Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning *Fall 2006, pp.5-15*

Analyzing Morton's Typology of Service Paradigms and Integrity

Robert G. Bringle, Julie A. Hatcher, and **Rachel E. McIntosh**
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

Research on college students found limited support for Morton's (1995) hypothesis that students have a preference for one distinct type of service orientation (i.e., charity, project, social change). The findings did replicate previous findings that college students prefer the charity paradigm. A measure of integrity was developed and two dimensions were identified that possessed distinct correlates. As Morton predicted, as the degree of integrity increased the preference for a distinct type of service became blurred, suggesting that developing integrity should be an intentional educational goal and it might be aided by exposing students to all three approaches to community service. Implications for service-learning educators are discussed.

As a long-time educator and leader in service-learning, Keith Morton (1995) has provided an analysis of different ways in which college students prefer to engage in community service. He describes three service paradigms: charity (providing direct service to another person), project (implementing or participating in service programs through community service organizations), and social change (transformational models of systemic change). Morton also posits that college students who are active in community service have a preference for a particular type of service with which they are most comfortable. He provides critical commentary on the strengths and limitations of each type of service with accompanying analysis of implications for the design of educational programs. Furthermore, he contends that, unlike other analyses (e.g., Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990; Elden & Chisholm, 1993; Illich, 1968; Lackey, Burke, & Peterson, 1987), these three types of service do not necessarily constitute a continuum of service (pp. 19-20). Rather, Morton presents the case that each type of service is a separate paradigm and each has "its own logic, strengths, limitations and vision of a transformed world" (p. 19), and contains "a world view, a problem statement, and an agenda for change" (p. 24). Therefore, it may not be reasonable for educators to have a developmental goal of challenging college students to move from acts of charity to planned projects toward social change.

Furthermore, Morton (1995) contends that how a college student engages in any one of the three types of community service can have differing levels of integrity or depth. To discuss integrity, he adapts the language of anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1973) and describes the conditions when integrity ranges from "thin" to "thick" (p. 21). Community service directed at charity, project, and social change lacks integrity, or is thin, when it is paternalistic, self-centered, produces negative consequences, creates dependencies and false expectations, and leaves others tired and cynical (p. 28). In contrast, high levels of integrity, across the three types of service, possess,

> deeply held, internally coherent values; match means and ends; describe a primary way of interpreting and relating to the world; offer a way of defining problems and solutions; and suggest a vision of what a transformed world might look like. (p. 28)

This level of integrity is described as "thick" because of the depth of integration between values and action.

Limited research has been conducted to evaluate Morton's (1995) typology of service preference and its implications for structuring service-learning courses and other educational programs. Morton (1995) and Bringle, Magjuka, Hatcher, MacIntosh, and Jones (2006) used a forced-choice procedure in which college students were asked to choose one of the three types of service for their current activities, "over the course of my life," and what others should do. Morton found charity to be the preferred paradigm when asked about current activities, but project was the modal choice for "over the course of my life" (p. 25) and as a recommendation for what others should do. Using the same items but collapsing preferences across the three items (i.e., current, over my life, others), Bringle et al. found that 48% of college students surveyed indicated a preference for providing charity or direct service, followed by 39% preferring service through project development or organizations, and 13% preferring social change.

Moely and Miron (2005) used two different approaches to measuring preferences for types of service: (a) a ranking of the importance of the three types

across four presentations of the three types of service, and (b) a rating on a five-point scale of the extent to which they would like to engage in each activity for descriptions of the three types of service activities in four sectors: education, health agencies, nonprofit organizations, and government offices. When respondents rank ordered their preference for the three types of service that were presented four different ways, the procedure yielded marginal reliability for social change and charity, and unacceptable reliability for project (i.e., alpha < .70). Their results showed that undergraduate students had a clear preference for charity and the mean ranks found the following ordering of preference: charity > project > social change. The rating procedure produced scales with marginal or unacceptable reliabilities, and a different ordering of preference: charity > social change > project. Across the two measurement techniques, they found mixed predictors of interest in charity (gender, high school service, Federal Work Study service) and social change (gender, year in college, experience with various kinds of service), with little convergence across the two measures of preference. The measurement of preference for project planning was not reliable enough to permit analyses.

Research Questions

Stimulated by Morton's (1995) analysis of community service and its implications for designing service-learning classes, this research identified the following research questions to address.

1. Can student preferences for type of community service be reliably measured? Morton (1995) presents no reliability data for his measures because he analyzed them as single items. Moely and Miron (2005) attained either marginally acceptable or unacceptable reliabilities for both of their measurement procedures. Bringle et al. (2006) collapsed across three forced-choice items. An alternative approach for measuring the three types of community service was implemented in this research and compared to these other procedures.

2. Do students have a preference for only one type of community service? Morton (1995) offers both qualitative and quantitative evidence concluding that students often showed a preference for one type of service and resisted being asked to do a different type of service. His evidence leads him to conclude that, "we come to service with a primary orientation, and work out of this orientation. Only occasionally, I would hypothesize, is a primary orientation given up for an alternative" (p. 28-29).

3. Can a self-report measure of integrity be developed? Presumably, the construct of integrity of service can be defined and the conceptual domain can be sampled with items that reflect key qualities delineated by Morton (1995) and clarified through discussions with him. Such a measure of integrity would need to be applicable to those who favor each of the three types of service, without specific reference to a particular type, and possess sound psychometric properties (i.e., reliability, validity, factor structure).

4. Does preference for only one type of service diminish or become blurred with a high level of integrity? Morton suggests that the distinctions among charity, project, and social change become blurred as the integrity of the server deepens and becomes "thick": "At their thickest, the paradigms seem to intersect, or at least to complement one another" (p.28).

Methods

Subjects

Respondents (N = 217) were solicited from different groups of undergraduate students at a large urban campus, to reflect students from the general student population and also with varied levels of community involvement through either a service-learning course or Federal Work Study positions in the community: students enrolled in four service learning courses (n = 37, 16.8%); students enrolled in one course without a service component (n = 79, 35.9%); Federal Work Study students employed on-campus (n = 41,18.6%); Federal Work Study students employed in community-based settings (n = 32, 14.6%); Federal Work Study students employed as America Reads tutors in community-based settings (n = 28, 12.7%) (three questionnaires were uncoded). Respondents had a mean age = 23.3; 71.8% were female; 53.2% were Caucasian and 30.9% were African-American; and 46.8% were first-year undergraduate students, 15.9% were second-year undergraduates, 21.4% were third-year undergraduates, 14.1% were fourth-year undergraduates, and 1.8% were graduate students.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire contained items developed to measure intrinsic and extrinsic motives, leadership, familiarity with and interest in the nonprofit sector, interest in and preference for different types of community service, and integrity. Items included (a) the importance of intrinsic motives for selecting a career (e.g., improve society through my career; job is consistent with my personal values; six items, alpha = .83) and extrinsic motives for selecting a career (e.g., salary; provide for financial needs of my family; three items, alpha = .78); (b) questions based upon Astin and Astin's (1996) Social Change Model of Leadership (consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose controversy with civility, citizenship) and traditional models of leadership (e.g., giving directions, coordinating

activities, proposing solutions, promoting communication; 28 items that loaded on an Efficacy factor, alpha = .89); (c) two items measuring familiarity with the nonprofit sector (e.g., had enrolled in a course that included the nonprofit sector; familiarity with the nonprofit sector), and four items measuring interest in and knowledge of the nonprofit sector (e.g., interest in taking a course on the nonprofit sector, interest in employment in the nonprofit sector; six-item scale, alpha = .79); (d) two items measuring past experience with community service (e.g., in high school, involvement of parents), and four items measuring future interest in community service (e.g., anticipated involvement after graduation; likelihood of contributing money and raising money for community causes; six-item scale, alpha = .70). Single items also measured: hours of community service during the previous two years, importance of faith to educational and career goals, grade point average, age, gender, and class standing.

All respondents were asked to complete those sections of the questionnaire. Respondents who had never been involved in community service or volunteer activities (n = 37) were instructed to stop responding at this point of the questionnaire and only those who had been involved in community service completed the final two sections (n = 180).

Morton's Types of Service. Modifying the previous research by Morton (1995) three sets of items asked respondents about their "confidence in my ability to. . .", "Over the course of my life, I would feel most comfortable having an impact by . . . ", and "I would feel most enthusiastic about recruiting others to . . . " (a) "provide direct service to another person", (b) "help set up and support community service organizations", and (c) "advocate for social change." Respondents indicated their preference on a six-point *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* response format. Each three-item composite scale had acceptable internal consistency (charity: alpha = .72; project: alpha = .84; social change: alpha = .90).

Integrity. Items were written that sampled the following components of Morton's concept of integrity: willingness to recruit other volunteers as a public declaration of interest in and commitment to community service; the degree to which friends know

Table 1
Items Used to Measure Integrity

1.	Being involved in community service is everyone's responsibility, therefore, I feel comfortable recruiting others to be involved.*	Being involved in community service is a personal choice of each individual, therefore I would not feel comfortable recruiting others to be involved.
2.	If I told those who know me well that I was signing up for a community service activity, they would be surprised.	If I told those who know me well that I was signing up for a community service activity they would not be surprised.*
3.	When I am involved in community service, I focus on what I can accomplish that day.	When I am involved in community service, I am motivated by the fact that I can make a difference over time.*
4.	I usually leave a community service activity with ideas for additional ways that I can be involved in the future.*	I usually leave a community service activity with a feeling of a job well done.
5.	When I interact with those I am serving, I try to not get too involved in their personal lives.	When I interact with those I am serving, I am often concerned by the number of complex issues influencing their lives.*
6.	When I am involved in community service, I focus on meeting the immediate need.	When I am involved in community service, I focus on the long-term impact of my involvement.*
7.	My community service involvement is one of the most important things that defines who I am.*	My community service involvement is not one of the most important things that defines who I am.
8.	As a result of my community service involvement, the direction of my life has dramatically changed.*	As a result of my community service involvement, the direction of my life has not dramatically changed.
9.	When I serve another person I am thankful for the opportunity to help.	When I serve another person, I find that we have a lot in common.*

Note. * denotes thick alternative

about the respondent's interest in community service; interest in making a difference over time as a means for distinguishing life-course commitment to service (vs. an episodic approach to service); thinking about community service when away from it as evidence of how encompassing it is in their lives (vs. compartmentalized); empathic responses; viewing service as part of an ongoing commitment; role of community service as part of one's identity; degree to which community service is transformational for one's life; and identification (vs. separateness) with those served (see Table 1). A format was used in which a high integrity ("thick") and low integrity ("thin") choice were placed at each end. Each choice was written to provide choices that were equally socially desirable. A six-point response format with the ends labeled *Describes me extremely well* was used.

Results

Factor Analysis

Factor analyses with Varimax rotation were conducted on the integrity items. There was not a one-factor solution. A two-factor solution included six of the nine items, with the remaining three items failing to form a third factor. Table 2 lists the items that formed the two-factor solution and their respective alphas. Although these alphas were low, because this was exploratory research on the concept of integrity, items for the two factors — Identity (alpha = .67) and Long-Term Commitment (alpha = .66) — were combined into scales that were assumed to be two somewhat independent components of integrity, $r(179) = .18$, $p < .05$. The remaining three items were excluded from subsequent analyses, although they may still be considered aspects of integrity that are distinct from the two components identified in this research.

Morton's Typology

A repeated measures MANOVA was conducted to determine if there were differences in preference for each of the three types of service. There was a significant effect, $F(2, 177) = 28.84$, $p < .01$. The means indicated that respondents had the strongest preference for Charity (mean = 4.64), the lowest preference for Social Change (mean = 3.97), with Project being intermediate (mean = 4.38). Each paired comparison was significant according to a t-test for dependent means.

As another type of evidence for whether or not students have a distinct preference for one type of service, the correlations between interest in the three types of service were calculated and all were found to be significant and positive: Charity and Social Change, $r(178) = .48$, $p < .01$; Charity and Project, $r(178) = .46$, $p < .05$; and Project and Social Change, $r(178) = .57$, $p < .01$.

As an additional strategy for evaluating the same research issue, tripartite splits (roughly, the highest one-third, middle one-third, lowest one-third) were conducted on the distribution of scores for preference for each of the types of service. Table 3 presents the contingency tables for the types of service taken two at a time. A criterion for evidence of a distinct preference for one type of service over the other would be contained in the cells that have a high preference for one type of service and moderate or low preference for the other type of service. These cells accounted for 27%, 27%, and 28% of all of the respondents. An additional criterion would be that a respondent was high on one type of service and low or moderate on both of the other two types of service. Twenty-six percent of the respondents matched this criterion (Table 3).

Integrity and Types of Service

To evaluate the relationship between integrity and types of service, four preference groups were created based on a median split of preference for each type of service: (a) low preference across all three types (i.e., below the median on direct service, project, and social change; n = 33, 18%); (b) preference for only one type of service (i.e., above the median on one type, below the median on the other two; n = 53, 30%); (c) preference for two types of service (i.e., above the median on two types, below the median on the other type; n = 39, 22%); and (d) preference for all three types of service (i.e., above the median for all three types of service; n = 55, 31%). A one-way ANOVA was conducted with the two components of integrity, Identity and Long-Term Commitment, as the dependent variables. In addition, the following nonorthogonal comparisons were tested: (a) preference for one type versus preference for three types of service; (b) no preference versus all others, and (c) preference for one type versus preference for two and three types of service. There was a significant effect for service preferences on Identity, $F(3,175) = 16.14$, $p < .01$, and on Long-Term Commitment, $F(3,175) =$

Table 2
Factor Structure of the Measure of Integrity

Identity	Loading
Item 1	.69
Item 4	.60
Item 7	.79
Item 8	.64
Long-Term Commitment	**Loading**
Item 3	.74
Item 6	.77
Items Not Loading	
Item 2	
Item 5	
Item 9	

Table 3
Contingency Tables for Preferences

	Charity		
	Low	Moderate	High
Social Change			
Low	28	19	6*
Moderate	19	24	7*
High	8*	27*	42

	Charity		
	Low	Moderate	High
Project			
Low	27	16	8*
Moderate	13	31	12*
High	15*	23*	35

	Social Change		
	Low	Moderate	High
Project			
Low	31	14	6*
Moderate	11	24	21*
High	11*	12*	50

	Social Change		
	Low	Moderate	High
Charity: Low			
Program: Low	17	10	0*
Program: Moderate	4	6	3*
Program: High	7*	3*	5
Charity: Medium			
Program: Low	10	3	3*
Program: Moderate	5	15	11*
Program: High	4*	6*	13
Charity: High			
Program: Low	4*	1*	3
Program: Moderate	2*	3*	7
Program: High	0	3	32

Note. *Cells consistent with Morton's prediction of favoring only one type of service.

9.11, $p < .01$. In addition, each contrast was significant (see Table 4).

Exploratory Regression Analyses

Two sets of stepwise multiple regression analyses were conducted to determine which variables were related to strength of preference for each type of community service and for the two measures of integrity (i.e., identity, long-term commitment). In both analyses, the following additional variables were included as independent variables: efficacy, hours of community service during the previous two years, importance of faith to educational and career goals, grade point average, extrinsic motivation for service, intrinsic motivation for career, history with community service and interest in community service in the future, familiarity with and interest in the nonprofit sector, age, gender, and class standing. For analyses of service preference (charity, project, social change) as the dependent variable, the two measures of integrity were also included as independent variables. For the analyses with the two integrity factors as the dependent variable, preference for charity, project, and social change were included as independent variables. Table 5 reports the results of the stepwise multiple regression analyses.

Discussion

Types of Service

Measurement. Different approaches have been used to measure preferences for different types of community service (Bringle et al. 2006; Moely & Miron, 2005; Morton, 1995). Rather than ranking or forced choice, in the current research respondents

Table 4
Means and Contrasts for One-way ANOVAs for Preference for Type of Service and Integrity

Means (Standard Deviations)			
Preference for Type of Service	N	Identity	Long-Term Commitment
1: No Preference	33	2.80 (.907)	3.20 (1.13)
2: Preference for One Type	53	3.12 (.793)	3.66 (1.10)
3: Preference for Two Types	39	3.44 (.988)	4.01 (1.20)
4: Preference for Three Types	54	4.13 (1.09)	4.47 (1.24)
Contrasts		Identity	Long-Term Commitment
2 vs. 4		5.44*	3.58*
1 vs. (2, 3, 4)		4.12*	3.76*
2 vs. (3, 4)		3.99*	2.87*

Note. df = 175. *$p < .01$

rated the three types of service by indicating on a six-point scale their preference for "confidence in their ability," "over their lifetime," and "recruiting others." The reliabilities were all marginally acceptable and analyses found significant differences among preferences and the following rank order of student ratings of preference for service: charity > project > social change.

Concerning the first research question, the measurement procedure used in the current research is tentatively recommended over the other procedures because of its superior reliabilities. Nevertheless, there is convergence across all of the procedures (with the exception of two of Morton's results) that college students have a clear preference for charity and — with two exceptions in Moely and Miron's (2005) results — the lowest interest in a service paradigm directed at advocacy and social change. As Morton (1995) notes, the three different paradigms can have important and different implications for the design and implementation of service-learning courses. These results show that most college students are interested in direct service and service through projects within a community organization, which are presumed to be the most typical ways in which service-learning courses and co-curricular programs involve students. Thus, educators can continue to include these two types of community service activities in service-learning courses and know that students, in general, will view them as most attractive.

That social change elicited the least interest across all studies except two measures by Moely and Miron (2005) has two contrasting implications. First, consistent with Morton's (1995) recommendation that a student's preference should be honored, the presence of service activities focused on social change should be proportionately minimal in service-learning courses and community service programming. However, an alternative conclusion, which is consistent with observations by Boyte (1991), is that community service as it is typically structured in college may not be the best way to have students become familiar with politically-oriented, justice-oriented, and advocacy-oriented activities and outcomes that are aligned with social change (a point with which Morton agrees, personal communication, January, 27, 2006). Cone (2003) reiterates this position by concluding that through service-learning "we are failing to help students understand that civic action involves more than direct service and that systemic problems require systemic solutions" (p. 15). Therefore, to correct for this deficiency, disproportionately more thought and programming may need to be dedicated to the design and implementation of ways in which students can increase their familiarity with, competency in, and motivation to work toward social change. Program initiatives such as the American Democracy Project (ADP), coordinated by the American Association of Colleges and State Universities in collaboration with *The New York Times*, and the Political Engagement Project, coordinated by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, make more explicit the vital importance of civic learning outcomes to increase participation in democratic processes, political activities, and seeking social change. Instructors of service-learning classes may also choose to intentionally incorporate community service directed at social change into their courses and design reflection activities that integrate course content with issues contained in this type of community service (e.g., social justice, policy analysis) to develop student interest in social change.

Not all courses may be well-suited for service experiences to involve students in social change activities due to limitations of time, student competency, learning goals in the course, community partner needs, or faculty interests. For many service-learning courses, direct service and projects within community organizations are most appropriate for all stakeholders. Nevertheless, identifying resources to cultivate civic learning through structured reflection (Gottlieb & Robinson, 2002; Perry & Jones, 2006) and supplemental readings focused on those who

Table 5
Multiple Regression Analyses of Integrity (Identity, Long-Term Commitment) and Preference for Types of Service (Charity, Project, Social Change)

Dependent Variable: Identity			
Predictor	Cumulative R	Final Beta	F Value
Project	.319	.27**	F(1,165) = 18.8**
Intrinsic	.368	.19*	F(2,164) = 12.8**
Dependent Variable: Long-Term Commitment			
Predictor	Cumulative R	Final Beta	F Value
Efficacy	.479	.329**	F(1,165) = 49.0**
Hours Served	.532	.216**	F(2,164) = 32.3**
Social change	.559	.188*	F(3,163) = 24.7**
GPA	.577	.146*	F(4,162) = 20.2**
Dependent Variable: Charity			
Predictor	Cumulative R	Final Beta	F Value
Intrinsic	.478	.386**	F(1,165) = 48.8**
Identity	.546	.214**	F(2,164) = 34.8**
Nonprofit Sector	.568	.174*	F(3,163) = 26.0**
Dependent Variable: Project			
Predictor	Cumulative R	Final Beta	F Value
Efficacy	.562	.427**	F(1,165) = 76.0**
Long-Term Commitment	.590	.169**	F(2,164) = 43.9**
Nonprofit Sector	.609	.175**	F(3,163) = 32.0**
Dependent Variable: Social Change			
Predictor	Cumulative R	Final Beta	F Value
Efficacy	.515	.298**	F(1,165) = 59.5**
Nonprofit Sector	.552	.201**	F(2,164) = 36.0**
Long-Term Commitment	.578	.182**	F(3,163) = 27.2**
Identity	.593	.159*	F(4,162) = 22.0**
Extrinsic	.607	.133*	F(5,161) = 18.8**

Note. $^{**}p < .01$, $^{*}p < .05$

have advocated for social change in American society (Burlingame, 2004; Daloz, Keen, Keen, & Daloz-Parks, 1996) can be used to build a connection between (a) direct service and programs, and (b) social change, even when the community service activities are not focused on social change.

The three types of service also had common and distinct correlates associated with them in the current research. All three were associated with interest in and knowledge of the nonprofit sector. This shows the centrality of the nonprofit sector to community involvement and suggests that the general population of students has a strong interest in nonprofit organizations and will benefit from educational programs that increase their knowledge of the nonprofit sector (e.g., philanthropic studies, nonprofit management). Service-learning instructors can intentionally draw upon the knowledge base about the nonprofit sector (Anheier, 2005; Clotfelter & Ehrlich 1999; Hammack, 1998; Powell, 1987) to supplement existing course content so that students can deepen their understanding of nonprofits' role in society. Although it is easy to see the nonprofit sector's relevance to each of the three types of service, not all students will seek careers in that sector. Educational programs should also include an examination of the relationships and interdependencies between the nonprofit sector, the public/government sector, and the private/for profit sector in addressing community needs.

The pattern of results for the multiple regression analyses also provided additional evidence of discriminate validity among the different approaches to community service, which is further endorsement of this measurement procedure for assessing interest in the various community service paradigms. Other than the nonprofit sector, there was no other correlate common across the regression analyses for the three types of service. Efficacy was a predictor for social change and project, indicating that the general capacity to effect change through one's actions (leadership, organizing, communication) is related to preferences for how one serves in these structured and goal-oriented types of service. Bandura's (1977, 1997) work on self-efficacy focuses on a person's capacity to take action toward a goal. These results highlight how efficacy is central to these two types of service. Educators, therefore, can work toward developing those competencies and skills that support the devel-

opment of efficacy in students enrolled in service-learning classes. Fortunately, a body of research exists that has construed efficacy within the framework of community service and has developed validated tools for further research (Ferrari, 2004; Reeb, 2006; Reeb, Katsuyama, Sammon, & Yoder, 1998). Furthermore, this finding reinforces the importance of matching competencies needed in a service site to the student's existing skills and motives, so that a sense of efficacy is cultivated in service-learning classes (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Miene, & Haugen, 1994; Clary et al., 1998; Houle, Sagarin, & Kaplan, 2005).

Preferences for charity and direct service were associated with internal aspects of the respondent: intrinsic motives for a career and the degree to which service is a part of one's identity. These correlates highlight the importance of intrapersonal development and personal growth to educational goals for students most interested in personal, one-on-one forms of direct service. This group constituted the largest subgroup in this sample as well as in Moely and Miron's (2005) sample. Attention to personal growth and values as a dimension of service-learning course design may challenge faculty to extend learning outcomes beyond academic and course content. This finding, along with input from service-learning students, resulted in adding personal values to our definition for service-learning:

> Service learning is a 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 personal values and civic responsibility. (cf. Bringle & Hatcher, 1995, p. 222)

This slight modification has been important in our work with faculty as we challenge them to acknowledge that both personal values and civic responsibility can be cultivated through service-learning courses. Ash, Clayton, and Atkinson (2005) demonstrated that pedagogical tools can be developed for service-learning classes that can improve students' higher order reasoning abilities and critical thinking skills relative to personal growth as well as academic growth and civic growth, and, and as a result, can improve the overall quality of their learning in a service-learning course. Furthermore, intrinsic motivation will be enhanced when students have the relevant skills to succeed and a sense of satisfaction about reaching intended goals (see Bringle, 2005).

Preference for social change, like charity, was associated with identity and also a long-term commitment to service and extrinsic motivations for a career. Service-learning students can benefit from relating service experiences to their personal and career goals through appropriate reflection activities tailored to the course content. Challenging students to see how their service relates to their career aspirations and identifying relevant professionals who have used their disciplinary expertise to work with community partners to address community needs can help students link community service to broader domains of career and long-term commitments. In this way, service-learning can contribute to developing civic-minded graduates and civic-minded professionals (Peters, 2004; Sullivan, 2005) who see themselves as social trustees of knowledge with a responsibility to work with others, both professionals and citizens, to address community needs.

Preference for One Type of Service. The results of the current research did not offer very convincing evidence for Morton's (1995) contention that students have a preference for only one paradigm. This conclusion on the second research question is qualified by acknowledging that the evidence from the current research was dependent upon a particular approach to measuring interest in the types of service and the criterion that was used to evaluate preferences. Thus, a different approach to measuring interests and a different criterion for evaluating preferences might support a different conclusion. Nevertheless, the procedure used in the current research (ratings) is a reasonable extension of prior measurement methods (forced choice, rankings), and had acceptable psychometric characteristics (i.e., reliability, validity, factor structure). Furthermore, asking for degree of preference overcomes the shortcoming of ranks and forced choice approaches because ratings allow respondents to express opinions about the degree to which they have preferences for each of the three types of service. These preferences were found to be positively correlated, whereas Morton's hypothesis would lead to the expectation that they would be uncorrelated or negatively correlated.

Furthermore, only a minority of respondents expressed preferences that were aligned with the expectation that they would favor one type of service and not favor the other two types. The modal response pattern was for respondents who had a preference for all three types (33% based on median split), followed by a preference for only one (30%). Some of Morton's (1995) recommendations for the design and implementation of service-learning were based on the assumption that students have a preferred way of being involved in the community and that educators should respect that preference and accommodate to them when, for example, selecting

service sites. Furthermore, research (Clary, et al., 1994; Clary et al., 1998; Houle et al., 2005) has found that satisfaction and persistence are greater when service activities match the volunteer's motive. This suggests, then, that there are potential costs associated with mismatches and students would benefit the most when care is taken by educators who design service-learning classes in matching site and volunteer. However, the current findings suggest that students' preferences were not as polarized and were less distinct than characterized by Morton. Therefore, the risks for inappropriate matches in service-learning classes are likely to be lower than suggested by Morton. Furthermore, the current findings imply that educators should design experiences that deepen the integrity of all three types of service, rather than categorizing students as favoring a particular type of service and deepening the integrity of only that approach, a point with which Morton concurs (Morton, personal communication, January, 27, 2006).

There were also a significant number of respondents who had low interest in all three types of service. Educators have often concentrated on designing programs for students who already have an interest for community involvement. Much more systematic work needs to be focused on how to design successful service-learning experiences for unmotivated students who are enrolled in service-learning classes. Bringle (2005) has detailed how Self-Determination Theory can be used as a guide for designing service-learning experiences to maximize the likelihood that students with low motivation for community service have rewarding experiences that develop, rather than undermine, intrinsic motivation. In particular, designing experiences that possess relatedness, competency, and autonomy will move unmotivated students toward intrinsic motivation.

Integrity

The measure of integrity resulted in mixed findings. According to this research based on this initial set of items, the construct was not unidimensional, but consisted of at least two dimensions (i.e., Identity, Long-term Commitment). Furthermore, the three survey items that did not load on these two factors, although they were not included in these analyses, could still be considered as aspects of integrity. The exploratory analyses of predictors of the two dimensions offer some evidence of the differentiation of these two dimensions, with different predictors being identified in the multiple regression analyses for the two components. These two aspects of integrity are tentatively offered as a research tool, acknowledging that there are aspects of Morton's (1995) discussion of the construct that were not included in the current research (defining problems and solutions, vision of transformed world) and that the psychometric properties can be improved. This research used an approach that may or may not be the best method for measuring integrity. The measures are self-report measures and other approaches (e.g., behavioral indicators, Morton, personal communication, January, 27, 2006) might be preferable. Morton's discussion about the nature of integrity and its implications for educational practice fits well with work by Sullivan (2005) and Astin and Astin (1996), and there should be additional attention directed at alternative measures for the construct and accumulating evidence on different measurement approaches.

Integrity and Preferences. Consistent with Morton's prediction, preference for the types of service did become blurred as integrity increased. Those respondents with a preference for all three types of service and those with a preference for two types of service scored higher on both dimensions of integrity than did those with a preference for a single type of service. This effect was not the result of prior experience with volunteering or with interest in volunteering because partialling out the composite variable of prior experience and interest had little consequence when the ordinal variable of preference in zero, one, two, or three types of service was correlated with Identity, $r(175) = .46$; partial correlation = .41; and with Long-Term Commitment, $r(175) = .37$; partial correlation = .32. In contrast to the general thesis that educators should develop the integrity of only one type of service for those students with a single preference, this provides further evidence for the recommendation that the development of integrity might be aided by involving students in all three approaches to community service through curricular and co-curricular programs. Morton concurs, by noting,

> I agree that the original paper probably overstates its case. My thinking is now that the challenge is providing more opportunities for "deepening" across enough variety that students can, as you suggest, find an experience that tracks with their cognitive or affective map. So the goal is not an opportunity for a service "match," but an opportunity for greater depth. Thus, the reflection process is perhaps more important than the activity itself. (personal communication, January, 27, 2006)

References

Anheier, H. K. (2005). *Nonprofit organizations: Theory, management, policy*. Routledge: New York.

Ash, S. L., Clayton, R. H., & Atkinson, M. (2005). Integrating reflection and assessment to capture and improve student learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *11*(2), 45-59.

Astin, H., & Astin, A. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development.* Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-Efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, *84*, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-Efficacy: *The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman.

Bringle, R. G. (2005). Designing interventions to promote civic engagement. In A. Omoto (Eds.), *Processes of community change and social action* (pp. 167-187). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1995). A service-learning curriculum for faculty. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *2*, 112-22.

Bringle, R. G., Magjuka, R. J., Hatcher, J. A., MacIntosh, R., & Jones, S. G. (2006). *Motives for service among entering college students: Implications for business education.* Manuscript under review.

Burlingame, D. F. (Ed.) (2005). *Philanthropy in America: Vols. 1 and 2*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

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

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Miene, P. K., & Haugen, J. A. (1994). Matching messages to motives in persuasion: A functional approach to promoting volunteerism. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *24*, 1129-1149.

Clotfelter, C. T. & Ehrlich, T. (Eds.) (1999). *Philanthropy and the nonprofit sector in a changing America*. Indiana University Press: Bloomington, IN.

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

Daloz, L. A., Keen, C. H., Keen, J. P., & Daloz Parks, S. (1996). *Common fire: Lives of commitment in a complex world*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Delve, C.I., Mintz, S. D., & Stewart, G. M. (1990). Promoting values development through community service: A design. In C. I. Delve, S. D. Mintz, & G. M. Stewart (Eds.). *Community service as values education No. 5*0 (pp. 7-29). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Elden, M., & Chisholm, R. (1993). Emerging varieties of action research: Introduction to the special issue, *Human Relations*, *46*(2), 121-142.

Ferrari, J.R. (2004). Australian healthcare providers: Comparing volunteers and temporary staff in work environment, interpersonal relationships, and self-efficacy. *Evaluation and the Health Professions*, *26*, 383-397.

Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In *The interpretation of cultures* (pp. 3-32). New York: Basic Books.

Gottlieb, K., & Robinson, G. (Eds.) (2002). *A practical guide for integrating civic responsibility into the curriculum*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Hammack, D.C. (Ed.) (1998). *Making of the nonprofit sector in the United States.* Bloomington, IN.: Indiana University Press.

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

Illich, I. (1968, 1990). To hell with good intentions. In J. Kendall (Ed.), *Combining service and learning: Vol. 1* (pp. 314-320). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Lackey, A. S., Burke, R., & Peterson, M. (1987). Healthy communities: The goal of community development. *Journal of Community Development Society*, *18*(20), 1-17.

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* (pp. 61-78). Greenwich, CN: 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.

Perry, J. L., & Jones, S. G. (2006). *Quick hit for educating citizens: Successful strategies by award-winning teachers*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Powell, W. (Ed.) (1987). *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Reeb, R. N., Katsuyama, R. M., Sammon, J. A., & Yoder, D. S. (1998). The Community Service Self-Efficacy Scale: Evidence of reliability, construct validity, and pragmatic utility. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *5*, 48-57.

Reeb, R. N. (2006). Community Service Self-Efficacy Scale: Further evidence of reliability and validity. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, *32*, 97-113.

Peters, S. J. (2004). Educating the civic professional: Reconfigurations and resistances. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Fall, 47-58

Sullivan, W. M. (2005). *Work and integrity: The crisis and promise of professionalism in America* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Authors

ROBERT G. BRINGLE is Chancellor's Professor of Psychology and Philanthropic Studies, and Director, Center for Service and Learning at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis.

His books include *With Service in Mind, Colleges and Universities as Citizens* and *The Measure of Service Learning*. Dr. Bringle received the Ehrlich Award for Service Learning and an honorary doctorate from the University of the Free State, South Africa for his scholarly work on civic engagement and service learning.

JULIE A. HATCHER is Associate Director, Center for Service and Learning at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, an instructor in the School of Liberal Arts, and a doctoral student in Philanthropic Studies. Her scholarly work has focused on the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education, the use of reflection activities in service-learning courses, the implications of John Dewey's philosophy for undergraduate education, guidebooks and resources for faculty, and institutional issues associated with enhancing and assessing civic engagement.

RACHEL E. McINTOSH completed a BA in Political Science (with Distinction) with a minor in International Relationships at IUPUI. She studied in Russia and then completed an MA in Philanthropic Studies and an MPA in Public Affairs with a major in Nonprofit Management at IUPUI. She received the Governor's Award for Tomorrow's Leaders for "excellence in personal achievement as an emerging Indiana leader." After graduation, she has worked in the nonprofit sector with a focus on community development.