Charity and Social Change: The Impact of Individual Preferences on Service-Learning Outcomes

Barbara E. Moely
Tulane University

Andrew Furco
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Julia Reed
University of San Francisco

Students from seven institutions of higher education reported their preferences for different paradigms of service at the beginning of their service-learning courses. At the end of the courses, they described the associated service activities in terms of the same paradigms and also completed scales describing their learning outcomes and attitudes toward civic issues. Students who expressed positive preferences for Charity or Social Change activities or both kinds of activity showed more positive learning outcomes and attitude change when there was a match between preference and service than when they experienced a mismatch. For a group of students with limited enthusiasm for either Charity or Social Change activities, the most facilitative service involved both Charity and Social Change experiences. The implications of these findings for service-learning practice and for future research are discussed.

The growing body of research in service-learning has begun to unearth programmatic features and participant characteristics that produce positive outcomes for students, faculty, institutions, and communities. In their groundbreaking research on the impact of service-learning on student learning, Eyler and Giles (1999) found that incorporation of meaningful reflection into the service-learning was a predictor of more robust learning outcomes for students. Our own research has demonstrated the importance of well-planned and meaningful service activities, clearly tied to academic course content, in determining service-learning outcomes for college students (Furco, Moely, & Reed, 2007).

In addition to programmatic features, participant characteristics may influence the extent to which service-learning produces positive outcomes. For example, Heffner and Beversluis (2002) have suggested that more positive outcomes are produced from service-learning when students have a strong religious or spiritual affinity. In their studies of motives for volunteering, Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haughen, and Miene (1998) demonstrated the importance of adults' motives in determining their satisfaction with particular kinds of community service activities. Similarly, Battistoni (2002), in his analysis of the development of civic responsibility through service-learning, has identified a variety of service goals, each of which encourages in participants the development of particular skills, attitudes, behaviors, and dispositions.

Keith Morton (1995) and others (Kahne, Westheimer, & Rogers, 2000; Moely & Miron, 2005) have described college students who participate in community service in terms of individual differences in preferred paradigms of service. Those endorsing a Charity paradigm of service focus on offering assistance to one or more individuals in an effort to solve immediate problems that individuals may be facing. Students who elect a Social Change paradigm are concerned with producing changes in the larger societal structures that ultimately determine outcomes for groups of individuals in need. College students participating in service-learning courses often express a stronger preference for the Charity than the Social Change orientation (Bringle, Hatcher, & McIntosh, 2006; Moely & Miron).

Morton (1995) proposed that students' preferences for a particular service paradigm were important because students would seek out and value service experiences consistent with those preferences. Related findings from social psychology look at the motives for volunteer service that individuals express, as in the work of Clary et al. (1998), who showed that older adults volunteering at a hospital were more satisfied with their service when they received benefits from the

service that matched their personal motives. These authors reported a similar finding for undergraduates engaged in service-learning, where the match of motives and service led to greater satisfaction and intentions to volunteer for service in the future. More recently, Houle, Sagarin, and Kaplan (2005) found that when given a choice, individuals prefer service activities that satisfy their volunteer motives. In the present study, we moved a step beyond this previous work to propose that students' learning outcomes, as well as their satisfaction with college experiences, would be affected by the match between preferences and the service in which they engaged as part of their service-learning courses.

In studying the Morton paradigms, researchers using a variety of measurement tools have found that the preferences for charity and social change are not independent. For example, Bringle et al. (2006) found a strong correlation between charity and social change preferences, as was also the case in the present study. To identify groups showing clear preferences for Charity or Social Change, we used median splits on the two preference scales to form groups of students: The Charity Preference group expressed a preference for charity activities and a low interest in social change activities; the Social Change Preference group preferred social change activities and did not endorse charity. These two groups fit Morton's paradigms. However, we also found a substantial number of students representing two other groups: The High Value Undifferentiated Preference group was positive about both kinds of service activity; and the Low Value Undifferentiated Preference group indicated little interest in either charity or social change activities.

Outcomes for each of the four preference groups were measured at the end of their participation in service-learning courses that involved work in a community agency over a term or semester. Outcomes were students' reports of having, through service-learning, (1) gained knowledge of their communities, (2) increased their satisfaction with their studies and college, (3) gained in interpersonal effectiveness, and (4) changed in attitudes toward civic responsibility and action. We have shown previously (Furco et al., 2007) that each of these outcome measures is related to social desirability responding, so a measure of social desirability was included as a covariate in examining the effects of a match or mismatch on outcomes.

Questions guiding the research were as follow: (1) How can we best characterize students in terms of their preferences for different kinds of community service? (2) How do students in different preference groups vary in demographic characteristics, experiences with community service, and civic attitudes? (3) What is the importance of these preferences? In particular, how does a match or mismatch between preferences and service opportunities affect students' learning outcomes from and attitude changes following a service-learning experience?

Method

Research Participants

Survey responses were obtained from 2,233 students enrolled in service-learning courses at seven institutions of higher education, described briefly in Table 1. The sample was 64% female and 60% white. Nonwhites included 10% each of Latino/Hispanic, African American, and Asian students. There were smaller numbers of students describing themselves as multiracial, Pacific Island, Native American, or other.

The average age of participating students was 20.4 (*SD* = 2.92), with a range from 16 to 50 years of age. The sample consisted of 23% first-year college students, 28% sophomores, 21% juniors, and 28% were senior level or above.

Consistent with our previous work with different samples (e.g., Moely, Mercer, Ilustre, Miron, & McFarland, 2002; Moely & Miron, 2005), the students were in the B to B+ range in their academic performance. College GPAs, reported by 1,721 students,

Table 1
Participating Institutions and Students

Institution	Student Body Size	Institutional Type	Number of Service-Learning Courses in Research	Students in Sample
A	1,500	Federal Work Study 4 year college	20	531
B	9,000	Private, Research I university	13	148
C	2,400	Private, Religious, 4 year college	17	655
D	1,700	Private, Religious, Masters level university	9	692
E	3,400	Private, Religious, Masters-level university	8	102
F	12,000	Private, Research I	3	43
G	8,200	Private, Religious, urban university	3	62
TOTALS			73	2,233

ranged from 1.66 to 4.15, with a mean of 3.18 (*SD* = .45). Only 16% of the sample planned to stop their education with a Bachelor's degree or less; 33% expected to earn a Master's degree, and 24% planned to complete a doctorate or a professional degree (law, medicine).

Most of the students reported prior community service activities: When asked to report their involvement in different kinds of service, 72% of the sample reported carrying out community service during high school; 47% reported service during college; and 44% reported community service through a religious organization.

Previous participation in service-learning courses was reported by 39% of the students: Only a few of the students had done service-learning in elementary school (4%) or middle school (6%), while 19% had done service-learning in high school and 29% had participated previously in a college-level service-learning course.

Measures

Students' preferences for community service that emphasized Charity or Social Change activities were assessed at the beginning of the service-learning course, using the scale presented in Table 2. At the end of their service-learning courses, students completed a posttest survey that included a measure (Table 3) on which they could describe the nature of the community service they had performed for the course. These two scales are modified from work presented by Moely and Miron (2005) and each shows acceptable reliability, as indexed by a measure of internal consistency.

As part of the posttest survey, students completed the scales shown in Table 4 to describe their views of what and how much they had gained as a result of their service-learning course participation. They also used the scale used by Moely et al. (2002) to assess Social Desirability responding.

At the beginning and end of the service-learning course, students completed scales from two pre-post, Likert scale questionnaires that have been used in previous studies of higher education service-learning. One questionnaire, the HES-LS (Furco, 2000), measures four constructs: Civic Responsibility, Academic Attitude, Career Development, and Empowerment. The other questionnaire, CASQ (Moely et al., 2002), measures Civic Action, Social Justice, and Appreciation of Diversity.

Procedure

Data were gathered over a two-year period, beginning in fall 2004. Surveys were administered in classrooms at the beginning and end of a semester or term. Representatives from the campus service-learning office attended the class to distribute survey forms and answer any questions. The representatives were asked to follow a prescribed set of guidelines that informed students that their participation was voluntary and assured them that their responses were confidential.

Treatment of Data

To address the research questions, four groups were formed on the basis of initial service prefer-

Table 2
The Community Service Preferences Scale: Students' Initial Service Preferences Described in Terms of Morton's Charity and Social Change Paradigms

Instructions: *The following statements describe different kinds of service-learning activities. Please rate each statement as to how much you would like to engage in this kind of service.*

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	*minimal extent*	*moderate extent*	*large extent*	*great extent*

Charity Preference
1. A service placement where you can really become involved in helping individuals.
2. Helping those in need.
6. Making a major difference in a person's life.
8. Working to give others the necessities that they lack.
Internal Consistency: Alpha coefficient for pretest = .83, *N* = 2,016

Social Change Preference
3. Changing public policy for the benefit of people.
4. A service placement where you can contribute to social change that affects us all.
5. Working to address a major social ill confronting our society.
7. Working to reshape the world we live in.
Internal Consistency: Alpha coefficient for pretest = .85, *N* = 2,017

Table 3
The Community Service Activities Scale: Students' Descriptions of Their Service Activity According to Morton's Charity and Social Change Paradigms

Instructions: Using the scale below, indicate the extent to which your service-learning activity involved each activity listed below:

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	*minimal extent*	*moderate extent*	*large extent*	*great extent*

Charity
1. A service placement where you can really become involved in helping individuals.
2. Helping those in need.
6. Making a major difference in a person's life.
8. Working to give others the necessities that they lack.
Internal Consistency: Alpha coefficient for posttest = .85, *N* = 1,650

Social Change
3. Changing public policy for the benefit of people.
4. A service placement where you can contribute to social change that affects us all.
5. Working to address a major social ill confronting our society.
7. Working to reshape the world we live in.
Internal Consistency: Alpha coefficient for posttest = .84, *N* = 1,646

ence: Students preferring the Charity approach, those preferring Social Change, those with highly positive views of both Charity and Social Change, and those giving low ratings to both approaches (thus addressing Research Question 1). Characteristics of each group were described using analyses of variance to compare the groups (Research Question 2). To determine the importance of this preference (Research Question 3), students were grouped on the basis of their reports of the characteristics of their service experience: Those in the Match group engaged in service activities that matched their initial preferences, while those in the Mismatch group did not. Analyses of covariance were carried out to determine the effects of Preference and Match on students' reported learning outcomes and the extent to which their attitudes changed from the beginning to the end of their service-learning experiences.

Results

Describing Student Preferences

Students' preferences for community service that emphasized Charity or Social Change activities were assessed at the beginning of the service-learning course. The 2,011 students completing the items shown in Table 3 showed an overall preference for Charity ($M = 4.35$, $SD = .63$) over Social Change ($M = 3.86$, $SD = .78$). These means differed significantly in a repeated measures analysis of variance, F (1, 2010) = 939.2, $p < .001$, *partial* $\eta^2 = .318$. The Charity preference is consistent with findings of previous research (Bringle et al., 2006; Moely & Miron, 2005). However, as mentioned earlier, there was a substantial correlation of scores on the two preference scales ($r = .49$, $p < .001$, $N = 2{,}011$), which suggests a lack of differentiation of the two paradigms. To identify "clear cases" of Charity or Social Change preferences, we sorted students into groups on the basis of median splits for the preference measures. Those above the median on the Charity preference scale but below the median on the Social Change preference scale formed the Charity Preference group ($N = 397$, 20% of those responding). Those above the median on Social Change preference but below the median for Charity formed the Social Change Preference group ($N = 316$, 16%). Many of the students did not show differential preferences for charity and social change. Among these were 711 students (35% of the sample) who obtained scores above the median for both Charity and Social Change. These were designated the High Value Undifferentiated Preference group. Another substantial group of students scored below the median on both preference measures, forming the Low Value Undifferentiated Preference group ($N = 587$, 29%).

The four preference groups were compared in terms of demographic variables: Women were more often in the Charity preference group (78% female) or the High Value Undifferentiated group (75% female) than in the Social Change preference group (56% female) or the Low Value Undifferentiated group (49% female). Non-white students were more likely to be represented in the High Value Undifferentiated group (43%) than in the other groups (32-36%). Students in the Charity and High

Table 4
Assessment of Student Outcomes from Service-Learning

Instructions: Below are some statements about service-earning and experiences with service-learning. You will agree with some, disagree with others and have no opinion about others. Please use the following scale to indicate your degree of agreement with each item. Do this by writing the appropriate number in the blank to the left of each statement (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Neither Disagree nor Agree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree). Again, please be open and honest in your answers. It would help us most if you do not skip any questions.

Through service-learning, I have:

Learning about the Community

Gained a deeper understanding of things I learned about in my service-learning course.
Become more aware of the community of which I am a part.
Learned about the community.
Changed the way I think about the community in which I worked.
Learned to see social problems in a new way.
Changed the way I think about societal problems.
Learned to apply concepts from my service-learning course to real situations.
Reflected on the concepts I learned in the service-learning course.
Applied things I learned in my service-learning activity to my college course.
Learned to appreciate different cultures.
Internal Consistency: Alpha coefficient = .92, *N* = 1,626

Satisfaction with College

Become more likely to continue study at this college/university.
Become more likely to stay at this college/university until I graduate.
Become more likely to stay in this region of the country after I graduate.
Changed the way I think about my academic studies.
Become more likely to recommend my college/university to other students.
Changed the way in which I learn.
Studied more diligently and intensively than I typically had before.
Become more positive about being at this college/university.
Become more satisfied with the opportunities my college/university offers me.
Changed my plans for my career and life's work.
Internal Consistency: Alpha coefficient = .91, *N* = 1,622

Interpersonal Effectiveness

Developed my leadership skills.
Had opportunities to take a leadership role.
Practiced my ability to lead and make decisions.
Worked with other students in a leadership role.
Developed friendships with other students.
Had beneficial interactions with other students.
Learned how to work with others effectively.
Internal Consistency: Alpha coefficient = .89, *N* = 1,630

Value Undifferentiated groups planned higher terminal degrees than did students in the Charity or Low Value Undifferentiated groups.

Students' reports of hours of service during high school, in college, and through religious groups were summed to obtain an indication of total prior service. Because the distribution of scores was skewed, we considered median hours of service for each preference group: The Charity group's median for hours of prior service was 125; Social Change: 100 hours; High Value Undifferentiated: 140 hours; Low Value Undifferentiated: 72 hours. To test for group differences, total prior service scores were coded into low, moderate, and high numbers of hours served. The four preference groups differed in previous service, with those in the Low Value Undifferentiated group reporting less service than individuals in the Charity or High Value Undifferentiated groups, while the Social Change group did not differ from others. The Group difference was highly significant ($p < .001$), according to analyses of variance of the coded score for hours of service. This finding reflects the relatively low amount of service reported by students in the Low Value Undifferentiated group.

Students in the Low Value Undifferentiated group also were less likely than the others to have taken a service-learning course in the past (38% in the Low Value Undifferentiated group vs. 44% to 46% in the

other groups) ($p < .001$ in a comparison of the groups). No significant group differences were found for age, year in college, or GPAs obtained in high school or college.

Descriptions of Service Activities

At the end of their courses, 1,643 students rated their service activities according to the extent to which they offered Charity or Social Change experiences. For Charity ratings, the mean was 3.44 (SD = .98), while for Social Change, the mean was 2.64 (SD = 1.02). These means differed significantly in a repeated measures analysis of variance, F (1, 1642) = 907.94, $p < .001$, *partial* $\eta^2 = .356$. This finding is not surprising, in that approximately 60% of the students were placed in schools, after-school programs, or other settings that involved children and families. Such work usually involves tutoring, mentoring, or otherwise assisting a limited number of individuals, activities consistent with the characterization in Table 3 of the Charity orientation. Students reported fewer hours of service for sites described as low in both charity and social change aspects (M = 15.12, SD = 14.15, for N = 511) than for other sites (M's ranging from 17.37 to 18.31), suggesting a less intensive service experience in these settings.

As with the preference scores, a median split approach was used to form four groups to describe service activities, creating groups of students that worked at sites they described as offering predominantly Charity Service opportunities (N = 283, 17%), predominantly Social Change Service opportunities (N = 341, 21%), or both Charity and Social Change opportunities (N = 475, 29%). Other students described their service opportunities as low in both Charity and Social Change activities (N = 544, 33%).

Match and Mismatch Groups

We formed groups of students who had experienced a Match between their initial preferences and those who had experienced a Mismatch. As shown in Table 5, Matches included 144 students who preferred Charity and were placed at a site that they later described as offering the opportunity to carry out Charity service (69 in a site offering predominately Charity service opportunities and 75 in settings with opportunities for both Charity and Social Change); 128 students who preferred Social Change and described their sites as offering Social Change opportunities (N = 66 Social Change and 62 offering Social Change along with Charity); 195 students in the High Value Undifferentiated group who saw their sites as offering both kinds of service activity; and 170 students in the Low Value Undifferentiated group, who described their sites as not offering activities that could be characterized as either Charity or Social Change activity. Mismatches included: 153 students who preferred Charity but described their placements as offering either Social Change or little of either kind of service activity; 100 students who preferred Social Change but were placed in sites offering Charity or little of either service approach; 131 High Value Undifferentiated students who were placed in sites described as low in either Charity or Social Change activities; and 226 Low Value Undifferentiated students who were placed in sites described as high in Charity, Social Change, or both kinds of service activity. As indicated in Table 5, there were 637 students in the Match group and 610 students in the Mismatch group; analyses reported below were done with data from these 1,247 students.

Table 5
Forming Groups of Individuals Whose Service Activities Matched or Did Not Match Their Initial Service Preferences

Site Characteristics: / Student Preferences:	Charity	Social Change	Both High Charity, High Social Change	Neither Low Charity, Low Social Change	Group	
					Total Match	Total Mis-Match
Charity	69	46	75	107	144	153
Social Change	26	66	62	74	128	100
High Value Undifferentiated	83	105	195	131	195	131
Low Value Undifferentiated	62	88	76	170	170	226
Totals	240	305	408	482	637	610

Table 6
Students' Reports of Their Learning about the Community, as a Function of the Match between Initial Service Preferences and Service Activities in the Service-Learning Course

Group: Initial Service Preferences:	Match	No Match
Charity	*M* = 3.80 *SD* = .69 *N* = 138	*M* = 3.39 *SD* = .79 *N* = 150
Social Change	*M* = 3.80 *SD* = .55 *N* = 126	*M* = 3.20 *SD* = .93 *N* = 97
High Value Undifferentiated	*M* = 4.17 *SD* = .53 *N* = 190	*M* = 3.37 *SD* = .78 *N* = 124
Low Value Undifferentiated	*M* = 2.97 *SD* = .80 *N* = 164	*M* = 3.44 *SD* = .68 *N* = 218

Notes. Mean score range is from 1.0 to 5.0.
ANOVA: Main effect of Preference: F (3, 1197) = 27.66, $p < .001$, *partial* $\eta^2 = .065$
Main effect of Match: F (1, 1197) = 53.17, **p** < .001, *partial* $\eta^2 = .043$
Interaction: Preference by Match: F (3, 1197) = 49.24, $p < .001$, *partial* $\eta^2 = .110$
The analysis controlled for Gender and Social Desirability.

Match and Mismatch Groups' Learning Outcomes and Attitude Changes

Building on previous research on service participants' satisfaction, we investigated whether students who experienced a Match between their preferences and their service activity would report more positive learning from their experience than those who experienced a mismatch. To investigate this, we looked at student reports of the outcomes of their service-learning experiences, in terms of their Learning about the Community, gains in Satisfaction with College, and increases in Interpersonal Effectiveness (Table 4). We conducted an analysis of variance on each outcome measure with Preference Group and Match as independent variables, and Gender and Social Desirability as covariates.

Analyses summarized in Tables 6 - 8 showed that

Table 7
Students' Reports of Their Satisfaction with College, as a Function of the Match between Initial Service Preferences and Service Activities

Group: Initial Service Preferences:	Match	No Match
Charity	*M* = 3.07 *SD* = .82 *N* = 137	*M* = 2.73 *SD* = .77 *N* = 148
Social Change	*M* = 3.35 *SD* = .69 *N* = 123	*M* = 2.65 *SD* = .89 *N* = 96
High Value Undifferentiated	*M* = 3.58 *SD* = .68 *N* = 191	*M* = 2.88 *SD* = .83 *N* = 123
Low Value Undifferentiated	*M* = 2.58 *SD* = .79 *N* = 164	*M* = 3.00 *SD* = .72 *N* = 217

Notes. Mean score range is from 1.0 to 5.0.
ANOVA: Main effect of Preference: F (3, 1189) = 17.26, $p < .001$, *partial* $\eta^2 = .042$
Main effect of Match: F (1, 1189) = 42.31, $p < .001$, partial _2 = .034
Interaction: Preference by Match: F (3, 1189) = 35.03, $p < .001$, *partial* $\eta^2 = .081$
The analysis controlled for Gender and Social Desirability.

Table 8
Students' Reports of Their Increased Interpersonal Effectiveness, as a Function of the Match between Initial Service Preferences and Service Activities

Group: Initial Service Preferences:	Match	No Match
Charity	*M* = 3.98 *SD* = .80 *N* = 138	*M* = 3.64 *SD* = .70 *N* = 150
Social Change	*M* = 3.93 *SD* = .54 *N* = 124	*M* = 3.45 *SD* = .90 *N* = 96
High Value Undifferentiated	*M* = 4.12 *SD* = .68 *N* = 191	*M* = 3.62 *SD* = .83 *N* = 124
Low Value Undifferentiated	*M* = 3.20 *SD* = .91 *N* = 163	*M* = 3.63 *SD* = .66 *N* = 217

Notes. Mean score range is from 1.0 to 5.0.
ANOVA: Main effect of Preference: F (3, 1193) = 20.70, $p < .001$, *partial* $\eta^2 = .049$
Main effect of Match: F (1, 1193) = 20.41, $p < .001$, *partial* $\eta^2 = .017$
Interaction: Preference by Match: F (3, 1193) = 26.16, $p < .001$, *partial* $\eta^2 = .062$
The analysis controlled for Gender and Social Desirability.

for three of the four preference groups (Charity, Social Change, and High Value Undifferentiated), a Match between preference and service activities was related consistently to positive outcomes. These groups reported greater learning about the community as a result of their participation in service-learning (Table 6). They indicated that service-learning led them to feel more satisfied with their studies and college (Table 7). They also indicated that service-learning had increased their feelings of interpersonal effectiveness and leadership (Table 8). Only the Low Value Undifferentiated preference group failed to show these positive outcomes of a match between preference and service.

To learn more about the Low Value Undifferentiated group, additional analyses were carried out looking at just those individuals. Differences by service site were significant for Learning about Community, Satisfaction with College, and Interpersonal Effectiveness (all at $p <$ .001), in analyses of variance (Table 9) involving Service-Learning Site as the independent variable and controlling for Gender and Social Desirability. As shown there, mean scores were most positive for students who described their service sites as including both Charity and Social Change components.

Attitude changes from the beginning to end of the service-learning course also varied as a function of the match between preference and service. We carried out analyses of variance for each of seven attitude scales from the HES-LS and CASQ. Each analysis included Preference and Match as between-subjects variables and Time of Test as a repeated measure, with Gender and Social Desirability as covariates. For the CASQ Civic Action scale, the pattern was very similar to those found for the Outcome variables. As indicated in Table 10, students in the Charity, Social Change, and High Value Undifferentiated groups who experienced a match showed increases in Civic Action scores from the beginning to the end of their service-learning courses, while students in the mismatch group showed slight decreases. As before, students in the Low Value Undifferentiated group did not fit this pattern. Instead, the Match group showed a slight decrease and the Mismatch group became somewhat more positive, consistent with findings for learning outcomes.

A significant interaction of Preference by Match by Pre-Post Test ($p < .05$) on the HES-LS Civic Responsibility scale reflected the same pattern of means as described in Table 10 for the CASQ Civic Action scale.

Findings for the other attitudes scales varied:

The HES-LS Academic Attitude showed a difference as a function of Preference, with positive change over the semester shown by all groups except the Low Value Undifferentiated group.

The HES-LS Empowerment scale showed a significant interaction of Preference by Match ($p < .01$), but means do not fit the pattern shown in Table 10: The match group was higher than the mismatch group only for the High Value Undifferentiated group.

There were no differences as a function of Preference, Match, or the interaction of the two factors for the HES-LS Career Development scale, the CASQ Social Justice scale, or the CASQ

Table 9
Service Sites Facilitative of Learning Outcomes for Students in the Low Value Undifferentiated Preference Group

Service Site Characterizations:	Service Learning Outcomes: Learning about the Community	Satisfaction with College	Interpersonal Effectiveness
Charity	*M* = 3.43 *SD* = .70 *N* = 61	*M* = 2.79 *SD* = .74 *N* = 61	*M* = 3.70 *SD* = .62 *N* = 61
Social Change	*M* = 3.26 *SD* = .70 *N* = 83	*M* = 3.00 *SD* = .70 *N* = 82	*M* = 3.42 *SD* = .74 *N* = 83
Both Charity and Social Change	*M* = 3.66 *SD* = .60 *N* = 74	*M* = 3.17 *SD* = .69 *N* = 74	*M* = 3.82 *SD* = .53 *N* = 73
Neither Charity nor Social Change	*M* = 2.97 *SD* = .80 *N* = 164	*M* = 2.57 *SD* = .79 *N* = 164	*M* = 3.20 *SD* = .91 *N* = 163

Notes. Mean score range is from 1.0 to 5.0.
ANOVA for Learning about Community: Main effect of Site: F (3, 376) = 16.29, $p < .001$, *partial* $\eta^2 = .115$
ANOVA for Satisfaction with College: Main effect of Site: F (3, 375) = 10.08, $p < .001$, *partial* $\eta^2 = .075$
ANOVA for Interpersonal Effectiveness: Main effect of Site: F (3, 374) = 12.21, $p < .001$, *partial* $\eta^2 = .089$
Each analysis controlled for Gender and Social Desirability.

Appreciation of Diversity scale. Thus, a match between student preferences and the nature of service activities is important for core civic attitudes (Civic Responsibility and Civic Action) but not for scales measuring attitudes toward academic involvement, career development, personal empowerment, social justice, or appreciation of diversity.

Discussion

There are a number of studies showing positive effects of service-learning on student learning outcomes and attitude changes, emphasizing the importance of a well-planned course that integrates community service with course content. The present study shows that the perspectives that students bring with them to the service-learning experience are also important in determining learning outcomes.

On the basis of various factors, including previous service experiences and others yet to be explored, about a third of the students expressed initial preferences for service that focus either on helping the individual (Charity) or working to affect larger social structures (Social Change). The remaining two-thirds of our sample show less differentiation in their views, with some reacting positively to the activities involved in both Charity and Social Change orientations and others taking a rather dim view of either kind of service activity. Comparisons of these four groups showed that the Charity and High Value Undifferentiated groups had a number of common characteristics: Women were represented strongly in both groups; students in these two groups indicated high amounts of community service in the past; and they also reported plans to pursue academic studies beyond the Bachelor's degree.

The High Value Undifferentiated group includes a larger proportion of students from communities of color, who indicate an interest in serving both for charitable and social change reasons. Perhaps they have acquired a greater awareness of social issues through their life experiences, prompting interest in social change, while also possibly living out the aim of "giving back" to the community.

For these three preference groups, learning outcomes were facilitated by having a match between their preferred and actual service activities. Students in the Charity, Social Change, and High Value Undifferentiated groups who experienced a match reported that the service-learning course experience led them to greater learning about the community, growth in interpersonal effectiveness, and greater satisfaction with their college experience than was shown for students who experienced a mismatch. They also showed more positive change in attitudes toward Civic Responsibility and plans to be involved in their communities in the future (the latter shown on the Civic Action scale). Why might such learning outcomes result from opportunities to experience one's preferred kind of service? Deci and Ryan's Self-Determination theory (Reeve, Ryan, Deci, & Jang, 2008) offers an

Table 10
Changes in Mean Scores on the CASQ Civic Action Scale Shown by Students of Four Preference Groups Experiencing a Match or Mismatch between Preference and Service

Group	N	Pretest *M (SD)*	Posttest *M (SD)*
		Preference: Charity	
Match	140	3.88 (.54)	4.03 (.63)
Mismatch	152	3.86 (.53)	3.79 (.61)
		Preference: Social Change	
Match	126	3.80 (.56)	3.90 (.61)
Mismatch	98	3.71 (.67)	3.65 (.78)
		Preference: High Value Undifferentiated	
Match	188	4.23 (.65)	4.33 (.62)
Mismatch	126	4.20 (.60)	4.12 (.67)
		Preference: Low Value Undifferentiated	
Match	163	3.24 (.64)	3.21 (.79)
Mismatch	220	3.37 (.66)	3.43 (.67)

Notes. Mean score range is from 1.0 to 5.0
Results of ANOVA of Covariance for Civic Action:
Interaction: Preference x Match x Pre-Post Test: F (3, 1203) = 4.19, $p < .01$, *partial* $\eta^2 = .010$
Interaction: Match Group x Pre-Post Test: F (1, 1203) = 9.54, $p < .01$, *partial* $\eta^2 = .008$
Main effect of Preference significant, F (3, 1203) = 123.69, $p < .001$, *partial* $\eta^2 = .236$
Interaction of Preference x Match: F (3, 1203) = 5.18, $p < .01$, *partial* $\eta^2 = .013$

explanation: If students in a match situation perceive their service activity as interesting and personally important, they will persist, initiate positive actions, and engage in autonomously-determined activities. Such actions are likely to result in satisfaction with the service experience, a high degree of relevant and self-determined learning, as well as feelings of personal well-being. Both Charity and Social Change activities can provide opportunities for such positive outcomes. In a Charity setting, service-learners can see the impact of their service on one or a few individuals with whom they work. Through their interactions with these individuals, they are motivated to learn about the community surrounding and influencing the individuals, and also will increase in their own self-awareness of their interpersonal skills and their attitudes about civic engagement and responsibility. In a Social Change experience, students are working to affect the community on a larger scale. To do so, they must become aware of community strengths and needs through interactions with members of the community. Through their service activities, which likely will involve cooperative action with others, they will gain in interpersonal skills and have opportunities to reflect upon their civic attitudes.

The benefit of a match does not hold for the Low Value Undifferentiated group. Instead, these students obtained higher scores for learning outcomes when their service involved both work with individuals and the opportunity to contribute to larger social change. At the beginning of the course, this group reported the fewest hours previously spent in service and the fewest prior service-learning courses. Their limited experience with service may be the source of their lack of interest in either Charity or Social Change activities. We cannot tell whether the preferences of students in the Low Value Undifferentiated group were affected by their service-learning experiences because we did not obtain a measure of service preferences at the end of the course. Future research might explore the extent to which preferences for Charity or Social Change are affected by different kinds of experience. If preferences reflect *familiarity* with distinct categories of service, changes may be relatively easy to produce. On the other hand, if we are measuring stable and consistent motives for community service, preferences should remain relatively stable over time in the absence of fairly dramatic interventions.

Because a match between students' preference(s) and their service experience appears to be an impor-

tant factor for building high quality service-learning, instructors should consider assessing individual students' preferences prior to engaging them in service-learning. Such assessments can help instructors identify appropriate service experiences for students as well as provide baseline information that can be used to gauge how students' service preferences might evolve or change over time. At the very least, service-learning instructors and facilitators should make students aware of the fact that individuals have different preferences for service, and that these preferences may influence how they view their service and how the overall service-learning experience might impact them. As Omoto (2005) suggests, engaging students in pre-service reflection can encourage them to be more self-reflective during their service experience as a means to help build greater self-awareness of civic and personal development.

Further, in creating new service-learning courses, faculty and community partners who are aware of these individual preferences can plan for them by making available a variety of service experiences, so that students can choose activities that best fit their interests and skills. Or it might be possible to provide both Charity and Social Change elements within one service-learning course. Although the High Value Undifferentiated service experience yielded positive outcomes, we do not know whether it is best for the service experience to contain both Charity and Social Change components or, if lectures, readings and classroom discussions can provide one or the other of these components. For example, community partners might incorporate Charity-type experiences into service that focuses on Social Change, or might emphasize the larger social issues surrounding service that is oriented toward helping the individual. Alternatively, the service-learning professor might teach Social Change concepts in class that relate to the Charity-oriented service in which students are engaged in the community. The community partner can play a meaningful role as co-educator in such service-learning efforts.

Working from Morton's (1995) proposal of service paradigms, we were able to create a reliable measure of student preferences. The rating scales used here had higher internal consistencies than other measures we used previously (Moely & Miron, 2005) that involved a ranking procedure or descriptions of service activities. Similarly, Bringle et al. (2006) found good internal consistency for scales that asked individuals to rate their preferences on numerical scales. Both of these studies found a substantial number of individuals who did not express a clear preference for only one type of service. The rating technique does not force students to choose a paradigm but allows a more qualified response that may better reflect the reality of student preferences.

Certain decisions had to be made in defining the Match and Mismatch groups for this study. For example, in forming the Charity preference Match group, we included as Match not only the sites described as involving Charity but also those described as including both Charity and Social Change because they did have a Charity component. The same was done in forming the Match group for Social Change, by including sites characterized as Social Change only together with those involving both Charity and Social Change. Future studies may choose different ways of defining a match, perhaps limiting the sample to only those showing exact matches. On the other hand, doing so will limit the number of individuals included in the research and, thus, will limit generalizability of findings.

Throughout post-secondary education in the United States, we have numerous models of service-learning that may yield findings different from those reported here. For example, it may be that student preferences and the impact of a match will differ on campuses where service-learning is required, relative to those where it is an option selected by the students. Many of the participants in the present study were attending institutions with religious affiliations, a feature that may also affect the ways in which preferences are distributed or the ways in which students react to service experiences. Or the patterns described here may vary depending upon programmatic emphases such as social justice, leadership and personal empowerment, or career development, or as a function of disciplinary emphases affecting the academic content of the service-learning course. Further research addressing these questions will help us better understand the meaning and importance of service preferences as motives for community involvement and enable us to plan service-learning courses for students' optimal learning and development as well as their worthwhile contributions to the community.

Notes

This research was carried out as part of the evaluation of a consortium grant from Learn and Serve America, for which Moely was Principal Investigator, Furco led the evaluation of the project, and Reed directed one of the service-learning programs in the initial group of subgrantees. Subsequently, Reed became the director of service-learning at another institution that participated in the consortium in the second and third years of the grant. We would like to thank our consortium colleagues and the faculty members and students at each participating institution for their assistance and support in this work.

Reports of this research were presented at the 2007 ATINER Conference on Psychology, the 2008 meeting of the American Educational Research Association, and the 2008 Continuums of Service conference.

References

Battistoni, R. (2002). *Civic engagement across the curriculum*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Bringle, R.G., Hatcher, J. A., & McIntosh, R. E. (2006). Analyzing Morton's typology of service paradigms and integrity. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *13*(1), 5-15.

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

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

Furco, A. (2000). The Higher Education Service-Learning Survey. Available at http://gse.berkeley.edu/research/slc/surveys/highered/HEdSurveyRel.doc

Furco, A., Moely, B. E., & Reed, J. (2007, July). *Formulating a model of effects of college students' service-learning experience*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Psychology, Athens Greece.

Heffner, G. G., & Beversluis, C. D. (Eds.). (2002). *Commitment and connection: Service-learning and Christian higher education*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Houle, B. J., Sagarin, B. J., & Kaplan, M. F. (2005). A functional approach to volunteerism: Do volunteer motives predict task performance? *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *27*(4), 337-344.

Kahne, J., Westheimer, J., & Rogers, B. (2000). Service-learning and citizenship: Directions for research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *7*, 42-51.

Moely, B. E., Mercer, S. H., Ilustre, V., Miron, D., & McFarland, M. (2002). Psychometric properties and correlates of the Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire (CASQ): A measure of students' attitudes related to service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *8*(2), 15-26.

Moely, B. E., & Miron, D. (2005). College students' preferred approaches to community service: Charity and social change paradigms. In S. Root, J. Callahan, & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *Improving service-learning practice: Research on models to enhance impacts*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Morton, K. (1995). The irony of service: Charity, project, and social change in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *2*, 19-32.

Omoto, A. M. (Ed.) (2005). *Processes of community change and social action*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Reeve, J. Ryan, R., Deci, E. L., & Jang, H. (2006). Understanding and promoting autonomous self-regulation: A self-determination theory perspective. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Authors

BARBARA E. MOELY is professor emerita in Psychology at Tulane University and research affiliate of Tulane's Center for Public Service. She was previously director of the Office of Service Learning at Tulane and has been principal investigator for a Learn and Serve Consortium grant involving seven institutions of higher education. She has published research on service-learning in higher education, focusing on student attitudes and retention and on the benefits of service-learning for community agencies.

ANDREW FURCO is associate professor in Educational Policy and Administration at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, where he also serves as associate vice president for Public Engagement and director of the International Institute for Research on Public Engagement. He conducts research on issues pertaining to the impacts and institutionalization of community and public engagement in K-12 and higher education in the U.S. and abroad.

JULIA REED is the director of the Office of Service-Learning and Community Action (OSLCA) within the McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good at the University of San Francisco. Previously she directed the Center for Public Service at Gettysburg College, and worked in the service-learning centers at Indiana University-Bloomington, IUPUI, Georgetown University, and California State University-Monterey Bay. Dr. Reed has administered an Annie E. Casey Foundation grant, as well as CNCS VISTA and LSA grants. She co-authored Facilitating Reflection in Higher Education, and developed the Advocates of Community Engagement (ACE) student leadership program now replicated in multiple states.