Directors**

**Program I**

Both service-learning directors provided pertinent information regarding the scope and goals of their respective programs. The physical layout of Program I (University A) was expansive, and spoke to the university’s commitment to service by communicating an open atmosphere. The similarly open nature of the director allowed me to ask questions and gain insight into the mission and goals of the program.

The physical layout of University A mirrors a mini-city. As with a city, there is an atmosphere of convenience and access to resources. City traffic merges into the campus thoroughfare, and shops and cafes line both the main and side streets. A system of quadrants divides the campus by disciplines, and a maze of sidewalks connects one area of the campus to another. This layout creates a merging of campus and community. Service is as accessible as transportation.

Upon arrival I met the program director at the welcome center. The importance of service to this campus was evident by the location of the main program office. These offices occupied space in the university’s main welcome center, demonstrating commitment to service as an important arm of the university’s mission. I was informed
that this is a land-grant institution, which means that service to the community and the building up of the community are essential to its presence in the community. A land-grant institution "is an institution that has been designated by its state legislature or Congress to receive the benefits of the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. The original mission of these institutions, as set forth in the first Morrill Act, was to teach agriculture, military tactics, and the mechanic arts as well as classical studies so that members of the working classes could obtain a liberal, practical education" (About the Land-Grant System, 1999, p. 2 of 8).

Description of Atmosphere

The interview with the director of Program I occurred throughout the day rather than in one sitting. While we did have a scheduled sit-down appointment, this occurred late in the afternoon, and by that time, my questions had been answered over the course of our conversation throughout the day. A very outgoing and sociable person by nature, this program director presents an open-door approach to management and gives those working with her the flexibility to run with their ideas. Due to the nature of the university, as a land-grant institution, the emphasis on public service is strong and the environment created is rich. The director took me to and from each interview. During this time I asked general questions, and was given an overview of the history of service-learning at this university. After the scheduled interview, I was given a tour.

From the service offices at the welcome center we moved to the Humanities quadrant, which houses the English department, for scheduled interviews, then finally to the campus-based service offices for a tour and meeting with the staff. Located in a refurbished building, these offices provide space for meetings, conferences, and staff.
There is quite a bit of student activity and several student volunteers are working on various community projects.

**Mission and Goals**

Program I seeks to provide students with opportunities to apply educational knowledge and skill in the community. According to the program description posted on University A's Center for Service-Learning website, “Students who participate in service-learning contribute to the public good of local, national and international communities via curricular and co-curricular service placements” (p. 1). It is essential to this program that students make the connection between content knowledge and “real-world” experiences. This type of learning is core to the framework and guiding principles of Program I, which is committed to providing opportunities for students to engage with the community and build personal and professional civic responsibility (p. 1). Work is done to aid non-profit and government organizations in their region. The center also assists in matching participating organizations with student volunteers who, on average, give 4-12 hours of service a week over a 10-week period. Short-term community projects are also coordinated by this Program.

Additional services include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Assisting in matching faculty and students from different academic disciplines with those in the community who need their services

2. Maintaining a database of services needed by partnership agencies

3. Assisting faculty in implementing best practices for integrating service into the curriculum and providing opportunities for reflection, and visiting classes to make presentations
4. Facilitating an application process that satisfies the quality and safety of service placements

5. Maintaining a collection of resources for faculty and other interested parties.

Program II

The physical layout of Program 2 (University B) differed from Program I. While the campus layout is easy to follow with the assistance of a campus map, the feel is that of a campus sharing space with a city. Homes, residence halls, and local businesses coexist and compete for space. Buildings are old and ivy covered, suggesting a long history in academia. Stone and brick buildings speak volumes of the history and heritage associated with the school. On the periphery of this daunting atmosphere sits a little yellow and white house, the home of Program II, its offices and meeting rooms.

As Program II is housed on the outskirts of the campus, it appears very separate from what happens on the campus. At the same time, the center of the campus is within walking distance. In architectural style it mirrors that of the campus, only it is made of wood rather than of stone. Designed to serve those involved in service-learning, whether faculty or students, the physical layout mirrors that of a cozy home. Living spaces serve as meeting rooms and conference rooms. Offices on the second floor belong to the directors and staff. In addition to meeting and conference rooms, the main floor houses kitchenettes for everyone’s convenience, restrooms, and a reception area.

At the time of my arrival, a student-led debriefing of a service project was in session, and a student volunteer leader warmed up his lunch while he awaited the arrival of his peers and one of the directors. They were about to have a planning session for an end-of-project program.
Description of Atmosphere

For this interview I arrived early, even though scheduled meetings with the program director and another faculty member would occur later in the afternoon. My first meeting was in one of the reserved conference rooms, formerly a dining room. The trappings of a regular family room remained in tact, purposefully so. A large mahogany dining table with seating for eight dominated the middle of the room. On the sides were comfortable padded and wooden chairs for lounging or reclining. Hanging plants draped the walls and standing plants decorated end tables. Standing lamps were placed at the corners to add to the room’s lighting.

My meeting with Program II’s director was the last appointment on my roster. The office décor mirrored that of the rest of the house—a cozy, familial environment. Office doors were opened which added to the atmosphere of openness and collegiality.

Mission and Goals

Program II seeks to “serve as a resource to build the capacity of faculty, schools, and colleges for developing students’ civic skills, knowledge, motivations, and aspirations” (University B brochure, 2006, p. 1). It also sees itself as a catalyst so “students and faculty can forge a link between theory and practice, knowledge and action, and campus and community” (University B brochure, 2006, p. 1).

A description of mission and goals for Program II states that the program “engages students, faculty, and community members in learning together through community service and civic participation in a diverse democratic society” (University B brochure, 2006, p. 5). This includes, but is not limited to, the following:
1. Helping students learn and lead in the community through civic and educational opportunities

2. Creating an environment where faculty can research and teach in ways that will strengthen community-based classes and communities

3. Building working relationships with communities that will improve both communities and students

4. Expanding the opportunities available for civic engagement at the university

5. Establishing the center as the central place where matters of student and institutional engagement take place.

Examples of Program II achieving its goals can be seen in several programs, specifically biology, dentistry, mechanical engineering, Spanish, and English composition. Of composition the pamphlet states: “Students develop their writing capacities by preparing written materials (press releases, brochures, etc.) for community-based organizations” (University B brochure, p. 3). Faculty have access to resources such as consultation, technical assistance, faculty workshops, curriculum development grants, training for student facilitators, access to a publications lending library, complimentary copies of key service-learning journals, and access to local listserv announcing grants and workshops, and workshops to prepare students for community-based service and learning. Also provided is an inventory of community-based organizations and assistance in identifying community placements compatible with course learning objectives (University B brochure, p. 2).
Research Question 1

Program Director Responses

Research question 1 asked, *What do service-learning composition courses look like?* The Program Directors provided a description of service-learning in general on their individual campuses. The first three questions posed to both program directors were introductory in nature and addressed the history of service at their respective schools, the primary role of their office, and how the university assessed the impact of service-learning on student learning. Both directors focused on the importance of service being supported by the institution, either as part of the mission, or as part of the tradition or culture of the campus. The director for Program I emphasized the importance of service being an integral part of the university’s mission by stating, “This is a land-grant institution and so an integral part of our mission is service for the public good – not for profit” (PD1, Q1, Interview). It was noted that the majority of the programs in the academic curriculum had some aspect of service attached to a student’s completion of that program. Specific mention was made of the teacher education programs, where students were attached to schools from very early in their program. Many juniors and seniors also have attached to their program completion participation in internships of some kind.

The director for Program II emphasized that joining service and learning was a tradition at the university. This director stated, “The [Program II] has a tradition of service and learning. Thousands of students participate in service courses designed by faculty” (PD2, Q1, Interview). The director of Program II felt strongly that “Faculty that
integrate service into their teaching and research how best to meet the community's needs become better scholars and teachers" (PD2, Q1, Interview).

Role of Service-Learning Office

The directors were asked to comment on the role their office held in supporting service-learning on their respective campuses. The director of Program I functions with a full-time staff of 12 and several student volunteers. This director's specific role is to assist faculty whenever the need arises and provide them “with whatever they need” (PD1, Q2, Interview). According to the director, “We provide placements, resources for grant funding and writing, representation on community boards and committees. We maintain partnerships, offer seminars, and support faculty research. We also encourage that all community volunteers go through us so that they can be covered under the university’s indemnification policy” (PD1, Q2, Interview).

The director for Program II functions as the associate director for academic service-learning. At this university, this position comes with appointment to committees and faculty rank. This director functions as one of several associate directors. The role of the associate director for academic service-learning here is as follows: “The role of the office is to provide support for faculty through consultation and technical assistance, workshops, training or preparing students and faculty for community-based programs, and even linking faculty with partners and placing students in service positions” (PD2, Q2, Interview). This director works with a staff of about 20 and hundreds of student volunteers.
Impact of Service-Learning on Student Learning

The final introductory question addressed how each university assessed the impact of service-learning on student learning, inclusive of challenges faced in the process, and how these challenges are overcome. On this point, there are differences in how assessment takes place. Program I conducts its own assessment of the impact of service-learning on student learning. According to the program director, “The center does its own assessment which is then given to the university, since we handle all that has to do with service and civic engagement” (PD1, Q3, Interview). Each semester this program surveys students and publishes an end-of-semester survey report containing both qualitative and quantitative results. Students are asked such questions as: Were you participating in service-learning for a course requirement? What type of service? How did service help you to learn about cultures different from your own? Think critically or reflect on values? Improve written communication? Improve problem-solving skills or understand how communities work? Students are then asked to rate their experiences along a scale of other descriptors. This report provides the university with tangible information regarding the practice of service and the extension of its mission.

Program II reported a different challenge in the area of assessment. According to the director:

The university is a Research I university. This means that we attract faculty interested and driven by research, and that the ‘carrot’ we offer to faculty is that they will be able to do research. Academic service-learning on this campus is not centralized. (PD2, Q3, Interview)

As a result, while Program II conducts its own assessment on how successful their programs are and how well they are addressing the needs of faculty, students, and community service agencies, the assessment has more to do with their own capacity
building rather than the university at large. In addition, faculty members participating in integrating service-learning into their courses are encouraged to have their own assessment tools built into the courses that they teach. It is interesting that the physical layout of both programs mirrors the way in which service-learning is emphasized and the degree to which it is a central part of each university's functioning. In Program I, offices occupy a central space, signifying that the focus is central to the mission, and assessment is conducted in a way to support that mission. In Program II, offices occupy a peripheral space, signifying a focus that is not as central to the mission, one that occurs outside of the main functioning of the school.

Challenges

Both directors discussed challenges faced in the area of institutional service-learning and noted that resolutions were not easily achieved. Program I reported its biggest challenge is in the area of securing transportation for students to and from service locations. According to the director, "A major challenge we have here is transportation. City transportation will take students within a 15-mile radius of our school to service locations; however, anything beyond that has to be funded" (PD1, Q3, Interview). This becomes a challenge in cases where classes are larger than normal, such as the general undergraduate and lecture classes. Securing additional funding in this area, whether from university resources or outside sources such as grants or assistance from community-based organizations, is dependent on assessment results that would demonstrate the effectiveness of service-learning as good pedagogical practice.

For Program II, the challenges are a little different. According to this director:
While the university has a climate of service, that climate has been hard fought for by the Center. Now, at the course level, we continue to encourage and motivate faculty to take it to the next level, to make it more personal. But, that continues to be a challenge. (PD2, Q3, Interview)

Maintaining a positive climate is foundational to the role of the service-learning director. Part of that positive climate comes from the range of services and support they are able to provide to faculty members practicing service-learning as pedagogy. These challenges are not unique to the directors, however. Faculty members cite similar challenges, which will be discussed in the section on faculty challenges.

**Motivating Faculty to Teach From a Service-Learning Perspective**

Faculty motivation is inspired by institutional commitment and support. When asked about faculty motivation, both directors shared some of their own experience with service-learning. From these responses, inferences can be made about soliciting and sustaining faculty commitment. Question 7 on the program director interview protocol asked, “Apart from institutional demands, share your motivation for participating in engaging faculty to be involved in academic service-learning.” The director of Program I shared:

I come to this from a community service background. I have always been involved in the community. I was a Peace Corps volunteer and have several awards for that, but I think I do this because it has always been a part of who I am, and I believe that the experience, no matter your major or academic discipline, changes you and gives you a very clear sense of who you are and what your role is in your local and global community. (PD1, Q7, Interview)

The director of Program II shared:

My background is in teaching art and design. I think, having the mind of a teacher, wanting to know how best to transmit knowledge and build skill, has allowed me to connect with this pedagogy. In my own experience I’ve found service-learning, or as in the early days--community-based learning--compatible with what I taught.
Students did better and developed a sense of ownership of their community. These were things I was not teaching them, but that they learned being part of the community. My own experience was one of community action and civic involvement. I know the benefits from experience, from the research done by the center and others we publish—I feel strongly that all round, it is a pedagogy that enhances the learning experience. (PD2, Q7, Interview)

From these responses it is clear that in both cases, institutional support encourages faculty motivation, and draws faculty who have a desire to participate in this type of pedagogical practice. It is interesting to note that both directors came to service-learning from two different perspectives: one from the area of community-based service, the other from the area of teaching and learning. From both perspectives, experience with service-learning came from personal experience, and the experience of seeing it at work in the classroom—seeing the scope of its possibility. Both emphasized the understanding of place in society, civic responsibility, and ownership for one's community. These responses mirror those of individual faculty, which will be discussed later.

The Future of Service-Learning

Both directors were asked to address the future of academic service-learning from their perspective as ones being responsible for the training and support of faculty in this method of instruction. Questions 8 and 9 asked about the future of academic service-learning at the respective institutions in the next 5 to 10 years, and the prospective challenges it would face as a pedagogical model. Both directors gave candid responses that suggested an optimism and hope, with concepts such as sustainability, longevity, and pedagogical practice being keystone.

Both directors addressed the future of academic service-learning as being characterized by sustainability, longevity, and capacity building. Regarding the place
academic service-learning would hold in the next 5 to 10 years, Program Director I responded:

At this university we have a five-ten year plan. That is in writing. We feel we have arrived at sustainability. Across the board, I see other schools struggling to arrive at the state we have accomplished--so I think that will be a challenge. (PD1, Q8, Interview)

Having arrived at sustainability, it is felt that this institution can serve as an example to other institutions currently facing the challenges of sustaining academic service-learning programs at their schools. Program Director II states:

I see more emphasis on the learning part of the pedagogy. I believe we see the possibilities of the service part, so there will be more of a learning focus. I see more capacity building taking place. I see more research (your project for example) on the part of practitioners and doctoral students--more scholarship, as in the scholarship of engagement. (PD2, Q8, Interview)

Capacity building serves both the sustainability and longevity of programs. In addition to this, both directors felt strongly that the future of service-learning includes moving beyond success in the classroom, to success at the national level, and success in terms of faculty advancement. According to Program Director I:

Our philosophy is students, service, synergy, education, engagement, empowerment, community, collaboration, citizenship, commitment. I think this shows everyone working together to accomplish shared goals. I see that this will continue to be an area of much interest given our national and global climate, and I see more emphasis on the content of service. (PD1, Q8, Interview)

Program Director II focused attention on the academic community:

The academy will begin to pay more attention to service as part of one's tenure. They will begin to see the value of community and scholarship. As a result I see a better quality of service-learning. More practitioners. As the understanding of the pedagogy expands, I see faculty beginning to understand how their area of concentration can benefit from service-learning. (PD2, Q8, Interview)
The desire for synergy and quality is evident in both responses. The perspective of academic service-learning as a pedagogical practice emerges for the first time here in these responses.

Question 9 asked "What do you see as the major challenges to academic service-learning as pedagogy?" Both directors responded that preserving the integrity of both the content of the discipline and the nature of service-learning as pedagogy would pose challenges for the future. According to Program Director I:

As far as challenges, I think the challenge of preserving the integrity of the content or discipline and the integrity of the community piece as being by far our greatest challenge. Too often one suffers. Both are significant to effective implementation of this pedagogy. (PD1, Q9, Interview)

Having arrived at sustainability, this program can focus its attention on making sure the integrity of content areas and of service are preserved. In contrast, Program Director II felt strongly that longevity and sustainability would be ascertained after the tenure of the current administration of the program. According to Program Director II:

I said earlier that one of the successes I see here is longevity. I also see this as a challenge. Longevity comes with buy-in and capacity building. The true success here at [name of institution] this university will be the sustainability of all that we do here long after I leave and this current staff moves on. Many programs fail because they have not been sustainable. (PD2, Q9, Interview)

In addition to seeing sustainability and longevity as challenges to the success of academic service-learning, Program Director II addressed several additional concerns, most focusing on the pedagogical aspect of academic service-learning.

Another major challenge to this pedagogy, and yes, I most definitely see it as a pedagogy - is understanding the pedagogy. This is a pedagogical model - it is a way of thinking about learning, content, goals, outcomes, instruction, assessment, evaluation. All the criteria we assess to a 'pedagogical model' we can assess to academic service-learning. This is what I talk about when I have roundtable discussions with departments and faculty. Service-learning's growth as a pedagogical model will continue as we grapple and think about how it can engage scholarship.
We have finally come to the point where we have faculty conducting research on service-learning as pedagogy versus research with service-learning with pedagogy. (PD2, Q9, Interview)

When asked if ‘research on service-learning as pedagogy’ and ‘research with service-learning with pedagogy’ were two different things, Program Director II responded that they were, indeed. He stated:

These are definitely two different things. There is a lot of research out there, as I’m sure you will find, conducted based on what students did in a service-learning course and the impact on the community. There is now more research available on how the actual framework of service-learning impacts student learning. One is the means to an end, the other is an end. (PD2, Q9, Interview)

The goal, then, is an approach that will integrate service as both the goal or objective of the course, and the framework or perspective from which the course is taught. Both occurring concurrently reduces the potential for gaps in student learning and ineffective service. Program Director II also noted:

I think, too, that avoiding the ‘buzz word syndrome’ will be a big challenge. Even now, there are so many definitions for ‘service-learning’ that it’s easy to use the term loosely. Adding in the word academic and people still don’t know exactly what you’re referring to. So, this is a challenge that practitioners will need to address and I think as research and scholarship continues, we will begin to see better understanding. (PD2, Q9, Interview)

Program Director II continues to add that scholarship will be one evident change in academic service-learning in the next 5 to 10 years, and it will also be one of the big challenges service-learning will face. This director felt that administrators and faculty would need to be motivated toward viable ways of engaging in scholarship. The director states:

You know, we talk about service-learning being a way of building civic responsibility and strong citizenship in learners—obeying laws, paying taxes, what it means to be a responsible citizen. These are the ends of service-learning. The means is how we frame service as an effective instructional process. Much of what we face in our society today has to do with a loss of value—value that has not been taught.
Mainstream values seem to have disappeared. I believe academic service-learning is part of the solution. (PD2, Q9, Interview)

Faculty Responses

Interviews were conducted with seven faculty members. In response to research question 1, *What do service-learning composition courses look like?*, participants created a descriptive picture of the nature of service-learning in the writing courses taught. Interview sessions lasted between 70 to 90 minutes and took place over a period of three separate sessions. All responses were tape recorded and later transcribed. For this study, quoted responses are not edited, but written as transcribed. The following section provides brief background to each respondent, inclusive of course descriptions.

Interview 1

My meeting with respondents 1A, 1B, and 1C of Program 1 (from here on PR1A, PR1B, and PR1C) occurred in a large, wood-paneled conference room in the English Department’s Writing Division. Our session began promptly, after discussion over whether the program director would join the session. It was decided that because my time with the program director would be ongoing, this session should occur with just the faculty. Two males and one female comprised this group. Each came to service-learning from diverse paths. The two male professors were seasoned instructors of this pedagogical practice; the female professor considered herself relatively new to the pedagogy. We met around the round table of the conference room and began our discussion.

I first needed to establish the nature of service-learning in first-year composition at the institution. They shared that as part of the *Writing Across the Curriculum* initiative
at their school, it was decided that in addition to traditional first-year courses in writing, students would have the opportunity to self-select writing courses that offered a service component to meet the institution's service requirement. With this background, I asked each respondent to share the objectives of their individual courses, since each faculty member had a different approach.

PR1A responded first. This respondent shared that she had been using this approach for the least amount of time in the area of first-year writing, although she had integrated service into courses taught in other disciplines. For the two semesters taught in the area of first-year writing composition, she stated, "What I've done is focused on the guidelines for service." The guidelines for her courses emphasize responsibility, citizenship or responsibilities of citizenship, helping students become better consumers of information, addressing current events with a special focus on items pertaining to responsibility, citizenship, and service. At the time of the interview, the class was focusing on the environment and the current administration's handling of the topic. She opined:

And the idea is to get them to think about how important information is and that information is conveyed and sort of misconstrued purposefully, in many cases, and to help them see that not only is it their responsibility to find out what is not true, what the actual facts are, but also to tap into it. I feel that people are, ah, a lot of the apathy that we see is because people are receiving so much misleading information from our politicians and media that they give up. They don't think that they can really say anything about anything.

As a result, the students in the course were placed at volunteer sites and organizations that had an environmental focus. The service component, as closely as possible, revolves around the themes of the course. The goal is to get students involved in advocacy, promoting organizations that are engaged, from a community perspective, in addressing
the focus of the course. Writing assignments are related to students’ tasks. For example, if students are cleaning up streets, they would be working on writing instructions for other volunteers who would come after them. For this course, while students are required approximately 20 hours of service, it was noted that there was no rigid way of ‘checking up’ on students.

The second course was quite different. PR1B shared that although he taught a course with similar goals, his structure was a bit more formal. He shared:

What I try to do is to try to get the students to place themselves in social situations and try to recapture some of the social nuances. So my course has a little more of the formal streams, the academic stream and the project stream, a lot of reading and talking about issues. Particularly in the area of education and things that relate to student bodies as it is.

His goal is to get students involved. Using a project approach, he wants to get students to put concepts into practice, to become a part of a social organization, and possibly bring about change. This is done through lots of writing, talking with each other, talking with partners, and addressing social issues.

I asked this respondent to describe ‘academic and project streams’ in a more precise way. His response was that he explains to the students that with everything there is a theoretical and practical perspective. The academic represents the theoretical, and the project represents the practical or ‘grassroots’, to use his word.

The third respondent agreed that in line with the Writing Division’s vision for service in writing, his course goals were similar to his colleagues. However, writing in his course is done online. Students put together two portfolios or web-folios online. One folio is organized around theoretical readings and writings. The second folio, the writing project folio, is a “separate entity with different audience.” The key here is audience.
While the theoretical folio has an audience of classmates or team members, the writing project folio’s audience includes the agencies where students serve:

I encourage their partner agents or agency, agency contact person, is what I mean to say, to visit that with some regularity. And it would have the profile of the agency and the history of the other agencies that are doing similar work, interviews with the contact person and this sort of thing, and then links to important aspects of the project. That is again to be done online.

In following up on how much time students were required to spend with a service agency, I asked if students had specific hours to be on site at their service location or if it was a fluid schedule where students would work with partner agencies on a needs-based schedule. This was in response to PR1A’s response that students were required to spend 20 hours at their sites, but this requirement was not checked in any rigid, sequential way. PR1C noted that for his course, community representatives would come to the class and say “Here’s what needs to be done, here’s what we’d like you to do with us.” Once the class gets a task, they address the task. The community representative agent then comes back to the class to hear the presentations. Throughout the process there is constant communication, as tasks can take several hours both in and out of class.

At this point the discussion moves on to effective ways of managing the body of work that is compiled for each project. Course management software products are critiqued. There is agreement that using some kind of course management software is beneficial to both students and partners. It allows partners, at anytime, to access projects and provide feedback, and it also allows students to work on projects off-site, as long as there is access to a computer. This reduces time conflicts with agency partners such as how long students are able to stay on-site, the distance between the campus and service site, and how often agency partners have to travel between their site and the campus.
The discussion on conflict raised another question pertaining to course goals. I asked the group how they addressed goals and outcomes when working with service partners; was it important for them that the service partner’s request be aligned with writing in some way, or was this extraneous in their thinking? Their response was unanimous. They agreed that their primary goal was to connect the classroom with the community, the emphasis being on meeting the needs of the community. They felt that they would be able to align content regardless of the task. According to PR1B:

"Usually what they come with is a shopping list. So, we get to choose what works for us that will usually align with the course. We want to put the kids in workable situations where they can do writing and composition things, yet still learn how to solve problems. The agencies are pretty flexible with us."

**Interview 2**

The second interview session was a meeting with PR1D. This respondent used service-learning as part of the instructional framework of the course designed to teach writing in digital environments. We met in the basement of the former community service-learning headquarters, an old building under renovation. However, due to the magnitude of the service-learning focus on the campus, the space was being utilized to house courses and programs associated with service on the campus. I began by asking this respondent to share with me a little about the courses he taught.

PR1D shared that his primary appointment was at the university’s center for writing research, which focused specifically on writing across genres, media, and situations in an electronic environment. The program is designed to help individuals, organizations, and communities understand how writing can bring about change in individuals, organizations, and communities. For example, the program can assess an
organization's writing practices and goals, and recommend improvements in training, technology use, and how to meet the needs of clients. Students in the program can also offer text analysis, participate in qualitative organizational work, and provide assistance to other departments, across the campus, in how to integrate writing technologies into the classroom. The three main questions that guide the program are as follows: What are the processes of digital composing? What are the best practices of digital composing? How do we enable the capacity for communities and organizations to write in digital environments? In addition to working with the center, this respondent also carries appointment to the writing faculty, teaching first-year writing and graduate-level courses.

He considers the work done by his classes a mixture of action learning and action research community projects: “People come to us with problems and we try to help them solve those problems. And they're almost always interestingly connected to curricular experiences.” There is often interaction between the work students do for class, and the work that the center does for the community; sometimes, the center adds backup to student projects that really need the additional support. At the time of the interview, the introduction to web-writing course was split in half: half of the class was working on a community-based project, which is also called a service-learning project, or according to PR1D:

Half the class is doing community-based projects which we call service-learning projects depending on how attached we are to a particular theory in service-learning. We're doing sustainable web design, that is, we're doing web development with community organizations that they can continue to write and maintain, as opposed to making web sites that people can never use them, never update them, they're useless.

While this discussion was interesting, I wanted to get his perceptions about service-learning and writing in the first-year setting. However, I realized that the existence of
this program, which offers degrees at the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral levels, signified institutional support of ongoing opportunities for writing in the community. This respondent, with his experiences in teaching first-year writing courses, professional writing courses, and graduate-level rhetoric and writing courses, provided insight into the topic.

Interview 3

My third interview took place not in an office or a center, but in a student union cafeteria. I met with PRIE at 1:15 on a sunny afternoon in one of the many student cafeterias/food courts. Students were eating together, and the bustle and flow of undergraduate university life seemed a perfect backdrop to our pending discussion. Program Director 1 introduced me to PRIE, who waited for us at one of the dining tables. We chatted for several minutes before the interview began about the nature of a campus and the unique quality that is campus life. Of all the respondents, PRIE seemed the most distracted and hesitant to provide direct responses. I believe this was because—later supported by his own confession—he was new to service-learning and was not as comfortable reflecting his role this far. I began by asking the respondent to share a description of his course. He proceeded to describe the process by which students would come to his service-learning writing course.

At his campus, students who did not test out of the writing requirement, or whose departments did not have their own first-year writing component, were automatically required to fulfill the first-year writing requirement in the writing division. The division provided a series of 100-level courses from which students would select. These 100-level courses are further divided into categories based on content area with titles such as Public
Life in America, Men in America, Women in America, Embracing Ethnicity, Science and Technology, and so on. The service-learning emphasis is placed in the Public Life in America category. This respondent was responsible for two sections of the course, which, overall, was taught by a total of five different instructors. Each course had a predetermined community partner. This respondent’s class partnered with the local public school system. There, students performed a variety of tasks, from tutoring, to playing basketball, to playing tiddlywinks. When asked how this type of engagement really helped the community, PRIE responded:

I can only speak for myself. The way that I see it, the schools NEED our students’ help, especially in [sic]. They’re having a funding crisis. They would not have after-school programs if my students didn’t go. So it’s not a false academic exercise. They don’t pretend that they’re helping out or something; they really do. So, sometimes they tutor, sometimes they play basketball, sometimes they play tiddlywinks.

This respondent shared that even though he received reports of student engagement, he often felt distanced from what was happening at the service sites. He did not visit sites, partners did not visit his classroom, and the only indicators he had about what was happening at the service location was that which students reported in their reflection papers. The nature of this course design did not allow for much engagement as the instructor would have liked. He stated that this was not necessarily a bad thing, and did not perceive a need for more involvement from the faculty perspective, preferring, rather, to keep the two experiences separate. Additional concerns included securing appropriate transportation for students (since most programs were after-school programs), the safety of his students, and the ability to get students to connect their tasks to their writing lives.
Interview 4

I met with PR2A at 1:00 on a rainy afternoon at the service center. The center is a renovated house designed to meet the needs of its clientele, with kitchen space, bathrooms, meeting rooms. The upper floor housed offices. I had reserved the dining room for my time with PR2A. We ended up conducting our session in one of the conversation units rather than at the cherry-wood dining table.

PR2A teaches writing and over the last 15 years has had several opportunities to teach courses with a service-learning component, including adapting a composition course to the field of service-learning, doing a first-year seminar, as well as building/developing a service-learning course that also counts as a first-year writing course. The nature of the writing program at her campus provides faculty members with several opportunities to design courses beyond the printed curricular offerings. In her experience, she has taught more traditional service-learning as part of the writing center courses where students are placed in various agencies or she has given students a list of suggested places and has had them choose and set up their own times to go and do service.

Being an active course designer, however, this respondent shared that she no longer addresses service-learning in composition from the same perspective. The lack of depth students seemed to give to written reflection papers, and their seeming lack of awareness of the impact of service experience on their lives in general, brought about a change in the last several years. Her current courses are designed around issues arriving from the ethics of service: race, place, power, social justice, and so on. Interview questions, then, were addressed from this perspective.
Interview 5

I met with PR2B at 1:00 on a summer afternoon at the English Department building, after many attempts to schedule an interview. This was the last interview to be conducted. By now I knew the campus and had a better feel for the surroundings. The historic, ivy covered walls and columns formed the façade of the multipurpose building which housed the English Department and social sciences, along with student services such as one of the many computer centers, student clubs, and offices. PR2B’s office was on the top floor, amidst a bevy of other offices, all of which were closed. Most of the action seemed to be around the student services area. PR2B arrived about 5 minutes late, although it felt like a longer time since I had arrived early, and could only give me a few minutes of time until the beginning of her next class. I took what I could.

PR2B shared that she taught two writing courses that have a service-learning component. The first-year writing course is designed as a rubric essay-writing course. Students in the course visit a nearby metropolitan area and work with senior citizens and children. With senior citizens, students write life stories. With children, students put together booklets of children’s writings. As part of this course there are also readings from essayists such as John Edgar Wideman, Annie Dillard, and so on. Students analyze these works as they write their own versions of life stories. In the second course students are either paired or work singly in an array of non-profit organizations in the community. They are responsible for writing something for that organization, with that organization, and then at the same time they work for the organization. The class is designed around a workshop approach; every piece of writing is reviewed by the class as a whole before it is sent to the service organization. She shared, “We review every piece of writing as a
group before we give it back to our partners so it tends to be great quality by the time we finish. We are the filters. It gets to be a really good group of editors. We see ourselves as co-editors, co-writing, co-editing."

This respondent did not come to service-learning from a writing background. PR2B shared that her literature background inadvertently brought her to service-learning. Her experiences teaching women’s literature and women in the arts courses always had an interactive component:

I was very interactive. In the women’s studies classes my students worked in community settings at some point, in women’s organizations and I had a lot of guest speakers. So, I’ve had a lot of background in this, and I’ve done a lot of community work myself so this was just a natural, it just seemed right.

She also shared that part of her growth in this experience came from the support from her university’s service office, which provided training, seminars, connections to agencies, roundtable discussions, support groups, and so on. All of this proved very helpful to her as an instructor seeking to utilize service-learning as pedagogy.

Summary

This chapter reports the findings of research question 1 gained from interview responses and field notes. Program directors describe what service-learning looks like at their institutions, and faculty members share what service-learning looks like in their composition courses. A summary of the interview introductions reveals several observations about the nature of service-learning as these practitioners see it. Respondents in the first interview shared different approaches to course design. For some, all assignments were designed around the service-learning event. For others, a more formal approach was taken, categorizing assignments into either academic or
service streams. Some felt the service-learning experience should be kept separate from the composition portion of the course; others felt the need to take course design to another level and develop courses targeted to issues rising out of the service-learning composition course.

In terms of alignment of service to composition, these respondents pointed out that aligning the service need to composition was something they felt quite comfortable doing. They placed more importance on the community partner being able to articulate their own need, no matter how specific, knowing that they would find a place to emphasize the goals of composition. Respondents also demonstrated a need for institutional support, whether in terms of training or providing follow-up opportunities for students to stay connected with the community beyond the course.

**Outline of the Following Chapter**

The following chapter discusses responses to the survey questionnaire and interviews for research questions 2-6 of this study. A description of the survey demographics is presented, followed by findings and results framed around the guiding research questions which address perceptions teachers in service-learning composition programs have about their success in ensuring composition and service outcomes are achieved, teaching content- and service-related skills, assessing performance of content- and service-learning activities, mastery of outcomes, and the compatibility of service and composition.
CHAPTER V

SURVEY RESULTS AND INTERVIEW RESPONSES

This chapter discusses the survey results and interview responses to research questions 2-6 of this study. A description of the survey demographics is presented, followed by findings and results framed around the guiding research questions, beginning with question 2:

2. What perceptions do teachers in service-learning composition programs have about their success in ensuring composition and service outcomes are achieved?

3. What perceptions do teachers in composition have about success in teaching content- and service-related skills?

4. What are the differences between the practices used to assess performance in service-learning activities and those used to assess performance in other aspects of the course?

5. How do teachers evaluate whether service-learning opportunities have helped students master stated composition objectives and outcomes?

6. Do teachers perceive service goals as compatible with composition goals, or do they perceive them as separate from composition goals?
In this chapter, responses to research questions 2-6 are presented in the following sequence: responses to survey items, responses to open-ended interview questions, and analysis of documents (syllabi).

**Survey Demographics**

The Teaching Outcomes Survey (TOS) was distributed to 38 composition faculty members at 15 schools. Of the 38 participants, 12 returned completed, usable surveys during the data collection period rendering a response rate of 31.5%. According to Alreck and Settle (1995), “The single most serious limitation to direct mail data collection is the relatively low response rate. Mail surveys with response rates over 30 percent are rare. Response rates are often only about 5 or 10 percent” (p. 35). Given the nature and size of this sample, this is an acceptable rate of return. Of the 38 surveys distributed, 18 were returned. Of the 18 surveys returned, 1 survey was returned stating that the course had not been taught for two semesters due to lack of enrollment; and 5 surveys were returned stating that of the composition courses initially taught, only one remained under the auspices of the English department, the others being renamed and redistributed within the university curriculum. Thus, 12 surveys were used in this study.

Of those responding, 8 (66.7%) were female and 4 (33.3%) were male. The ethnic breakdown is consistent with the literature in that 9 (75%) were Caucasian/White; 2 (16.7%) were of Asian/Pacific Islander; 1 (8.3%) reported other and specified Middle Eastern (see Table 2).

Of all the respondents, 11 selected English as the primary academic discipline, and 1 selected English and Modern languages. Of those responding to the survey, 11 taught First-year Freshman Composition, and 1 taught Basic Writing (see Table 3).
Table 2

Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional courses taught included courses in interdisciplinary writing and master’s-level writing courses. The academic rank of respondents included 6 instructors, 1 adjunct, and 2 other (further clarified as graduate teaching assistants); in the rank of tenure track, 1 assistant professor; and in the rank of non-tenure track, 1 assistant professor and 1 full professor. The types of institutions the respondents taught at include the following: 7 at a public institution; 4 at a private institution; 6 at a college or university.

Survey items 10, 11, 13, and 17 sought to identify the environment in which faculty taught service-learning composition courses. For item 10, “Is service-learning part of the university’s general education requirement?” 7 (58.3%) said no, and 3 (25%) said yes, and 2 (16.7%) were not sure. For item 11, “Is service-learning participation required for your course?” 11 (91%) responded that participation was required, 1 (8.3%) said
participation was optional. In response to item 13, where respondents were asked to rate their success in integrating service-learning into the composition course, 8 (66.7%) rated themselves as successful, and 4 (33.3%) rated themselves as very successful. In response to years at current institution, item 17, 3 (25%) had 0-3 years of teaching; 5 (41.7%) had 4-7 years of teaching; 1 (8.3%) had 8-11 years of teaching; 3 (25%) had 12 or more years of teaching (see Table 4).

All of the respondents reported that they perceived themselves to be successful in integrating service-learning with composition. Of those responding, those with 4-7 years of teaching experience at the current institution reported feelings of success more so than

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track Assistant Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track Associate Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track Assistant Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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those in other categories. Of those teaching in this category, 3 reported feeling successful, and 2 reported feeling very successful. The category with the next highest level of success of those responding included those with 12 or more years of teaching at their current institution, where 2 felt successful, and 1 felt very successful (see Table 5).

This suggests that those with departments that supported the service-learning requirement 4 or more years at current institution, and an academic rank above the instructor level, were more likely to select successful or very successful. Of those reporting 0-3 years, 2 respondents noted the difficulty in integrating service-learning with composition when asked to evaluate the impact of service on students’ mastery of content related goals. One noted, “It is difficult to balance discussions and texts, service and writing, and often, though the connection between service and composition often slips if not reiterated” (TOS9). Another simply stated: “It’s somewhat of a challenge to connect composition with service-learning” (TOS11). Both respondents were also at the instructor rank.
Table 5

*Years of Teaching and Success Integrating Service-Learning*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of teaching</th>
<th>Success at integrating service-learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 2**

Research question 2 was divided into two parts. The first part of question 1 asked, "What perceptions do teachers in service-learning composition programs have about their success in ensuring composition outcomes are achieved?" The second part of question 2 asked, "What perceptions do teachers in service-learning composition programs have about their success in ensuring service outcomes are achieved?"

Question 2A was addressed by items 1, 2, 3, and 4 in Part I of the TOS; items 6, 9, and 13 in Part III of the TOS, and item 1 of the Faculty Interview Protocol. Question 2B was addressed by items 5A-P in Part I of the TOS; items 6, 9, and 13 in Part III of the TOS, and item 1 of the Faculty Interview Protocol. These responses were analyzed using...
bivariate correlation in SPSS, and responses from the interview Protocol organized using Nvivo.

Survey Results

Part I sought to identify how teachers perceived their success in ensuring the general objectives for composition and for service were achieved. The items addressing general objectives for composition courses were taken from the Writing Program Administrator Outcomes Statement. While all institutions do not follow this guide, it can be used as a gauge, in that it was formulated by the Council of Writing Program Administrators. Items 1-5 on the survey asked questions about what faculty hoped to achieve by the end of the service-learning composition course in the areas of rhetorical knowledge, critical thinking, reading and writing, writing processes, knowledge of conventions, and service. Respondents were asked to respond along a 5-point scale of 5=essential—a goal you always try to achieve; 4=very important—a goal you often try to achieve; 3=important—a goal you sometimes try to achieve; 2=unimportant—a goal you rarely try to achieve; 1=not applicable—a goal you never try to achieve. Respondents selected 5 (essential—always try to achieve) and 4 (very important—often try to achieve) for most questions for items 1 and 2 (see Tables 6 and 7). Discussion of results will focus attention on items where 6 (50%) or more of the respondents selected sometimes, rarely, or never (see Tables 8-10). This will identify items that are not being addressed in the courses that the respondents teach, rather than focusing on those items that respondents agree are important (always achieved).
Responses to item 3 (see Table 8), writing processes, were the most varied. For item 3g, Use a variety of technologies, 3 (25%) responded that they sometimes achieved this goal, and 3 (25%) responded that they rarely achieved this goal.

Responses to item 4 (see Table 9), Knowledge of convention, were also varied. For item 4a, Learn common formats for different kinds of texts, 3 (25%) responded that they sometimes achieved this goal; 2 (16.7%) responded that they rarely achieved this goal; and 1 (8.3%) did not respond to this item.

Responses to item 5n (see Table 10), Service outcomes, were the most varied. For item 5b, Develop leadership skills, 5 (41.7%) responded that this was a goal they sometimes tried to achieve, and 2 (16.7%) responded that this was a goal they rarely sought to achieve.

For item 5l, Improve self-esteem/self-confidence, 5 (41.7%) responded that this was a goal they sometimes tried to achieve; 2 (16.7%) responded that this was a goal they never tried to achieve; 1 (8.3%) responded that this was a goal they rarely sought to achieve; and, 1 (8.3%) did not respond to this item.

For item 5m, Cultivate physical health and well-being, 4 (33.3%) responded that this was a goal they never tried to achieve; 3 (25%) responded that this was a goal they sometimes tried to achieve; and, 3 (25%) responded that this was a goal they rarely tried to achieve.

For item 5n, Cultivate an active commitment to honesty, 4 (33.3%) responded that this was a goal they sometimes tried to achieve; 2 (16.7%) responded that this was a goal they never tried to achieve; and, 1 (8.3%) responded that this was a goal they rarely tried to achieve.
For item 5p, Develop capacity to make wise decisions, 6 (50%) of the respondents reported that this was a goal they sometimes tried to achieve.

Item 6 asked respondents to identify composition objectives that were best achieved through service learning: rhetorical knowledge; critical thinking; critical reading; critical writing; writing processes; knowledge of conventions; social change (see Table 11).

According to the responses, respondents felt that critical thinking and writing for change were the objectives best achieved by service-learning in composition. Respondents were divided on whether critical reading and critical writing skills were best conveyed in a service-learning composition course. Respondents also felt that rhetorical knowledge and knowledge of conventions were not best achieved with a service-learning composition course.

Item 9 asked respondents to select or identify objectives represented as outcomes in their service-learning composition course. The objectives most listed as outcomes for those responding to the survey include reflection, value of diverse cultures and perspectives, cultivating community partnerships, critical thinking skills, critical reading skills, critical writing skills, writing processes, knowledge of conventions, and cultural criticism (see Table 12).
Table 6

*Rhetorical Knowledge Goals Instructors Achieved*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By the end of the service-learning composition course, my students are able to:</th>
<th>5 Always</th>
<th>4 Often</th>
<th>3 Sometimes</th>
<th>2 Rarely</th>
<th>1 Never</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. focus on a purpose</td>
<td>9 (75.0)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. respond to the needs of different audiences</td>
<td>7 (58.3)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. respond appropriately to different kinds of rhetorical situations</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. use conventions of format and structure appropriate to the rhetorical situation</td>
<td>8 (66.7)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. adopt appropriate voice, tone, and level of formality</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. understand how genres shape reading and writing</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. write in several genres</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 7

*Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing Goals Instructors Achieved*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By the end of the service-learning composition course, my students are able to:</th>
<th>5 - Always N (%)</th>
<th>4 - Often N (%)</th>
<th>3 - Sometimes N (%)</th>
<th>2 - Rarely N (%)</th>
<th>1 - Never N (%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. use writing and reading for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating</td>
<td>8 (66.7)</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. understand a writing assignment as a series of tasks, including finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing appropriate primary and secondary sources</td>
<td>12 (100.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. integrate their own ideas with those of others</td>
<td>10 (83.3)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. understand the relationships among language, knowledge, and power</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>7 (58.3)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 8

*Writing Process Goals Instructors Achieved*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By the end of the service-learning composition course, my students are able to:</th>
<th>5 Always N (%)</th>
<th>4 Often N (%)</th>
<th>3 Sometimes N (%)</th>
<th>2 Rarely N (%)</th>
<th>1 Never N (%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. be aware that it usually takes multiple drafts to create and complete a successful text</td>
<td>9 (75.0)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. develop flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proofreading</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
<td>7 (58.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. understand writing as an open process that permits writers to use later invention and re-thinking to revise their work</td>
<td>10 (83.3)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. understand the collaborative and social aspects of writing processes</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 8—Continued.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |  
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. learn to critique their own and others’ works | 8 (66.7) | 4 (33.3) | 0 (00.0) | 0 (00.0) | 0 (00.0) | 4.67 .492 |
| 6. learn to balance the advantages of relying on others with the responsibility of doing their part | 4 (33.3) | 4 (33.3) | 4 (33.3) | 0 (00.0) | 0 (00.0) | 4.00 .853 |
| 7. use a variety of technologies to address a range of audiences | 3 (25.0) | 3 (25.0) | 3 (25.0) | 3 (25.0) | 0 (00.0) | 3.50 1.168 |
Table 9

Knowledge of Conventions Goals Instructors Achieved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By the end of the service-learning composition course, my students are able to:</th>
<th>5 Always</th>
<th>4 Often</th>
<th>3 Sometimes</th>
<th>2 Rarely</th>
<th>1 Never</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. learn common formats for different kinds of texts</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. develop knowledge of genre conventions ranging from structure and paragraphing to tone and mechanics</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>1(8.3)</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. practice appropriate means of documenting their work</td>
<td>7 (58.3)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>1(8.3)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 10

*Service Goals Instructors Achieved*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By the end of the service-learning composition course, my students are able to:</th>
<th>5 Always N (%)</th>
<th>4 Often N (%)</th>
<th>3 Sometimes N (%)</th>
<th>2 Rarely N (%)</th>
<th>1 Never N (%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. develop ability to work productively with others</td>
<td>7 (58.3)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. develop leadership skills</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. develop a commitment to accurate work</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>9 (75.0)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. improve ability to follow directions, instructions, and plans</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. improve ability to organize and use time effectively</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. develop a commitment to personal achievement</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. develop ability to perform skillfully</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8. cultivate a sense of responsibility for one's own behavior</th>
<th>9. improve self-esteem/self-confidence</th>
<th>10. develop a commitment to one's own values</th>
<th>11. develop respect for others</th>
<th>12. cultivate emotional health and well-being</th>
<th>13. cultivate physical health and well-being</th>
<th>14. cultivate an active commitment to honesty</th>
<th>15. develop capacity to think for one's self</th>
<th>16. develop capacity to make wise decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>8 (66.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>2*(1)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

*Composition Objectives Best Achieved Through Service-Learning*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition Objectives Best Achieved</th>
<th>Selected</th>
<th></th>
<th>Not selected</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Knowledge</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reading</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Writing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Processes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Conventions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Change</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 12

*Objectives Represented as Outcomes in Service-Learning Composition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Selected</th>
<th></th>
<th>Not Selected</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value diverse cultures and perspectives</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivate community partnerships</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical knowledge skills</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking skills</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical reading skills</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical writing skills</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing processes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of conventions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural criticism</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview Responses

Faculty Responses

In discussing teacher perceptions about their primary role in ensuring outcomes are achieved, interview respondents were first asked to describe their courses and course objectives. This question sought to determine how faculty members saw themselves as functioning as designers of their courses. Faculty shared that their primary role took the form of planning for success by incorporating a variety of teaching methods and calling on students to use a variety of learning styles. Methods of instruction included activities, argumentation, discussion, class-wide short writing exercises, group work, guests, lectures, mini-lectures, projects, and questioning.

Methods of Instruction

In describing their courses, faculty members described how activities played an important part in engaging students in course material. One respondent described the two activities used in her course: the privilege walk and the power line. According to this respondent, "We do a lot of activities like that... to spark discussion" (PR2B, Interview).

The privilege walk is an exercise students participate in on a voluntary basis, and once they have begun, they may also choose not to continue at any point. Students stand in a line and take steps forward and backward depending on the experiences they have had in their lives. For example, they may take one step forward if they grew up in a household with more than 50 books or if they went to a summer camp. Then, they may go backward if they were ever discriminated against on the basis of their gender, race, cultural heritage, and so on. Throughout the experience students may end up taking 30 or
40 of these little moves. Next, there would be discussion about what it felt like to be in
the front of the line or in the back of the line, how all these steps could shape an
individual’s view of the world, what it means to be in one part of the power structure, or
what it means to not be a part of the power structure, and how these all work with or
against each other.

The power line is another activity. According to this respondent:

I sometimes have my partners come in to the class. For example, my non-profit
administrator who runs empowering workshops for people who are homeless does a
great job, talking about power lines in my class in a way that dismantles some of my
students assumptions about power. (PR2B, Interview).

The power line consists of listing pairs of people, some have power and some do not
(e.g., a teacher-student or parent-child relationship). This exercise is done
simultaneously with having those students write ten positive things about themselves.
The exercise is based on the principle that people at the top of the power line have less
difficulty writing positive things about themselves, while those at the bottom of the
power line have more difficulty, in that they often have to overcome negative mental
scripts about themselves. This exercise is about how individuals internalize a role and
often, with conscious effort, live life accordingly.

Another faculty member shared how using a strategy of argumentation assists in
getting students out of their comfort zone. Whether through groups, dialog papers, or
oral arguments, this faculty member utilizes argumentation as a principle method of
instruction in an effort to get students to look at experiences from as many angles as
possible. According to this respondent, “I’m sure other instructors have told you this.
It’s hard because they just don’t have the experience connecting something theoretical to
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something they see and, and they don’t even know how to look, you know how to look. We’re trying to teach them that” (PR2A, Interview).

One respondent shared that the writing project model of write, talk, write, talk, gives enough time for students to dialog with the information, and at the same time, for the faculty member to address writing content. Others responded that facilitating class-wide discussions worked best, allowing students to talk directly and openly about problem areas or misconceptions.

There was division on how important the lecture was to their perception of success in conveying course objectives and goals. One respondent said that mini-lectures worked best and were based on areas that were determined to be problem areas for students, based on work submitted. Another respondent noted that lectures were used only when it appeared that students did not have background information on the topic of discussion. Most responded that lectures were not part of how they conveyed course content or objectives.

The project and portfolio method seemed to be the one most respondents adapted their classrooms to, in that each student or group of students would be with a different agency, service location, or partnership program. According to one respondent:

Because if I have three groups or five groups doing three or five different projects, they are no longer in any meaningful sense one class. There are three or four, three to five different classes. Each group has different problems they need to solve, different research they need to do, different support that they need. I mean, my commitment to them in completing these projects is that I exist to ensure their success. I teach them all individually. (PR1D, Interview)
Research Question 3

Research question 3 was divided into two questions: 3A. "What perceptions do teachers in composition have about success in teaching content-related skills?" 3B. "What perceptions do teachers in composition have about success in teaching service-related skills?" Research question 3A was addressed by items 1A-L in Part II of the TOS; research question 3B was addressed by item 2A-P in Part II of the TOS. Item 4 on the Faculty Interview Protocol and item 5 on the Program Director Interview Protocol also addressed this question. These responses were analyzed using frequency tables and responses transcribed from interviews with faculty and program directors.

Survey Results

Part II asked questions about teachers' perceptions of success in transmitting content goals and outcomes, and service goals and outcomes. Respondents were asked to respond along a 5-point scale of 5=strongly agree; 4=agree; 3=disagree; 2=strongly disagree; 1=not applicable. I will focus attention on items where 50% or more of the respondents selected disagree, strongly disagree, or not applicable (see Tables 13 and 14).

Responses for Part I did not indicate any areas of disagreement or strong disagreement. Responses for item 2 did, however. Faculty were asked to respond to the following statements about service outcomes: I feel I am successful in helping my students learn to: develop ability to work productively with others; develop leadership skills; develop a commitment to accurate work; improve ability to follow directions, instructions, and plans; improve ability to organize and use time effectively; develop a commitment to personal achievement; develop ability to perform skillfully; cultivate a sense of responsibility for one's own behavior; improve self-esteem/self-confidence;
develop a commitment to one's own values; develop respect for others; cultivate emotional health and well-being; cultivate physical health and well-being; cultivate an active commitment to honesty; develop capacity to think for one's self; develop capacity to make wise decisions.

For item 2b, Develop leadership skills, 5 (41.7%) disagreed that they were able to transmit this goal, and 1 (8.3%) strongly disagreed. For item 2m, Cultivate physical health and well-being, 3 (25%) strongly disagreed about their success in transmitting this goal, 3 (25%) did not see this goal as applicable, and 1 (8.3%) did not respond to this item.

Interview Responses

Faculty Responses

Composition goals

Faculty responses to item 4 on the Faculty Interview Protocol addressed research question 3, “What perceptions do teachers in service-learning composition programs have about their success in teaching content-related skills?” These responses provided insight into how faculty addressed content-related goals. Here, themes relating both to the content area and service emerged. I will address composition themes first, then themes relating to service. Composition themes emerging were placed into a category labeled ‘expanding rhetorical situations’. Service themes emerging were placed into categories labeled ‘community partners understanding their role in the course’, ‘students learning to take initiative’, and ‘worldview re-alignment’.

Getting students to think outside of the traditional parameters of teacher-as-audience is one of the successes cited by several faculty members. According to PR1B:
Being able to catch the students in a particular situation, particularly on the project side, to get them thinking about rhetorical situations, thinking about audience, thinking about things they’ve never had to think about before when they were writing for teacher, in the prescriptive sense. (PR1B, Interview)

This respondent continues by adding that “to help students grow past that five paragraph, patent-service, prescribed type of writing that a lot of first-year students are prone to write” (PR1B, Interview) has been the biggest challenge, and at the same time, the biggest success. Also, providing students with a broader perspective of how the course counts beyond the classroom, with the avenue for seeing themselves as part of a broader community, gave this faculty member a feeling of success at the end of each semester.

Another respondent shared a similar response. This respondent felt that the course she taught helped students develop a sense of awareness better than any other writing course. This respondent stated: “Their experiences in high school, regardless, is basically writing for the teacher and so they can do that quite well, but then you ask them to go out and craft something for someone. Then they’re really stuck in that situation” (PR1A, Interview). Another respondent characterized his course as equipping both himself and his students with tools, and fitting into what composition theory is all about, “Giving students the tools to operate in different rhetorical situations, and to be successful in understanding what’s expected of me [them] in the situation where I’m dealing with a community representative or with my peer or my professor” (PR1C, Interview).

Finally, respondent PR1A suggested that her feelings of success came from being able to take the students to a place in their thinking where audience and purpose were just as important as form and structure. She shared the perception that there is a lack of
Table 13

*Composition Instructors’ Perceptions of Success in Transmitting Composition Goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel I am successful in helping my students learn:</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>3 Disagree</th>
<th>2 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1 Not Applicable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. the main features of writing in their field</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>7 (58.3)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. the main uses of writing in their field</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. the expectations of readers in their field</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>8 (66.7)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. the uses of writing as a critical thinking method</td>
<td>7 (58.3)</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. the interactions among critical thinking, critical reading, and writing</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. the relationships among language, knowledge, and power in their field</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>7 (58.3)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. to build final results in states</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>1.206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes (Percentage)</th>
<th>No (Percentage)</th>
<th><em>p</em></th>
<th><em>t</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>to review work-in-progress in collaborative peer groups for purposes other than editing</td>
<td>7 (58.3)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>to save extensive editing for later parts of the writing process</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>to apply the technologies commonly used to research and communicate in their field</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>the conventions of usage, specialized vocabulary, format, and documentation in their field</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>strategies through which better control of conventions can be achieved</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>8 (66.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table 14

*Composition Instructors’ Perceptions of Success in Transmitting Service Goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel I am successful in helping my students learn:</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>3 Disagree</th>
<th>2 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1 Not Applicable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. develop ability to work productively with others</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. develop leadership skills</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. develop commitment to accurate work</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>7 (58.3)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. improve ability to follow directions, instruction, and plans</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>7 (58.3)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. improve ability to organize and use time effectively</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>8 (66.7)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. develop a commitment to personal achievement</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>7 (58.3)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. develop ability to perform skillfully</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. cultivate a sense of responsibility for one’s own behavior</td>
<td>7 (58.3)</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 14—Continued.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. improve self-esteem/self-confidence</td>
<td>10 (83.3)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. develop a commitment to one's own values</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. develop respect for others</td>
<td>8 (66.7)</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. cultivate emotional health and well-being</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. cultivate physical health and well-being</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. cultivate an active commitment to honesty</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. develop capacity to think for one's self</td>
<td>9 (75.0)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. develop capacity to make wise decisions</td>
<td>11 (91.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>1 (8.3)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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“authenticity” in the writing that freshmen traditionally produce in first-year writing courses. Her success comes from having students think about form in light of their new audience, community; an audience, prior to the course, they had not experienced. She states:

But doing a research paper as a freshman or as a senior in high school is not an authentic thing, really. So you know, they have to learn the form. You can talk about what’s the purpose of the forms. What’s the purpose of the bibliographic entry? That’s so people can find that information; there’s a very practical reason for that. Why all of the commas and semicolons? All of those things count? Because that’s a way of communicating. So, you know, I think that projects offer just a wider array of things to do. You never know what they’re going to end up doing. In my case, some of them are doing fact sheets, some of them are doing letters to volunteers, letters to recruiters, some of them are doing . . . let’s see, identification booklets, sort of a wide variety of things. They end up getting to use different kinds of presentation software and so on. Those are things that they’ll probably end up using in whatever career they go into as well. (PRIA, Interview)

Expanding rhetorical situations, taking students beyond the traditional understanding of audience and purpose, and providing access to multiple styles of writing are all areas through which these respondents perceived themselves as being successful in transmitting content related skills.

Service goals

Several faculty members responded to this question by addressing goals in terms of service, rather than composition. Service-learning in the classroom would not be possible without community support and involvement. The degree to which the faculty instructor is able to navigate the demands of the service agency or partner can determine success or failure. One respondent addressed this factor by sharing a success story about how community partners ‘got it’ and began to understand their role in student success. He shared that while sitting with a community advisory board, the point of discussion
turned to how the partnering writing program could better address what needed to be happening with students:

I love our community and industry advisory board. They're very smart people. So we're looking at how should we assess a writing program, particularly a writing program that does the kinds of things that I've described. And what our board said to us is we ought to find a way to measure our students as citizens. That is, is there any growth or learning in terms of how they understand their responsibilities as citizens, as members of communities, as people who have talents and abilities and understandings that are unique? We're trying to figure out what that actually means and how to measure it. We're going to try that. It seems to me that that's an absolutely radical move if you put as part of your program assessment the extent to which our students have shown themselves to be citizens, not just to learn about citizenship, but to BE citizens. That seems remarkable to me. (PR1D, Interview)

One faculty responded that her perception of success came from having students re-think their professional lives. She shared that she has had several students report to her that their lives would take a different direction as a result of the course: “I’ve had students after the course report back that they’ve changed their major or changed their career, they’re going into Teach for America . . . How the course has changed their lives in some way. So I think that’s really good. Their whole view of the world shifts” (PR2B, Interview).

Another responded to this question by addressing one aspect of service-learning courses that was not addressed by any other respondent: a perception of success gained from having students understand more about race and power. This respondent shared an example of an international student who came to understand, through the course, more about the dynamics of race and culture in the United States. She shared:

You know I had an international student last year. I swear she did four or five drafts of every piece and I would not say that the writing necessarily improved. Sometimes it got worse. But, she handed in a portfolio that was thicker, twice as anyone else. She’s a Korean student--she’s been studying Japanese, intensive Japanese at the same time as she was taking my class. So, there was a lot of language going on in her head, but she really felt proud of herself and happy by the end. She felt that she had
accomplished a lot. She had done a tremendous amount of writing. She learned a lot of content. Of course, the culture was new to her, too. This was her first time in the States. She didn’t know how race was constructed here, so right from square one it was all new to her. (PR2A, Interview)

For this respondent, what started as a service-learning composition course soon evolved into writing courses designed specifically around themes of race, place, and power in communities. Her perception was that students in these rhetorical situations often do not know much about how they perceive issues of race and culture, many having not had the experience of interacting with a racial group other than their own. Becoming discouraged with ‘inauthentic’ reflections and responses, this faculty member re-designed the composition course to address the need students seemed to demonstrate for a course that would tap into their own perceptions on race, place, and power. Her perceptions of success came directly from student responses to how their own perceptions changed or were challenged.

Perceptions of success also emerged from what students were able to accomplish in spite of the instructor, outside the boundaries of the service requirement. One instructor shared an example of how a student, seeing a need, used initiative to develop a series of activities to assist one of the classes where observation was taking place. The student was classified as an average student whose work ethic needed improvement. The student became engaged in developing plans for the classroom, and this enthusiasm transferred to what he did for the class, and his performance improved. Support came from the supervising teacher who was absolutely thrilled about the student’s work, and “raved about him being one of the best students she ever had” (PR1E, Interview). This respondent noted:
I also see, in general, a lot of students open up and become more participatory and much more confident. These are all first-year students, and in the fall, especially. They’ve just unpacked their bags. Some of them are quite intimidated by the university, and they’re immediately sent across town on a bus? To work with school children? I mean, they’re brave. They’re very flexible. I tell them, you need to be flexible. We need to be flexible. (PRIE, Interview)

Program Directors

The response that program directors had to this question was different from the response of faculty members. Item 5 of the Program Director Interview Protocol asked directors to describe their successes working with faculty, especially staying true to content-related goals. Both directors shared that faculty success came not only from having support, but also from being willing to put in the effort. According to Program Director 1:

Those that work with us do so because they see the benefit. It allows students to take content knowledge into the real world. Once faculty members realize that no matter the major or discipline, this is a pedagogical practice that allows students to go deeper, they are hooked. (PRD1, Interview)

Program Director 2 had a similar response. He noted that “successes happen with attitude changes” and that in roundtable talks with different departments, it is always interesting to see the change in attitude when the possibilities are realized. He states: “Service-learning can have a place in any area, but one has to be willing to see its possibilities” (PRD2, Interview).

Program Director 1 introduced the idea that the greatest barrier and hindrance to success for most faculty seems to be getting to the “heart of the pedagogy—the seamless integration” (PRD1, Interview) of service with the discipline. When asked how faculty could navigate this hurdle, it was suggested that faculty become more engaged in what is
happening at the service site so better connections can be made to what is occurring in the classroom. This director stated:

It means the faculty member has to be aware of what is happening at the site so that he/she can make connections between the service experience and course content. They have to be aware of what the reflection reports are saying so that they can, again, help the students in making connections. It’s fine for the graduate assistant to read the reflection papers, but the faculty member should also be aware of what is happening. . . . The integration is truly intentional. If not, students can participate for an entire semester and not make connections to the content of the course. (PRD1, Interview)

Research Question 4

Research question 4 asked “What are the differences between the practices used to assess performance in service-learning activities and those used to assess performance in other aspects of the course?” This question was addressed by items 1, 2, and 7 in Part III of the TOS; items 7-10 in the interview protocol; and submitted syllabi. Interview responses were analyzed using transcribed and categorized interview responses using Nvivo and syllabi were analyzed using the Document Analysis Matrix.

Survey Results

To address this question, items 1, 2, and 7 in Part III of the TOS were used. Question 1 stated: I use the following tools to evaluate student work in my composition course, and Question 2 stated: I use the following tools to evaluate service-learning in my composition course. These options included journals, oral presentations, visual presentations, interviews, written reports/projects, peer evaluations, partnership evaluations, and other options that the respondent was free to submit. Question 7 stated: I measure my students’ mastery of composition objectives by using the following methods. These options included interviews, oral presentations, reflective essays, action
research papers, reflective journals, performance evaluations from service sites, and other options that the respondent was free to add.

More than 50% of the faculty responded that they used evaluation tools such as journals, oral presentations, written reports/projects, and peer evaluations to evaluate student work in their courses. In evaluating service-learning in the same courses, more than 50% used journals, oral presentations, and written reports/projects, no different from tools used to evaluate student work. Only 4 (33.3%) of the respondents used peer evaluations to evaluate service-learning within the course. Also, 50% used evaluations from service partners to evaluate student performance (see Table 15).

Table 15

_Evaluation Tools (Percentages within parentheses)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Tools</th>
<th>N who used tools to evaluate composition content</th>
<th>N who used tools to evaluate service-learning content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>7 (58.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral presentations</td>
<td>10 (83.3)</td>
<td>7 (58.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual presentations</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written reports/projects</td>
<td>10 (83.3)</td>
<td>9 (75.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer evaluations</td>
<td>9 (75.0)</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership evaluations</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addressing mastery of composition objectives, 1 (83.3%) used reflective essays, 7 (58.3%) used reflective journals, and 50% used oral presentations. Here, most of the respondents used traditional methods of measuring students' mastery of composition objectives. It is interesting to note that 5 (41.7%) used performance...
evaluations from the service site to measure mastery. This could be accounted for by the fact the service sites have to determine whether the work written for them by the students meets an acceptable standard (see Table 16).

Faculty Interview Responses

**Evaluation and Instruction Strategies**

Items 7 and 8 of the Interview Protocol addressed questions of evaluation and instruction strategies. Items 9 and 10 addressed the question of reflection and its function in assessing student work. The specific questions for items 7 and 8 read as follows:

*What evaluation strategies have you found to be most effective in assessing your students' grasp of composition outcomes? Service outcomes? What instruction strategies have you found to be most successful in helping you transmit composition outcomes? Service outcomes?*

Interview respondents' comments fell into the following categories: traditional assessment, continuous assessment, graded assignments, portfolio evaluation, and flexible grading. The responses showed that these faculty members used similar approaches in evaluating writing that was done for the course and writing that was done for the partnering agency.

Traditional assessment involved “the usual composition kind of format” (PR2A). This includes students writing responses and receiving a grade based on a predetermined grading system of writing and rewriting. Respondent PR2A uses different types of writing assignments, which include students selecting a quotation or a prompt question from a prepared list and responding in writing, or students may be asked to react in writing to a visitor or film. These are categorized as informal writing events, where the audience is the teacher:
Table 16

*Evaluation Methods (Percentages within parentheses)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Methods</th>
<th>N who used methods to measure mastery of composition objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>3 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral presentations</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective essays</td>
<td>10 (83.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action research papers</td>
<td>4 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective journals</td>
<td>7 (58.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluations from service sites</td>
<td>5 (41.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I stress that they are writing to me, that I am the reader that's really interested in their thoughts and that they need to not write it as if it's a journal that they would write before they go to sleep at night where it's for themselves. It's really for an audience. [I] explain fully that if I don't understand I'm going to ask questions about it. So that's what I'm doing to try to engage in dialog with each draft with "this is really interesting can you go further with that?" or my evaluation system which is plus, plus, plus, plus, or the RW rewrite system. It's pretty idiosyncratic. (PR2A)

PR2A continues to note that though idiosyncratic, the system is explained in depth at the beginning of the semester, and students learn to write within a system of rewrites and become capable in editing their own work for clarity, depth, and mechanical detail. She concludes by emphasizing:

The content intimately connects with the writing. So to me, to those of us in composition, writing is about what you say and then how you say it to reach a particular audience and to understand the purpose for which you're writing. And so, by focusing on the content, it should reach those things. That develops the writing. (PR2A)

In addition, respondent PR1E noted that while the "ancient departmental set of principles and guidelines for what is an A paper, what is a B paper, what is a C paper, what is a D paper, and so on" still exists, he has the flexibility to use, or not use, a version of this format.
Another approach to evaluation is the use of graded, weighted assignments. Respondents PR1ABC, the focus group, all supported a similar approach to assessment and evaluation. Participants in this group used a system where writing assignments were categorized, weighted, and assessed against a predetermined framework.

I have graded assignments, too. The formal papers are worth so much, the mock writings are worth so much, the project itself is worth so much and so on. It gets complicated. And I think you have to. I don’t think you can be monolithic in this type of course. You have to have flexibility because even though my formal papers are 25%, I don’t have to divide that into thirds. I can say, this last paper is worth more than the last two and so on. (PR1B)

It was noted here that sometimes students were given the option to vote on whether an assignment should be more heavily weighted, to some degree, infusing a more democratic approach to assessment. However, regardless of the student participation in the process, all three respondents noted that they reserved the right to credit students for simply completing an assignment, or deciding to spend more time and point values on a similar assignment down the road, if it appeared the students’ writing would benefit from more attention being given to the assignment. PR1A noted, “It’s easy enough to explain to them why you’re doing it this way because you couldn’t write enough to become a better writer if I had to read everything and grade everything that you wrote.” This summarized the general feeling that they wished to communicate to their students the principle that writing, as a process, extends beyond the turning in of a final draft.

In contrast to the traditional approach of a teacher-created framework or a system of graded and weighted assignments, PR2B supported the use of continuous assessment: “It’s ongoing but there are certain things that are graded and it’s partly because, you know, it’s a writing course.” In continued discussion, this respondent noted that due to the nature of her classes, students worked on several writing projects at the same time, all
leading to the culmination of the final project. As assignments are turned in in a piece-by-piece manner, it makes sense to assess them in like manner.

The final approach to assessment culled from the responses is that of the portfolio. In this approach, student writing culminates in a project that is periodically evaluated by the teacher, but is fully assessed by the partnering agency. Agency members receive a copy of the students' work, and offer feedback based on feasibility, usability, and how well it meets the needs of the specific organization. According to PR1F, "They also do an oral presentation and I sort of help partners come to campus to hear these." The total grade is dependent on the usability of the project and portfolio.

Opportunities for Reflection

Questions 9 and 10 on the faculty interview protocol asked the following: What opportunities do you provide for reflection? What instructions do you give for reflection activities? Responses indicate that meaningful reflection, whether done for a reading assignment or in response to what students' observed at their service site, is perceived as being necessary but challenging. The responses to this question address the use of prompts, open-ended questions, ineffective strategies, and getting learners to stretch beyond a surface response. PR1E shared that prompts worked well for students unsure of how to address the concept of reflection:

[I] usually give model types of things that they would talk about... I say, well what did the teacher say? How? Observe the teacher, you know, think about your school ride to the urban area... the bus ride, how the transportation system in this town works, you know, think critically about your participation in public life. It's not "Oh, I just helped a kid with multiplication tables today." Did the child say how did it work? How is your structure, what types of instruction did you get from the professor or the other professionals? (PR1E)
This response was similar to that of PR2B who preferred the use of open-ended responses: "It changes. It varies. Sometimes it’s guided, sometimes it’s more open. What are you thinking and feeling right now?" This respondent takes time to emphasize the fluid nature of the responses sought. Students are encouraged to identify what bothers, disturbs, pleases, or moves them. They are "completely free" to find subjects that are meaningful to them, and in writing the responses, free to be focused or not.

Concurrently, PR1ABC, the focus group, noted, "There is not a single, ‘this is what I want everyone to get out of this.’" All agreed that the process of reflection, whether done at the beginning, throughout, or at the end of the course, provided the opportunity for students to put the course in the larger context of life and learning. As PR1A shared, her goal was to have students take the process of reflection into every single class, as a means of helping them understand why and how each course connects with what would be their lives.

However, while all interview respondents agreed that reflection was important, even necessary, not all respondents agreed on their level of efficacy in eliciting ‘good’ reflection, or that any reflection is ‘good’ reflection. PR1D candidly shared, “I’ve never been happy with my ability to get good reflection out of my students.” This respondent felt that due to the nature of service-learning in the course, students did not see reflection as being integral to their projects. In this course, reflection had been presented as a project management strategy: keep a work log or a research notebook. However, this did not produce good reflection. PR1D noted, “I’ve stopped doing it because students didn’t seem to spend time with it and I got bad work. Nobody wants to read bad work. They didn’t want to write it.” To remedy the situation, this respondent shifted and took the
approach of end-of-project reflection. While the reflection was better, the respondent remained dissatisfied with his ability to elicit good reflection from his students.

This response is similar to that of respondent PR2A, whose dissatisfaction with the depth of student reflection responses led to designing a whole new approach to integrating service with learning in composition. This response is shared below:

A child and a parent would come in and the parent is obviously, you know, not in very good shape for whatever reason. Immediately, the student who is writing this up would say, “The parent doesn’t care.” See, already they’re bonded with these cute little kids and so somebody’s got to be the villain. So, who is it? Well, it’s that disheveled parent, you know, who has come in. Maybe she’s loud, maybe she’s got alcohol on her breath, maybe . . . This obviously is not in the majority of cases but when it happens, then they’ll say it’s that parent’s fault or they’ll just likely say, “Well, if this parent cared more about education, or cared more about this child . . . .” Oh my golly, you know, that used to drive me up the wall and so I would try to get them to reflect on why—let’s look at possible reasons that parents are like this or that kids, these cute kids, they grow up in this community that provides so many resources and still fall into the welfare trap or whatever. That’s a hard stretch for them. It’s just hard. That kind of reflection is almost harder than reflecting about one’s own experiences with race, or maybe I’ve just learned to do that better because I’ve focused on it more.

Reflection, by definition, is the point where students make connections and integrate what they have learned, observed, or experienced with actual practice. From the responses, it appears that this is not as tangible as it appears to be, and that students need prompting and guidance to go beyond the ‘pat’ response.

Document Analysis of Syllabi

In addressing the question regarding differences between assessment practices used to evaluate performance in service-learning activities and those used to evaluate performance in other aspects of the course, submitted course syllabi were also used. Six first-year writing syllabi were submitted by respondents, and two syllabi were submitted from writing courses beyond the first year. These syllabi, however, did not provide a
clear understanding of how faculty evaluated performance in service-learning activities. The Document Analysis Matrix (see Table 17 & Appendix C) used by Zlotkowski (1998) provided a framework for analyzing syllabi. According to the Matrix, syllabus components are matched against a 4-point observation scale.

Of the syllabi submitted, four demonstrated a well-developed description of what students were required to learn from service-learning experiences in a section titled ‘objectives’ or ‘goals’ on the syllabi, and two syllabi had a description that was somewhat developed. For the syllabi submitted, one demonstrated limited development of course goals, and one did not address course goals. For the two latter categories, no objectives were listed or the syllabus addressed attendance policies, plagiarism, services available to students, and a brief course description along with instructor contact.

Of the objective or goal statements, some were worded to include both knowledge of writing processes and conventions: argument, essays, speeches, rhetorical invention, drafting, critical reading, writing process, discourse community, and ways of knowing; while others added one or two objectives that were worded to include service terminology: social and civic responsibility, engagement, power, race, activism, social change, and community. Of the six syllabi presenting well-developed or somewhat developed objectives or goal statements, one used writing process terminology only, two used composition terminology and service-learning terminology, and two used service-learning terminology only. None demonstrated an integration of both composition and service terminology. This suggests that instructors may perceive service-learning as experiences that are either added on to a course, or as experiences that, by nature, change the composition of the course.
Table 17

*Analysis of Submitted Syllabi (N=8)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllabus Component</th>
<th>Observation Scale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of service-learning goals</td>
<td>Well-developed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions of service-learning activity</td>
<td>Somewhat developed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of required related assignments</td>
<td>Very limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of service-learning evaluation</td>
<td>Not developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of service hours required</td>
<td>Well-developed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of service-learning evaluation</td>
<td>Somewhat developed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of how service-learning will affect grade</td>
<td>Very limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar of events, due dates, reading lists, attendance</td>
<td>Not developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of describing the service-learning activity, three syllabi gave a well-developed description of what students were supposed to do to complete the service requirements of the course. One gave a somewhat developed description, two gave a very limited description, and two did not provide a description. A well-developed or somewhat well-developed description included how students would select or be partnered with a service agency or community project, where the service site was located or contact information for the service site, the number of hours required to meet the service requirement, and a description of what the student would deliver as evidence of participation in service: journal entries, essays, research papers, portfolios, class discussions, or reflection papers.

In describing how service-learning would be evaluated in the course, however, six syllabi presented a limited and not developed description. Two syllabi specifically stated how service would be assessed. Conversely, four syllabi gave a description of how service-learning would affect the course grade (whether added on as a component or integrated into the percentage of the grade), and one syllabus gave a somewhat developed description. Three syllabi gave a limited or not developed description. The limited description of how service-learning will be evaluated is interesting, especially since the same syllabi present a description of how service-learning will affect the course grade. Even though the service-learning deliverable itself may carry the weight of 10-15%, essays, research papers, class discussions, and related readings are tied to the service site, which means that service, and the reflection and critical thinking coming out of the experience, will influence the grade beyond the actual deliverable. As a result, a well-
developed description of how service-learning would be evaluated would have been good to see.

In contrast, descriptions of other aspects of the course were well developed or somewhat developed in seven of the eight syllabi, and not developed in one. Other aspects included a calendar of events, specified due dates, detailed attendance policies, annotated reading lists, writing center times, services, and locations, writing conference schedules, and writing assignment descriptions. Of interest here is the detail that is given to the description of writing assignments, and the process of how these assignments would be graded. One instructor noted: “For each class I will assign several pages of in-depth reflection on course readings. For each assignment I expect you to write at least two typed, double-spaced pages. . . . I will grade for . . . more depth of reflection, specific details, and/or attention to sentence level issues (grammar, sentence structure, word choice, clarity of ideas) (Syllabus 8, p. 5).

Another instructor gave detailed definitions and descriptions of what is referred to as the essay cycle. Each student would complete four major essay assignments for the course: an evaluation essay, a critical synthesis essay, a proposal essay, and a portfolio. In these essays students would evaluate, interpret, synthesize, argue, and research various issues (Syllabus 1, p. 4). In addition to a description of each type of writing, attention is given to the essay format and how it should be submitted, how to highlight and number quoted or paraphrased information included in each essay, and the different types of conferences available to the students: peer, instructor, and portfolio containing all of the students’ written drafts for the semester.
Overall, service objectives and goals were not present, added on to a list of composition objectives, or present in lieu of composition objectives and goals. More syllabi gave a well-developed description of the service-learning experience than those that did not, and more gave a well-developed description of other writing deliverables for the course than those that did not. Few gave a clear description of how the service-learning experience would be evaluated, even though more gave a good description of what percentage of the grade would account for the service experience.

Research Question 5

Research Question 5 asked, “How do teachers evaluate whether service-learning opportunities have helped students master stated composition objectives and outcomes?” Research Question 5 was addressed by items 11 and 14 in Part III of the TOS and item 2 on the Faculty Interview Protocol. The responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics and transcribed and categorized interview responses using Nvivo.

Survey Results

Item 11 addresses whether participation in service activities for the course was required. Of the 12 respondents, 11 required participation in the service portion of the course, and 1 did not. Of those who responded that participation was required, 9 responded to item 14.

Item 14 asked respondents to evaluate the impact of service on students’ mastery of content-related goals using an open response format. Faculty respondents reported that they evaluated whether service-learning opportunities helped their students master stated course objectives and outcomes through constructs such as attitude; awareness of
audience; and, critical thinking, process, and dialogue. It is interesting to note that the

two responses indicating difficulty in integrating service-learning with composition came

from respondents who had 3 years or less of teaching composition.

One factor that faculty perceived to be essential in evaluating the impact of

service on learning in composition is attitude. One respondent stated, “Change is often in

attitude and sometimes in action and in a few cases in career choice.” Another

respondent noted that students demonstrated “enthusiasm and a real interest in the work.”

A third respondent shared:

I think my students become more aware of underlying attitudes that have affected

their daily interactions and unarticulated attitudes in relation to prejudice. For

example, I am less certain that the course dramatically changes their actions in terms

of social responsibility. Their ability to recognize multiple viewpoints and

counterarguments also seems to improve.

This respondent also wrote the following words in the margins of the survey: critical

thinking, process, conventions, and service. These concepts, though not articulated in the

response, suggest that the respondent may have continued to comment had there been

more room. The observation that ‘underlying attitudes’ and ‘unarticulated attitudes’ were

brought to the surface coincides with responses from those participants who were

interviewed, many of whom re-directed the nature of their service-learning composition

course to address underlying prejudices. The feeling was that true service needed to be

unencumbered, not shackled by prejudice or preconceived perceptions about a particular

race or class.

Another respondent noted service experiences generated a greater awareness of

audience in providing them with an actual audience—people they work with, community,

and class members. And, still another reported: “Service-learning worked really well in
providing the students with a real text against which they could think critically and analyze other texts (readings, previous knowledge, etc.)." A third noted that this pedagogical practice "improved students' focus of audience and purpose in writing."

A final perspective shared addressed the impact of service on critical thinking, process, and dialogue. One respondent noted that service improved the critical thinking on social issues discussed in class, while another noted its impact on classroom dialogue. Another stated: "My students learned to process, categorize, and evaluate data in ways they did not anticipate. So, class discussions of their service tasks were interesting for one another." A fourth respondent noted students' increased ability to use multiple texts, or kinds of texts, in one piece of writing. Together, these responses demonstrate faculty perception on how effective service was in creating an environment for students to develop positive attitudes towards writing, an awareness of audience, and critical thinking and processing skills.

Two respondents commented on the difficulty of integrating service-learning with composition, and both respondents had 3 years or less at the current institution. One respondent commented that the process of integrating service-learning with composition was difficult: "It's somewhat of a challenge to connect composition with service-learning." Yet this respondent also felt successful in integrating service-learning into the Basic Writing course. The other respondent concurred by stating, "Occasionally the impact is large. It is difficult to balance discussions and texts, service and writing, often, though, the connection between service and composition often slips, if not reiterated." This respondent also felt successful in integrating service-learning in composition in a first-year composition/freshman comp course. This suggests that even though a faculty
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member may consider himself or herself to be successful at integrating service-learning with composition, he or she may still experience difficulty in achieving the sought-after ‘seamless integration’ of service into the content-area classroom.

Interview Responses

Faculty Responses

Research question 4 on the Interview Protocol asked, “How do you assess the impact of service-learning on student mastery of course outcomes?” As part of this question, respondents were given the prompt of addressing the challenges faced in this process and how they overcame them. Responses ranged from not addressing the impact of service at all to not promising to address either service or composition, but an amalgamation of the two. The respondents cited that balancing the two proved challenging.

One respondent noted that the goal was not to evaluate the service experience in any way, but to make sure there were no problems with the students’ placements at the service site. The reason for not evaluating the service experience was a logistical one of getting to and from a variety of service locations for 25 students, and organizing a timely return of evaluation sheets from those supervising the students. For this portion of the course, the respondent noted that students received a grade for completing the requirement.

Instead, this respondent put emphasis on curricular objectives, making sure that students completed a wide variety of reading in the area of service, and that students participated in a variety of writing experiences, from journals, to essays, and reflective writing activities. These written assignments, rather than being “impressionistic personal
narratives” (PR1E), are to incorporate course materials. This respondent included works by Jonathan Kozol, Robert Coles, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Dorothy Day, Albert Schweitzer, Mother Teresa, and people writing about public service in areas that impact education, specifically issues such as poverty and literacy.

During the semester, students are encouraged to talk about their service experience and make connections to the readings assigned for the course. This is done in an informal manner. These discussions help students to differentiate between the different types of service. Distinctions are made between service through churches, social or political service, service for one’s country, and so on. This is done to make curricular connections to public life.

Another respondent shared that assessing the impact of service-learning on student mastery of content-area goals was a difficult task. In addressing the question, this respondent noted that the framework used for his course did not strive to make any distinction between the two. According to PR1D, there is a coherence one should strive for, so that no one set of objectives outweighs or stands out:

I'm just not comfortable right now with the category systems, so I'm creating, trying to do something a little bit different. This is how the coursework and the work we do with communities for me is coherent. What we do, what I say to people in communities with whom we work is I ask them a simple question, and that is, “What kind of work can we do together?” And that’s a question that’s appropriate to ask once I’ve listened to the kind of work they do. Once they have a little bit of a sense of who we are . . . once they have a better understanding of the capacities of a writing program . . . then they’re able to say, “Well, here’s the work I think we can do together.” (PR1D, Interview)

As a result, sometimes the work done for communities would be in the form of a research project, or a course project that fit into a service-learning model, making the work that the students would do for the project, the actual service. According to PR1D:
That is, our students aren't writing about community-based organizations, right? We're not writing about the people who need service in community service organizations. They're not researching those people or about those people, they're helping those organizations do the work that they need to do to serve their mission. And, in that regard, if they help that organization become better able to write grants, then they've been of use. And they've also done intellectual work in terms of the major. (PR1D, Interview)

This respondent felt that being useful, transferring the knowledge that usefulness could be achieved regardless of the service experience, meant more than making any specific distinction between content goals and service goals.

Group respondents PR1A, B, and C concurred that objectives were based on the needs of the community partner.

I have agency contact people come in, offer up their shopping list, then sort of formalize this with sort of a contract, saying this is what’s going to be expected of me, this is the number of meetings we’re going to have with the contact person, then we have two at the beginning of the semester. Then about a month later we have like an up-date to make sure and see if, okay, this really wasn’t doable, but we’ll focus on this level. Or, you know what, that was a snap, give us something else to do. And then a month later, there’s another update just to make sure everybody is on the same page—that objectives are being met. (PR1A, Interview)

At the end of the semester, agency contacts are provided with evaluation sheets for each one of the students who worked on the project. They evaluate the strengths and weaknesses. PR1C responded that evaluation took place only if there were circumstances the service agency may not have been aware of, such as problems within the team or individual students who demonstrated weaknesses in participation, attendance, or academic skills. Overall, writing assignments and projects were evaluated according to weight. Respondent PR1B, however, reported that his course design separated the academic from the project. Once students organized, decided on a project, and divided into teams to address the project, the tasks around which they divided themselves became
the objective or standard for that project. Rubrics would be designed around that task, along with self and peer evaluation check sheets.

PR2B supported an integrated approach. In discussing assessing the impact on service-learning on mastery of course outcomes, this respondent shared that there is no separating of the two. She shared:

I would say they’re pretty integrated. I think that students write better, they work harder at the writing, when there’s more at stake. And there’s more at stake in the writing when they have specific outcomes, specific audience, specific function for pieces that they write. So if you know that there’s a partner who’s ninety-five that you’re responsible for writing that elder’s life story, you are very committed to workshopping in class and producing the best possible elder story you can. Tremendous motivation. (PR2B, Interview)

Unlike any of the other respondents, PR2A felt evaluation of objectives was a balance between how much writing would be taught and how much content area (service) would emerge. Respondent PR2A shared that “writing is never devoid of content because students always have to write about something” (PR2A, Interview). Yet, when placing students into impoverished communities, one ends up with quite a bit to teach.

I did a course called “Why is there poverty?” That was a first-year seminar and that was the main question of the course--Why, in the richest country in the world, are some people living in very, very difficult circumstances? And so we looked at a variety of ways that poverty can be seen... then we also had to to dwell centrally on race and racism, especially because the communities that they mostly chose to be helpful in, in this area, are African-American communities, or largely African-American communities. They had to learn something about how their own or how people’s perceptions of them or their “race” was going to impact their ability to communicate, their understanding of the situation, and vice versa. That even adds more content. I consider it rich in the possibilities for writing because there’s a lot to talk about. (PR2A, Interview)

This respondent discovered that in addressing content emerging from service placements, discussions on race and privilege needed to be addressed. While the majority of the students in the course were Caucasian and from relatively privileged backgrounds, there
were several students in the course who were immigrants, the children of immigrants (second generation), or from cultural minority groups. In addition, given that the course was a first-year writing course, many of the participants had not had any courses in sociology that would have given them additional insight into cultural relations or the nature of race in the United States. The result: “[Students] resist, many of them, and so that area sometimes creates either very shallow writing or writer’s block--especially the writer’s block, [which] comes as they are beginning to understand what is going on in the society around them [and] they begin to see examples of contemporary racism” (PR2A, Interview). While this respondent felt that this created interesting opportunities for learning, she also felt that it brought about difficulties for writing, noting that while “at the same time you want to be teaching, or have to be teaching, the standard composition agenda,” this must be put aside to address other topics that emerge as a result of the service experience.

Program Director Responses

Program Directors assessed the impact of service-learning in different ways. Program 1 did a semester-by-semester survey designed around qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. Students are asked questions such as: Were you participating in service-learning for a course requirement? What type of service? How did service help you to learn about cultures different from your own, think critically or reflect on values, improve written communication, improve problem-solving skills, or understand how communities work? They are then asked to rate their experiences along a scale of other descriptors.
Program 2 noted that assessment of the impact of service on learning was not centralized. Given the nature of the university, a research university, faculty members have different research agendas. Although the center does its own assessment of how their programs are meeting faculty, student, and community partner needs, faculty members must do their own assessment, which is often built into their courses, of how well they are addressing the goals and outcomes of those courses.

**Research Question 6**

Research Question 6 asked, "Do teachers perceive service goals as compatible with composition goals, or do they perceive them as separate from composition goals?" This question was addressed by item 8 in Part III of the TOS, and item 6 of the Faculty Interview Protocol.

**Survey Results**

Item 8 asked respondents to rate service-learning's compatibility with composition along a scale of compatible, somewhat compatible, or not compatible. Of the 12 respondents, 11 (91.7%) responded that service-learning was compatible with composition, and 1 (8.3%) responded that it was somewhat compatible.

**Interview Responses**

**Faculty Motivation**

Item 6 asked respondents to *explain your motivation for teaching a service-learning composition course*. Respondents were given a prompt which asked if service-learning’s compatibility with composition was part of their motivation, and if they did not perceive service-learning as compatible, to then explain their motivation for including it
in their course. Of the responses, all felt that there was compatibility between service-learning and composition, which was not a surprise given that they were enthusiastic about the process. However, several themes emerged. These themes were coded as personal reward, student engagement, teaching style, and departmental support.

Personal reward

Many responded that there was personal reward gained from teaching courses with a service-learning framework. According to one respondent, “Regular engagement in the community in which I live is personally leading. I find it intellectually rich; I find it pedagogically rewarding; I find it personally rewarding” (PR1D, Interview). Another stated that it was incredibly rewarding and gave a sense of pride (PR2B). Others noted that service had always been a part of who they considered themselves to be.

Student engagement

Other respondents focused their responses on the impact on student performance and engagement. Program Director 1 felt strongly that as a pedagogy, service-learning enhanced the learning experience. Another faculty member said, “I saw how their attitudes toward it changed; I see every semester how glad they are that they did it” (PR1E, Interviews). Still another responded, “Students love it. . . . They just love to get out there and do stuff and they love it when they design their own things” (PR2A, Interview). The comments from students regarding the level to which the course affected their understanding of content material, or influenced a decision they would make about the direction of their lives, serve as a motivating factor for faculty.
Teaching style

Another themed perspective that emerged from the responses was that of teaching style. It was felt that those who chose to use service-learning as an approach often have a bit of an edge. According to Program Director 2, "those that teach from a service-learning perspective are on the fringe" (PRD2, Interview). Faculty members also shared this perception. One respondent shared, "The type of teaching that you bring to this is a little bit edgy. . . . In other words, you see opportunities pop up and you never know what they're going to be from turn to turn" (PRIA). Others cited the need to be flexible, not tied to any particular process method, or to allow students to have control over their own processing.

Departmental support

One theme emerging from the responses to the question of motivation is the importance of departmental support in shaping the faculty member's perception of success. Respondents, both faculty and program directors, had a variety of perspectives. Faculty had different perceptions of how the availability of departmental support increased their perceptions of success. One respondent noted that upon arrival to the department, he was told that he would be teaching a composition course with a service-learning component. At first he was apprehensive; however, his apprehension was abated when he realized that the framework was already in place, and a support system was there to aid in his success. He said, "So something was already in place. What I didn’t have to do was any outreach finding schools and setting up how many students would go where" (PRIE, Interview). It was also noted that while much of the support came through the office of service-learning, the faculty member retained the right to adapt the syllabus and
curriculum: “That was all set up by [the service-learning office]. As far as the syllabus and the curriculum I was absolutely free to choose whatever I wanted to do” (PRIE). For this faculty member, an environment of support, from the departmental level, influenced his perception of success in integrating service-learning into the composition course.

In contrast, another faculty member noted that support from outside the department made her task easier. In discussing the need to let go of the idea of having to know everything, this faculty member shared that there are times when one has to allow others to assist:

The necessity of learning humility in that kind of exchange, you know. And then having community partners commit. I sometimes have my partners come in to the class. For example, my non-profit administrator who runs empowering workshops for people who are homeless, does a great job talking about power lines in my class in a way that dismantles some of my students’ assumptions about power. (PR2B, Interview)

While departmental support is important, support from other avenues can influence the faculty member’s perception of being successful at the task.

On the other hand, while university or departmental support may exist, it may be viewed as being restrictive and formulaic, rather than being a source of empowerment. One respondent shared the perception that having a required participation in service, as part of the general education requirement, may lead students to take the requirement lightly, or treat it as something to check off on a list of things to do. In this program, while the course taught by this instructor is designed around a service-learning perspective, it is an option for those taking composition, and it is not one that meets the university’s criteria for fulfilling the service requirement, although this has been requested.
This respondent’s perception was that in addition to service-learning courses, there are many other courses that a student should take during his/her college tenure that would build a commitment to a life of service. The concern voiced was that each year, more and more students appear less tolerant of service requirements and see them as something to ‘check off’ the list, thereby, minimizing the benefit of the requirement. According to the respondent, “I always tell them, you know, you’ve got to take other courses . . . a lot of them, say, ‘Yeah, you know we’d like to but you know it’s a requirement.’ They want to be able to check it off” (PR2A, Interview).

Program Directors

On the Program Director Protocol, the question of department support garnered different responses. Item 4 on the Program Director Interview Protocol asked the question, “How are faculty motivated to teach from an academic service-learning perspective?” Prompts for this question included: Are faculty provided with incentives or is participation voluntary?; Are faculty given workshops, in-services, or training; Are they given training in evaluation, instruction, and curricular alignment?

In response to these questions, Program Director 1 noted that success came from support at the university level: “Again . . . this is part of our mission” (PRD1, Interview). At this institution, 25-30% of undergraduates are involved in service-learning at some point in their experience, and the program director believed that this was an indication of a good rate of faculty response and participation.

In terms of faculty training and support, this director reported that training and workshops were available for interested faculty. Classroom and lecture hall visits are also available to faculty, so that service-learning personnel could orient students about
what was available to them and how to contact those who could help them. With regard to curricular alignment, this director stated:

Yes. Curricular alignment is so important. We make sure that we understand what content the course would like to emphasize so that we can make suitable placements – connect content with the service site. We work individually with faculty in making sure best practices are followed for curriculum integration and, as important, reflection. We try to help them move beyond tacking on a service component and go for a, as it were, seamless integration of content and service. (PRD1, Interview)

Conversely, Program Director 2 had a different perspective. According to this director, those teaching from a service-learning perspective “are on the fringe” (PRD2, Interview), and it is noted that on a university campus where faculty number in the hundreds, approximately 50-75 faculty across the university are engaged in service-learning. Part of the responsibility this program director has is to continually seek out and make connections with various departments, encouraging them to engage using service-learning as pedagogy. According to this director, “We like to start at the college or department level and get buy-in, as it were, there” (PRD2, Interview). It was felt that this worked better for the faculty member who then wanted to incorporate service-learning into the class, as the support would already be in place. Faculty support is provided through individualized workshops and training sessions, placement services, and library facilities.

Summary

The responses to research questions 2-6 of this study are discussed in this chapter. A description of the survey demographics is followed by the findings and results of teachers’ perceptions about their success in ensuring composition and service outcomes are achieved, teaching content- and service-related skills, assessing performance of
content- and service-learning activities, mastery of outcomes, and the compatibility of service and composition. Course syllabi are also analyzed using Zlotkowski’s (1998) evaluation matrix. Respondents reveal a commitment to the service-learning pedagogy, but also share concerns regarding the ability to achieve a ‘seamlessly integrated’ course to offer their students and elicit quality written reflection from their students. Respondents affirm the importance of having departmental support and training available to all faculty members participating in such programs.

Outline of the Following Chapter

The following chapter presents a summative discussion of the findings and results. A discussion of key findings, research questions, and alignment of this study with the theoretical framework and the literature review is shared. Also discussed is how this study fills the gap that exists in the literature available in the area of service-learning in composition, and recommendations for further research and study.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In his major work, *Writing Partnerships*, Tom Deans (2000) wrote that combining college writing and community engagement would take composition studies in a new direction, if the movement continued its rapid growth (p. 1). Concurrently, Eyler (2000) suggested more was needed to address the impact of service-learning on learning outcomes across the disciplines (p. 11). Within the context of these two perspectives, this study sought to identify how successful teachers of first-year composition courses with an integrated or added on service-learning component perceived themselves as being in integrating service with composition.

The study was conducted as an objective-oriented program evaluation using a mixed-methods research design for data collection. This mixed-methods approach used a concurrent triangulation strategy which allowed for triangulation of qualitative and quantitative sources of data. Sources of data included the Teaching Outcomes Survey, a Program Director Interview Protocol, a Faculty Member Interview Protocol, and course syllabi submitted by participants. Responses from the survey, interviews, and syllabi were collected and used to evaluate the participants’ perceived level of success at ensuring that composition and service outcomes were achieved, and successfully assessing and evaluating student work.
Data collection took place in two phases. During the first phase, 38 surveys were distributed to faculty teaching composition from a service-learning perspective. Of the 38 surveys distributed, 18 were returned. Of the 18 surveys returned, 6 were returned noting that the courses were no longer taught, or no longer under the auspices of the English department. As a result, 12 surveys were used for this study. During the second phase, nine faculty members from two universities in the Midwest were selected to participate in open-ended interviews. Participants at both schools submitted course syllabi which were analyzed against a document analysis matrix. Areas taught by respondents included first-year Freshman Composition, Basic Writing, and graduate writing courses. Finally, respondents came from both public and private institutions.

This chapter will summarize the key findings, summarize responses to research questions 1-6, and discuss how the study aligns with theoretical framework and literature review. A discussion of how the study addresses what is missing from the literature, along with a recommendation of how the WPA Outcomes Statement aligns with service outcomes is followed by recommendations for further research and study.

Key Findings

Summary

There were several key findings in this study. Overall, participants in both the survey and interview phases perceived themselves to be successful at integrating composition with service. They also perceived themselves as successful in assessing and evaluating composition and service outcomes using a variety of assessment tools and instruction methods. Themes such as positive departmental support and years of teaching emerged as critical to a teachers’ perceived sense of success. The fragmentation of
course outcomes, poor quality of reflection, and the lack of importance placed on community partners emerged as themes that militated against a teachers’ perception of success.

Departmental Support

Departmental support emerged as a factor that influenced the teachers’ perception of success. An interesting finding was that even though service was not part of the general education requirement for 7 (58.3%) of the respondents to the survey, these respondents still felt supported by their departments, as 11 (91.7%) responded that participation in service-learning was required for their individual course. This could not occur without departmental support of some kind.

Years of Teaching

Faculty perception of success was also influenced by years of teaching at current institution. Those who had taught at their current institution 0-3 years indicated in qualitative responses that integrating service-learning with composition proved a challenge. These respondents were also at the instructor rank. Perception of success, then, emerged to be dependent on years at current institution and experience. Interestingly, 8 (66.7%) reported perceiving themselves as successful at integrating service-learning with composition, while 4 (33.3%) reported perceiving themselves as very successful at integrating service-learning with composition.

While all of the respondents reported that they perceived themselves to be successful in integrating service-learning with composition, those with 4-7 years of teaching experience at the current institution reported higher feelings of success than those in other categories. Of those responding in this category, three faculty members
reported feeling successful and two reported feeling very successful. The category with
the next highest level of success of those responding included those with 12 or more
years of teaching at their current institution, where two felt successful, and one felt very
successful. These results suggest that those who belonged to departments that supported
the service-learning requirement, who had 4 or more years at their current institution, and
who held an academic rank above the instructor level, were more likely to select
successful or very successful.

Missing from the discussion was a clear indication of how faculty members
integrated composition with service, or how they aligned the WPA Outcomes Statement
with service outcomes. When asked to evaluate the impact of service on students’
mastery of content-related goals, of those reporting in the category 0-3 years of
experience, two respondents commented on the difficulty of integrating service-learning
with composition. Instructors with less experience integrating service-learning with
composition may be encountering difficulty, given that courses of this nature seem to go
through a metamorphic process of changing into courses that may not be entirely
composition or service courses, but are seamlessly integrated into a new product that
could easily be placed elsewhere in the curriculum.

An instructor in a service-learning composition course must achieve some level of
comfort in balancing the demands of both composition requirements and service goals,
not holding too strongly to either. Given that six surveys were returned due to the
courses no longer taught under the English department, it can be ascertained that
composition courses that integrate service-learning may have trouble placing themselves
directly under the auspices of the English department, in that by the nature of integration,
the courses no longer rely on strictly composition objectives. Many courses are allocated to other content areas.

**Fragmented Outcomes**

The fragmentation of outcomes emerged as an area of great concern. The responses suggest that the goals and outcomes of both composition and service are more likely to be fragmented rather than integrated. While survey respondents agreed that outcomes such as critical thinking and writing for change were ones they were best able to achieve by integrating service-learning with composition, the same respondents were divided on whether critical reading and critical writing skills were best conveyed in their service-learning composition courses.

Further insight was given into this dichotomy by interview responses, from which emerged the idea that objectives achieved and those taught were dependent on the nature of the class, the project, and the needs of individual participants in a given course or semester. Similarly, of the syllabi submitted, those that listed outcomes tended not to give an integrated list of outcomes, but rather listed outcomes as they pertained to the emphasis of the course. This suggests that while participants perceived themselves to be successful at integrating service with composition, the actual process was one of fragmentation, as documented by their responses and syllabi.

**Poor Reflection**

While participants agreed the reflection was essential to the service-learning course, they were not satisfied with their ability to obtain good reflection from their students. Several respondents commented on the lack of depth present in written
reflections, and the need to uncover stereotypes and biases in oral reflections (class discussions). Other respondents commented on their own inability to provide effective prompts from which students would respond. This area continues to be a challenge for practitioners.

Absent Community Partners

Finally, missing from the discussion was the role of community partners and agencies in helping teachers transmit goals and outcomes of service and content area. For those participating in the survey, 6 (50.0%) respondents reported relying on evaluations from partners to assess service-related coursework. At the same time, 0 (0.0%) respondents reported using partner evaluations to assess work done for the composition component of their courses. For those participating in interviews, only two respondents mentioned the role of partners specifically: one respondent mentioned the relationship with partners as one that provided support (guest lecturing), and one respondent mentioned partners as being on an advisory board and participating in decision-making on how best to achieve writing outcomes in the partnership arrangement.

Discussion of Research Questions

The six research questions that guided this study addressed the role of the teacher, content area outcomes, and service outcomes, within the area of service-learning in composition. These questions were designed to address perceptions faculty teaching service-learning composition courses had about ensuring that composition and service outcomes were achieved, perceptions about their success in teaching content-related
skills, evaluation of mastery of composition outcomes, and the compatibility of service-learning with composition. The following is a discussion of each of these questions.

**Research Question 1**

Research Question 1 asked, "What do service-learning composition courses look like?" Based on responses from interview participants, there is no one visual snapshot that characterizes service-learning in composition. However, one element that is common to all courses described for this study is that students are engaged in, as is stated by Deans (2000), writing for, with, and about the community. Faculty members interviewed provided a range of experiences. Some courses emphasized citizenship, social responsibility, and service through selected readings and written assignments. Others made specific distinctions between academic, research-based writing done to meet the writing requirements for the course, and reflective writing done to meet the requirements of academic service-learning. Still other courses were project-based, driven by goals and outcomes arising from the service experience, rather than a collection of writing outcomes.

As the courses varied, so did the environments in which students were asked to write. Some wrote in digital environments, others wrote in peer-mediated settings. In either case, engagement in the process of writing involved the students, service agencies, and the instructor. Most interview respondents reported that service agencies often provided a list of their needs, leaving it to the instructor and the class to determine to what degree those needs could be addressed during a given semester. The level of involvement of service partners was not clearly established.
Interview responses revealed that service-learning composition courses did not fit a specific mold. For these courses, emphasis on composition outcomes, as suggested by the WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition (CWPA, 2000), would provide a framework that would work against the “seamless” integration of service and composition. Respondents noted that teaching content-related skills came about as part of the process, a means to an end, rather than the end itself. The goal for these respondents seemed to be to provide students with a variety of experiences, and provide a new text for their individual lives. One respondent noted that the lack of depth students seemed to give to written reflection papers, and their seeming lack of awareness of the impact of service experiences on their lives in general, brought to her mind a need for a change in how service-learning courses are designed (PR2A, Interview).

The observation by PR2A is of great interest, since it alludes to the importance of time and scheduling in this process. Faculty respondents felt the pressure of how to utilize their time effectively. According to Deans (2000), the amount of time it takes for a faculty member to re-invent a course, so that students could do more writing on issues rising out of service-learning experiences or writing for the community, is the same amount of time it would take for a faculty member to participate in activities that will count toward professional advancement and tenure. This observation was further articulated by Program Director II who noted that service-learning buy-in at predominantly research institutions is a process that requires ongoing networking and promotion.
Research Question 2

Research Question 2 asked, "What perceptions do teachers in service-learning composition programs have about their success in ensuring that composition and service outcomes are achieved?" The first part of this question addressed perceptions teachers had about their success in ensuring composition outcomes were achieved. This question was addressed by the survey and looked at four specific content outcomes for composition, as specified by the WPA Outcomes Statement (CWPA, 2000). These outcomes are rhetorical knowledge, critical thinking, reading and writing, processes, and knowledge of conventions. Respondents felt critical thinking and writing for social change were best achieved in service-learning composition courses (see Figure 4).

According to the responses, respondents felt sub-items listed under critical thinking and writing for change were the outcomes best achieved by service-learning in composition. Respondents were divided on whether critical reading and critical writing...
skills were best conveyed in a service-learning composition course. Respondents also felt that rhetorical knowledge and knowledge of conventions were not best achieved with a service-learning composition course. According to survey results, 6 (50.0%) of the respondents reported that using a variety of technologies to address a range of audiences was something they sometimes or rarely achieved. In terms of learning common formats for different kinds of texts, 6 (50.0%) of the respondents sometimes or rarely achieved this goal. These results seem to align with interview responses that instruction in content area outcomes occurs on a needs basis. As the situation arises, composition content is taught or re-taught. One respondent said that mini-lectures worked best and were based on areas that were determined to be problem areas for students, based on work submitted.

The second part of this question addressed perceptions teachers had about their success in ensuring service outcomes were achieved. This question was addressed by item 5 in Part I of the TOS. Several service goals were listed. Responses to this item were most varied. Developing leadership skills, improving self-esteem/self-confidence, cultivating physical health and well-being, cultivating an active commitment to honesty, and developing a capacity to make wise decisions were outcomes respondents sometimes or rarely tried to achieve. It would appear the leadership skills—self-esteem/confidence, well-being, honesty, and decision-making processes—should be goals for any course integrating service with learning. However, it is possible that these outcomes are more 'caught than taught'—i.e., the faculty member is not out to teach these traits, but to provide opportunities where these traits may flourish. Whether they do or not is not something faculty members assess as an outcome.
Responses from interviews with faculty members provided insight into why composition and service outcomes such as rhetorical knowledge, knowledge of conventions, items pertaining to leadership, self-confidence, honesty, and decision-making capacities were perceived to be not well addressed in service-learning composition courses. Interview responses revealed that service-learning composition faculty must do a balancing act between content area and service. Emphasis is placed wherever the student need is the greatest. One day students may need content area instruction, on another day those same students may need more discussion time to talk about issues arising out of their service experience or with their service projects.

According to PR2A:

When you put students in communities, especially impoverished communities, which was my aim—it wasn’t to do any kind of service like volunteering in a hospital or something like that—then you have a lot of things to teach them. So you, for example, I did a course called ‘Why is there poverty?’ That was a first-year seminar and that was the main question of the course: why, in the richest country in the world, are some people living in very, very difficult circumstances? And so we looked at a variety of ways that poverty can be seen and have causes that are connected to other causes... I consider it rich in the possibilities for writing because there’s a lot to talk about. (PR2A, Interview)

This same respondent speaks of having a multiple draft submission system which allows students to write and rewrite works throughout the semester, and submit writing in a portfolio format. This example demonstrates the recursive dance faculty members engage in between addressing content-area goals and content arising out of the service experience. Success in addressing content-area goals and service goals, then, seems to be viewed in terms of one’s ability to move comfortably between two sets of outcomes, as student need dictates.
Research Question 3

Research Question 3 asked, "What perceptions do teachers in composition have about success in teaching content- and service-related skills?" The first part of this question addressed perceptions teachers had about their success in teaching content-related skills.

Responses for Part I did not indicate any areas of disagreement or strong disagreement regarding their success in teaching content-related skills. This section addressed skills such as learning the main features of writing; the uses of writing; understanding audience; writing and reading critically; understanding the relationships among language, knowledge, and power; collaborating; editing; and using conventions of the language.

The second part of this question addressed perceptions teachers had about their success in teaching service-related skills. There was more disagreement in this area. Responses for item 2 in Part II of the TOS addressed service-related skills. Faculty were asked to respond to the following statements about service outcomes: I feel I am successful in helping my students learn to: develop ability to work productively with others; develop leadership skills; develop a commitment to accurate work; improve ability to follow directions, instructions, and plans; improve ability to organize and use time effectively; develop a commitment to personal achievement; develop ability to perform skillfully; cultivate a sense of responsibility for one's own behavior; improve self-esteem/self-confidence; develop a commitment to one's own values; develop respect for others; cultivate emotional health and well-being; cultivate physical health and well-
being; cultivate an active commitment to honesty; develop capacity to think for one's self; develop capacity to make wise decisions.

For developing leadership skills, 5 (41.7%) disagreed that they perceived themselves as successful in teaching this outcome, and 9 (8.3%) strongly disagreed. For cultivating a sense of physical health and well-being, 3 (25%) strongly disagreed about their success in teaching this outcome, and 3 (25%) did not see this goal as applicable, and 1 (8.3%) did not respond to this item. For both items, it appears that respondents felt that these were not skills to be taught.

This is further clarified by interview responses. The interview prompt for this question asked, "What perceptions do teachers in service-learning composition programs have about their success in teaching content-related skills?" Interview responses were grouped into categories that addressed students taking initiative and students re-aligning their worldview. Here, creating an environment where students could think outside of the traditional parameters of teacher-as-audience seemed to be the goals. According to PR1B:

Being able to catch the students in a particular situation particularly on the project side, to get them thinking about rhetorical situations, thinking about audience, thinking about things they’ve never had to think about before when they were writing for teacher, in the prescriptive sense. (PR1B, Interview)

This respondent felt that providing students with a broader perspective of how the course counts beyond the classroom, with the avenue for seeing themselves as part of a broader community, provided a feeling of success at the end of each semester.

Another respondent shared a similar response. This respondent felt that the course she taught helped students develop a sense of awareness better that any other writing course. This respondent stated: “Their experiences in high school, regardless, are
basically writing for [the] teacher and so they can do that quite well, but then you ask them to go out and craft something for someone. Then they're really stuck in that situation” (PRIA, Interview). Another respondent characterized his course as equipping both himself and his students with tools, and fitting into what composition theory is all about: “Giving students the tools to operate in different rhetorical situations, and to be successful in understanding what’s expected of me [them] in the situation where I’m dealing with a community representative or with my peer or my professor” (PR1C, Interview).

Here, having students think of audience outside the confines of the classroom and expanding their mental frameworks seemed to be the emphasis. As a result of being a part of these types of situations, students will develop skills in learning how to work with different environments and audiences. Collaboration and leadership are not often synonymous. Also, a sense of well-being in environments that should cause unease—since service-learning seeks to illuminate areas of community need, social injustice, the need for advocacy, etc.—may not be appropriate. Expanding rhetorical situations, taking students beyond the traditional understanding of audience and purpose, and providing access to multiple styles of writing are all areas through which these respondents perceived themselves as being successful in transmitting content-related skills. Successfully working with students as they navigate this transition in their thinking processes, while simultaneously working to meet the requests of the service agencies or partners, seems to provide a strong sense of being successful.
Research Question 4

Research Question 4 asked, "What are the differences between the practices used to assess performance in service-learning activities and those used to assess performance in other aspects of the course?" This question sought to identify if faculty members were able to articulate how they assessed students' performance in both service and content area. To address this question, survey respondents were asked to identify assessment tools. Options included: journals, oral presentations, visual presentations, interviews, written reports/projects, peer evaluations, partnership evaluations, and other options that the respondent was free to submit. Respondents were also asked to identify tools used to assess students' mastery of composition outcomes. These options included: interviews, oral presentations, reflective essays, action research papers, reflective journals, performance evaluations from service sites, and other options that the respondent was free to add.

Faculty reported using traditional evaluation tools such as journals, oral presentations, written reports/projects, and peer evaluations to evaluate student work in their courses. In addressing mastery of composition outcomes, 10 (83.3%) used reflective essays, 7 (58.3%) used reflective journals, and 6 (50.0%) used oral presentations. It is interesting to note that 5 (41.7%) used performance evaluations from the service site to measure mastery of composition outcomes. This could be accounted for by the fact the service sites have to determine whether the work written for them by the students meets an acceptable standard.

In evaluating service-learning in the same courses, more than 6 (50.0%) used journals, oral presentations, and written reports/projects, no different from tools used to
evaluate student work. Only 4 (33.3%) of the respondents used peer evaluations to evaluate service-learning within the course. Also, 6 (50%) used evaluations from service partners to evaluate student performance.

Interview respondents were asked to identify evaluation strategies that they found to be most effective in assessing students’ grasp of composition outcomes and service outcomes. Here, again, most used traditional forms of assessment such as graded assignments, portfolios, and a system of draft/re-write submissions. Faculty responding to the interviews used similar approaches in evaluating writing that was done for the course and writing that was done for the partnering agency. This suggests that while methods and tools used for evaluation differ, assessment remains a critical part of the process.

The main area of concern for faculty in addressing this question, however, was their ability to garner effective reflection from students. Central to service-learning literature is the importance of reflection as part of the process (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Gray et al., 1999; Heffernan, 2001; Mabry, 1998). According to work done by Kolb (1984):

> Learners are engaged in a cycle in which work in community or work settings forms the basis for written or oral reflection. Under the guidance of an instructor, reflective work is used to form abstract concepts and hypotheses are generated which then get cycled back into further concrete experiences. (p. 45)

In asking faculty what opportunities they provided for reflection, responses were varied and troubling. While faculty perceived reflection as necessary, several found it challenging. Some provided students with prompts and open-ended questions:

>[I] usually give model types of things that they would talk about. . . . I say, ‘Well, what did the teacher say? How? Observe the teacher, you know, think about your school ride to the urban area . . . the bus ride, how the transportation system in this town works. Think critically about your participation in public life.’ It’s not, ‘Oh, I just helped a kid with multiplication tables today.’ Did the child say how did it work?
How is your structure, what types of instruction did you get from the professor or the other professionals? (PRIE, Interview)

At the same time, these guidelines do not necessarily provide ‘good’ reflection. Another respondent noted, “I’ve never been happy with my ability to get good reflection out of my students” (PR1D, Interview). This respondent felt that due to the nature of service-learning in the course, students did not see reflection as being integral to their projects. In this course, reflection had been presented as a project management strategy: keep a work log or a research notebook. However, this did not produce good reflection. PR1D noted, “I’ve stopped doing it because students didn’t seem to spend time with it and I got bad work. Nobody wants to read bad work. They didn’t want to write it.” To remedy the situation, this respondent shifted and took the approach of end-of-project reflection. While the reflection was better, the respondent remained dissatisfied with his ability to elicit good reflection from his students.

This response is similar to that of respondent PR2A, whose dissatisfaction with the depth of student reflection responses led to designing a whole new approach to integrating service with learning in composition. Reflection, by definition, is the point where students make connections and integrate what they have learned, observed, or experienced with actual practice. From the responses, it appears that this is not as tangible as it appears to be, and that students need prompting and guidance to go beyond the ‘pat’ response.

In addressing the question regarding differences between assessment practices used to evaluate performance in service-learning activities and those used to evaluate performance in other aspects of the course, submitted course syllabi were also used. Six first-year writing syllabi were submitted by respondents, and two syllabi were submitted.
from writing courses beyond the first year. These documents, however, did not provide a clear understanding of how faculty evaluated performance in service-learning activities. It is arguable that if the courses were truly integrated service-learning composition courses, there would be no need to articulate separate forms of assessment for content-area outcomes or service outcomes. However, none of the syllabi presented demonstrated an integrated approach in outlining course outcomes.

Of the syllabi submitted, four demonstrated a well-developed description of what students were required to learn from service-learning experiences in a section titled ‘objectives’ or ‘goals’ on the syllabi, and two syllabi had a description that was somewhat developed. Of those that provided objective or goal statements, some were worded to include both knowledge of writing processes and conventions, while others added one or two objectives that were worded to include service terminology. Of the six syllabi presenting well-developed or somewhat developed objectives or goal statements, one used writing process terminology only, two used composition terminology and service-learning terminology, and two used service-learning terminology only. None demonstrated an integration of both composition and service terminology.

In terms of describing the service-learning activity, three syllabi gave a well-developed description of what students were supposed to do to complete the service requirements of the course. One gave a somewhat developed description. A well-developed or somewhat well-developed description included how students would select or be partnered with a service agency or community project, where the service site was located or contact information for the service site, the number of hours required to meet the service requirement, and a description of what the student would deliver as evidence...
of participation in service: journal entries, essays, research papers, portfolios, class discussions, or reflection papers.

In describing how service-learning would be evaluated in the course, however, six syllabi presented a limited and not developed description. Two syllabi specifically stated how service would be assessed. Conversely, four syllabi gave a description of how service-learning would affect the course grade (whether added on as a component or integrated into the percentage of the grade), and one syllabus gave a somewhat developed description. Three syllabi gave a limited or not developed description. A well-developed description of how service learning would be evaluated would have been good to see.

In contrast, descriptions of other aspects of the course were well-developed or somewhat developed in seven of the eight syllabi. Of interest here is the detail that is given to the description of writing assignments, and the process of how these assignments would be graded. On instructor noted: “For each class I will assign several pages of in-depth reflection on course readings. For each assignment I expect you to write at least two typed, double-spaced pages. . . . I will grade for . . . more depth of reflection, specific details, and/or attention to sentence level issues (grammar, sentence structure, word choice, clarity of ideas)” (Syllabus 8, p. 5).

Overall, more syllabi gave a well-developed description of the content-area requirements and how they would be assessed than those that gave the same level of description to service-learning tasks and how they would be assessed. The work done by Heffeman (2001) in assessing over 900 syllabi from service-learning courses nationwide, and the work done by Cushman (2002) where she lists lack of connection among tasks as a primary concern in service-learning course design (pp. 48-49), concur with the lack of
coherence found in the submitted syllabi. Instructors may still perceive service-learning as experiences that are either added on to a course, or as experiences that, by nature, change the composition of the course.

**Research Question 5**

Research Question 5 asked, "*How do teachers evaluate whether service-learning opportunities have helped students master stated composition objectives and outcomes?*"

Survey respondents were asked to evaluate the impact of service on students' mastery of content-related goals. Faculty respondents reported that they evaluated whether service-learning opportunities helped their students master stated course objectives and outcomes through constructs such as attitude; awareness of audience; and critical thinking, process, and dialogue. It is interesting to note that the two responses indicating difficulty in integrating service-learning with composition came from respondents who had 3 years or less of teaching service-learning composition at their institutions. One respondent commented that the process of integrating service-learning with composition was difficult: "It's somewhat of a challenge to connect composition with service-learning."

The other respondent concurred by stating, "Occasionally the impact is large. It is difficult to balance discussions and texts, service and writing; often, though, the connection between service and composition often slips, if not reiterated."

One factor that faculty perceived to be essential in evaluating the impact of service on learning in composition was attitude. One respondent stated, "Change is often in attitude and sometimes in action and in a few cases in career choice." Another respondent noted that students demonstrated "enthusiasm and a real interest in the work."

A third respondent shared:
I think my students become more aware of underlying attitudes that have affected their daily interactions and unarticulated attitudes in relation to prejudice. For example, I am less certain that the course dramatically changes their actions in terms of social responsibility. Their ability to recognize multiple viewpoints and counterarguments also seems to improve.

The observation that ‘underlying attitudes’ and ‘unarticulated attitudes’ were brought to the surface coincides with responses from those participants who were interviewed, many of whom re-directed the nature of their service-learning composition course to address underlying prejudices. The feeling was that true service needed to be unencumbered, not shackled by prejudice or preconceived perceptions about a particular race or class. Together, these responses demonstrate faculty perception on how effective service was in creating an environment for students to develop positive attitudes towards writing, an awareness of audience, and critical thinking and processing skills.

Faculty members responding to interview questions were asked, “How do you assess the impact of service-learning on student mastery of course outcomes?” As part of this question, respondents were given the prompt of addressing the challenges faced in this process and how they overcame them. Responses ranged from not addressing the impact of service at all, to not promising to address either service or composition, but an amalgamation of the two. The respondents cited that balancing the two proved challenging.

One respondent noted that the goal was not to evaluate the service experience in any way, but to make sure there were no problems with the students’ placements at the service site. The reason for not evaluating the service experience was a logistical one of getting to and from a variety of service locations for 25 students, and organizing a timely return of evaluation sheets from those supervising the students. For this portion of the
course, the respondent noted that students received a grade for completing the requirement.

Another respondent shared that assessing the impact of service-learning on student mastery of content area goals was a difficult task. In addressing the question, this respondent noted that the framework used for his course did not strive to make any distinction between the two. According to PR1D, there is a coherence one should strive for, so that no one set of objectives outweighs or stands out:

"I'm just not comfortable right now with the category systems, so I'm creating, trying to do something a little bit different. . . . This is how the coursework and the work we do with communities for me is coherent." (PR1D, Interview)

This respondent felt that being useful, maintaining a sense of coherence, and transferring the knowledge that usefulness could be achieved, regardless of the service experience, meant more than making any specific distinction between content goals and service goals.

Program Directors assessed the impact of service-learning in different ways. Program 1 did a semester-by-semester survey designed around qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. Program 2 noted that assessment of the impact of service on learning was not centralized. Given the nature of the university, a research university, faculty members have different research agendas. While the center does its own assessment of how their programs are meeting faculty, student, and community partner needs, faculty members must do their own assessment, which is often built into their courses, of how well they are addressing the goals and outcomes of those courses. This suggests that even though a faculty member may consider himself or herself to be successful at integrating service-learning with composition, he or she may still experience
difficulty in achieving the sought-after ‘seamless integration’ of service into the content-area classroom.

Research Question 6

Research Question 6 asked, “Do teachers perceive service goals as compatible with composition goals, or do they perceive them as separate from composition goals?”

Survey respondents were asked to rate service-learning’s compatibility with composition along a scale of compatible, somewhat compatible, or not compatible. Of the 12 respondents, 11 (91.7%) responded that service-learning was compatible with composition, and 1 (8.3%) responded that it was somewhat compatible.

Similarly, interview respondents were asked to explain their motivation for teaching a service-learning composition course. As part of addressing this question, respondents were given a prompt which asked if service-learning’s compatibility with composition was part of their motivation, and if they did not perceive service-learning as compatible, to then explain their motivation for including it in their course. Of the responses, all felt that there was compatibility between service-learning and composition, which was not a surprise given that they were enthusiastic about the process.

Themes such as personal reward and student engagement emerged. Many responded that there was personal reward gained from teaching courses with a service-learning framework. Respondents shared candidly that the opportunity to teach using a pedagogy that mirrored their personal philosophies of service and community engagement was a great privilege. According to one respondent, “Regular engagement in the community in which I live is personally leading. I find it intellectually rich; I find it pedagogically rewarding; I find it personally rewarding” (PR1D, Interview).
Other respondents focused their responses on the impact on student performance and engagement. One faculty member said, “I saw how their attitudes toward it changed; I see every semester how glad they are that they did it” (PRI1E, Interviews). Still another responded, “Students love it. . . . They just love to get out there and do stuff and they love it when they design their own things” (PR2A, Interview). The comments from students regarding the level to which the course affected their understanding of content material, or influenced a decision they would make about the direction of their lives, serve as a motivating factor for faculty.

The perceptions of success of participants in this study, assessment practices, and evaluation practices paint a fascinating picture. Faculty engaged in teaching composition from a service-learning perspective perceive themselves to be successful. However, this perception of success does not negate feelings of inefficacy at what was referred to as achieving a ‘seamless’ integration of both composition and service, or at eliciting ‘good reflection’ from students participating in the process. For respondents to both the survey and interviews, success revolved around shifts in attitudes toward the world at large, recognition of purpose, place, and power within communities, and identification of voice and clarification of audience in the process of writing for, with, and about the community.

These respondents’ approach to assessment and evaluation practices mirrored their perception of success. They perceived themselves as being successful in using a variety of instructional methods and evaluation tools to measure student work. While respondents used traditional methods of assessing and evaluating student work in both the content area and service, what respondents assessed was not traditional. Journals, oral
and visual presentations, reflective essays, written reports, projects, performance evaluations, and interviews were used to assess and evaluate student performance in composition and service. However, the content assessed by these traditional methods was not limited to composition outcomes or students amassing the requisite amount of service hours. Instead, respondents used traditional methods to evaluate students' appreciation of diverse cultural perspectives, to cultivate in students an appreciation and understanding of community partnerships, and to help students develop an understanding of cultural criticism, activism, and advocacy. Responses show that a framework such as the WPA Outcomes Statement (CWPA, 2000) could not be applied arbitrarily to these courses, since emphasis on service or content area occurred on a need basis. In addition, syllabi did not reflect a clear articulation of 'seamlessly' integrated courses, and several did not clearly state how service would be assessed.

Alignment With Theoretical Framework

Bridging the Gap

This study aligns with the theoretical framework in addressing the significance of making the connection between the theoretical and practical (Dewey, 1916), the importance of providing avenues for good reflection (Kolb, 1984), and the essential nature of reciprocity between those giving service and the recipients of service (Freire, 1970). This study bridges the gap, however, by providing access to specific examples of how faculty seek to manage the reciprocal dance between content and service, elicit good reflection, and create a climate of reciprocity.

This study rests on a framework of bridging the divide between classroom content and practical application of that content within the context of community. However,
given the results of this study, bridging the gap between the theoretical and the practical remains a challenge for practitioners. Boyer (1987), in his work *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*, comments that undergraduate students need more opportunities to understand the relationship between what is learned in the classroom and the lives they live outside the classroom. Preceding him, John Dewey (1916) in *Democracy and Education* supported the premise that the best learning took place when learners were able to make the connection between content knowledge and one’s place in society, or at least reduce the separation between theory and practice. This is what academic service-learning seeks to accomplish in general.

In composition, academic service-learning seeks to provide more opportunities for learners to develop an awareness of audience, individual voice, and place within the community. In 1997, Adler-Kassner et al. suggested that the concept of service-learning in composition was in a stage of micro-evolution for teachers of English and composition, since many were “unaware of the benefits of service-learning, or skeptical of its influence” (p. 2). Deans (2000) opined a few years later that the application of service-learning as pedagogy would take composition in a new direction, if the rapid growth continued (p. 1). This study reveals that while a seamless integration of service with composition remains a challenge, it is still the ideal sought after by practitioners. Participants in this study reported that some level of fragmentation must be expected. There were those who segmented writing assignments into academic and non-academic (reflective writing) categories, those who approached problems arising out of content-area and service experiences on a case-by-case basis, and those who admitted to having limited contact with community partners. Within the micro-evolution, these devout
practitioners admit to challenges and seem committed to perfecting the application of the pedagogy.

Missing from the literature, then, are the voices of those in the field who achieve the seamless integration of service and learning. This study adds to the body of literature available on this topic the voices of practitioners—their challenges, successes, and enthusiasm. For example, by establishing a community advisory board consisting of him and members of the partnering agency, Program Respondent D at University A modeled, both in theory and practice, that uniting the outcomes of composition and service is possible.

Reflection

Another key theoretical premise is the importance of the process of reflection within academic service-learning. Reflection has been identified as the essential component in academic service-learning. From David Kolb's (1984) *Experiential Learning*, which emphasizes the significance of reflecting on experience, to the work of Eyler and Giles (1999), which identifies the hyphen between service and learning as that of reflection—that which brings together service and experience—reflection maintains its place as the central element to the pedagogy. In this study, reflection emerged as an area that poses a challenge to practitioners.

Missing from the literature is a true reflection of how faculty members address this element of service-learning. This study adds to the literature an honest articulation of this challenge. Some respondents reported the inability to 'get good reflection' from their students. By this, respondents meant that written reflections did not achieve the level of depth they would have liked. Some respondents perceived themselves as being
responsible for their students’ poor reflection, citing their inability to provide prompts that would encourage students to be more thoughtful. Others attributed surface-level reflections to the maturity of first-year writers.

Respondents felt more comfortable about their success at providing opportunities for oral reflection during class discussions. In the work of Jacoby (1996) reflection is defined as opportunities for feedback and rumination, whether as a group or as an individual, oral or written. They also note that reflection is often used as a predictor of academic success, as it is often used as a measure of the student’s engagement in the act of service (pp. 6, 7). In this study, this was also the case, which proved problematic. While admitting to having difficulty eliciting good reflection, practitioners also espoused the importance of reflection as an indicator of student engagement with the community.

Reciprocity

Central to effective academic service-learning is the importance of reciprocity between those giving service and those on the receiving end of service. The work of Paulo Freire (1970) supports intentional action and re-action, or reciprocity. While it is important for those engaged in service to address community needs, it is just as vital for those engaged in service to treat community members with dignity, respect, and honor, learning from what the community has to offer. This study shows that those engaged in service are concerned with providing intentional service to their communities with dignity, respect, and honor. Participants were careful to mention that in the process of reflection (class discussions) and in class activities (power lines or privilege walks) care was given to uncovering stereotypes and dismantling biases. However, in looking at the data collected, little mention is made of community partners and their role in the process.
Even less mention is made of community members. The limited references to
community partners and members in this study mirrors the results of current studies in the
area, and is the basis for the call for practitioners and researchers to explore this area
more carefully.

The limited references to participation of community partners in the survey
responses and interview responses suggest that the role of the community partner, while
important, is not perceived as being central to the process. In an article titled
*Composition Studies and Service Learning: Appealing to Communities*, Kevin Ball and
Amy Goodburn (2000) write:

> Current representations of service learning do not represent the learning of
community participants or the impact of this learning on how we think about the
value of service learning in our classrooms. The absence of these voices in our
representations elides, both literally and symbolically, community participants’ roles
in the service learning experience, and thereby limits our conceptions of “learning”
for all participants. (p. 80)

It is interesting to note that in a practice that is dependent on all parties working together,
little mention is made of an important participant in the process. I do not believe this
omission is intentional, however. As one respondent noted regarding the level to which
community partners are involved with the actual classroom experience, “I don’t go to the
schools with them. And I don’t bring—people don’t come to the classrooms. So their
service experience is very distant from me” (PRIE, Interview). Given that the process of
writing and that of service appear as fragmented entities in the syllabi submitted, a
natural, unintentional outflow seems to be one of separating the components of the
course. For a seamless integration of service-learning and composition to occur, an
intentional connection must be made by teachers, service partners, and students to meet,
discuss, and reflect on the experience. This, however, will require a synchronizing of schedules, which is difficult to achieve given the varied schedules of all participants.

**Alignment With Literature Review**

In addition to aligning with the theoretical framework, this study also aligns with the literature review and adds to the body of knowledge on this topic in areas such as the importance of institutional/departmental support, the formation of clear objectives, strong faculty leadership, and faculty motivation.

This study reveals that institutional/departmental support plays a significant role in a teacher's perception of success. In a study by Abes et al. (2002), factors such as professional responsibilities, institutional priorities, administrative commitment, instructional support, and outcomes of service-learning were cited as influencing faculty to use service-learning. Similarly, respondents to this study viewed departmental support as contributing to their motivation to engage in this pedagogy.

This study also reveals that integrating service with composition often results in a new product. Tutt (2001), in sharing responses to his study, reported “service learning faculty in this study seemed to be aware that they were attempting to accomplish something different in the classroom, and their teaching goals reflected the new objectives” (p. v). Like those in Tutt’s study, respondents in this study noted that attempts to achieve a seamlessly integrated product often meant addressing content outcomes and service outcomes with different levels of intensity, and as the need arose on a case-by-case basis.

This study reveals that course outcomes do not clearly articulate a seamless integration of composition with service. Instead, composition outcomes either
overshadow service outcomes, or vice versa. Heffernan (2001) reviewed over 900 syllabi and deemed the vast majority to be “overwhelming and confusing” (p. iii), reflecting a conflict between service and content objectives. The results of this study are comparable to Heffernan’s, though on a much smaller scale. This is an area that will need more attention if clarity is to be achieved.

Finally, this study reveals the importance of faculty motivation. The work of Driscoll (2000) highlights the importance of faculty motivation. According to this author, while much attention is given to the role of faculty, little attention is given to motivation and attractions of faculty to service-learning. Research Question 6 of this study specifically addresses faculty motivation and attraction, and responses were candid, providing added insight into faculty role that will add to the body of research on this topic.

Overall, the results of this study provided added insight into the perceptions of composition instructors who integrate service-learning into their courses. For most, it is not an easy task; however, those who choose to practice this pedagogy demonstrate a commitment to successful outcomes. Faculty perception of success in aligning outcomes and using effective assessment and evaluation strategies increases with years of practice. Also intrinsic motivation seems to be an important factor in faculty success. Faculty members in this study were just as candid about their challenges as their successes.

The National Campus Compact has over 900 colleges and universities throughout the United States that have committed to service in their mission statements. To date, service-learning exists in various forms on these campuses. However, service-learning in the curriculum, as academic service-learning, demands more that just participation in a
service activity. Academic service-learning requires careful attention to the impact of service on the curricular outcomes of the given discipline. This study reveals that aligning content outcomes with service is a challenge, and one that requires constant evaluation on the part of the instructor. In order for this to happen, systems must be in place to provide support and training. While service-learning in composition may not have achieved the state of being a macro-evolution, as some predicted, it remains constant at institutions that are committed to its sustainability through providing support and training for faculty, community partners, and students.

**Implications**

While alignment with previous research is important, this study serves another purpose in that it adds to what is missing in the literature on service-learning and composition: the voices of practitioners. Through their voices this study presents how alignment is being addressed, the role of the faculty member in ensuring alignment takes place, and a need for a rethinking about what happens when content area goals are aligned with service.

First, the literature suggests that alignment between the outcomes and objectives of composition and those of service are compatible and achievable. However, no clear articulation of how this is accomplished or what it would look like is given. Given the responses by participants in this study, a clear articulation of alignment would be helpful since their current practice reflects that composition outcomes and objectives are addressed depending on students' needs. As a result, the balanced approach to addressing service and learning, as suggested by Sigmon (1979), is not achieved. This study recommends that alignment is possible (see Table 18) and in order to achieve it,
Table 18

**WPA Outcomes Statement Aligned With Service Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition Outcomes</th>
<th>Faculty Outcomes</th>
<th>Service Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help students learn the main features of writing in their fields (1a)</td>
<td>--Develop a commitment to personal achievement (2f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help students learn the main uses of writing in their fields (1b)</td>
<td>--Develop ability to perform skillfully (2g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help students learn the expectations of readers in their fields (1c)</td>
<td>--Improve self-esteem/self-confidence (2i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help students learn the uses of writing as a critical thinking method (1d)</td>
<td>--Develop a commitment to accurate work (2c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help students learn the interactions among critical thinking, critical reading, and writing (1e)</td>
<td>--Improve self-esteem/self-confidence (2i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help students learn the relationships among language, knowledge, and power in their fields (1f)</td>
<td>--Develop capacity to think for one's self (2o)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Writing Processes (3a-g) | Help students learn to build final results in stages (1g) | --Develop a commitment to accurate work (2c)  
--Develop capacity to make wise decisions (2p) |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Help students learn to review work-in-progress in collaborative peer groups for purposes other than editing (1h) | --Develop ability to work productively with others (2a)  
--Develop a commitment to accurate work (2c)  
--Improve ability to organize and use time effectively (2e)  
--Cultivate a sense of responsibility for one's own behavior (2h)  
--Develop respect for others (2k)  
--Cultivate an active commitment to honesty (2n)  
--Develop leadership skills (2b) |
|  | Help students learn to save extensive editing for later parts of the writing process (1i) | --Develop a commitment to accurate work (2c)  
--Develop ability to perform skillfully (2g) |
|  | Help students learn to apply the technologies commonly used to research and communicate within their fields (1j) | --Develop ability to work productively with others (2a)  
--Develop capacity to make wise decisions (2p) |
| Knowledge of Conventions (4a-d) | Help students learn the conventions of usage, specialized vocabulary, format, and documentation in their fields (1k) | --Develop a commitment to accurate work (2c)  
--Develop ability to perform skillfully (2g)  
--Cultivate an active commitment to honesty (2n) |
|  | Help students learn the strategies through which better control of conventions can be achieved (11) | --Develop ability to work productively with others (2a)  
--Develop ability to perform skillfully (2g)  
--Develop capacity to make wise decisions (2p) |
faculty members must be intentional. Given intentional input from the instructor, the WPA Outcomes Statement can align with service outcomes.

Second, the literature suggests that faculty members have an important role to play in ensuring that alignment takes place between content area and service. This study adds to the body of literature on how faculty members are addressing the much needed alignment of composition outcomes and service outcomes. According to this study, collaboration between the professor and service agency is necessary in order for alignment to take place. At the heart of the process is the faculty member whose intentional forays into determining how the service experience will benefit both the service agency and the students (see Table 18). For example, Program Respondent E at University A, without the input from the service site, would not have been able to attribute his underachieving student's sudden engagement in the course to the service component. It is difficult to attribute a success to a pedagogical practice if there is no alignment of outcomes, or if as a faculty member, one is not aware of what is happening at the service location.

Third, this study reveals what practitioners must recognize: Aligning course objectives with service may mean a shift in thinking about objectives, and a change in the nature of the course. Interview respondents shared that they needed to change their thinking about what composition outcomes they could achieve in one course, given factors such as the demands of the service agency and the time allotted for the course. Also, surveys were returned noting that the courses previously identified as composition courses were no longer taught in the English departments. An understanding that these courses change and become a new product is essential to the success of the pedagogy.
In order to achieve sustainability of such programs, program directors must continue to increase buy-in at the departmental levels, provide mentoring for new faculty and faculty new to the pedagogy, and strive for integration of service into the course, rather than the 'tack-on' approach. This will mean paying more attention to the implementation of the pedagogy through course syllabi that clearly articulate how elements of both composition and service will be assessed and evaluated.

**Recommendations for Further Research and Study**

Taken together, the review of literature and findings of this study provide several areas for additional research:

1. To establish a model of alignment between the WPA *Outcomes Statement* and goals of service, a study that evaluates the current use of the WPA *Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition* in traditional and service-based composition courses

2. To establish grounded theory, a study of service-learning composition courses that ‘seamlessly’ integrate service and composition

3. To add the voices of practitioners in the field, a comparative qualitative study that shadows two teachers of service-learning composition courses (one with less than 3 years and one with 4 or more years of experience integrating service-learning into composition) over a longer period of time and includes in-class observations along with interviews with students and assessment of a larger body of documents

4. To better identify and address the problem with fragmented outcomes in course syllabi, a follow-up to Heffernan’s (2001) longitudinal study of course syllabi to see what changes have occurred in the level to which teachers clearly articulate course goals and outcomes
5. To add the missing voices of community partners, a qualitative study
to uncover the impact community partners have on shaping the outcomes of a
composition course that integrates service-learning

6. To address the problem of poor reflection, a qualitative study that uses
document analysis to evaluate written student reflection coming out of service-learning
composition courses, from which a model of quality reflection could emerge.
APPENDIX A

SURVEY
Teaching Outcomes in Service-Learning Composition Courses

Survey # ___

Part I Course Goals and Outcomes
This survey is designed to gather your perceptions about teacher success, content and service goals and outcomes, and assessment practices in academic service-learning in Composition. Part I asks questions about your perceptions on specific content area outcomes. Part II asks questions about your perception of your success at transmitting content and service outcomes. Part III asks questions specific to your service-learning environment. After you have completed the survey, return your completed form in the enclosed envelope, along with a copy of the syllabus for your course. By completing and returning this survey, you are giving your consent to participate.

Instructions
Using the following response scale, rate the importance of each goal below in terms of what you aim to have students accomplish in your course.

5 Essential 5 a goal you always/nearly always try to achieve
4 Very Important 4 a goal you often try to achieve
3 Important 3 a goal you sometimes try to achieve
2 Unimportant 2 a goal you rarely try to achieve
1 Not Applicable 1 a goal you never try to achieve

1. Rhetorical Knowledge
By the end of the service-learning Composition course, my students are able to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a. focus on a purpose</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. respond to the needs of different audiences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. respond appropriately to different kinds of rhetorical situations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. use conventions of format and structure appropriate to the rhetorical situation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. adopt appropriate voice, tone, and level of formality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. understand how genres shape reading and writing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. write in several genres</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing
By the end of the service-learning Composition course, my students are able to:

|   | a. use writing and reading for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
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b. understand a writing assignment as a series of tasks, including finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing appropriate primary and secondary sources 5 4 3 2 1

c. integrate their own ideas with those of others 5 4 3 2 1

d. understand the relationships among language, knowledge, and power 5 4 3 2 1

3. Processes
By the end of the service-learning Composition course, my students are able to:

a. be aware that it usually takes multiple drafts to create and complete a successful text 5 4 3 2 1

b. develop flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proof-reading 5 4 3 2 1

c. understand writing as an open process that permits writers to use later invention and re-thinking to revise their work 5 4 3 2 1

d. understand the collaborative and social aspects of writing processes 5 4 3 2 1

e. learn to critique their own and others' works 5 4 3 2 1

f. learn to balance the advantages of relying on others with the responsibility of doing their part 5 4 3 2 1

g. use a variety of technologies to address a range of audiences 5 4 3 2 1

4. Knowledge of Conventions
By the end of the service-learning Composition course, my students are able to:

a. learn common formats for different kinds of texts 5 4 3 2 1

b. develop knowledge of genre conventions ranging from structure and paragraphing to tone and mechanics 5 4 3 2 1

c. practice appropriate means of documenting their work 5 4 3 2 1

d. control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling 5 4 3 2 1

5. Service Outcomes
By the end of the Composition course, my students are able to:
a. develop ability to work productively with others 5 4 3 2 1
b. develop leadership skills

c. develop a commitment to accurate work

d. improve ability to follow directions, instructions, and plans

e. improve ability to organize and use time effectively

f. develop a commitment to personal achievement

g. develop ability to perform skillfully

h. cultivate a sense of responsibility for one's own behavior

i. improve self-esteem/self-confidence

j. develop a commitment to one's own values

k. develop respect for others

l. cultivate emotional health and well-being

m. cultivate physical health and well-being

n. cultivate an active commitment to honesty

o. develop capacity to think for one's self

p. develop capacity to make wise decisions

5 4 3 2 1
Part II Success in Faculty Role
Part II of this survey asks questions about your perception of your success at transmitting content goals and outcomes.

Using the following response scale, select the most appropriate response to your perception of your success:

5  Strongly Agree
4  Agree
3  Disagree
2  Strongly Disagree
1  Not Applicable

1. Content Area Outcomes

I feel I am successful in helping students learn:

a. the main features of writing in their fields  5  4  3  2  1
b. the main uses of writing in their fields  5  4  3  2  1
c. the expectations of readers in their fields  5  4  3  2  1
d. the uses of writing as a critical thinking method  5  4  3  2  1
e. the interactions among critical thinking, critical reading, and writing  5  4  3  2  1
f. the relationships among language, knowledge, and power in their fields  5  4  3  2  1
g. to build final results in stages  5  4  3  2  1
h. to review work-in-progress in collaborative peer groups for purposes other than editing  5  4  3  2  1
i. to save extensive editing for later parts of the writing process  5  4  3  2  1
j. to apply the technologies commonly used to research and communicate within their fields  5  4  3  2  1
k. the conventions of usage, specialized vocabulary, format, and documentation in their fields  5  4  3  2  1
l. strategies through which better control of conventions can be achieved  5  4  3  2  1
2. Service Outcomes

I feel I am successful in helping students learn to:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>develop ability to work productively with others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>develop leadership skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>develop a commitment to accurate work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>improve ability to follow directions, instructions, and plans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>improve ability to organize and use time effectively</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>develop a commitment to personal achievement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>develop ability to perform skillfully</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>cultivate a sense of responsibility for one's own behavior</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>improve self-esteem/self-confidence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>develop a commitment to one's own values</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>develop respect for others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>cultivate emotional health and well-being</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>cultivate physical health and well-being</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>cultivate an active commitment to honesty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.</td>
<td>develop capacity to think for one's self</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td>develop capacity to make wise decisions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part III
Part III of this survey is designed to gather information about your specific service-learning environment. Place a check (✓) in front of the most appropriate response.

1. I use the following tools to evaluate student work in my Composition course. (Select all that apply)
   - Journal
   - Oral presentations
   - Visual presentations
   - Interviews
   - Written reports/projects
   - Peer evaluations
   - Other ___________________________

2. I use the following tools to evaluate service-learning in my Composition course. (Select all that apply)
   - Journal
   - Oral presentations
   - Visual presentations
   - Interviews
   - Written reports/projects
   - Peer evaluations
   - Partnership evaluations
   - Other ___________________________

3. Students in my course engage in the following service-learning experiences on a regular basis (Select all that apply)
   - Peer Tutoring
   - Project-based activities
   - Environment-based activities
   - Internships/Apprenticeships
   - Literacy Programs
   - Community Centers
   - Activism
   - Advocacy
   - Other

4. I use the following instruction methods to help my students to master Composition skills (rhetorical knowledge, critical thinking/reading/writing, writing processes, knowledge of conventions) (Select all that apply)
   - Peer Tutoring
   - Project-based learning
   - Environment-based learning
   - Participation in Internships/Apprenticeships
   - Participation in Literacy Programs
   - Other

5. I think service-learning helps my students become (select all that apply)
   - Charitable
   - Change agents
   - Advocates
   - Activists
   - Altruistic
   - Empathetic
   - Other ___________________________
6. In my opinion, the following objectives of Composition are best achieved through service-learning (Select all that apply)
   ___ Rhetorical Knowledge
   ___ Critical Thinking
   ___ Critical Reading
   ___ Critical Writing
   ___ Writing Processes
   ___ Knowledge of Conventions
   ___ Social change

7. I measure my students' mastery of Composition objectives by using the following methods (select all that apply)
   ___ Interviews
   ___ Oral Presentations
   ___ Reflective Essays
   ___ Action research papers
   ___ Reflective journals
   ___ Performance evaluations from service site
   ___ Other _________________________

8. My perception of service-learning's compatibility with Composition can be rated along the scale below: (Place an 'X' at the appropriate position along the scale).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compatible</th>
<th>Somewhat Compatible</th>
<th>Not Compatible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The following objectives are represented as outcomes in my service-learning Composition courses (select all that apply)
   ___ Reflection
   ___ Value diverse cultures and perspectives
   ___ Cultivate community partnerships
   ___ Rhetorical knowledge skills
   ___ Critical thinking skills
   ___ Critical reading skills
   ___ Critical writing skills
   ___ Writing Processes
   ___ Knowledge of conventions
   ___ Cultural criticism
   ___ Activism
   ___ Advocacy
   ___ Other _________________________

10. Service-learning is a required part of the general education requirement at my institution
    ___ Yes
    ___ No
    ___ Not sure

11. Participation in service activities in the course I teach is
    ___ Required
    ___ Optional
12. I teach the following course(s):
   __Basic Writing
   __First Year Composition (Freshman Composition)
   __Advanced Writing Course
   __Other Writing Course ____________________

13. I rate my success in integrating service-learning into my Composition course(s) as
   __Very successful
   __Successful
   __Somewhat successful
   __Not successful

14. Evaluate the impact of service on students' mastery of content related goals in 2 – 5 sentences.

15. Indicate your academic rank

   __Instructor
   __Adjunct
   __Other
   __Tenure Track
   __Assistant Professor
   __Associate Professor
   __Full Professor
   __Non-Tenure Track
   __Assistant Professor
   __Associate Professor
   __Full Professor

16. The institution at which I teach is (select all that apply)
   __Public
   __Private
   __Community College (2 yr)
   __College/University (4 yr)
   __Other__________________

17. Years at current institution
   __0 – 3
   __4 – 7
   __8 – 11
   __12 +

18. Gender
   __Female
   __Male

19. Race
   __Asian/Pacific Islander
   __Black/African American
   __Hispanic/Latino
   __Native American
   __White/Caucasian
   __Other__________________

20. Academic Discipline
   __Accounting
   __Art
   __Biology
   __Business
   __Chemistry
   __Communication
   __Computer Science
   __Education
   __Engineering
   __English
   __Modern Language
   __Geology
   __History
   __Information
   __Mathematics
   __Music
   __Nursing
   __Philosophy
   __Physical
   __Political Science
   __Psychology
   __Social Work
   __Sociology
   __Special Education
   __Other__________________

   Thank you!
APPENDIX B

FACULTY INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
School of Education
Andrews University
Berrien Springs, MI 49104

Dear Composition Teacher:

As practitioner in the field of Composition, your perceptions regarding outcomes of academic service-learning in Composition are critical to understanding and improving this practice. Service-learning in Composition has received much attention over the last fifteen years, and your participation will assist in addition to the body of knowledge available on this subject.

The purpose of this interview is to gather in-depth information that will help the researcher assess teacher perceptions about content goals and service outcomes of the Service-Learning Composition Courses they teach. As a doctoral candidate in the Curriculum and Instruction program at Andrews University, I am investigating the role teachers in Composition see themselves as having, how teachers meet the content demands of first year composition, and how service is assessed in the courses that they teach. As a practitioner in the field, your responses and participation will prove invaluable to this study.

In participating in the interview, I wish to assure you that all responses are confidential. This interview will be recorded to ensure accuracy in transcription. All responses will be used only for the purpose of this project. If at any point in this interview process you feel compromised, you have the right to refuse participation in this interview. Your request will be honored without prejudice. Participation in this research is voluntary. Your involvement will add perspective to the results of this research.

For additional information on this project or final results, you may contact me, Faith-Ann McGarrell, Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum, at faithann@andrews.edu, or 269-471-3479; Dr. Larry Burton, Dissertation Committee Chair & Co-Director, Graduate Programs in Curriculum and Instruction, at burton@andrews.edu, or 269-471-6700; or the Andrews University Office of Scholarly Research, Institutional Review Board (IRB) at irb@andrews.edu, or 269-471-6361.

I understand that my participation is voluntary, and that if at any point in this interview process I feel compromised, I have the right to refuse participation. My request will be honored without prejudice.

Participant ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Witness ___________________________ Date ___________________________
The purpose of this interview is to gather in-depth information that will help the researcher assess teacher perceptions about content goals and service outcomes of the Service-Learning Composition Courses they teach. In participating in the interview, be assured that responses are confidential. All responses will be used only for the purpose of this project.

If at any point in this interview process you feel compromised, you have the right to refuse participation in this interview. Your request will be honored without prejudice. Participation in this research is voluntary.

1. List the service objectives of your course.
2. How do you assess the impact of service-learning on student mastery of course outcomes?
   a. What challenges do you face in this process?
   b. How do you overcome these challenges?
3. Describe the challenges you have faced correlating service objectives in your course with those of Composition.
4. Describe the successes you have encountered correlating service objectives with those of Composition.
5. Describe the obstacles/challenges you, as a faculty member, face in constructing an integrated service-learning courses.
6. Explain your motivation for teaching a service-learning composition course. Prompt: Do you find service-learning compatible with Composition
   a. If so, explain compatibility.
   b. In not, explain motivation.
7. What evaluation strategies have you found to be most effective in assessing your students' grasp of Composition outcomes? Service outcomes?
   a. Written assignments
   b. Oral assignments
   c. Service participation
8. What instruction strategies have you found to be most successful in helping you transmit Composition outcomes? Service Outcomes?
   a. Written assignments
   b. Oral assignments
   c. Service participation
9. What opportunities do you provide for reflection?
10. What instructions do you give for reflection activities?
APPENDIX C

PROGRAM DIRECTOR INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
Dear Program Director:

As practitioner in the field of service-learning, your perceptions regarding outcomes of academic service-learning in Composition are critical to understanding and improving this practice. Service-learning in Composition has received much attention over the last fifteen years, and your participation will assist in addition to the body of knowledge available on this subject.

The purpose of this interview is to gather in-depth information that will help the researcher assess teacher perceptions about content goals and service outcomes of the Service-Learning Composition Courses they teach. As a doctoral candidate in the Curriculum and Instruction program at Andrews University, I am investigating the role teachers in Composition see themselves as having, how teachers meet the content demands of first year composition, and how service is assessed in the courses that they teach. As a practitioner in the field, your responses and participation will prove invaluable to this study.

In participating in the interview, I wish to assure you that all responses are confidential. This interview will be recorded to ensure accuracy in transcription. All responses will be used only for the purpose of this project. If at any point in this interview process you feel compromised, you have the right to refuse participation in this interview. Your request will be honored without prejudice. Participation in this research is voluntary. Your involvement will add perspective to the results of this research.

For additional information on this project or final results, you may contact me, Faith-Ann McGarrell, Department of Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum, at faithann@andrews.edu, or 269-471-3479; Dr. Larry Burton, Dissertation Committee Chair & Co-Director, Graduate Programs in Curriculum and Instruction, at burton@andrews.edu, or 269-471-6700; or the Andrews University Office of Scholarly Research, Institutional Review Board (IRB) at irb@andrews.edu, or 269-471-6361.

I understand that my participation is voluntary, and that if at any point in this interview process I feel compromised, I have the right to refuse participation. My request will be honored without prejudice.

Participant ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Witness ___________________________ Date ___________________________
The purpose of this interview is to gather in-depth information that will help the researcher assess teacher perceptions about content goals and service outcomes of the service-learning courses they teach. In participating in the interview, be assured that responses are confidential. All responses will be used only for the purpose of this project.

If at any point in this interview process you feel compromised, you have the right to refuse participation in this interview. Your request will be honored without prejudice. Participation in this research is voluntary.

1. What is the history of academic service-learning at your university?
2. What is the primary role of your office?
   a. Your function [covered]
   b. How many staff
3. How does your university assess the impact of service-learning on student learning?
   a. What challenges do you face in this process?
   b. How do you overcome these challenges
4. How are faculty motivated to teach from an academic service-learning perspective?
   c. Are the provided with incentives or is it voluntary
   d. Are they given workshops/in-services/training?
   e. Are they given training in evaluation, instruction, and curricular alignment?
5. Describe the successes you have working with faculty?
6. Describe the obstacles/challenges you face working with faculty
7. Apart from institutional demands, share your motivation for participating in engaging faculty to be involved in academic service-learning?
8. Where do you see academic service-learning in the next five (5) to ten (10) years?
9. What do you see as the major challenges to academic service-learning as pedagogy?
   [Do you see service-learning as pedagogy? You’ve mentioned the word several times.]
## Document Analysis Matrix

--developed from Victoria Littlefield's appendix in Zlatkowski's *Successful Service-Learning Programs Appendix C-2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Components</strong></th>
<th><strong>Observation Scale</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of what students are required to learn from service-learning experience (course goals)</td>
<td>Well-developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed description of service-learning activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of required related assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of service hours required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of how service-learning will be evaluated (written/oral exams, papers, interviews, questionnaires, observations, skills assessments, journal logs, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of how service-learning will affect course grade (added on component or integrated, percentage of grade)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar of events, due dates, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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