A STUDY OF STUDENT PERCEPTION AND THE IMPACT OF REQUIRING

COMMUNITY SERVICE OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS AT LIBERTY

UNIVERSITY IN LYNCHBURG, VIRGINIA

A Dissertation

Presented to the
Faculty of Argosy University

In Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

by

Lew A. Weider

June 2005

A STUDY OF STUDENT PERCEPTION AND THE IMPACT OF REQUIRING

COMMUNITY SERVICE OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS AT LIBERTY

UNIVERSITY IN LYNCHBURG, VIRGINIA

A Dissertation

Submitted to the
Faculty of Argosy University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

by

Lew A. Weider

Argosy University

Sarasota, Florida

June 2005

Dissertation Committee Approval:

_____
Stanley Imhulse, Ph.D., Chair　　　　date

_____
Ron Hirst, Ed.D., Member　　　　date

_____
Carlotta Cooley, Ed.D., Reader　　　　date

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the
Graduate School of Argosy University/Sarasota
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Education

A STUDY OF STUDENT PERCEPTION AND THE IMPACT OF REQUIRING

COMMUNITY SERVICE OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS AT LIBERTY

UNIVERSITY IN LYNCHBURG, VIRGINIA

by

Lew A. Weider

2005

Chairperson: Dr. Stanley Imhulse
Member: Dr. Ron Hirst
Reader: Dr. Carlotta Cooley

Department: Education

This study examined student perceptions and the impact of requiring

community service at Liberty University in Lynchburg, Virginia. Three hundred forty six

students voluntarily participated in this study. Students were asked to respond to a 25

question online survey which attempted to ascertain four key questions. First, should

Liberty University should continue to require community service of it students in order to

graduate? Secondly, did the students perceive their required community service as a

benefit to them personally as well as to those they served? The third question to be

answered through this study was how the requirement to do community service impacted

student's attitudes about serving now as well as their desire to serve in the future.

Finally, since Liberty University is an evangelical Christian university, this research

study was designed to investigate how the student's religious faith impacted their attitude

about performing required community service in order to graduate.

Findings revealed that a significant majority of students, 70%, supported the university's decision to require community service in order to graduate and 76.8% also indicated that they had a positive attitude about performing required community service.

The data also showed that students do perceive their community service requirement to be beneficial to them personally as well as to those whom they served. In addition, 81% of the students who responded to the survey plan to volunteer in the future. It was also found that 80.4% believed their religious faith positively impacted their attitude concerning the required Christian/Community Service (CSER) program at Liberty University. Although additional research is needed, through this initial study, it can be recommended that Liberty University continue its requirement of community service.

List of Tables

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: THE PROBLEM AND ITS COMPONENTS

Introduction

Institutions of higher education are faced with many pedagogical questions as education continues to evolve in the United States. Administrators and faculty are challenged with the task of providing students with the knowledge and skills to remain competitive in an ever growing national and international market while trying to maintain a student friendly environment with the amenities students demand. However, is it also the responsibility of colleges and universities to educate and equip students to address the social needs of people in the communities and world in which they live?

Each generation is confronted with new challenges that need to be addressed by the academy and as this new century has begun, the challenge of meeting human needs is evident throughout the United States. Whether it is literacy among children or older adults, poverty in various forms or drugs, crime, and gangs in our communities, the need for addressing and solving these issues are apparent. With health care costs increasing and social security issues looming, the elderly often face additional challenges that can be overlooked and neglected. Human service organizations are faced with tighter budgets and the need for volunteers is great.

However, who should be teaching citizenship and what is the most effective way of teaching it? Many states have begun to require their high school students to do community service in order to graduate. Colleges and universities have also been actively involved in their communities through various forms of community service projects and assignments. Some institutions encourage students to perform community service and provide them assistance in finding places to serve. Other colleges and

universities require community service in order to graduate and have a formal office and staff to facilitate the program. The newest trend in the last 25 years has been the development of service learning courses which include a community service component. These courses are designed to also include meaningful reflection which has been found to be essential to learning.

<p style="text-align:center">Problem Background</p>

Historically, colleges and universities in the Unites States have included service as a part of its mission and activities as institutions of higher learning. For example, William and Mary began with the mission of evangelizing Indians in order to civilize them (Geiger, 1999; Ward, 2002). Many of the early collegiate institutions such as Harvard and Yale were started specifically to train members of the clergy or civil servants who could positively impact their communities while they were gaining their education as well as in the future (Boyer & Hechinger, 1981).

After the American Revolution states began to make a collegiate education available to more of its citizens. Many of these state institutions were denominationally funded in the beginning but finding qualified instructors presented a great challenge (Geiger, 1999). As Americans moved west, new collegiate institutions were started and they were viewed as partners with the community to assist them develop into successful communities. In the west, higher education was designed to be available to average community citizens and not only the elite (Boyer & Hechinger, 1981). This provided a catalyst for college students to positively impact their home communities and starting these institutions was viewed as an investment in the community.

The Land Grant College Act of 1862 greatly influenced the role of experiential education in collegiate institutions (Altbach, 1998; Bringle, Games, & Malloy, 1999; Ward 2002).   Through the sale of federal lands, institutions of higher learning were created to prepare students to improve the quality of life of Americans.

By the early part of the 20th century, greater diversity existed on campuses with the inclusion of women and minority students in co-educational institutions. Although students were being trained to better serve their communities, no formal theory of experiential education had been articulated. This was changed by the emergence of an educational theorist by the name of John Dewey. Dewey challenged the educational theory of his day and his works greatly altered educational practice and educational institutions as a whole (Dworkin, 1959). His works continue to impact educational theory and it has been suggested that his works laid the foundation to the current service learning model of experiential education (Giles & Eyler, 1994).

Dewey (1916) believed that a democracy required of its citizens and especially those being educated to engage in the service of others for the larger good of society. He believed that students learned by putting theory into practice. However, he did not mean that all experiences were beneficial. "The belief that all genuine education comes about through experience does not mean that all experiences are genuinely or equally educative… for some experiences are mis-educative" (Dewey, 1938, p. 25). According to Dewey's theories (1916, 1938) a person's education should not be isolated from actual life experiences, and a formal education should make a connection between ones internal development as a person and one's experiences in the community.

More recently, Kohlberg (1971) argued that when individuals have meaningful

experiences out of the classroom in confronting moral issues, those experiences help to develop the individual in their moral development. It has also been shown that the student volunteer benefits proportionately to the time and effort that they invest in their experiences (Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999).

However, with new and alternative practices in educational theory comes controversy and tension. Questions have been raised in relation to experiential education known as community service as well as service learning. It has been questioned whether these forms of practical education are pedagogically sound (Cone, 2003). There has also been disagreement over the value of mandating community service (Anderson, 1999).

Many studies have found that community service and service learning have positive benefits. These forms of experiential education have been shown to benefit the students who participated in the service, the community in which the service was performed, and the educational institution providing the students (Jacoby & Associates, 1996; Pritchard, 2002; Learn and Serve, n.d.).

Although these various forms of experiential education have been found to be beneficial, higher education leaders still debate over institutionalizing service within the curriculum. Administrators at Liberty University, the institution where this study will be conducted, also struggle with these important issues.

 Liberty University, originally Lynchburg Baptist College, has required community service since the school's inception. The original mission of service placed the students in "a laboratory experience, where they can make immediate application of learning gained from the classroom" (Lynchburg Baptist College Catalogue, 1971, p.2). The school originally limited the service opportunities to involvement in the local church or

4

Christian evangelism for students of all majors. Service opportunities expanded to include community agencies in 1988, and today, students participate in over 350 different locations throughout Central Virginia (N. T. Matthews, personal communication, March, 2005).

Many questions need to be answered in relationship to Liberty University's overall Christian/Community Service Program. Institution officials should know how requiring service of its students impacts student perceptions of service while being educated and also how it impacts their decision making about serving in the future. In addition, does requiring community service actually benefit students? Currently, assumptions have dictated university policy.

<div align="center">Literature Review</div>

Community service in its various forms has been a topic of much concern over the last two decades. Many institutions have included service as a part of their mission statements however administrators and faculty continue to debate about the best method of incorporating community service into the lives of college students (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000). Service activities consist of basically four models: community service performed by the student without external forces mandating the service, community service as a graduation requirement, service learning courses being an option for students, and service learning courses added as a requirement for graduation.

Community Service and Service Learning Defined

Community service and service learning are not the same things. Community service is a service activity which is not directly connected to an academic course. "Community service is generally a service performed by individuals for the benefit of

others, for an organization, and/or for a community" (Burns, 1998, p.38). Service

learning is a "course-based, credit bearing educational experience" (Bringle & Hatcher,

2000, p. 273). Service learning incorporates meaningful classroom instruction about

environmental needs and "real" community needs. Students research and discuss a

problem found within the community and then a plan of action is formulated and

implemented to meet that particular need (Anderson, 1999). This type of learning

experience has been shown to have benefits that far exceed those of just generic

community service participation (Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000).

Benefits of Community Service and Service Learning

Research suggests that undergraduates who participate in service projects have a

number of positive short-term cognitive and affective outcomes (Astin & Sax, 1998). In

addition, students also have long-term effects and affects of volunteering during their

undergraduate years. According to a study conducted by Astin, Sax, & Avalos, (1999),

they found that participating in community service positively impacts student's

commitment to the community and helps them to develop both socially and academically.

The benefits of performing service learning in particular have also been well

documented (Elwell & Bean, 2001; Jacoby, 1996; Myers-Lipton 1998; Vogelgesang &

Astin, 2000; Zlotkowski, 2001). Those benefits include the development of higher order

thinking skills like analysis, synthesis, and evaluation; an increased understanding of

social problems and social responsibility; a better understanding of human difference and

commonality: the ability to work collaboratively with others and the potential to develop

career goals (Elwell & Bean, 2001). These benefits have been categorized by Waterman,

(1997), into four broad categories which include: "(a) enhancement in the learning of

material that is part of the traditional in-school curriculum, (b) promoting personal development, (c) fostering the development of civic responsibility and other values of citizenship, and (d) benefits accruing to the community" (p. 3).

The character and moral development of university students have also been an interest of educators as well as how community service can impact that development. According to Judith Boss (1994), when students engage in community service, the student's moral reasoning ability improves. Universities have become increasingly interested in the development of the whole person but this cannot be ascribed to ethics classes alone. Boss also found in her study that the moral development of students is enhanced the greatest by students engaged in problem-solving activities with a moral issue such as participating in community service projects.

Reflection has been closely tied to the benefits received from participating in service projects. Reflection unfortunately has been a key element often missing from community service programs. It has been shown to be an essential element to the success of service learning courses which distinguishes them from "generic" community service programs. "Reflection activities provide the bridge between the community service activities and the educational content of the course" (Bringle, Games & Malloy, 1999, p. 179). In their study, Bringle, Games and Malloy identify several types of reflective activities including journals, experiential research papers, ethical case studies, directed reading, class presentations, and electronic reflection.

There is wide ranging support for students to participate in voluntary community service but there has been resistance to incorporating it into the curricula (Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000). It is argued that if community service is made available to students they

will participate without coercion; however other research shows that many people still choose not to serve even when opportunities are made available (Stukas, Snyder, & Clary, 1999). This tension has made it difficult for institutions to decide whether to require community service or service learning of its graduates.

Requiring Community Service

Historically colleges and universities have used optional as well as required community service within their institutions. According to Morton, (1996) schools that have offered optional community service have done so in one of three primary ways. It has been used as extra credit in a fixed grading system, as a replacement for another assignment, or as additional course credit with negotiated service and reflective activities approved in advance. The positive aspects of this approach are that the service is optional to students and requires less faculty supervision for outside activities.

Morton, (1996) also addresses some of the concerns if community service is required. If it is required, students must put a significant amount of time outside of class to earn their class grade. In addition, classroom time must be used for discussion and reflection. He also addresses logistical concerns such as finding appropriate sites where students can perform their service, the need for more meetings and supervision, and conflicts with site supervisors and students was also mentioned.

Requiring community service has emerged as a popular option for many institutions. Administrators and government policy makers have several intentional goals for requiring service from its students. They include: getting students to work together to accomplish a task, promoting citizenship and the education of students in relation to their

community, enhancing character development, and the promotion of academic outcomes (Anderson, 1999).

In addition, being a benefit to the community and increasing the likelihood that students will volunteer in the future have also been suggested as the motive behind requiring volunteerism. This however does not mean that those outcomes are actually met. In fact, some research suggests that if institutions require community service, students perceive that they will be less likely to volunteer in the future (Stukas, Snyder & Clary, 1999).

Purpose of the Study

Requiring community service and/or service learning has created a great controversy among high schools, and institutions of higher learning. Administrators and faculty are looking to research to help them make decisions about institutionalizing service within their schools and programs of study. Liberty University is among those institutions seeking to know how requiring community service impacts its students. The purpose of this study, therefore, is to examine how requiring community service at Liberty University impacts student perceptions about performing community service while they are attending the university as well as how it may impact their choice of volunteering in the future. This study will also provide administrators data about how requiring community service positively or negatively impacted student's lives and their perceptions of how performing their service responsibility impacted the lives of those to whom they served. In addition, the Christian/Community Service Office staff and faculty who coordinate the community service program at Liberty University will use this data to improve the overall program.

Research Questions

1. Do students perceive that Liberty University should continue to require community service of full-time students in order to graduate?

2. Do students who are required to complete community service in order to graduate perceive it as benefit to them personally as well as to the community?

3. How does being required to complete community service in order to graduate impact student perceptions about performing community service now as well as in the future?

4. Does religious faith impact student perceptions about being required to complete community service at Liberty University?

Limitations/Delimitations

Limitations

The survey used in this study was designed by the researcher and has not been tested outside the university. The survey data was self-reported, thus the analysis was reliant on the accuracy and honesty of the respondents perceptions. Students were not required to complete the survey so there is no guarantee that students will complete the survey. The study was designed for a specific population of students at one institution. The survey will be sent to all sophomores, juniors, and seniors via email who were currently enrolled in a Christian/Community Service. Thus, results will be limited to those whose email accounts are able to accept additional email and whose accounts are currently available.

Delimitations

This study was conducted at a large evangelical university and cannot be

generalized to that of students at other religious or state colleges and universities. This study was limited to those undergraduate sophomores, juniors, and seniors who were currently enrolled in Christian/Community Service and did not involve the entire student body.

Definitions

The following terms are defined as a means of ensuring that the information and conclusions drawn from this study are accurately communicated to the reader.

Christian/Community Service. A requirement of full-time liberty University students who must volunteer a minimum of 20 hours each semester they are full-time up to a maximum of six semesters. Students can choose to serve during the fall, spring or summer to earn their graduation requirement.

Community. The term community refers to the community in community service (Waterman, 1997; Jacoby, 1998; Zlotkowski, 1999). For purposes of this study there are four types of parameters in relation to its definition.

1. Off-campus populations underserved by our society

2. Non-profit organizations whose primary purpose is the common good of individuals

3. For-profit organizations that exist to serve human needs such as nursing homes

4. On-campus service to others such as tutoring students or assisting faculty with classes or research

Community Service. For the purpose of this study, the term refers to "a service performed by individuals for the benefit of others, for an organization, and/or for a

11

community. Individuals and/or organizations usually commit their time and energy to a worthy cause without engaging in a structured learning process" (Burns, 1998, p. 38).

CSER. The four letter acronym used by Liberty University to identify student's specific Christian/Community Service assignment.

Experiential Education. For the purpose of this study, the term refers to the formal process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience (Kolb, 1984)

Full-time Student. Any undergraduate student enrolled in 12 semester hours or more of academic credit during one semester.

Reflection. For the purpose of this study, this term refers to "directed readings, directed writings, electronic-mail and classroom discussions, ethical case studies, experiential research papers, personal journals, personal narratives, and service learning portfolios" which are designed to enhance a students learning after volunteering (Bringle & Hatcher, 1997, p. 153).

Service learning. For the purpose of this study, this term refers to a "course-based, credit bearing educational 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" (Bringle, Hatcher, Plater, & Cambridge, 2001).

Volunteerism. For the purpose of this study, this term can be defined as "long-term, planned, prosocial behaviors that benefit strangers and occurs within an organizational setting" (Penner, 2002).

Importance of the Study

The importance and benefits of student involvement in community service has been well documented (Astin & Sax, 1998; Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999; Bringle, Games & Malloy, 1999). However, there continues to be a debate among administrators and faculty as to the value and impact of requiring college and university students to perform community service (Morton, 1996; Anderson, 1999; Stukas, Snyder & Clary, 1999). Administrators and faculty are continuously looking to research to help them make decisions about institutionalizing service within their schools and programs of study.

Understanding how requiring community service impacts student perceptions about serving while attending the university as well as in the future is very important. For example, a goal of students performing community service has traditionally been to be a benefit to the community. However, if student's negatively respond to being required to register and complete community service in order to graduate it could have the opposite intended affect within the community.

Liberty University is one among many institutions that require community service assignments before a student can graduate. Since its inception, it has required community service of all of its undergraduate students and it was seen as a part of a Christian education by providing students with an opportunity to serve their fellow man and positively impact the community of Lynchburg, Virginia and its surrounding counties. However, just because it has always been done that way does not mean that it is should continue to or always be done that way. As the Director of Christian/Community Service, this researcher desires to utilize this survey data to

potentially make changes in existing practices within Liberty University as well as share this research with other Christian colleges and universities.

Many other Christian colleges and universities such as Wheaton, Cedarville, Tennessee Temple, and Pensacola Christian, although they encourage it, have decided to drop community service also known as Christian service as a graduation requirement. This data could also be used to assist them in determining whether they made the right decision or to guide them to re-instate it as a graduation requirement.

Service learning has emerged as a beneficial form of experiential education (Elwell & Bean, 2001; Jacoby, 1996; Myers-Lipton, 1998; Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000; Zlotkowski, 2001). This research study can also assist Liberty University officials in deciding whether to start service learning courses as an option for students or to change existing generic community service activities to service learning activities required for graduation.

The remainder of this document will include a more extensive literature review which will provide the reader with the historical and theoretical background of experiential education as well as provide a literary review of community service and service learning in higher education. In addition, it will include a research study of sophomore, junior and senior undergraduate students at Liberty University who were currently enrolled in a required community service program. The results of that study will be enclosed which will provide invaluable data to determine whether changes should be made in current university policies. Suggestions and recommendations for further research will also be included which could be conducted at a later date.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In the field of higher education there has been an increased awareness as well as a concern about the part experiential education, community service and more recently, service learning should play in a student's education. Although service has been traditionally a part of the college experience, students, faculty, and administrators are questioning its role and function in relation to students overall education.

During the 1990's there was a significant increase in the number of college and university students who participated in either community service or service-learning classes (Cone, 2003). Two decades ago experiential education was viewed by faculty, administrators, and some outside of the institution as the way to renew higher education's curriculum (Kolb, 1984). Colleges and universities are now experimenting with new ways to educate its students but questions continue to be raised and more studies need to be done to understand the value and role of experiential education in the modern higher educational institution (Ehrlich, 2000).

What function does the university play in relationship to the rest of society and in particular its role in teaching citizenship to the student body? Service has traditionally been a part of its mission as an institution (Hollander & Saltmarsh 2000; Kozeracki 2000). But to what extent should that mission be carried out? Should students be encouraged to participate in community service projects? Should students be required to volunteer a certain number of hours to graduate? Should service-learning courses be available or mandated as a part of the curriculum? These questions need to be answered by educational institutions.

The review of the literature for this study will explore the historical and theoretical review of experiential education. To set the context, a history of experiential education in colleges and universities in the United States and an overview of community service will also be given. Defining the terms community service and more recently service-learning will be included as well as defining the differences between the two will be explored. One of the key focuses of this study will be an investigation into the requirement of community service. Attitudes, motivations, and the effects of performing community service will also be addressed.

A Theoretical Review of Experiential Education in the United States

Cyril Houle (1976) expressed a key fundamental question in relation to experiential education. "Can anything worth knowing be taught or must the individual discover it for himself" (p. 20)? Educational theorists have dealt with this issue and historically, John Dewey would be considered one of the most influential theorists.

Dewey's ideas were viewed as nontraditional at the time they were written. His influence had an impact on educational theory at the time of their writing and they are still impacting educational theory and practice today. It is also noted that "of all his published work, it is his writings on education that have exerted the widest and deepest influences upon life in the Unites States and other countries" (Dworkin, 1959, p. 2).

Dewey (1938) sensed a philosophical divide between traditional education and a new progressive view of education which emphasized experience as a necessary part of learning. "I assume that amid all uncertainties there is one permanent frame of reference: namely, the organic connection between education and personal experience" (Dewey, 1938, p. 25). He did reject the idea however, that traditional education was void of

experience. It was however, that the experiences were the wrong kind of experiences. In

fact, the experiences themselves could cause the exact opposite affect on students that the

experience was intended to develop. "The belief that all genuine education comes about

through experience does not mean that all experiences are genuinely or equally educative.

Experience and education cannot be directly equated to each other" (Dewey, 1938, p. 25).

He believed that an improper experience was one that negatively impacted future

experiences. Thus a mis-educative experience would be one that caused a student to

become uninterested in future experiential learning.

Dewey also contended that students should be guided by their instructors. This

platonic view of education is seen throughout his works. Learning was a democratic

process which helped develop students into productive citizens who were a part of the

larger community who were also impacted through these experiences (Dewey, 1916).

Democracy was not just about government, but all citizens working toward the

betterment of society. A democracy is more than its citizens having the right to vote. It

is one in which persons are involved in a type of relational living and they make

decisions based upon the potential impact of others (Rhoads, 1997). "There is no

substitute for the vitality and depth of close and direct intercourse and

attachment…Democracy begins at home, and its home is the neighborly community"

(Dewey, 1927, p. 213).

Although Dewey believed and supported the idea of personal freedom, he

recognized that this needed to be balance with a concern for the community. He believed

that those schools which focused on cooperative living and proper teacher training would

be successful (Fisherman & McCarthy, 1998).

Not everyone agreed with Dewey's ideas. The most noted protagonist was Robert Maynard Hutchins. Hutchins believed the undergraduate curriculum should be under girded by a study of "Great Books" which were works from great Western intellects. He believed that through the study of those books students would learn key principles which would guide them through the rest of their lives (Ehrlich, 1996). Ehrlich believed that Dewey's ideas prevailed over Hutchins' which is why it has led to the modern concept of service-learning. "The basic theory of service-learning was Dewey's: the interaction of knowledge and skills with experience is key to learning. Students learn best not by reading the Great Books in a closed room but by opening the doors and windows of experience" (Ehrlich, p. xi-xii).

Attention should also be directed toward Dewey's concern of problematic dualisms existing in education, for example, the dualism between practical and intellectual activity. Dewey's philosophy of education had evolved from his understanding of the history of philosophy which contained these dualisms and he believed they prevented democratic education from emerging. He particularly was concerned about the way educational institutions elevated the intellect over the experience, an individual over the community and the intellect over knowledge. (Kezar & Rhoads, 2001)

According to Dewey (1925) reflection was also necessary for a student to have a meaningful experience. "Reflection occurs only in situations qualified by uncertainty, alternatives, questioning, search, hypothesis, tentative trials, or experiments which test the worth of thinking" (Dewey, p. 59). Experiences occur naturally and without reflection, those experiences can become meaningless. "For Dewey, reflective thinking

is essential to the pragmatic application of the scientific attitude and outlook to human life and education" which also develops "open-mindedness, whole-heartedness, and intellectual responsibility" (Cooper, 1998, p. 52).

McIntyre (1993) echoed Dewey's views on reflection. Reflection was not thinking about an experience in a vacuum. On the technical level, students reflect on their ability to achieve the learning objective. On the practical level, students reflected upon their assumptions, values, predispositions and consequences of what was learned. The third level of reflection was the critical level. At this level, students reflected on the wider societal and ethical issues raised during the experience. Reflection then becomes a discipline and a necessary element which enhances the learning experience.

Building on the foundation laid by Dewey, David Kolb developed a model for learning and problem solving which involved a four-stage cycle. Kolb et al., (1974) stated that the four stages included:

1. Concrete experiences – These experiences should then be tested.

2. Observations and reflections – Modifications should be made based on the experiences.

3. Formation of abstract concepts and generalizations – which leads to #4

4. Testing implications of concepts in new situations – Learning continues and is not static. Learning is constantly evolving based on the process (p.28).

Through these stages of learning the student is able to assess the importance of each of these stages to them personally to evaluate which of them they tend to emphasize as well as de-emphasize for future improvement. Kolb's intention is to help students become competent at each stage which will assist them on the learning process.

Kolb (1984), following Dewey's concepts tried to develop a link between what

was considered the traditional classroom and personal experiences. In addition, he saw experiential education as an accepted practice among colleges and university and was becoming "for many so-called nontraditional students – minorities, the poor and mature adults … the method of choice for learning and personal development (Kolb, 1984, p. 3).

Kolb (1984) also contributed to ones understanding of experiential learning by summarizing the experiential learning theories of Kurt Lewin, John Dewey, and Jean Piaget. He identified seven key themes that were a part these author's works. From these themes he developed five contemporary applications of experiential learning theory which are helpful in deciphering the value gained from these theories.

Kolb's theories continue to impact modern thinking in relation to the value of experiences as a catalyst to learning. Jacoby (1996) even suggests that Kolb's experiential learning cycle "is useful in elucidating the role of service-learning as pedagogy" (p. 9). Although there continue to be critics of the value and role experience plays in student's education, the influence of Dewey and Kolb's theories continue to impact pedagogical practices today.

A History of Experiential Education in Colleges and Universities in the United States

Historically the citizens of the United States have traditionally organized to participate in volunteer activities to better the community in which they live. DeTocqueville, the famous 19th century writer, saw this upon his visit to the U.S. and he noted that these organizations were very important to the "vitality of American society" (Pritchard, 2002, p. 4)

While community service has been a part of the fabric of American culture, it has also been a part of institutions of higher learning. "Colleges and universities have always

been involved to some degree in their communities" (Bringle, Games, & Malloy, 1999, p. 3). To better understand how modern institutions are struggling with the issue of engagement it is helpful to gain an historical perspective of how higher educational institutions have served society in the past. "Although the service mission of higher education is most strongly associated with the public college and land grant movements of the mid-nineteenth century, the tradition of service has a long history in all sectors of higher education" (Ward, 2002, p. 17).

Kelly Ward (2002) divides higher education and its legacy of service into five general eras: the colonial college, the denominational college, the research university, mass education, and the contemporary era. These divisions will be used as a guide throughout this section.

The Colonial College (1636-1770)

The colonial college era began in Cambridge, Massachusetts with the founding of: Harvard in 1636, William and Mary in 1693, Yale in 1701, the College of New-Jersey-later Princeton in 1746, the College of Philadelphia in 1775, Rhode Island College which was later named Brown in 1764, Dartmouth in 1766 and Queens in 1768 which later became Rutgers (McCaughey, 1999). These institutions were formed through the influence of primarily English institutions of higher learning. Although diverse in their form of service it was evident in their basic mission as institutions.

The first three colleges, Harvard, William and Mary, and Yale were all started from their respective church denominations. Their students were trained as members of the clergy for their specific denomination or as civil servants. For example, "Harvard's purposes were clearly understood: train a literate ministry, educate future lawyers and

civic leaders, and, more generally, perpetuate the tradition of humane learning in the New World" (Boyer & Hechinger, 1981, p. 9).

In addition, William and Mary was started to train ministers to American Indians for the purpose of civilizing and evangelizing them in the Christian faith. As students of the Anglican Church, they performed these activities as a service to Indians whether invited to do so or not (Geiger, 1999; Ward, 2002). At Yale, students understood their mission through its founding charter. Yale was described as a place "wherein Youth may be instructed in the Arts and Sciences who through the blessing of Almighty God may be fitted for Publick employment both in the Church and Civil State" (Levin, 2003, p. 7).

Although Harvard, William and Mary, and Yale started out as distinctively denominational institutions Harvard and William and Mary became more tolerant throughout the 17th century. Students in these English colonies lost interest in piety and many refused to return to England for ordination which was a requirement for graduation. Thus, most students at William and Mary never graduated. According to Geiger (1999) only Yale preserved and refined the sectarian passion of the Reformation era into the middle of the eighteenth century.

The Denominational College (1770-1860)

The American Revolution and the new freedoms it brought had a significant impact on the roles of higher educational institutions and expansion was on the minds of its citizens. After its independence, a goal of this young country as new towns and communities were developed was to start colleges and universities which would make an impact on their communities. Those states that did not offer collegiate education opened new institutions for its citizens. Examples include Maryland (1782 and 1784), Georgia

(1785), South Carolina (1785), North Carolina (1789) and Vermont (1791). Those

institutions which were denominationally funded had few students in these early years

and professors to teach them were difficult to find (Geiger, 1999).

Although some American colleges struggled in the beginning, by the 1820's many

of them, such as Harvard, Yale, Brown, Union and even Columbia had greatly improved

its standing as strong institutions (Geiger, 1999). During this era the classical college

was challenged and the new denominational college found a stronghold in American

higher education especially as the nation moved west. These denominational colleges

worked hand in hand with its communities to develop them economically and culturally

(Ward, 2002; Geiger, 1999). Unlike their earlier colonial predecessors, these new

colleges attracted students from the community and did not attract only the elite. "The

Eastern colleges were mostly in the hands of traditionalists, but the new frontier colleges

had a flexibility unknown to the Old World" (Boyer & Hechinger, 1981, p. 10).

Since these colleges were seen as a benefit to the community, those who never

took advantage of this type of education still supported them. Institutions of higher

learning were viewed as advantageous for the publics good and communities often found

themselves in bidding wars trying to attract collegiate institutions to their community

(Ward, 2002).

The west, however, was not alone in the emergence of the denominational

colleges. In the east, religious supported institutions began to be founded. Baptists

started Waterville College in1820 and Columbian College began in 1821. Randolph-

Macon (1830) and Wesleyan (1831) were started by the Methodists. Although these

schools were started by the aforementioned denominational groups, the state now had an

influence on their admissions standards. These schools could not impose religious tests

to their students (Geiger, 1999).

During this time-frame other service-type institutions were created. Most notably,

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute which began in Troy, New York in 1834 had a

philosophical impact on the future of higher educational institutions such as Harvard and

Yale. It paved the way for institutions to provide meaningful services to the community

through engineering and other technical studies. Through Rensselaer, students were

prepared to assist communities in the development of railroads, bridges and roads

through traditional classroom instruction and hands on laboratory-type training (Boyer,

1987; Boyer & Hechinger, 1981; Ward, 2002).

The Research University (1860-1945)

The Morrill Act, also known as the Land Grant College Act of 1862, was the

catalyst for the research university (Altbach, 1998; Bringle, Games & Malloy, 1999;

Ward, 2002). Through this Act, federal land was given to states which would be sold.

The money from the sale of these lands would then be used for the establishment of

colleges and universities that would train its students in the fields of agriculture,

mechanical arts, as well as new liberal arts institutions as well as those already in

existence. This form of utilitarian education again attracted a different type of student

who would have typically attended a technical college or would not have attended college

at all (Ward, 2002).

Influenced by the German reformers of the mid-nineteenth century, according to

Altbach (1999) "American reformers further transformed higher education by stressing

the relationship between the university and society through the concept of service and

24

direct links with industry and agriculture" (p. 17). Although American institutions were created out of a sense of need incurred by the establishment of a new nation, they were still influenced by other countries.

The mission of the university was still in flux. Who should benefit from higher education? Did it include all of its citizens? Rural communities were impacted in particular through the Hatch Act of 1887 and after the Civil War, African American institutions were added to the list of land grant institutions through the Morrill Act of 1862 (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997; Ward, 2002). These Acts as well as others helped to enlarge scope and mission of higher educational institutions. "American higher education, once devoted primarily to the intellectual and moral development of students, added *service* as a mission, and both private and public universities took up the challenge" (Boyer, 1990, p. 5)

During the late 1800's to early 1900's another major shift occurred within higher educational institutions. Women were historically primarily only admitted to single-sex colleges which were viewed by many as inferior. However, from 1890-1913 the number of co-educational institutions almost doubled. Sixty-eight percent of colleges and universities had become co-educational, a trend which was continued through the next generation (Geiger, 1999).

Bridges were continually being built between the university and the American society. "The Wisconsin idea", which was promoted by Governor Robert LaFollette under the leadership of the president of the University of Wisconsin, Charles Van Hise, developed a partnership between the state and the university by providing expert faculty support and resources to government agencies (Boyer & Hechinger, 1981; Ward 2002).

This view of the practical nature of the university still impacts higher educational institutions today.

Mass Education (1945-1975)

The period after World War II saw a great expansion in admissions at higher educational institutions. This was due to two very revolutionary changes. The first was the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 also known as the G.I. Bill. This flooded colleges and universities with a mass of individuals who had some life experiences into the classroom. As Boyer and Hechinger (1981) notes, "the G.I. Bill changed the entire tradition of who should attend college. Almost 8 million former World War II servicemen and women benefited from the legislation" (p. 15-16). The G. I. Bill also provided the opportunity for colleges and universities to obtain a much more diverse student body. It provided a college education to those who were historically neglected from this type of education (Rice, 2003).

The second change occurred in the 1960s with the massive growth of community college students (Carter, 2004). "This period was the most expansive in the American experience. The proportion of young people attending college tripled from 15% to 45%; undergraduates grew almost fivefold, graduate students almost ninefold" (Geiger, 1999, p. 61).

A great tension occurred on American campuses during this volatile era. In 1957, America was shocked by the Soviet Union launching the first satellite, known as Sputnik. Educational advancement in science and mathematics was viewed as an immediate necessity to catch up with the Russians. The National Defense Education Act supported by President Eisenhower was a clear indication of the emphasis on higher learning in the

sciences (Geiger, 1999).

However, there was also a great deal concern about the quality of life for all of American citizens. Many civil rights activists came from college campuses. "In the 1960s and 1970s, America's schools and colleges assumed a major role in the nation's unfinished business of ending racial discrimination and extending social justice" (Boyer & Hechinger, 1981, p.17). In addition, John F. Kennedy in 1960 also extended the vision of service around the globe by introducing the creation of the Peace Corps, while speaking at the University of Michigan stumping as the future President of the Unites States.

Student activism during this time also brought to light significant social problems and issues facing America's citizens. Community service organizations and federal volunteer service programs were initiated and professors began the discussion between community service and student learning (Mintz & Liu, 1994).

Although some faculty were interacting with their students about social issues, Mintz and Liu (1994) also note that by the end of the 1970's and early 80's many colleges and universities saw a decline in their community service programs. They were often deemphasized by college administrators by their obscure location on campuses.

Many higher educational institutions were also becoming more bureaucratic and administrators wanted faculty to focus more attention on research to make the institution prestigious rather than teaching and being involved in service. This caused communities to view colleges and universities as ivory towers and they viewed faculty as self seeking individuals who did not spend enough time preparing students adequately to be productive members of society able to address the complex needs that were evident

(Ward, 2002). This also had an impact on student's views as well. Boyer (1987) noted

that between 1969 and 1984 students became less interested in developing social skills

and personal values and became more interested in making a living.

The Contemporary Era (1975-Present)

While the growth of higher education is well documented, bigger does not always

mean better. Extensive criticism has been leveled against higher educational institutions

for not fulfilling its civic responsibilities in relation to the community (Boyer, 1987;

Checkoway, 2000; Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003; Strand, Marullo,

Cutforth, Stoecker, & Donohue 2003). The mission of these institutions has been

questioned by external as well as internal forces. Boyer (1996) gives a scathing view of

the academy at the beginning of this era by stating that being an intellectual:

> has come to mean being in the university and holding a faculty appointment,
>
> preferably a tenured one, of writing in a certain style understood only by one's
>
> peers, of conforming to an academic rewards system that encourages
>
> disengagement and even penalizes professors whose work becomes useful to
>
> nonacademics or popularized. What I find most disturbing… is that higher
>
> education is being viewed as a place where students get credentialed and faculty get
>
> tenured. (p. 13-14)

Conversely, Neusner & Neusner (2000) disagree with their contemporaries

regarding the role of the academy. They contend that the university is being asked to do

too much out of their true scope of responsibility. They believe the role of faculty has

shifted from its traditional roots to support three nonessential and non-academic tasks

which detract from the students overall educational training.

1. Preparing students for their future professions by linking them with practical experiences during their collegiate years. This, they argue should occur after graduation.

2. Act as a means of bringing about social change as well as being a change agent for the students themselves through teaching in the classroom. If remedial help or moral development is necessary to help students succeed, then the university should be responsible to provide it. It is a lie.

3. Educating good citizens.

Neusner and Neusner (2000), defending their contention of the third point state:

> We teach math. Society expects us to produce conscience. We teach the correct usage of the English language. Society demands that we educate tomorrow's leaders, tomorrow's workers. Above all, we teach skills of mind meant to serve a lifetime. Students want us to give them skills to sell in the marketplace tomorrow. We teach habits of work and habits of thought. People expect us to find them jobs. (p. 116)

Boyer (1987) points out that the university during the 1980s and early 1990s was viewed as an era of mission confusion. Although academic institutions had clearly defined academic rules, there existed confusion over the social and civic aspects of collegiate life. He notes that "the goal of the university, it was argued, should be to help all students understand that they are not only autonomous individuals with a unique heritage, but also members of a human community to which they are accountable" (Boyer, 1987, p. 325).

Do higher educational institutions have a responsibility to educate the total person and prepare them not only from a traditional pedagogical perspective or should they also prepare students for their life's occupation and to be productive members of society? The review of the literature indicates a majority of writers in support of higher educations role in developing the total person including a student's civic responsibility.

One of the key influences of developing civic mindedness in students was the development of Campus Compact in 1985. It was developed by college presidents. Their goal was to integrate service into the mission statements of colleges and universities. By 1992, 305 institutions had joined Campus Compact and were developing courses and programs to incorporate service into the curriculum (Winniford & Carpenter, 1997).

Since then, several other initiatives to promote service activities have been started by the federal government. These include the National and Community Service Act of 1990, the Serve America Program, the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993, and the Learn and Serve America Program (Pritchard, 2002). These were not all met however with open arms. For example, the Clinton Administrations initiative passed in 1993 was met with criticism from the Republican Congress. The initiative was designed to pay postservice educational expenses or to pay off educational debt already incurred by volunteer service and Congress believed the cost per student would be too expensive (Gladieux & King, 1999).

Although sometimes criticized, these and other measures have influenced students to focus outside of themselves and begin a new movement of civic-mindedness. Because

of this shift in philosophy, Sullivan (2000) recommends to colleges and universities that they begin to offer new opportunities for its students.

> The notable upsurge of interest among students in social service volunteer programs, as well as the growth in institutional support for such efforts at every level of higher education, is a testimony to the breadth of the sense that there is need for a change in direction, that academe must do more to educate for civic leadership and service. (p. 33)

Although students are showing an increase in interest in community service and volunteerism, academic institutions have not responded as fast as some would hope or expect. Some would even argue that citizenship education could be completely eradicated from some institutions.

> As American higher education has evolved from the eighteenth century to the present, moral and civic concerns have moved from its center…to its margins, segregated from the rest of academic life. If these trends prevail, education for responsible citizenship could be squeezed out altogether, at least in some kinds of institutions (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens 2003, p. 25).

American higher education has had several paradigm shifts in relation to its mission and role as educational institutions and in its function in preparing students for their future. The colonial college era offered limited educational opportunities and focused its efforts on training the clergy and those in leadership within the larger cities on the east coast. The denominational college era is noted for its shift to being accessible to the masses, especially as these institutions moved into communities in the West. These

31

institutions were viewed as partners with their communities and were inextricably linked with them.

The research university era solidified the tripartite nature and function of higher educational institutions by emphasizing teaching, research, and service as its mission (Kozeracki, 2000). The Land Grant College Act of 1862 formulated a necessary bond between the expertise found in the university and the needs represented within the community. Educational institutions then experienced significant growth during the mass education era due to the impact of the G.I. Bill and the community college. Student activism and their concern of social issues prompted a dialog between the university and community. However, by the end of this era more students were concerned about gaining an education to make a living than better society.

In the last twenty-five years, the American college and university has struggled to identify its role and mission as an academic institution. Although some argue that experiential education does not have a place in educational institutions of higher learning, the review of the literature supports a great interest regarding the matter. Cohen (1994) articulates the urgency of making the case of service to be included in colleges and universities by stating that "the challenge for educators interested in community service is immediate. A case for the academic legitimacy of the marriage of community service and higher education must be made, explicitly and with vigor" (p. 98).

This study will continue to address these concerns and investigate the roles community service and service learning should take part in student's collegiate experience. In particular, it will investigate whether requiring service in order for a student to graduate is a legitimate function of the university.

Experiential Education as Community Service and Service-Learning

Defining Community Service and Service Learning in Higher Education

Experiential education in the Unites States has evolved significantly even before its inception as a nation. Today, many students attending American colleges and universities participate in traditional volunteer and or required service programs of various types. The two most common terms used to describe these today are community service and service learning. However these two terms are not necessarily synonymous with each other. "While some people use the terms interchangeably, others insist that the two are quite distinct. Researchers and practitioners are divided, both among themselves and between each other, about what is community service, what is service-learning, and whether there is any difference" (Pritchard, 2002, p. 3). Disagreement even exists in the writing of the term "service learning". Even a brief review of the literature reveals a distinct disagreement about whether the term "service learning" should be hyphenated or whether it should remain two separate words.

Regardless, whether it is community service or service learning, engaging with the community has been viewed as a necessity for higher educational institutions. Boyer (1996) states that "The academy must become a more vigorous partner in the search for answers to our most pressing social, civic, economic, and moral problems, and must reaffirm its historic commitment to what I call the scholarship of engagement" (p.11).

Community Service Defined

Community service is often closely linked with volunteerism since there is not an immediate connection with academic credit. Students involved in community service are not necessarily focusing on the educational benefits from their involvement in their

service project (Perkins & Miller, 2002; Waterman 1997). "Community service is generally a service performed by individuals for the benefit of others, for an organization, and/or for a community. Individuals and/or organizations usually commit their time and energy to a worthy cause without engaging in a structured learning process" (Burns, 1998, p. 38).

Colleges and universities often use community service activities to meet various learning goals established by their institutions. Neururer and Rhoads (1998) explored student outcomes from performing community service. In their study they wanted to clarify the difference between charity and volunteerism. Donating money, for example, is a type of charity, and is not the same as volunteering in the community. Performing volunteer service and donating money would clearly have different outcomes. They viewed volunteerism as:

> a highly charged activity, replete with ethical, didactic, social, and intrapersonal dimensions. After all, it serves as a vehicle for connecting students and institutions to their communities and the larger social good, while at the same time instilling in students values of community and social responsibility. (p. 321)

Neururer and Rhoads, (1998) also see a distinct difference between volunteerism and community service. Community service was determined to be a concentrated service project in which students would work "with" instead of "for" an individual or a particular service group.

Institutions of higher learning are continually trying to evaluate the appropriate types of service their students should participate in which will assist them to not only become good students but good citizens. In reviewing the literature, there is a clear

preference among most writers for service learning within institutions rather than traditional "generic" forms of community service. Although community service is considered an integral component of service learning since it uses service as part of its pedagogical methodology, community service alone is often rejected as an activity that is academically sound (Burns, 1998). Many reasons have been given for this perspective which will be addressed later in the chapter.

Service Learning Defined

Service learning is one of the most discussed forms of experiential education in the last two decades. According to Kozeracki (2000), service learning is rooted in two distinct educational realms, community service activities and experiential education. Community service was viewed as an extracurricular activity and experiential education was traditionally viewed as an internship or practicum. When combined they form a service activity which is tied directly to learning outcomes. "Service-learning represents a potentially powerful from of pedagogy because it provides a means of linking the academic with the practical" (Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000, p. 25).

There are several definitions of service learning presented in the literature. Jacoby (1996) defines service-learning as "a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development" (p. 5). Two important key elements she also addresses were "reflection" and "reciprocity". Jacoby (1996) contends that the learning in service learning does not take place simply because of the experience itself but from the reflection that takes place after the service is completed. In addition, both the server and the one being served both

learn and teach through the process of service learning. Bringle and Hatcher (1997) give several activities that can be used by students to reflect on their service experience. These would include "directed readings, directed writings, electronic-mail and classroom discussions, ethical case studies, experiential research papers, personal journals, personal narratives, and service learning portfolios" (p. 153). All of these methods provide a form of reflection which would enhance the learning experience and provide a greater benefit to the student than from just the service experience alone.

Waterman (1997) condensed The Commission on National and Community Service's definition of service-learning listed in the National and community Service Act of 1999 by stating that service-learning is a method:

(A) under which students learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service experiences that meet actual community needs and that are coordinated in collaboration with the school and community;

(B) that is integrated into the students' academic curriculum or provides structured time for the student to think, talk, or write about what the student did and saw during the actual service activity;

(C) that provides students with opportunities to use newly acquired skills and knowledge in real-life situations in their own communities; and

(D) that enhances what is taught in school by extending student learning beyond the classroom and into the community and helps to foster the development of a sense of caring for others. (p. 2)

Service learning then is not just adding a community service assignment to the syllabus as a course requirement or as an option among many to earn credit for the

course. For there to be real "learning" in service learning the community service requirement must be integrated as a part of the course's learning objectives. As Howard, (1998) notes, "academic service learning is not about the addition of service to learning, but rather the integration of service with learning" (p. 21). Howard goes on to define service learning as "a pedagogical model that intentionally integrates academic learning and relevant community service" (p. 22).

Robert Sigmon and Associates, (1996) attempted to provide a more accurate definition of service learning by developing a typology that compares the way different programs unite learning with the service activity. His typology is as follows:

1. service-LEARNING – The learning goals are primary and the service outcomes secondary

2. SERVICE-learning – The service outcomes are primary and the learning goals are secondary

3. service learning – The service and learning goals are completely separate

4. SERVICE-LEARNING – The service and learning goals are of equal weight and each enhances the other for all participants

Based on Sigmon's typology one can see the different emphases of service learning that exist today by the institution placing equal or greater importance on the two terms themselves. In relation to this study being conducted at Liberty University, Sigmon's second typology would best describe its community service program. The emphasis at the university is placed on the service hours being performed by the students and the learning that takes place is a secondary concern.

Institutionalizing Community Service and Service Learning in Higher Education

Administrators of colleges and universities often struggle with the amount of conflicting data that has been written concerning community service and service learning being integrated into the programs of the university. A review of the literature reveals that many studies have found that community service and service learning are beneficial to the students who participate in the service, the community in which the service was performed and the educational institution providing the students as resources (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000; Jacoby & Associates, 1996; Learn and Serve, 2003; Pritchard, 2002; W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 2000).

Although it has been found to be beneficial, there can be a disconnection between volunteering while living at home and transitioning as a volunteer in college. "Most students have some involvement in community service in their home communities, but when they go to college, these connections are often broken, leaving them to form new ties to new communities" (Eyler & Giles, 1999, p. 45). Even though it may be more difficult to forge new relationships in an unknown area, students are still finding ways to volunteer and doing so in record numbers (Cone, 2003; Guarasci & Cornwell, 1997).

While this increase has been documented, is it due to programs offered by the university? In a study conducted by Berger and Milem (2002) a definite connection was found between students who volunteered at the university and those who performed community service while in high school. They concluded through their study that most students who volunteer in a higher educational setting are not participating in new experiences but are living out patterns of behavior already established in high school. The university's efforts to promote community service and service learning may not be as

affective as they presume. However, this should not discourage institutional

administrators from the promotion of service on their campuses. They also suggest

through their study that students can benefit from performing community service.

However, "the quality of service involvement is more important than the amount of

service performed by students" (Berger & Milem, 2002, p. 85). Thus, higher educational

institutions can positively impact student's lives in relation to service projects.

Colleges and universities can promote and institutionalize service through a variety of

means. Bringle and Hatcher (2000) suggest several ways this can take place.

> Institutionalization can be represented at the institutional level in a campus
>
> mission statement, presidential leadership, policy, publicity, budget allocations,
>
> broad administrative and staff understanding of and support for service learning,
>
> infrastructure, faculty roles and rewards, and service learning integrated with
>
> other aspects of institutional work (e.g. admissions, student affairs, financial aid,
>
> general education, long-term planning, institutional assessment). (p. 275)

When the administration supports service it has a greater likelihood of success on the

campus, regardless of student and faculty participation. As an example, Sacred Heart

University made community service an integral part of the schools mission and

volunteerism thrived on the campus (Corrigan, 2001). The Chancellor of the University

of North Carolina during his State of the University Address in October of 2001 echoes

this sentiment by stating:

> We cannot – and at Carolina, I would argue, do not – consider engagement an
>
> option. It is an integral part of a great university's life, not something to be
>
> practiced when convenient or if the mood strikes us. We must remember

Carolina's tradition of public service, and we must consider such service an obligation and responsibility, a debt we owe to the people of North Carolina as well as to society at large (Blanchard, 2002, p. 4).

Liberty University, originally Lynchburg Baptist College, has incorporated community service into their programs of study from the school's inception. The original mission of service placed the students in "a laboratory experience, where they can make immediate application of learning gained from the classroom" (Lynchburg Baptist College Catalogue, 1971, p.2). The school originally limited the service opportunities to involvement in the local church or Christian evangelism for students of all majors. Service opportunities expanded to include community agencies in 1988, and today, students participate in over 350 different locations throughout Central Virginia (N. T. Matthews, personal communication, March, 2005).

Pritchard, (2002) reviewed the service-learning and community service (S&CS) survey data that was conducted by the U.S. Department of Education. Although the data was gathered from community service and service-learning administrators from high schools, it still provides insight for higher educational administrators as well. The S&CS survey data listed reasons why administrators supported community service and service-learning activities on their campuses (see Table 1).

Administrators were given a set of ten options and they were instructed to choose the top three reasons they support their schools community service or service-learning activities. "The data clearly show that the educators focus on the relationship between the students and the community, for both community service and service-learning programs" (Pritchard, 2002, p. 11).

Table 1

Reasons for Encouraging Service-Learning or Community Service and the Percentage of Administrators Listing it as One of Their Top Three Reasons

Reasons for Encouraging Service-Learning or Community Service	Top Percentage = SL Bottom Percentage = CS
1. To reduce student involvement in risk behaviors (e.g., drug or alcohol use).	10 6
2. To improve student achievement in core academic courses.	12 4
3. To improve student participation in and attitudes toward school.	16 13
4. To increase career awareness and exposure among students.	18 9
5. To teach critical thinking and problem solving goals.	19 6
6. To improve student personal and social development.	26 33
7. To encourage student altruism or caring for others.	46 60
8. To meet real community needs or foster relationships between the school and surrounding community.	48 60
9. To increase student knowledge and understanding of the community.	51 41
10. To help students become more active members of the community.	53 69

Note: Data presented in this table are based upon the number of schools having service-learning or community service – 32 and 64 percent, respectively.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), "National Student Service-Learning and Community Service Survey," FRSS 71, 1999, found in Pritchard, I. A. (2002). Community service and service-learning in America. In A. Furco & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *Service-learning: the essence of the pedagogy.* Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

Students who volunteer through their institutions do so through a variety of opportunities on and off their campuses. The Astin and Sax (1998) study provides invaluable data concerning students and their involvement in community service while attending a higher educational institution. They studied the results of 3,450 students at 42 institutions that had federally funded community service programs. Of the respondents, 2,309 students indicated that they were involved in some type of community service during the 1994-1995 school year.

Table 2 shows the specific breakdown of where students served. The highest percentage of students (51.8%) volunteered on campus. The authors also point out that the second highest location percentage (38.5%) was at elementary or secondary schools. This was due to the partnerships that existed between the schools surveyed and their local elementary and secondary schools. They found that the lowest percentage (5.6%) of students volunteered for a political organization.

Eugene Lang, chairman emeritus of Swarthmore College's Board of Trustees started a program called Project Pericles to combat this lack of political concern across campuses. Young (2003) agrees that students are involved in service however he notes that fewer young adults are voting or becoming leaders in their communities. He also indicates that students need to understand that volunteering in the community is not the same as voting. However, many students do not equate voting with being civic-minded.

Astin and Sax (1998) also noted the reasons students participated in service (see Table 3). They made a point to note that three of the top four reasons students gave for serving involved an understanding of their civic responsibility and their need to serve others.

Table 2

Service Participation by Location of Service (N=2,309)

Location of Service	Percentage
College or University	51.8
Elementary or secondary school	38.5
Church or other religious organization	36.7
Social or welfare organization	28.8
Hospital or other health organization	25.9
Community center	22.5
Park or other outdoor area	20.3
Other private organization	17.0
Sport or recreational organization	14.1
Other public organization	12.8
Local service center	12.0
Political organization	5.6

Note. Percentages exceed 100 because many respondents marked more than one category.

Taken from Astin, A., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 93*(3), 251-263.

Table 3

Why Students Participate in Service (N=2,309)

Reason	Percentage noting reason as "important"
To help other people	91.2
To feel personal satisfaction	66.9
To improve my community	62.5
To improve society as a whole	60.6
To develop new skills	43.2
To work with people different from me	38.1
To enhance my academic learning	37.6
To fulfill my civic or social responsibility	29.6
To enhance my résumé	13.3

Note. Percentages exceed 100 because many respondents marked more than one
category.
Taken from Astin, A., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service
    participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 93*(3), 251-263.

Administrators attempting to decide whether to institutionalize community service or service learning into their institution must take a couple factors into consideration according to Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, (2000). First, as a form of pedagogy, service learning is new for faculty and they may not use it effectively or accurately which can skew data outcomes. If that was the case, students may resent the service requirement which would affect their attitudes when completing attitudinal surveys.

Secondly, pedagogical elements that are praised in service learning can also be found in "generic" community service activities. These would include reflective activities which can positively affect student attitudes about their service experience. However, they do conclude through their study that generic community service has fewer overall benefits than performing community service as a part of a course.

Benefits of Community Service and Service Learning in Higher Education

When deciding whether or not to institutionalize service into the curriculum, a study of its benefits should be considered. As mentioned earlier, there have been several studies conducted which have shown the benefits of students performing community service and service learning. One of the benefits of participating in community service is the development of a student's "self-concept" (Berger & Milem, 2002). In an earlier study Berger and Milem (2000), noted three dimensions of self-concept. These were academic ability, achievement orientation, and psycho-social wellness.

A study by Rhoads (1998) supports the importance of students developing their self-concept and he indicates that higher educational institutions have an important role in assisting the student with that development. Students learn about themselves through their interaction with others and the feedback they receive from that interaction.

45

Community service provides the opportunity for students to learn about themselves through the interaction of people that they would not necessarily interact with in the classroom. He believes that students learn how to care for others and develop a commitment to the betterment of society through community service activities. Guarasci and Cornwell (1997) describe this as the "self-other" dichotomy. "Students see how they are both different from and yet similar to others outside their immediate biographies; they begin to comprehend how self-respect and regard for others are intimately linked both in their development and in the needs of the communities in which they live" (Guarasci & Cornwell, 1997, p. 11). Thus, community service can have a transforming educational impact on undergraduate students.

Rhoads (1997) shares many personal testimonies from students how volunteering impacted their lives. He also shares from his own experiences and how they impacted his life personally. He recalls remembering his own issues of poverty from childhood while working along side low-income families in Maryland serving with Habitat for Humanity. He notes:

> At no time in my life have I been so self- and other-oriented at the same time. At no time in my life have I been more aware of how someone else contributes to who I am as a person. It seemed as though my sense of self was changing right before my eyes through someone else's eyes. I was supposed to be doing the giving, and yet I was receiving. I was supposed to be learning about others, and yet I was learning about my self. (p. 16)

While participating in community service, Rhoads learned about himself and his studies have shown that this same benefit was realized by others who served as well.

However, not all forms of community service equally develop a students' value of caring for others. Neururer and Rhoads, (1998) concluded that students who worked with or along side community members in a service project gained the most from their experiences rather than working only with other students.

Research suggests that undergraduates who participate in service projects have a number of positive short-term cognitive and affective outcomes (Astin & Sax, 1998). In addition, students also have long-term effects and affects of volunteering during their undergraduate years. According to a study conducted by Astin, Sax, and Avalos (1999), they found that:

> service participation positively affects students' commitment to their communities, to helping others in difficulty, to promoting racial understanding, and to influencing social values. In addition, service participation directly influences the development of important life skills, and conflict resolution skills. Service participation also has a unique positive effect on academic development, including knowledge gained, grades earned, degrees sought after, and time devoted to academic endeavors (p. 188).

The benefits of performing service learning in particular have also been well documented (Elwell & Bean, 2001; Jacoby, 1996; Myers-Lipton, 1998; Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000; Zlotkowski, 2001). Those benefits include the development of higher order thinking skills like analysis, synthesis, and evaluation; an increased understanding of social problems and social responsibility; a better understanding of human difference and commonality: the ability to work collaboratively with others and the potential to develop career goals (Elwell & Bean, 2001). These benefits have been categorized by Waterman,

(1997), into four broad categories which include: "(a) enhancement in the learning of material that is part of the traditional in-school curriculum, (b) promoting personal development, (c) fostering the development of civic responsibility and other values of citizenship, and (d) benefits accruing to the community" (p. 3).

It must be noted though that service learning has been shown to have benefits over and above "generic" community service (Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000). Because their study was a longitudinal study they were able to control many student and institutional characteristics. Even with those controls in place, service learning was beneficial in all eleven of the outcomes they examined. Many of these outcomes were better realized through service learning than through generic community service activities.

Although also not rejecting the value of performing "generic" community service, Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, (2000) found in their study that service learning was superior in developing positive outcomes in relation to student careers. They discovered that:

> for all academic outcomes as well as for some affective ones, participating in service as part of a course has a positive effect over and above the effect of generic community service. Service-learning participation is a clearly superior predictor of choosing a service-related career, exhibiting a stronger effect than generic community service in almost all career-choice analyses. (p.15)

Myers-Lipton (1998) studied the effects of a comprehensive service-learning program on college students' civic responsibility in contrast to students performing community service or students not volunteering at all. He suggested one caution at the beginning and end of his study regarding an assumption made by faculty and

48

administrators concerning service-learning. Although there is an assumption that service

learning positively affects a student's civic mindedness, more research needs to be

conducted before final conclusions can be made about its benefits in this regard.

Based on the overall research which has been conducted, institutionalizing

community service or service learning as a part of the curriculum or as an encouraged

activity among college and university students can be recommended. As Astin (1985)

states succinctly, "students learn by becoming involved" (p.133).

If administrators and faculty decide to incorporate service into their schools, there

are some concerns which must be addressed.

Concerns with Community Service and Service Learning in Higher Education

Community Service vs. Service-Learning

When considering which type of service program to implement administrators will

find advocates of community service in their institutions who oppose service learning and

they will find advocates for service learning who oppose community service. Pritchard

(2002) identifies this adversarial relationship. He states that some supporters of

community service believe:

1. The general public does not recognize the term "service-learning" and sees no
    need to introduce a new term when community service is accepted and
    understood.

2. Educators who want to use the term "service-learning" have an ax to grind. In
    particular they want the more progressive term to be used to promote a
    political view of how "American society, social institutions, and citizens
    should be reformed". (p.7)

3. Supporters of service-learning tend to emphasize a student's cognitive development over the student's moral development and the benefit their service provides the community.

He also indicates that some supporters of service-learning believe:

1. Community service is associated with an elitist view of social obligation and it implies the moral superiority of those who are serving over those who are being served.

2. Community service is viewed in contrast to academic learning and is viewed as a form of punishment for convicts which might benefit the community but is viewed as embarrassing or disliked by the service provider.

3. Community service is associated with merely altruistic or benevolent activities in which the emphasis is placed primarily on the benefits to the one being served and little if any significant learning takes place.

Leonard T. Burns (1998) articulates this struggle by the title of his article; "Make Sure It's Service Learning, Not Just Community Service" (p.38). It should be noted however that administrators can use both within their institutions and gain the benefits of both while dealing with the concerns of the aforementioned advocates.

Community Service and Service-Learning Not Viewed as Academic

Burns (1998) contends that most view community service as an activity that benefits others, an organization or the community at large. However, community service performed by students does not necessarily have a specific learning component attached to it. It is not typically linked to learning outcomes in the curriculum and is not the same

as service learning, thus it is not academically sound. Burns (1998) views service

learning as an academic activity. He states that service learning should be:

> designed to achieve a variety of learning objectives or outcomes outlined in the
>
> curriculum; designed to yield outcomes integrated in the context of learning,
>
> enabling students to relate and apply their learning to real-life situations;
>
> comprising planned activities in which community organizations and students work
>
> together to provide a high-quality experience designed to achieve prescribed
>
> learning outcomes…including outcomes related to reading, writing, listening,
>
> speaking, researching, problem solving, critical thinking, assessment, and
>
> evaluation. (p.39)

This is also supported by some who view community service as just an altruistic

expression of charity. Because of this, they do not believe that community service is a

valuable educational experience (Neusner & Neusner, 2000; Pritchard, 2002).

Service-learning also has its skeptics. It has been noted that there are those who

believe that service-learning weakens the curriculum by spending valuable classroom

time doing service projects in the community. Problems with service learning can also

range from the demands of such a program on faculty members to the quality of the

learning activities assigned. Because of this, few faculty and in particular tenured and

tenure-track faculty, use service-learning as a form of pedagogy in their classrooms

(Gray, Ondaatje, Fricker, & Gerchwind, 2000).

This concern has been echoed by others. Bringle, Games, and Malloy (1999)

comments that applying educational principles in a practical setting is often less valued

than theoretical in-class work. They note that "service learning, with the integration of

51

community service into an existing curriculum, is viewed with the suspicions that students are receiving academic credit for volunteer work and that academic standards are being compromised" (p. 195). However, they also point out that the reason for this suspicion is the lack of faculty understanding or familiarity with service learning as an academically credible form of pedagogy.

To combat the concern that community service is not an academically valid form of pedagogy, the Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) developed the following "Critical Elements of Thoughtful Community Service" (as cited in Jacoby & Associates 1996) to assist schools in developing a legitimate community service program.

1. Community Voice – Colleges and universities should build bridges with the community. Their voice concerning the real needs of the community should be heard.

2. Orientation and Training – This is an important first step. Students should learn about the community in which they are serving, the organization in which they will be partnering with and the specific problem that will be addressed by their service.

3. Meaningful Action – This one could be the most crucial of the five elements. Meaningful action means that the service which is being provided is necessary and is valued by the community. Students need to know that they are making a difference through serving and that their time was appreciated and useful to the betterment of society.

4. Reflection – Reflection is very important to the community service learning experience. Reflection should take place soon after the service is completed

so that critical academic elements are added to the experience.

5. Evaluation – Evaluation can be used to provide meaningful feedback from the student and the service organization representative or immediate supervisor. Evaluation provides the opportunity for overall improvement in relation to the student and the agency. (p. 30-31)

Faculty and Student Resistance to Community Service and Service Learning

Faculty members are often resistant to change. There are several concerns that faculty members have raised in relationship to incorporating service into the academy. First, as it has already been noted, some faculty members, though supportive in general of community service, do not believe that serving in the community is the responsibility of higher educational institutions. There are those academicians who believe that their teaching and research should remain separate from their volunteerism. Some faculty members believe that community service is unimportant, has few rewards, and if performed might even jeopardize their careers (Checkoway, 2000).

In many colleges and universities, faculty promotion is directly linked with research and publication (Altbach, 1998). According to Checkoway (2000) this is often perpetuated by the administration and department chairs placing pressure on faculty to only participate in traditional academic work. One of the ways to combat this barrier to service is to redefine scholarship to include combining teaching with service. In support of this perspective, Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) state:

We believe that institutions of higher education that fail to recognize the need for good teaching and for engagement in society are falling out of step with the

expectations of parents, students, politicians, and the larger public, as well as their own stated goals. (p. 8)

A second concern observed according to Manicas (2000) is that many faculty view the traditional setting of the classroom not only to be an effective pedagogical method but the only possible method. This fear of the unknown is due to their ignorance of newer technologies.

Another concern is that "some faculty members fear that service-learning will dilute the academic rigor of a course" (Elwell & Bean, 2001, p. 49). Although a number of studies have shown this not to be the case, education of faculty becomes paramount to deal with this issue.

A final concern that will be addressed is perhaps the most common objection to community service involvement during the undergraduate years. Astin and Sax (1998) note that "perhaps the most common objection to volunteer participation during the undergraduate years is that volunteering consumes time and energy that the student might otherwise devote to academic pursuits" (p. 256). The problem with this idea is the misleading assumption that service is not an academic pursuit. In reviewing the literature it has also been well documented that those who perform community service and especially service learning do well in school academically. Further research still needs to be conducted in this area as to whether it was the service activity that influenced them to become better students or whether it was because better students were the ones who performed the service.

Community Service as Punishment

A potential detractor from all of the positive attributes of institutionalizing service

within higher education is the use of community service as a form of punishment (Perkins & Miller, 2002). This is one key reason there are those who support service learning over community service (Burns, 1998; Pritchard, 2002). In reference to this, Burns (1998) states, "without the structure of service learning, mandated community service may become controversial, centering around the use of community service by the judicial system. Consequently, community service may be perceived as punishment for criminal activity". (p.39)

Using community service as a method of punishment or as restitution for a debt owed to society is very common. In many cases it has been used to reduce jail time. Liberty University, as an example, uses community service as a form of punishment for students who incur an excess of reprimands but have not committed an act worthy of being expelled from school (M. Hine, personal interview, March, 2002). According to a report in the Chronicle of Higher Education, Alabama State also uses community service as a form of punishment. Those first-time offenders of punishable behavior such as cheating on a test or stealing a book from the library are required to do 45 hours of community service (Alabama State University, 1999).

When students equate community service with punishment it can undermine the very purpose community service is promoted or required on campuses. Community service should be viewed as a positive educational experience and not associated with negative reinforcement such as a type of punishment for students (Burns, 2002).

Requiring Community Service or Service Learning in Higher Education

High schools as well as colleges must deal with the issues of whether or not to mandate community service or service learning as a graduation requirement. Since this

study is going to focus on student attitudes about required community service, a review of the literature regarding this issue should be addressed.

Is it the responsibility of colleges and universities to teach the value of serving? Is experiential education a valid form of learning? Learning has been defined as "a change of behavior" (Miller, 1973, p. 5). If a person's behavior has been modified through an experience does it infer that their values have changed through the experience or is it only an action devoid of moral development? Curtler (2001) argues that morals and values cannot be taught in higher educational institutions since moral development ends at some point in childhood. Requiring a course to develop a student's morals or values in college then becomes unproductive. This has not been the traditional beliefs however of colleges and universities.

Historically higher educational institutions have used optional as well as required community service within academic courses. According to Morton, (1996) schools that have offered optional community service have done so in one of three primary ways. It has been used as extra credit in a fixed grading system, as a replacement for another assignment, or as additional course credit with negotiated service and reflective activities approved in advance. The positive aspects of this approach are that the service is optional to students and requires less faculty supervision for outside activities. Morton, (1996) also addresses concerns if service is required. If this is the case, students must put a significant amount of time outside of class to earn their class grade. In addition, classroom time must be used for discussion and reflection. He also addresses logistical concerns such as finding appropriate sites where the students can serve, the need for more

meetings and supervision, and conflicts with site supervisors and students was also mentioned.

There is a great deal of controversy today over the issue of requiring community service. There are those in higher education who disagree that community service should be required of students. Stukas, Snyder, and Clary (1999) communicate this concern by stating that "to promote citizen participation, various institutions have started to use their authority to 'require', as opposed to 'inspire' individuals to engage in community service" (p. 59).

If student opinion means anything in this inquiry, survey data indicates that a majority of students don't object to being required to perform community service. Eyler and Giles (1999) indicates that:

> although requiring community service of students was controversial among the students we surveyed, as it is among educators generally, the majority endorsed the idea of requirements, and those with applied and reflective service-learning were more likely to see its value. (p.159)

Newquist (1997) also notes that although there is not enough research to support either side of the argument, anecdotal evidence indicates that mandatory community service is a positive experience for most students opening new opportunities that would otherwise not been available to them.

Southern University in Louisiana is a unique university among public institutions. They require 60 clock hours of community service before graduation. Carpenter and Jacobs (1994) indicated the following:

> The most compelling reason for establishing the community service requirement,

however, was that the University believed that its graduates would now have a greater sensitivity for the needs of humanity and that they would view volunteerism as a legitimate means of addressing those needs. The university also believed that volunteerism in the minority community was an indispensable activity in creating a society in which the quality of life is improved. (p. 97)

These hours are typically earned while taking one of three community service classes offered by the university.

Liberty University, an evangelical university in Lynchburg, Virginia has also had a unique required community service since its inception. According to their Christian/Community Service Handbook (2004-2005) students are required to complete two, one-hour community service classes their first year of full-time enrollment. Students are then required to serve a minimum of twenty clock hours of community service each semester until they graduate or up to a maximum of six semesters. Students can complete their service requirements during the spring, summer or fall semesters.

There is not a lot of support however for requiring community service of students in higher education. Although there is agreement that volunteerism have its benefits, some researchers question whether adding more student volunteers to the community outweighs the negative aspects that mandatory servitude could produce (Anderson, 1999; Creighton University 1999; Stukas, Snyder, & Clary, 1999). According to Matthews (2005) "negative aspects of mandating community service in higher education may include:

1. Service that must be completed outside of school hours may interfere with other student activities (e.g., homework, jobs, sport, clubs)

2. Detrimental effect on the attitudes of students who would not normally volunteer

3. Negative representation of the university by reluctant students serving at a service agency

4. Mandating service undermines the sincerity of those students who volunteer on their own

5. Service requirements could have liability insurance ramifications. (p. 46)

Research by Stukas, Snyder, and Clary (1999) indicates that when students perceive a more controlling form of community service mandated upon them the less desire they had to volunteer in the future. Marks and Jones (2004) also support this perspective by acknowledging that "requiring community service of college students is not a policy we would recommend based on the negative effects of mandated service among high-school students" (p.335). They would rather recommend to school administrators that efforts be made to make service a norm. This would simply be a form of encouraging faculty, staff and students to participate in community service rather than mandating it.

Anderson, (1999) suggests through national research that inviting students to volunteer is almost as productive as mandated programs. Student participation of volunteer activities in schools that encouraged community service and arranged opportunities for them were almost as high as schools that require community service to graduate.

Conclusion

As this review of the literature has shown, experiential education has played an

important role in higher education throughout the history of the United States. Community service and more recently service learning has emerged as a controversial but often used form of pedagogy in many colleges and universities. Administrators at these institutions need additional research to answer the many questions raised through adding service to the curriculum. This study is designed to provide additional research to assist college and university officials in deciding whether to mandate service at their institutions or to keep it a volunteer activity for their students.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The quantitative descriptive research methodology, "which focuses on explaining cause-and-effect relationships, studies a small number of variables, and uses numerical data" (Ravid, 2000, p.4-5) was the method used to study student perceptions and the impact of requiring community service at Liberty University. The researcher also chose to use a "nonexperimental" (McMillan & Wergin, 2002, p. 4) study since the data would be obtained from students who are currently registered for a required community service and no control was put in place which would influence student responses. This study explicitly sought to examine the variables that have positively or negatively impacted student perceptions of performing required community service while attending Liberty University as well as in the future. In addition, it was designed to study university student perceptions of the benefits and the personal impact of being required to volunteer in order to graduate.

The researcher designed this study to provide important information to the Christian/Community Service office faculty and staff who coordinates the required CSER program at Liberty University. It was also designed to provide assessment data which can be included in the evaluation of the university's Five-Year Strategic Plan and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools re-affirmation visit.

Since "a survey is a system for collecting information to describe, compare, or explain knowledge, attitudes, and behavior" (Fink, 1995, p. 1) a survey was chosen to gather the information used in this study. It was also determined that the respondents to this survey will constitute a sample of convenience since students will not be coerced into

completing the survey and they will be responding by invitation by e-mail (Matthias, Fricker, & Elliot, 2002).

Selection of Participants

The population for this study was taken from current undergraduate students at Liberty University during the Spring semester of 2005. First year freshmen and transfer students were not included in the study since they are not required to register for a Christian/Community Service during their first year. Freshmen and first year transfer students are required to take a one-credit hour class their first two semesters called Contemporary Issues I and Contemporary Issues II. These courses are designed to help prepare students for their CSER requirements during their subsequent semesters.

In consultation with the Provost's office, the researcher contacted and gained permission from the Associate Vice President of Administrative Information Management to use Liberty University students and Liberty University's name in this study (Appendix A). It was necessary to secure institutional approval to ethically conduct the research study and to gain access to the university database for the purpose of soliciting student responses.

To create the appropriate population to study, a query was requested from the university's Registrar's office. The Registrar's office provided the researcher with a Microsoft Excel file query of students who were enrolled in a CSER during the Spring semester of 2005 and who were sophomores, juniors, and seniors and first year students were eliminated. The query also provided the student's e-mail address which will be used in contacting the students to complete the survey.

Prior to conducting the survey, the researcher examined the file for anomalies that were present. Because some students could be registered for more than one CSER, duplicates were found in the query which needed to be removed to aid in the validity of the study. Once these duplicate files were removed the researcher had a population of 2705 students to survey. To maintain a 95% level of confidence and to ensure that the sample proportion p was within $\pm$ .05 of the population, the researcher sought 338 completed surveys from participants (Isaac & Michael, 1997).

<div align="center">Study Context</div>

Liberty University is an academic institution of higher learning in the evangelical tradition with an enrollment of approximately 7,300 total resident students. It has its roots as a Baptist college and was highly influenced by a founder who was trained at a Bible college. From its inception, Christian/Community Service, formerly known as Christian Service, has been a graduation requirement for all undergraduate students. Students are required to register and complete one CSER for each semester they are full-time up to six semesters after their first two semesters. The minimum number of volunteer hours needed to pass each semester is 20 hours. Students can register and complete their CSER requirements during the Spring, Summer, or Fall semesters.

Students can volunteer on campus through a variety of service opportunities including mentoring programs, tutoring students, assisting faculty members, serving in various campus church services and outreaches, as well as being a spiritual leader in the dorms. Students can also volunteer off campus in churches of their choice, civic and community service organizations such as boy's and girl's homes, Habitat for Humanity, Circle K, (the Kiwanis Club for college students) as well as many more. Students can

also volunteer in nursing homes and hospital as well as public, private and Christian

schools.   During the Spring semester of 2005, students volunteered in over 350 different

Christian/Community Service sites (Matthews, 2005).

Instrumentation

The researcher designed the survey used in this research study (Appendix B)

according to accepted survey guidelines (Fink, 1995; Isaac & Michael, 1997). The survey

consisted of 25 questions and all but one was closed. The one open-ended question

sought to know the name of the community service organization in which the student

volunteered. Fourteen questions used a five-point Likert scale designed to assess student

perceptions concerning the impact CSER has had them and others and whether CSER

should continue to be required. Although Liberty University does not currently provide

service learning courses, one question asked students if they would prefer required

community service through a course instead of the way community service is currently

being administered.

"Validity must be documented when evaluating new survey instruments or when

applying established survey instruments to new populations" (Litwin, 1995, p. 34). The

researcher determined that "content validity" (Litwin, 1995, p. 35) was appropriate for

this study. To ensure the content validity of the survey, the researcher had the faculty and

staff members of the Christian/Community Service Department review the survey's

content to ensure that it included all of the data necessary as well as exclude any

unnecessary questions.

In addition, to ensure that errors were eliminated, that the form of the survey was

accurate, that the verbiage used was understandable to the survey population, and to

ensure cultural sensitivity (Litwin, 1995), the questionnaire was piloted with 21 students who were familiar with the CSER program. Immediate feedback was given by the respondents and it was determined as a result of the pilot test that no changes in the survey instrument were needed.

The researcher also took steps to ensure the validity and reliability of the survey by basing his questions on questions that had been implemented in other similar and successful surveys (Fink, 1995). These include:

1. Community Service Attitudes Scale – (Shiarella, McCarthy, & Tucker, 2000)
2. Supplemental Survey of Service Learning Participants by the Higher Education Research Institute – (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000)

Assumptions

1. Students carefully read and thoroughly understood the survey.
2. The Spring semester of 2005 is representative of any given semester regarding student perceptions regarding their Christian/Community Service experience.
3. Students responded truthfully to the survey questions.
4. Students know how to access their Liberty University email account.

Limitations

1. The survey designed by the researcher was sent to the students through their e-mail accounts. All Liberty University students are given a liberty.edu e-mail address and are asked to check it daily; however some students do not check their Liberty email account frequently and may not respond to this survey because they are unaware that it is available to them.

2. Students responding to the survey may have had the researcher for class and they responded as a favor to him personally. That relationship may affect the validity of the results.

Procedures

In consultation with the Provost's office, the researcher contacted and gained permission from the Associate Vice President of Administrative Information Management to use Liberty University students and Liberty University's name in this study (Appendix A).   Securing permission from the survey site was part of Argosy University's Institutional Review Board's (IRB) application process in keeping with the guidelines for the ethical treatment of human subjects. The researcher did not begin the study until approval was granted from the IRB committee.

Data Collection

Primary sources provided the data used in this study. A letter of invitation for students to take a survey was developed (Appendix C). This letter described the research being conducted, the purpose of the survey as well as an indication that by taking the survey the student was giving permission of the researcher to use their responses in the survey analysis. Included in the invitation to participate in the survey was a hyperlink which directed the student to the web server where the survey could be taken and where the data would be collected.

Survey

The survey was created using a purchased online survey creator at www.CreateSurvey.com. This survey development and hosting site was chosen because it provided simple survey development tools, was cost effective, provided easy

downloadable research data, and provided anonymity for the students who took the survey. The survey instrument was only available to the students who were sent the invitation by email and the student could only complete the survey once which was a part of the online design so that the validity of the survey could be maintained.

Historically, surveys have been administered using the postal system or done in person. Recent research indicates that the World Wide Web is increasingly being implemented as a valid vehicle for gathering data through the use of surveys since the costs are relatively low and the response rates are high (Carini, Hayek, Kuh, Kennedy, & Ouimet, 2003). Carini, et al., (2003) also believe that using Web technology is especially practical and suitable when surveying computer-savvy university students. In addition, Musch and Reips (2000) have identified several positive factors for using the internet as a means of conducting research and collecting data. Their study highlighted several advantages of this modern research tool.

1. Access to the infinitely larger population that the internet provides can increase the study's validity

2. Costs for implementing the study can be drastically reduced

3. The data collection instrument can be made available 24 hours a day

4. The participants in an internet based study are completely voluntary which improves the respondents' motivation to participate (p. 73)

The invitation to participate in the study was sent via e-mail to the identified population on May 3, 2005. This date was chosen because it was near the end of the semester when most students would have completed their 20 hours of community service,

yet it still provided enough time for the researcher to gather data before the semester ended.

Data Processing and Analysis

The survey was completed by 346 students and the data gathered by the online surveys was stored by the survey hosts web server. The results were then downloaded into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. The data was then be analyzed statistically using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, v.12.0) an industry standard statistical analysis software program. Using SPSS will permit the researcher to conduct various types of statistical analyses which will be used for this dissertation as well as for further study by the university. For purposes of this study the researcher will utilize frequency counts, percentages, and measures of central tendency to analyze the data (Ravid, 2000).

The following research questions were specifically examined for this study.

1. Do students perceive that Liberty University should continue to require community service of full-time students in order to graduate?

2. Do students who are required to complete community service in order to graduate perceive it as benefit to them personally as well as to the community?

3. How does being required to complete community service in order to graduate impact student perceptions about performing community service now as well as in the future?

4. Does religious faith impact student perceptions about being required to complete community service at Liberty University?

The survey provided the researcher with a variety of variables that were crosstabulated to provide frequency and tables of percentages. According to Shannon and Davenport (2001), crosstabulation is used when the researcher desires to determine the extent of the correlation between two variables. For example, in this study the researcher wanted to determine the relationship between being required to perform community service at Liberty University and the students perceived intent on volunteering in the future. In addition, the researcher wanted to discover whether there was a difference in student opinion concerning Liberty University's requirement to do community service when a student is a sophomore and when a student is a senior.

The quantitative research method used in this study provided important data which will be used to help determine whether Liberty University should continue to require community service of its undergraduate students in order to graduate. The findings from this research will be presented in Chapter Four and will be discussed in Chapter Five. Suggestions for additional research will also be suggested in Chapter Five which will guide Liberty University officials in its final decision regarding required service.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Introduction

Administrators of colleges and universities must address the role that community service should play at their institutions. Decisions need to be made whether volunteerism will be encouraged but not required of it students and what impact that decision will have in preparing students to address the needs of the communities in which these students will live and work. Proponents of service learning courses suggest that the benefits gained from these types of course designed community service projects which include a vital reflective component is an improved way to prepare students for a life of service (Vogelgesang &Astin, 2000). Liberty University has since its inception required students to perform community service in order to graduate. This is accomplished through a structured program funded and supported by the administration. However, is this constructive and an effective way to educate students in citizenship and prepare them for a life of service to others.

The purpose of this quantitative descriptive research study (Ravid, 2000) was to examine the variables that have positively or negatively impacted student perceptions of performing required community service while attending Liberty University as well as in the future. In addition, it was designed to study university student perceptions of the benefits and the personal impact of being required to volunteer in order to graduate. This study found that a majority of students perceived that Liberty University should continue to require community service of its students and that their service experience was

beneficial to them. The findings of this study are organized by the four research

questions and the questions from the student survey related to each research question.

Questions were crosstabulated with key demographic questions to investigate potential

impacts to student perceptions.

The first research question investigated student perceptions of whether Liberty

University should continue to require community service in order to graduate. This was

crosstabulated with student rank, the type of high school they attended, and whether they

were required to also perform community service in high school in order to graduate.

The second research question related to student perceptions concerning the

benefit(s) they received from being required to do community service and the benefit(s)

they perceived the community received through their service. One question asked

students to choose from a list of motivations as to why they choose their particular

community service assignments. Another question asked students to identify how being

required to perform community service benefited them in a positive way. A list of

options was included for them to choose from including the option, "It did not benefit

me". Five statements were also included indicting areas of personal benefit and a Likert

scale was used to evaluate their perceptions. An additional statement was included which

identified on a Likert scale student perceptions of whether they believed their service

benefited others and it was crosstabulated based on whether their service was performed

on campus, off campus in a local or home church, or whether it was performed off

campus but not in a church.

The third research question investigated how being required to complete

community service in order to graduate impacted student attitudes about serving while

71

attending the university as well as in the future. In reference to present attitudes, student opinions were crosstabulated with their rank and the type of high school they attended. In regards to how it has impacted their attitude about serving in the future, student responses were crosstabulated with their rank.

The fourth research question asked if their religious faith impacted in a positive way their attitude about their requirement to participate in CSER. This question was crosstabulated with the student's gender and their rank.

<div align="center">The Respondent Demographics</div>

There were 346 respondents to the survey (see Appendix B) which consisted of 25 questions, 24 closed and one open-ended question. Of the respondents 37.57% were male and 62.43% were female. In reference to rank, 21.1% of the students were sophomores, 30.92% were juniors and 47.69% were seniors. Since CSER is not required of freshmen, the researcher only sent the survey to those in the upper ranks. However, one freshman taking CSER for credit also took the survey. In reference to the type of high school they attended, 60.12% of the students had attended a public high school, 27.17% attended a private Christian high school, 6.07% were home schooled, 5.78% had gone to another unique type of school or they had attended two or more types of schools and .87% or 3 students went to a different private institution.

<div align="center">Perceptions Regarding Required Community Service to Graduate</div>

The first research question asks: Do students perceive that Liberty University should continue to require community service of full-time students in order to graduate? According to Table 4, students indicated that 70% agree or strongly agree that community service should be required by the university. In contrast, 17.1% indicated

Table 4

	Liberty University Should Continue the CSER Requirement					
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Rank						Total
Freshmen	0	1	0	0	0	1
% within Rank	.0%	100%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100%
% of Total	.0%	.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
Sophomore	34	21	6	4	8	73
% within Rank	46.6%	28.8%	8.2%	5.5%	11.0%	100%
% of Total	9.8%	6.1%	1.7%	1.2%	2.3%	21.1%
Junior	43	33	18	8	5	107
% within Rank	40.2%	30.8%	16.8%	7.5%	4.7%	100%
% of Total	12.4%	9.5%	5.2%	2.3%	1.4%	30.9%
Senior	61	49	21	17	17	165
% within Rank	37.0%	29.7%	12.7%	10.3%	10.3%	100%
% of Total	17.6%	14.2%	6.1%	4.9%	4.9%	47.7%
Total	138	104	45	29	30	N= 346
% of Total	39.9%	30.1%	13.0%	8.4%	8.7%	100%

that they disagree or strongly disagree that it should continue to be required. In addition, 13% of the respondents indicated that they felt neutral about the requirement.

When the results were crosstabulated with the students rank, it was found that 74.4% of sophomores agreed or strongly agreed that community service should be required. However, 71% of the juniors and 66.7% seniors had the same perception about the requirement. This constituted nearly an 8% drop in opinion about the requirement. Similarly, sophomore respondents indicated that 16.5% disagreed or strongly disagreed that CSER should be required. That percentage increased to 20.6% for seniors.

When the results were crosstabulated with the type of high school the students attended (see Table 5) students who were home-schooled had the highest percentage (80.9%) of positive attitudes about the requirement of community service followed by 75% of those who had attended at least two different types of high schools and 71.6% of those who had attended a public school. Other than three students who had attended a special private school, the lowest group responding positively was those students who had attended a private Christian school and 63.8% of them indicated a positive perception about the requirement. Public school students indicated the highest negative perception about requiring community service at 18.2%. Private Christian school students followed closely behind at 17% and 14.3% of home-school students indicated a negative response to the requirement. The students who chose other/mixed, 10% of them had a negative attitude about the requirement. However none of the three students attending a private school were against the requirement.

The same question was crosstabulated with those students who were and were not required to do community service in high school (see Table 6). Seventy seven

74

Table5

Type of High School	Liberty University Should Continue the CSER Requirement					
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Public	82	67	21	19	19	208
% within Type	39.4%	32.2%	10.1%	9.1%	9.1%	100%
% of Total	23.7%	19.4%	6.1%	5.5%	5.5%	60.1%
Private Christian	36	24	18	8	8	94
% within Type	38.3%	25.5%	19.1%	8.5%	8.5%	100%
% of Total	10.4%	6.9%	5.2%	2.3%	2.3%	27.2%
Private Other	0	1	2	0	0	3
% within Type	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	.0%	100%
% of Total	.0%	.3%	.6%	.0%	.0%	.9%
Home School	10	7	1	1	2	21
% within Type	47.6%	33.3%	4.8%	4.8%	9.5%	100%
% of Total	2.9%	2.0%	.3%	.3%	.6%	6.1%
Other/Mixed	10	5	3	1	1	20
% within Type	50.0%	25.0%	15.0%	5.0%	5.0%	100%
% of Total	2.9%	1.4%	.9%	.3%	.3%	5.8%
Total	138	104	45	29	30	N= 346
% of Total	39.9%	30.1	13.0%	8.4%	8.7%	100%

percent of students who were not required in high school to do community service compared to 75.5% of those who did, had a positive attitude about being required to do CSER. To add additional support, 14.3% of high school students who were required to do community service had a negative attitude about required CSER at Liberty compared to only 8.8% of students who were not required to do community service in high school.

Table 6

	Liberty University Should Continue the CSER Requirement					
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Community service was required in High School	22	15	5	2	5	49
% within required	44.9%	30.6%	10.2%	4.1%	10.2%	100%
% of Total	6.4%	4.4%	1.4%	.6%	1.4%	
Community service was <u>not</u> required in High School	135	93	42	15	11	296
% not required	45.6%	31.4%	14.2%	5.1%	3.7%	100%
% of Total	39.1%	27.0%	12.2%	4.3%	3.2%	85.8%
Total Count	157	108	47	17	16	N= 345
% of Total	45.5%	31.3%	13.6%	13.6%	4.6%	100%

Benefits Perceived from Required Community Service

The second research question asks: Do students who are required to complete community service in order to graduate perceive it as a benefit to them personally as well as to the community? Question 10 sought to know what motivated the respondents to choose the particular CSER (see Table 7).   The students had the opportunity of choosing more than one option. "Making a difference in someone's life" and "It would be a good experience for my future" received the highest response rate among the students at 60.12% and 55.2% respectively. Helping others in need received a 41.62% response rate and 39.88% said that scheduling and time issues were key factors in their choice of a CSER. In addition, 31.21% also said that they chose their community service because it was an easy service to complete. The choice that received the lowest response was "Transportation" at only 5.49%.

Students were also asked to indicate the areas that their involvement in CSER benefited them in a positive way (see Table 8).   Students indicated that "leadership skills" was the greatest benefit to them personally at 69.08%. The students also choose "new friendships" and "caring for others" as their second and third greatest benefits at 66.47% and 65.31% correspondingly. "Dealing with conflicts" came in fourth with 52.31% and "grew in my religious faith" was fifth at 51.73%. In addition, 35.26% of the respondents indicated that they gained "work experience" through their community service and 27.17% viewed it as a benefit for future employment. Only 14.74% viewed it as a benefit to them academically. The students were also given the choice to respond that CSER had not been a benefit to them personally. Eighteen students or 5.2% of the respondents chose this response which was the lowest response of all of the choices.

Table 7

What would you say Motivated you to Select the Particular Community Service

that you are Involved in? (You may select more than one reason)

	Count	Percentage
Scheduling and time issues	138	39.88%
Making a difference in someone's life	208	60.12%
It would good on my résumé (job applications)	74	21.39%
Friends	77	22.25%
Experience with a similar service (prior to coming to Liberty University)	92	26.59%
It was an easy service to complete	108	31.21%
I wanted to help others in need	144	41.62%
It would be good experience for my future	191	55.20%
Transportation	19	5.49%

Table 8

_____

Indicate the Areas that you believe that your Involvement in a Community Service

Benefited you in a Positive Way (You may indicate more than one reason)

	Count	Percentage
Caring for others	226	65.31%
Grew in your religious faith	179	51.73%
New friendships	230	66.47%
Leadership skills	239	69.08%
Dealing with conflicts	181	52.31%
Academically	51	14.74%
Future employment	94	27.17%
Work experience	122	35.26%
It did not benefit me	18	5.2%

Students were also given five Likert scale questions related to the benefits the student received from their CSER at Liberty University (see Table 9). Question 13 and 15 asked students to indicate if they had gained a better understanding of people and the needs of people through their CSER. Of the respondents, 83.24% indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed they received both benefits. Question 14 sought to know if students had gained a better understanding of themselves through their CSER. The respondents indicated that 78.61% agreed or strongly agreed that they had a better understanding of themselves. Question 17 asked students if through their CSER they had gained skills they will use in the future and 77.74% responded that they agreed or strongly agreed that they had gained skills they would use in the future. The final question asked whether through their CSER students had been able to apply their academic learning in a practical setting. Only 55.5% stated that they had been able to do so and 17.63% indicated that they disagreed or strongly disagreed that they were able to apply their academic learning in a practical setting.

Table 10 shows a crosstabulation between student responses to question 12, "Through my CSER I have helped others" and question 9, which indicated if they had fulfilled their CSER requirements on campus, off campus in a local or home church, or off campus but not in a church. Those serving on campus consisted of 229 students and 94.3% of these respondents indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that they had helped others through their CSER. Fifty seven students completed their CSER in a local or home church. 92.9% of them agreed or strongly agreed that they had helped others. Of the 60 students who choose to volunteer in the community but not in a church, 91.6% stated that they agreed or strongly agreed that they had helped others through their CSER.

Table 9

	Benefits of Community Service to the Student				
Through my CSER I have:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Gained a better understanding of people	171	117	38	16	4
	49.42%	33.82%	10.98%	4.62%	1.16%
A better understanding of myself	151	121	43	23	8
	43.64%	34.97	12.43%	6.65%	2.31%
A better understanding of the needs of others	162	126	34	18	6
	46.82%	36.42%	9.83%	5.20%	1.73%
Gained skills I will use in the future	159	110	44	24	9
	45.95%	31.79%	12.72%	6.94%	2.60%
Been able to apply my academic learning in a practical setting	76	116	93	45	16
	21.97%	33.53%	26.88%	13.01%	4.62%

Table 10

CSER Location	Through my CSER I have Helped Others					
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
On Campus	109	107	9	3	1	229
% within Rank	47.6%	46.7%	3.9%	1.3%	.4%	100%
% of Total	31.5%	30.9%	2.6%	.9%	.3%	66.2%
local or home church	32	21	3	1	0	57
% within Rank	56.1%	36.8%	5.3%	1.8%	.0%	100%
% of Total	9.2%	6.1%	.9%	.3%	.0%	16.5%
Off Campus but not in a church	26	29	3	2	0	60
% within Rank	43.3%	48.3%	5.0%	3.3%	.0%	100%
% of Total	7.5%	8.4%	.9%	.6%	.0%	17.3%
Total	167	157	15	6	1	N= 346
% of Total	48.3%	45.4%	4.3%	1.7%	.3%	100%

Impact of Required Community Service on Volunteering Now and in the Future

The third research question asks: How does being required to complete community service in order to graduate impact student perceptions about performing community service now as well as in the future? Question 16 asked students whether they had a positive attitude about performing CSER at liberty. This question was crosstabulated with question two (See Table 11) and question three (See Table 12) which related to their student rank and where they went to high school respectively.

Table 11 reveals that 76.9% of the students indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that they had a positive attitude about performing CSER at Liberty compared to 9.5% that had a negative attitude. Juniors had the highest positive attitude about doing CSER with a positive response rate of 82.2%. Sophomores were the second highest percentage of positive respondents at 74.8% and seniors were ranked the lowest at an even 74%. Seniors also ranked the highest percentage with a negative attitude about performing CSER at 12.8%.

In Table 12, student attitudes were crosstabulated with the type of high school they attended. Students who were home-schooled had they highest percentage of positive attitudes about performing CSER at 80.9%. Students attending public high schools ranked 2nd with a positive response rate of 78.3% followed by private Christian schools at 74.5% and other/mixed schools at 70%. The lowest positive attitude came from students who had attended a non-Christian private school with only a 66.6% positive response rate. However, as noted earlier, there were only three students who responded in this category. Those attending a private Christian school had the highest negative response rate at 12.7% followed by other/mixed at 10% and public high school students at 8.7%.

Table 11

	Positive Attitude toward CSER Requirement at Liberty University					
Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Freshmen	1	0	0	0	0	1
% within Rank	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
% of Total	.3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	.3%
Sophomore	45	10	12	4	2	73
% within Rank	61.6%	13.7%	16.4%	5.5%	2.7%	100%
% of Total	13.0%	2.9%	3.5%	1.2%	.6%	21.1%
Junior	50	38	13	4	2	107
% within Rank	46.7%	35.5%	12.1%	3.7%	1.9%	100%
% of Total	14.5%	11.0%	3.8%	1.2%	.6%	47.7%
Senior	61	61	22	9	12	165
% within Rank	37.0%	37.0%	13.3%	5.5%	7.3%	100%
% of Total	17.6%	17.6%	6.4%	2.6%	3.5%	47.7%
Total	157	109	47	17	16	N= 346
% of Total	45.4%	31.5%	13.6%	4.9%	4.6%	100%

Table 12

Type of High School	I have a Positive Attitude about Performing CSER at Liberty					
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Public	92	71	27	11	7	208
% within Type	44.2%	34.1%	13.0%	5.3%	3.4%	100%
% of Total	26.6%	20.5%	7.8%	3.2%	2.0%	60.1%
Private Christian	41	29	12	5	7	94
% within Type	43.6%	30.9%	12.8%	5.3%	7.4%	100%
% of Total	11.8%	8.4%	3.5%	1.4%	2.0%	27.2%
Private Other	1	1	1	0	0	3
% within Type	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	100%
% of Total	.3%	.3%	.3%	.0%	.0%	.9%
Home School	12	5	3	0	1	21
% within Type	57.1%	23.8%	14.3%	.0%	5.0%	100%
% of Total	3.5%	1.4%	.9%	.0%	.3%	6.1%
Other/Mixed	11	3	4	1	1	20
% within Type	55.0%	15.0%	20.0%	5.0%	5.0%	100%
% of Total	3.2%	.9%	1.2%	.3%	.3%	5.8%
Total	157	109	47	17	16	N= 346
% of Total	45.4%	31.5%	13.6%	4.9%	4.6%	100%

The researcher sought to know what impact if any requiring students to complete community service as a graduation requirement had on their intentions to volunteer in the future and in particular, after graduation. Question 23 asked students if they plan to volunteer in the community after graduation. This question was crosstabulated with question two to determine if their rank had an impact on their response rate (See Table 13). The research study showed that 81% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they plan to volunteer. Only 13 students or 3.7% indicated that they did not plan to volunteer in the community after graduation.

When the crosstabulation is considered, other than the one freshman who indicated that they strongly agreed that they planned to volunteer in the future, sophomores had the highest positive response rate at 84.9% followed by the seniors at 82.4%. Juniors ranked the lowest with a positive response rate of 75.7%. Juniors also had the highest neutral response rate at 19.6%. There was a slight trend shown in relation to the negative responses. Two percent of the seniors disagreed or strongly disagreed that they planned to volunteer in the future compared to 1.5% of the juniors and .3% of the sophomores.

Question 24 asked the respondents if they had a greater desire to volunteer after graduation because of their experience with CSER. This question was also crosstabulated with question two to determine if rank had an impact on their responses (See Table 14). It was found that 43.7% of the students agreed or strongly agreed that they had a greater desire to volunteer after graduation because of their CSER experience. In addition, 33.2% indicated that they neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement and 15.3% choose disagree as their response and 7.8% choose strongly disagree.

Sophomores had the highest positive response rate at 46.6% followed by seniors at

Table 13

| | I Plan to Volunteer in the Community after Graduation | | | | | |
Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Freshmen	1	0	0	0	0	1
% within Rank	100%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100%
% of Total	.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
Sophomore	30	32	10	1	0	73
% within Rank	41.1%	43.8%	13.7%	1.4%	.0%	100%
% of Total	8.7%	9.3%	2.9%	.3%	.0%	21.1%
Junior	42	39	21	2	3	107
% within Rank	39.3%	36.4%	19.6%	1.9%	2.8%	100%
% of Total	12.1%	11.3%	6.1%	.6%	.9%	30.9%
Senior	66	70	22	5	2	165
% within Rank	40.0%	42.4%	13.3%	3.0%	1.2%	100%
% of Total	19.1%	20.2%	6.4%	1.4%	.6%	47.7%
Total	139	141	53	8	5	N= 346
% of Total	40.2%	40.8%	15.3%	2.3%	1.4%	100%

Table 14

| | I have a Greater Desire to Volunteer in the Community after Graduation | | | | | |
Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Freshmen	0	0	1	0	0	1
% within Rank	.0%	.0%	100%	.0%	.0%	100%
% of Total	.0%	.0%	.3%	.0%	.0%	.3%
Sophomore	16	18	29	7	3	73
% within Rank	21.9%	24.7%	39.7%	9.6%	4.1%	100%
% of Total	4.6%	5.2%	8.4%	2.0%	.9%	21.1%
Junior	11	34	41	15	6	107
% within Rank	10.3%	31.8%	38.3%	14.0%	5.6%	100%
% of Total	3.2%	9.8%	11.8%	4.3%	1.7%	30.9%
Senior	23	49	44	31	18	165
% within Rank	13.9%	29.7%	26.7%	18.8%	10.9%	100%
% of Total	6.6%	14.2%	12.7%	9.0%	5.2%	47.7%
Total	50	101	115	53	27	N= 346
% of Total	14.5%	29.2%	33.2%	15.3%	7.8%	100%

43.6%. Juniors followed close behind at 42.1% indicating that they agreed or strongly agreed that they have a greater desire to volunteer after graduation because of their experience with CSER. The one freshman respondent chose neither agree nor disagree.

Though the positive response rate shows very little change from the student's sophomore to senior years, the negative response rate increased noticeably. Only 13.7% of sophomores indicated that they disagreed or strongly disagreed that they had a greater desire to volunteer after graduation because of their experience with CSER. Juniors had a negative response rate of 19.6% and the seniors had a 29.7% negative response rate.

Impact of Religious Faith on Student Perceptions of Required Community Service

The Fourth research question asks: Does religious faith impact student perceptions about being required to complete community service at Liberty University? Question 21 attempted to ascertain this answer by asking students if their religious faith impacted in a positive way their attitude about CSER at Liberty University.   This question was crosstabulated with question one in relation to students gender (See Table 15).

Table 15 reveals that 80.4% of the respondents indicated that their religious faith had a positive impact on their attitude about CSER at Liberty University. Only 5.5% disagreed or strongly disagreed that their faith impacted in a positive way their attitude about CSER and 14.2% neither agreed nor disagreed. When question 21 is crosstabulated with question one, 75.4% of the males indicated that their religious faith impacted in a positive way their attitude about being required to perform CSER at Liberty compared to 83.3% of the females. In addition, 7.7% of the males and 4.2% of the females indicated that they disagreed or strongly disagreed that their religious faith impacted in a positive way their attitude about performing CSER at Liberty University.

89

Question 21 was also crosstabulated with question two (See Table 16) and other than the one freshman who indicated that the agreed that their religious faith impacted in a positive way their attitude about CSER, juniors ranked the highest with a positive response rate of 85.9%. This was followed by sophomores at 78.1% and seniors at 77.6%. Students who responded that they disagreed or strongly disagreed that their faith impacted in a positive way their attitude about CSER were led by seniors at 7.8% followed by juniors at 3.8% and sophomores at 2.7%.

Table 15

	My Religious Faith Impacts in a Positive Way my Attitude about CSER					
Gender	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Male	53	45	22	4	6	130
% within Gender	40.8%	34.6%	16.0%	3.1%	4.6%	100%
% of Total	15.3%	13.0%	6.4%	1.2%	1.7%	37.6%
Female	97	83	27	6	3	216
% within Gender	44.9%	38.4%	12.5%	2.8%	1.4%	100%
% of Total	28.0%	24.0%	7.8%	1.7%	.9%	62.4%
Total	150	128	49	10	9	N=346
% of Total	43.4%	37.0%	14.2%	2.9%	2.6%	100%

Table16

	My Religious Faith Impacts in a Positive Way my Attitude about CSER					
Rank	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Freshmen	0	1	0	0	0	1
% within Rank	.0%	100%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100%
% of Total	.0%	.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
Sophomore	34	23	14	0	2	73
% within Rank	46.6%	31.5%	19.2%	.0%	2.7%	100%
% of Total	9.8%	6.6%	4.0%	.0%	.6%	21.1%
Junior	56	36	11	2	2	107
% within Rank	52.3%	33.6%	10.3%	1.9%	1.9%	100%
% of Total	16.2%	10.4%	3.2%	.6%	.6%	30.9%
Senior	60	68	24	8	5	165
% within Rank	36.4%	41.2%	14.5%	4.8%	3.0%	100%
% of Total	17.3%	19.7%	6.9%	2.3%	1.4%	47.7%
Total	150	128	49	10	9	N= 346
% of Total	43.4%	37.0%	14.2%	2.9%	2.6%	100%

Summary

The survey data and crosstabulation of the questions revealed important statistics for Liberty University administrators and faculty who continue to make decisions regarding the impact of requiring community service of its students. These findings will add additional information to their current research as the future of the Liberty University Christian/Community Service Program is evaluated.

Survey questions revealed a positive attitude among the students regarding their requirement to perform CSER to graduate. Although a clear majority believed that Liberty University should continue to require community service, 17.1% is still a high percentage of negative responses to the question and seniors had the highest negative response rate. This was true in most of the crosstabulations. This study also showed that being required to perform community service in high school had little impact on student's positive attitude about the requirement at the university. However it did impact student's negative attitude about the requirement.

Respondents viewed their experiences with CSER as a benefit to them as well as to the community. The data revealed an overwhelming positive response to the benefits gained and given through the CSER program.

Survey results also indicated that students had a positive attitude about performing their CSER responsibilities. However, that positive attitude diminished slightly by the students senior year.

An important factor when deciding whether to require community service for graduation is the impact it might have on a student's desire to volunteer in the future. This study found that it did not negatively impact student's plans to volunteer in the

future. However, it also did not cause a majority of students to have a greater desire to do community service in the future.

Since Liberty University is an evangelical Christian school it was appropriate to study how students religious faith impacted their attitude about performing required community service. It was learned from this study that student's religious faith did have a positive impact on their attitude about fulfilling their CSER requirement.

The results of this study add important data to those who will decide whether Liberty University should continue to require Christian/Community Service of its students in order to graduate. Questions raised by this study will be examined in light of previous research and conclusions and recommendations for further research will be given in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Problem Statement

Administrators and faculty are often faced with the challenge of deciding the role their particular academic institution will take in relation to educating students in the area of citizenship. Historically, institutions of higher learning in the United States viewed civic education as in integral part of its overall mission (Boyer & Hechinger, 1981; Geiger, 1999; Ward, 2002).

As America evolved as a nation, so has its approach to community service. During the 1860's, the federal government through the Land Grant College Act viewed collegiate institutions as partners in the development of the lives of its citizens (Altbach, 1998; Bringle, Games, and Malloy, 1999). As Americans moved West the relationship between the community and the college or university became essential and they were viewed in many ways as partners trying to achieve a common goal of bettering themselves and their communities.

By the early 1900's, John Dewey's influence in the educational world became evident as he espoused an experiential approach to learning in the classroom (1916, 1938). Although not all of his ideas were accepted in relation to educational theory, his influence on educational pedagogy is studied and utilized in various forms today.

The challenge of institutionalizing community service in institutions of higher learning continues to be discussed today on and off campuses and Liberty University is one of those institutions attempting to decide whether to continue to require community service of its graduates. Liberty University, originally Lynchburg Baptist College, has

required community service of its students from its inception. In the beginning, most of

its students were involved at Thomas Road Baptist Church pastored by the founder of the

institution, Dr. Jerry Falwell. He viewed the church as a laboratory for the college

students to gain valuable experience to be used in local churches around the world upon

graduation.

By 1985, the college had grown significantly and had then become a fully

accredited liberal arts university and its name changed to Liberty University. Liberty still

required community service of its students in order to graduate. However, the university

began to permit students to volunteer in the local community in places other than local

churches or religious organizations.

Today, students have the opportunity to choose from numerous areas to serve on

and off the campus. The question that needs to be addressed is whether the current

practice of Christian/Community Service (CSER) is the best possible approach to educate

students in their civic responsibility and to prepare them for a life of service to others.

Methodology

Quantitative research methodology was used to study and reflect upon student

perceptions and the impact of requiring community service at Liberty University. This

study was conducted near the end of the Spring semester of 2005. This provided students

the opportunity to virtually complete their CSER for the school year before they were

asked to participate in this study.

The following four research questions were specifically examined in this study.

1. Do students perceive that Liberty University should continue to require

     community service of full-time students in order to graduate?

95

2. Do students who are required to complete community service in order to graduate perceive it as benefit to them personally as well as to the community?

3. How does being required to complete community service in order to graduate impact student perceptions about performing community service now as well as in the future?

4. Does religious faith impact student perceptions about being required to complete community service at Liberty University?

In view of the fact that primarily sophomores, juniors and seniors are the students who are required to be registered for a CSER, the researcher requested a query of those student ranks from the Registrar's Office. The researcher was provided an Excel database of students and after eliminating duplications and other anomalies the researcher was able to contact 2705 students who were currently enrolled in a CSER during the Spring semester of 2005. Three hundred forty six students responded to the 25 question online survey which provided the researcher with an array of variables that were crosstabulated to provide frequency and tables of percentages which enhanced the findings.

Findings

Findings from this study will provide important data to the Christian/Community Service Office staff and the administration as they look to research to decide whether to continue to require community service of its graduates. These findings clearly show that students are not against doing community service in order to graduate. However, when the results are crosstabulated with rank demographics, trends are revealed which should

be considered in decision-making. The following is a brief synopsis of the findings as they relate to the research questions.

Perceptions Regarding Required Community Service to Graduate

This research study revealed that a large majority of students, 70%, indicated that they agreed with the university's decision to require community service in order to graduate. However, it was also noted that when the responses were crosstabulated with student rank, an 8% decrease in a positive response rate was seen between the sophomore and senior years.

It was also learned that the majority of Liberty University students came from public schools. When the same question was crosstabulated with where students attended high school, public school students had the highest negative response rate of all student respondents.

In addition, a significant majority of students, 85.84%, had not been required to do community service in order to graduate from high school. Although this did not drastically impact their positive attitude response rate to being required to do CSER in order to graduate from Liberty, it did impact their negative response rate. Students who were required to volunteer in high school had a 5.5% greater negative attitude response rate to doing CSER at Liberty.

Benefits Perceived from Required Community Service

Question 11 asked students to indicate the area(s) in which they believed that their involvement in a community service benefited them in a positive way. Students could choose more than one response. Most notably was their least response. Students were

given the option of choosing "It did not benefit me". Only 18 students or 1.34% of the respondents indicated that their CSER did not benefit them.

Interestingly, the choice that received the highest response was "leadership skills" at 17.84% and "new friendships" and "caring for others" were close behind at 17.16% and 16.87% respectively. It should also be noted that only 51 students or 3.81% of the responses indicated that they "academically" benefited from their CSER. Liberty University does not offer service learning classes which may be why students did not immediately view their community service as an enhancement of their academics. However, when asked if they were able to apply their academic learning in a practical setting, a majority, 55.5% indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that they had been able to do so.

Students also viewed their service as a benefit to the community as 93.7% of the students responded positively that through their CSER they were able to help others. This was true whether they served on campus, off campus in a church, or whether they served off campus but not in a local or home church.

Impact of Required Community Service on Volunteering Now and in the Future

One area of concern was whether requiring community service would impact students to have a negative attitude about serving while fulfilling their requirement as well as their attitude about serving in the future. An important finding was that 76.9% had a positive attitude about their current CSER experience. Interestingly, 13.6% indicated that they neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement which should be researched in more detail. Only 9.5% disagreed or strongly disagreed that they had a

98

positive attitude about the CSER requirement. It should be noted however, that when the data was crosstabulated with the students rank, seniors had the highest negative attitude.

In reference to student's perceptions about volunteering in the future, 81% indicated that they planned to volunteer in the future. Only 3.7% indicated that they did not plan to volunteer in the future, however the reasons for that are not known by the researcher. Question 23 sought to know if because of their CSER experience students had a greater desire to volunteer in the community after graduation. Only 43.7% responded positively. 33.2% could not agree nor disagree with the statement, 15.3% disagreed with the statement and 7.8% strongly disagreed that their CSER experience has given them a greater desire to volunteer in the community after graduation. However, because this was a closed-ended question, reasons for their negative or uncommitted responses are unknown.

Impact of Religious Faith on Student Perceptions of required Community Service

Since Liberty University is an evangelical Christian institution, the researcher wanted to know the impact that the students religious faith had on their attitude about the required CSER program. In reference to question 21, 80.4% of the respondents indicated that their religious faith positively impacted their attitude about CSER at Liberty University. Only 5.5% responded negatively to the same question.

When the data was crosstabulated with the students gender the researcher learned that females had nearly an 8% higher positive response rate over their male counterparts. Question 21 was also crosstabulated with the students rank. The research indicated that juniors responded with the highest positive response rate at 85.9% and sophomores and seniors were relatively even at 78.1% and 77.6% respectively. However, seniors had a

much higher negative response rate than did the sophomores and juniors as 7.8% of the seniors indicated that they disagreed or strongly disagreed that their religious faith impacted in a positive way their attitude about CSER. In contrast only 2.7% of sophomores and 3.8% of juniors responded in disagreement.

<div align="center">Conclusions</div>

This research study will add important data to research already conducted by Troy Matthews who studied the impact of choosing a CSER within ones major and how doing so impacted their attitudes about the CSER program. Several conclusions can be implied from this research study.

First, in contrast to the opinions of Stukas, Snyder and Clary (1999), requiring community service was not viewed negatively. A majority of students did not object to being required to participate in community service in order to graduate. As this study indicates, 70% believed that Liberty University should continue the requirement. As other research by Eyler & Giles (1999) indicated, although students viewed requiring community service to be a controversial issue, the majority of their respondents endorsed the requirement as well. It should be noted however that when the question of requiring CSER at Liberty University was crosstabulated with the student's rank, seniors showed an increase in a negative response rate over sophomores and juniors. It is unknown through this study why this was the case.

Secondly, this study found that requiring community service did not have a negative impact on student's perceptions of the benefits they received from performing the service. One of the benefits gained through community service according to Berger & Milem, (2002) is the development of the students "self concept". This researcher also

discovered that a clear majority, 78.61% of the students indicated that they have a better understanding of themselves because of their CSER. It can be concluded that the social interaction gained through the community service was constructive in their development of self concept.

It can be concluded that students viewed their CSER as a benefit to them in many ways. A significant majority, over 75%, believed that they gained a better understanding of people, a better understanding of the needs of others and they gained skills that they will use in the future through their community service.

Since Liberty University does not offer service learning courses, it is not known whether through service learning courses, as Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, (2000) indicate, if students would benefit more from those classroom and experiential service projects. When asked whether Liberty University should require community service as a part of an academic course (service learning class), instead of a separate assignment as it is currently administered, more students were opposed to this option. However, the researcher realizes that it is very difficult if not impossible for students to respond to an issue with which they are unfamiliar.

It was also discovered that regardless of where the service took place, over 90% viewed their community service as a benefit to others. Although not a stated hypothesis, it was predicted by the researcher that students who served in the community would view their service as a greater benefit to others than those who completed their requirements on campus. This was not the case as students who volunteered on campus had the highest positive response rate to the question.

Thirdly, it can be concluded that students have an overall positive attitude about being required to do CSER in order to graduate and they plan to continue to volunteer after graduation. 76.9% either agreed or strongly agreed that they had a positive attitude about the requirement. It should be noted here though that the senior respondents had the highest negative response rate at 12.8%. This may by due to the fact that they had academic or other pressures which impacted them to view it in a negative way. A weakness is seen here in this research study with the absence of open-ended questions. Open-ended questions could have provided invaluable information about the reasons why students choose their responses. In many cases it could have assisted the researcher in knowing why seniors, for example, although very supportive of the program, had a more negative response rate on this issue and on many of the other research questions than did their sophomore and junior peers.

It cannot be concluded through this study, as Stukas et al., (1999) did through their research, that when students perceive a more controlling form of community service mandated upon them that they will have a diminished desire to volunteer in the future. 81% of the Liberty University respondents indicated a positive response to their plans of volunteering in the future. Only 3.7% or 13 students indicated that they did not plan to volunteer in the future.

However, this data was gathered only from students who were currently enrolled in the program. It cannot be concluded that students had less of a desire to volunteer in the future because they were required to participate in Liberty's mandated community service program. According to this research study, the data did reveal that 43.7% of the students had a greater desire to volunteer in the future because of being involved in the

CSER program. Although 23.1% indicated that they did not have a greater desire to volunteer in the future because of their participation in CSER it could not be determined through the question why this was the case.

Finally, it can be concluded through this research study that religious faith is a positive factor in student's attitudes about required community service. 80.4% of the respondents believed that their religious faith impacted in a positive way their attitude about CSER. Only 5.5% of the respondents chose disagree or strongly disagree that their faith had a positive impact on their attitude. The data also suggests that seniors do not connect their religious faith to their attitude about required community service as much as their sophomore and junior counterparts. It could be concluded that this was not due to a lack of religious zeal but a discontentment to the requirement.

<div align="center">Conclusions about the Design and Methodology</div>

The researcher concluded that the choice of using e-mail technology and the web based survey application from www.CreateSurvey.com was extremely successful and time efficient. This was primarily due to the demographics of the respondents. Since all of the students have an e-mail account through the university and they utilize it almost daily it was found to be extremely effective in gathering data as 346 students responded in eight days. The researcher also believes that a greater number of surveys would have been completed if the web site server used in this study had not went done for several hours during the first two days it was sent to the students to access.

As indicated earlier, open-ended questions should have been utilized in this study. It could have provided important narrative data which could have aided the researcher in coming to conclusions in relation to several of the research questions. Open-ended

questions could also have provided the students with the opportunity to clarify some of their responses which would have provided key interpretive data. However, it would have been difficult to complete such an analysis with the sample size used in this study.

Recommendations

Future Research

Liberty University's Christian/Community Service program impacts several thousand students each year. The researcher believes many more studies should be conducted before university administrators make their final decision changing the requirement of community service. The researcher suggests the following areas for future research:

1. Future research should be conducted on the impact that the required CSER program has had on Liberty University graduates. This study should not only include the graduate's perception of the requirement but also how their involvement with CSER impacted their attitude about serving in the community after they graduated as well as if their service experiences were found to be beneficial to them.

2. Additional studies need to be conducted in relationship to service learning classes. The current research indicates that service learning has been shown to have greater benefits than the traditional generic community service program that Liberty University provides (Vogelgesang et al., 2000). If this is the case, then Liberty University should consider adding service learning courses. Then, a quantitative or qualitative study could be conducted to determine which type of program provided the best learning outcomes.

3. This study did not attempt to show whether through the CSER program students became more civic-minded. Although some researchers believe that moral development cannot be taught in higher educational institutions (Curtler, 2001), it is not explicitly known whether student participation in community service whether required or not aids students in their citizenship development. Further studies could potential show a link or provide additional data to determine a better course of action.

4. Research should also be conducted with community service supervisors. Although many positive comments are made concerning the program, no assessment data has been analyzed or research conducted to determine if supervisors perceive the program to be a positive benefit to the students or the organizations in which they serve.

Future Practice

1. Although modifications should be considered, Liberty University should continue to require community service of its students in order to graduate.

2. Liberty University should consider adding service learning courses either as an elective or as an option to the required CSER program. If this is approved, better research could be conducted to determine best practices.

3. The CSER Department should provide more opportunities for students to apply their academic learning in their community service activities. If students are able to apply their classroom instruction, and in particular, their major area of study to a related community service, greater benefit s may be perceived and realized from the CSER program.

4. Additional flexibility in how the CSER requirements are fulfilled should be given to students. This flexibility may positively impact senior perceptions on the program. For example, students are currently only permitted to complete one CSER per semester unless they are making up for semesters in which they failed to register for a CSER or they simply failed to pass their CSER in a previous semester. Lifting that requirement could positively impact students attitudes about serving when they have the flexibility to choose when and how many services they wish to complete in any given semester.

5. The Christian/Community Service Office should change its overall structure to become a Center which would provide the opportunity to divide the office staff and faculty into two separate entities. One group of faculty and staff from the Center would focus its attention primarily on the required Contemporary Issues classes. The other group of primarily staff members would focus its attention on the Christian/Community Service Program. Currently, faculty members are involved in both the classroom teaching aspects of the program and the community service part. Unfortunately, at times the community service part is neglected. Creating a Center would aid in this current disparity.

References

Alabama State University. (1999). Students who cheat or steal at Alabama State
    University can expect to do some hard time- - serving the community, that is.
    Chronicle of Higher Education, 45(19), 43. retrieved October 26, 2002, from
    Academic Search elite database (1428391).

Altbach, P. G. (1998). *Comparative higher education: knowledge, the university, and
    development.* Greenwich, CT: Ablex Publishing Company.

Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (1999). Patterns in higher education development. In P. Altbach, R.
    Berdhahl, & P. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first
    century: social, political, and economic challenges.* Baltimore: The Johns
    Hopkins University Press.

Anderson, S. M. (1999, November). *Mandatory community service: citizenship education
    or involuntary servitude?* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

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

Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service
    participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 39,* 251-263.

Astin, A. W., Sax, L. J., & Avalos, J. (1999 Winter). Long-term effects of volunteerism
    during the undergraduate years. *The Review of Higher Education, 22,* 187-202.

Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. (2000). *How service learning
    affects students.* Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute.

Berger, J. B., & Milem, J. F. (2000). Promoting self-concept: differences between
    historically black and predominantly white colleges. *Journal of College Student
    development,* 41 (4), 1-14.

Berger, J. B., & Milem, J. F. (2002). The impact of community service involvement on
    the three measures of undergraduate self-concept. *NASPA Journal, 40,* 85-103.

Blanchard, L. W. (2002). The "seven c's (plus one)" of public service. *Insight Out, 6(Spring),* 4-5.

Boss, J. A. (1994). the effect of community service work on the moral development of college ethics students. *Journal of moral education,* 23, 183-190.

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

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: priorities of the professoriate.* New York: Harper & Row.

Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service & Outreach,* 1(1), 11-20.

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

Bringle, R. G., Games, R., & Malloy, E. A. (Eds.). (1999). *Colleges and universities as citizens.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2000). Institutionalization of service learning in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education,* 71, 273-290.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A., Plater, W., & Cambridge, B. (2001). *Campus interventions to promote an engaged campus.* Retrieved November 23, 2002, from the Center for Service and Learning Web Site: http://csl.iupui.edu/documents/campusinterventions.PDF

Burns, L. T. (1998). Make sure it's service learning, not just community service. *Education Digest, 64*(2), 38-41.

Carini, R. M., Hayek, J. C., Kuh, G. D., Kennedy, J. M., & Ouimet, J. A. (2003). College students responses to web and paper surveys: does it matter. *Research in Higher Education,* 44(1), 1-19.

Carpenter , B. W., & Jacobs, J. S. (1994 Fall). Service learning: a new approach in higher education. *Education,* 115, 97-98.

Carter, C. G. (2004). Service-learning: an examination of community college faculty attitudes, integration of service, and institutional support (Doctoral dissertation, Morgan State University, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International,* (UMI No. 3133754)

Checkoway, B. (2000 Jul/Aug). Public service: our new mission. *Academe, 86*(4), 24-29.

Christian/Community Service Office. *Christian Community Service Handbook, 2004-2005*. Retrieved March 20, 2005, from http://liberty.edu/Academics/Religion/CCService/index.cfm?PID=1303

Cohen, J. (1994). Matching university mission with service motivation: do the accomplishments of community service match the claims? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1*(1), 98-104.

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cone, R. (2003). Service-learning and civic education: challenging assumptions. *Peer Review, 5*(3), 12-15.

Cooper, D. D. (Ed.). (1998). Reading, writing and reflection. In R.A. Rhodes & J. P. F. Howard (Eds). *Academic service learning: a pedagogy of action and reflection.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Corrigan, R. L. (2001). *Answering the call: the story of service and volunteerism at Sacred Heart University.* Fairfield, Ct: Sacred Heart University Press.

Creighton University. (1999). *Final report: should public service be a requirement for all degrees granted by Creighton.* Retrieved August 20, 2002, from http://www.creighton.edu/cpp/group09/reporta.html

Curtler, H. M. (2001). *Recalling Education.* Wilmington, Delaware: ISI Books.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education.* New York: The Macmillian Company.

Dewey, J. (1925). *Experience and nature* (2nd ed.). La Salle, Illinois: The Open Court Publishing Company.

Dewey, J. (1927). *The public and its problems.* New York: Henry Holt & Company.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and Education.* New York: Collier Books.

Dworkin, M. S. (1959). *Dewey on education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Ehrlich, T. (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education.* Phoenix: The Oryx Press.

Ehrlich, T. Forward, (1996). In B. Jacoby, *Service learning in higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Elwell, M. D., & Bean, M. S. (2001 Spring). Editor's choice: the efficacy of service-learning for community college ESL students. *Community College Review, 28,* 47-61.

Eyler, J., & Giles, Jr., D. E. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fink, A. (1995). *The survey handbook.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Fisherman, S. M., & McCarthy, L. (1998). *John Dewey and the challenge of classroom practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Geiger, R. (Ed.). (1999). The ten generations of American higher education. In P. Altbach, R. Berdahl & P. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

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

Gladieux, L.E. & King, J.E. (1999). The ten generations of American higher education. In P. Altbach, R. Berdahl & P. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: evaluation of the professoriate .* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gray, M J., Ondaattje, E. H., Fricker, R. D., & Gerchwind, S. A. (2000 Mar/Apr). Assessing service-learning: the benefits of community service for students. *Change, 32*(2), 30-40.

Guarasci, R., & Cornwell, G. H. (1997). *Democratic education in an age of difference: redefining citizenship in higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hollander, E. L., & Saltmarsh, J. (2000 Jul/Aug). The engaged university. *Academe, 86*(4), 29-32.

Houle, C. O. (1976). Deep traditions of experiential learning. In M. Keeton and Associates, *Experiential learning: rationale, characteristics, and assessment.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Howard, J. P. (1998). Academic service learning: a counternormative pedagogy. In R.A. Rhodes & J. P. F. Howard (Eds). *Academic service learning: a pedagogy of action and reflection.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Isaac, S. & Michael, W. B. (1997) *Handbook in research and evaluation: for education and the behavioral sciences.* (3rd ed.). San Diego, CA: Educational and Industrial Testing Services.

Jacoby, B. & Associates (1996). *Service-learning in higher education: concepts and practices.* San-Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kezar, A., & Rhoads, R. A. (2001). The dynamic tensions of service learning in higher education: a philosophical perspective. *The Journal of Higher Education,* 72, 148-171.

Kohlberg, L. (1971). *The philosophy of moral education.* New York: Harper & Row.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc..

Kolb, D. A., Rubin, I. M., & McIntyre, J. M. (1974). *Organizational psychology: an experiential approach* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc..

Kozeracki, C. A. (2000). Service learning in the community college. *Community College Review, 27,* 54-70.

Learn and Serve. (n.d.). About learn and serve: service learning. In Learn and Serve (). Retrieved May 21, 2003, from Learn and Serve Corporation for National & Community Service Web Site: http://www.learnandserve.org/about/service_learning.html

Levin, R. C. (2003). *The work of the university.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Litwin, M. S. (1995). *How to measure survey reliability and validity.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications

Lynchburg Baptist College (1971). *Academic catalog.* Lynchburg, VA: Author

Manicus, P. (2000). Higher education at the brink. In S. Inayatullah & J. Gidley (Eds.), *The University in Transformation* (p. 31-40). Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.

Marks, H. M., & Jones, S. R. (2004). Community service in the transition: shifts and continuities in participation from high school to college. *The Journal of Higher Education, 75,* 307-339.

Matthews, N. T. (2005). *The attitudes and impact of community service on the undergraduate student when the service completed is related to one's major. A study of undergraduate students at Liberty University, Lynchburg, Virginia.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Argosy University Orange County.

Matthias, S., Fricker, R. D., & Elliot, M. N. (2002). *Conducting research surveys via e-mail and the web.* Pittsburg, PA: RAND.

McCaughey, R. A. (1999, July). *A mighty clamour: the contested founding of King's College*. Retrieved May 30, 2004, from http://beatl.barnard.columbia.edu/kingsv1/narratives/founding.htm

McIntyre, A. (1993). Levels of reflection. In J. Calderhead & P. Gates (Eds), *Conceptualizing reflection in teacher development.* London: Falmer Press.

McMillan, J. H., & Wergin, J. F. (2002). *Understanding and evaluating educational research.* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Miller, W. C. (1973). *Educator's fact book on school organization.* Balmont, California: Lear Siegler, Inc./ Fearon Publishers.

Mintz, S., & Liu, G. (1994). Service-learning: an Overview. *National and Community Service Roles for Higher Education: a Resource guide, 64,* .

Morton, K. (1996). Issues related to integrating service-learning into the curriculum. (p. 276-296). In B. Jacoby, *Service learning in higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Myers-Lipton, S. J. (1998). Effects of a comprehensive service-learning program on college students' civic responsibility . *Teaching Sociology, 26,* 243-258.

Neururer, J., & Rhoads, R. A. (1998 Jul/Aug). Community service: panacea, paradox, or potentiation. *Journal of College Student Development,* 39, 321-330.

Neusner, J., & Neusner, N. M. (2000). *Reaffirming higher education.* New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Newquist, C. (1997). Community service: opportunity or exploitation? *Education World.* Retrieved August 20, 2002, from http://www.education-world.com/a_curr/curr037.html

Penner, L. A. (2002 Fall). Dispositional and organizational influences on sustained volunteerism: an interactionist perspective. *Journal of Social Issues,* 58, 447-467.

Perkins, D. F., & Miller, J. (2002). W*hy community service and service-learning? providing rationale and research*. Retrieved November 8, 2002, from Lions International Web Site:http://www.lions-quest.org/content/Resources/ServiceLearningArticles/slarticle2.htm

Pritchard, I. A. (2002). Community service and service-learning in America. In A. Furco & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *Service-learning: the essence of the pedagogy.* Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

113

Ravid, R. (2000). *Practical statistics for educators* (2nd ed.). Lanham. MD: University Press of America.

Rhoads, R. A. (1997). *Community service and service learning: explorations of the caring self.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Rhoads, R. A. (1998 May/June). In the service of citizenship: a study of student involvement in community service. *Journal of Higher Education,* 69(3), 277-298.

Rice, R. E. (Fall 2003). Rethinking scholarship and engagement: the struggle for new meanings. *Campus Compact Reader,* 3.

Shannon, D. M., Davenport, M. A. (2001). Using SPSS to solve statistical problems: a self-instruction guide. Columbus, OH: Prentice Hall Inc.

Shiarella, A. H., McCarthy, A. M., & Tucker, M. L. (2000). Development and construct validity of scores on the Community Service Attitudes Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* 60, 286-300.

Sigmon, R. L. and Associates (1996). *Journey to service-learning: Experiences from independent liberal arts colleges and universities.* Washington DC: Council of Independent Colleges.

Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., & Donohue, P. (2003). *Community-based research and higher education.* San Francisco : Jossey-Bass.

Stukas, A. A., Snyder, M., & Clary, E. G. (1999). The effects of "mandatory volunteerism" on intentions to volunteer. *American Psychological Society,* 10(1), 59-64.

Sullivan, W. M. (2000). Institutional identity and social responsibility in higher education. In T. Ehrlich, (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education.* Phoenix: The Oryx Press

Vogelgesang, L. J., & Astin, A. W. (2000 Fall). Comparing the effects of community service and service-learning. *Michigan Journal of community Service Learning,* 7, 25-34.

W. K. Kellogg Foundation. (2000). *How service works: A retrospective evaluation of higher education service programs* [Brochure]. Battle Creek, MI: Author.

Ward, K. (2002). *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Waterman, A. S. (Ed.). (1997). *Service-learning: applications from the research.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Winniford, J. C., & Carpenter, D. S. (1997). Motivations of college student volunteers: a review. *NASPA Journal, 34*(2).

Young, J. R. (2003, April 11). *Persuading students to care: Eugene Lang's program to prod colleges into encouraging civic involvement.* Retrieved April 11, 2003, from The Chronicle of Higher Education Web Site: http://chronicle.com/weekly/v49/i31/31a04701.htm

Zlotkowski, E. (2001 Jan/Feb). Mapping new terrain: service-learning across the disciplines. *Change, 33,* 25-33.

APPENDIX A

Letter of Institutional Approval to Conduct the Research

April 5, 2005

To Whom It May Concern:

Permission is granted for Lew A. Weider to use Liberty University students as part of an anonymous survey to examine the impact and attitudes of requiring Christian/Community Service on our students. We realize this is in partial fulfillment of his dissertation at Argosy University, Sarasota campus.

The data gathered will not only be helpful in relationship to his dissertation study but could also be beneficial information for university assessment and in relationship to Liberty Universities Five-Year Strategic Plan to determine potential changes in university programs and offerings.

Sincerely,

Lawrence C. Shackelton
Associate Vice President – Administrative Information Management
Liberty University

APPENDIX B

Survey Instrument

COMMUNITY SERVICE (CSER) PERCEPTION AND IMPACT SURVEY

INSTRUCTIONS

- Please complete the survey, being sure to answer all the questions.
- Do not complete this survey if you are **under** 18 years of age.
- Read and answer the following questions/statements as you reflect upon your Christian/Community Service (CSER) experience at Liberty University.

1. What is your gender?

☐ Male   ☐ Female

2. What is your academic rank?

☐ Freshman   ☐ Sophomore

☐ Junior   ☐ Senior

3. What type of high school did you attend?

☐ Public   ☐ Private Other   ☐ Other/Mixed

☐ Private Christian   ☐ Home School

4. Were you required to do community service in high school in order to graduate?

☐ Yes   ☐ No

5. How many hours of community service were you required to fulfill in order to graduate from high school?

☐ Not applicable   ☐ 25-50   ☐ 76-100

☐ under 25   ☐ 51-75   ☐ over 100

6. Do you believe that high schools should require community service in order to graduate?

☐ Yes   ☐ No

7. Have you successfully passed the CSER's you have registered for at Liberty University?

☐ Yes   ☐ No

8. What is(are) the name(s) of the CSER('s) you were registered for during the Spring 05 semester?

_____

_____

9. Where did you primarily complete your CSER?

- ☐ On Campus

- ☐ Off campus in a local or home church

- ☐ Off campus but not in a local or home church

10. What would you say motivated you to select the particular community service that you are involved in? (you may indicate more than one reason)

- ☐ Scheduling and time issues

- ☐ Making a difference in someone's life

- ☐ It would look good on my resume (job applications)

- ☐ Friends

- ☐ Experience with a similar service (prior to coming to Liberty)

- ☐ It was an easy service to complete

- ☐ I wanted to help others in need

- ☐ It would be good experience for my future

- ☐ Transportation

11. Indicate the areas that you believe that your involvement in a community service benefited you in a positive way. (you may indicate more than one reason)

- ☐ Caring for others

- ☐ Grew in your religious faith

- ☐ New friendships

- ☐ Leadership skills

- ☐ Dealing with conflicts

- ☐ Academically

- ☐ Future employment

- ☐ Work experience

- ☐ It did not benefit me

Check the answers that best expresses your opinion concerning the following statements.

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)
12. Through my CSER I have helped others	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. Through my CSER I have gained a better understanding of people	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Through my CSER I have gained a better understanding of myself	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. Through my CSER I have gained a better understanding of the needs of others	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. I have a positive attitude about performing CSER at Liberty	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. Through my CSER I have gained skills I will use in the future	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. Through my CSER I have been able to apply my academic learning in a practical setting	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. Liberty University should continue to require CSER	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. I would perform community service regularly even if it wasn't required	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. My religious faith impacts in a positive way my attitude about CSER at Liberty University	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Strongly Agree 5	Agree 4	Neither Agree nor Disagree 3	Disagree 2	Strongly Disagree 1
22. My high school involvement in community service positively impacts my attitude about CSER at Liberty University	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. I plan to volunteer in the community (religious or non-religious) after graduation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. I have a greater desire to volunteer after graduation because of my experience with CSER	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25. Community service should be required as part of academic courses instead of as a separate assignment each semester	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Thank you for your participation!

APPENDIX C

Survey Instrument Evaluation Form

INSTRUMENT EVALUATION FORM

Thank you for piloting this survey instrument. Please answer these questions regarding the instrument.

1. Was the instruction sheet clear in the information it provided about the survey? _____ Why or why not?
    _____
    _____

2. Were the directions for completing the survey clear and understandable? _____ Why or why not?
    _____
    _____

3. Were the questions and statements clear and understandable? _____ Why or why not?
    _____
    _____
    _____

4. Please list any questions/statements that were unclear or confusing.
    _____
    _____
    _____

5. Did the questions/statements seem to adequately cover the topic of evaluating the Attitudes and Impact of community service on the undergraduate student? _____ Why or why not?
    _____
    _____
    _____

6. Are there any questions that you would add to this survey?
    _____
    _____
    _____

7. Offer any criticisms, comments or suggestions about this survey.
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

**Thank You for
your participation!**

APPENDIX D

Letter of Invitation to Participate in the Study

COMMUNITY SERVICE (CSER) PERCEPTION AND IMPACT SURVEY

Researcher: Lew A. Weider (GNED Professor)

This survey is part of the research being conducted by Argosy University (Sarasota Campus) student Lew Weider for his writing of a doctoral dissertation on the topic, **A study of student perception and the impact of requiring community service of undergraduate students at Liberty University in Lynchburg, Virginia.**

The purpose of this study is to examine how requiring students to perform community service impacts their attitudes about serving while they are attending the university as well as in the future. In addition, the study will investigate the potential impact of influential elements such as religious faith, student understanding of benefits of performing community service, and high school community service requirements on student's attitudes regarding performing their current required community service assignments. Lastly, the study will also examine the potential benefits of performing required community service on university students.

By completing this survey you are giving your consent for the researcher to include your responses in his data analysis. Your participation in this research is strictly voluntary, and you may choose not to participate without fear of penalty or any negative consequences. Individual responses will be treated confidentially. No individually identifiable information will be disclosed or published, and all results will be presented as aggregate, summary data.

If you wish, you may request a copy of the results of this research by writing to the researcher at:

>Liberty University
>Christian/Community Service Office
>1971 University Blvd.
>Lynchburg, VA 24506

The survey will take approximately 5 minutes to complete. Thank you for your valued participation.

This hyperlink will take you directly to the survey.

Click here →   http://www.createsurvey.com/c/25775-v9Ttgm/

APPENDIX E

Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Approval Form