

Spring 2024

Service-Learning and Student Success: Are Underrepresented Students Gaining the Same Benefits?

Sondra Bellard

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd>



Part of the [Community Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bellard, Sondra, "Service-Learning and Student Success: Are Underrepresented Students Gaining the Same Benefits?" (2024). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 2786.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/2786>

This thesis (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by the Jack N. Averitt College of Graduate Studies at Georgia Southern Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Georgia Southern Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Spring 2024

Service-Learning and Student Success: Are Underrepresented Students Gaining the Same Benefits?

Sondra Bellard

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd>



Part of the [Community Psychology Commons](#)

This thesis (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by the Jack N. Averitt College of Graduate Studies at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

SERVICE-LEARNING AND STUDENT SUCCESS: ARE UNDERREPRESENTED
STUDENTS GAINING THE SAME BENEFITS?

by

SONDRA F. BELLARD

(Under the Direction of Rebecca Ryan)

ABSTRACT

Service-learning (SL) has increasingly been used as an educational tool based on the theory of experiential learning, which states that knowledge is developed through experience (Kohl, 1984). SL provides students with the opportunity to connect course work to the community leading to a better understanding of the content. Previous research has shown that SL is associated with positive academic, social, and civic outcomes. However, many of the previous studies fail to provide demographic information on the participants, specifically their ethnicities. There has also been a lack of quantitative studies that examine how first-generation students perceive SL and its benefits. The current study explored the extent to which students benefited from SL and if students who are a part of underrepresented populations, ethnic minority and first-generation, gained the same benefits that previous research has shown. This study used the Benefits of Academic Community Engagement (BACE) scale to determine the extent to which students' personal development and social responsibility were positively connected to SL. Results showed that the students in the ethnic minority scored higher than those in the ethnic majority on personal development, social responsibility, and overall. These findings suggest that ethnic minorities found their SL experience to be even more beneficial than those in the ethnic majority. On the other hand, there were no statistically significant differences on personal

development, social responsibility, or overall, based on family education level as first-generation and continuing-generation students did not differ. These findings extend previous research about SL and underrepresented populations and show that SL is just as, if not more, beneficial to underrepresented populations.

INDEX WORDS: Service-learning, Underrepresented, Personal development, Social responsibility, First-generation, Minority

SERVICE-LEARNING AND STUDENT SUCCESS: ARE UNDERREPRESENTED
STUDENTS GAINING THE SAME BENEFITS?

by

SONDRA F. BELLARD

B.S., University of Central Missouri, 2022

M.S., Georgia Southern University, 2024

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Georgia Southern University in

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF PSYCHOLOGY

© 2024

SONDRA F. BELLARD

All Rights Reserved

SERVICE-LEARNING AND STUDENT SUCCESS: ARE UNDERREPRESENTED
STUDENTS GAINING THE SAME BENEFITS?

by

SONDRA F. BELLARD

Major Professor: Rebecca Ryan
Committee: Lindsey Stone
Nicolette Rickert

Electronic Version Approved:
May 2024

DEDICATION

To my mother, Sandra Bellard, who always put family and my education first. To my great grandmother, Marie Bellard, who taught me the importance of kindness and learning. To my late aunt, Linda Bellard, whose light keeps me moving forward.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you to my thesis chair Dr. Rebecca Ryan for guiding me and helping me develop in more ways than one. I felt like I had someone in my corner cheering me on through all of my academic and professional adventures. Thank you to my thesis committee, Dr. Lindsey Stone and Dr. Nicolette Rickert for supporting and encouraging me throughout my time in this program. Thank you to Dr. Sally Brown for mentoring me, trusting me, and expanding my knowledge to unbelievable lengths. Lastly, thank you to the Georgia Southern University Office of Leadership and Community Engagement for allowing me to use the archival data analyzed in this study. To my family and friends, thank you for rooting for me throughout this journey. There were many ups and downs, but your love and belief in my abilities kept me inspired.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	3
LIST OF TABLES	6
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	7
Purpose of the Study.....	7
SL Outcomes	8
Generalization.....	9
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	12
Scales and Measures.....	12
Service-Learning Involvement	13
Personal Development Outcomes.....	15
Social Responsibility Outcomes.....	17
Underrepresented Students	20
The Current Study	24
3 METHOD	27
Participants.....	27
Measures	28
Procedure	29

4 RESULTS	31
5 DISCUSSION	33
Ethnic Majority and Minorities	34
First-Generation and Continuing-Generation.....	36
Implications	37
Limitations and Future Directions	40
6 CONCLUSIONS.....	43
REFERENCES.....	45
APPENDIX A.....	49

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Race/Ethnicity of Students Enrolled at Public Southeastern University- Fall 22'	49
Table 2: Faculty Race/Ethnicity and Positions at Public Southeastern University- Fall 22'	50
Table 3: Demographic Characteristics of Participants.....	51
Table 4: BACE Scores and Ranges.....	51

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

Service-learning has a myriad of benefits for students including increased personal development, social responsibility, interpersonal skills, tolerance, learning, and appreciation of learning (Eyler et al., 2001). Service-learning (SL) is defined as students participating in an organized service activity that meets community needs and then reflecting on the service activity for further understanding of course content for course credit (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995). Students who participate in SL courses are often tasked with identifying problems in the local community such as social justice issues, research projects, or service needs. For example, in Fleck and colleagues' (2017) study students met with a representative from The Boys and Girls Club and completed their research project by offering suggestions to help administration better understand youth attendance patterns. Other examples of SL activities would be an English professor having students write and share children's books or computer science students helping older adults with technology at a local library.

Service-learning as a learning tool is based on Kohl's (1984) Experiential Learning Theory. What this theory suggests is that knowledge is created through the transformation of experience. The four stages that are highlighted in the learning cycle include concrete experience (feeling), reflective observation (watching), abstract conceptualization (thinking), and active experimentation (doing). The goal of using experiential learning techniques like SL is to ensure that students can apply classroom concepts and skills, produce a tangible product that can be used by an organization, and work with and learn from a community organization (Kenworthy-U'Ren, 2000). The American Psychological Association (APA) has stated their own goals for

SL. Those goals include academic learning, civic learning, personal development, community building, and career development.

SL Outcomes

Previous research has shown that SL is associated with increases in self-confidence, engagement in school, and academic performance (Conway et al., 2009). Hébert and Hauf (2015) conducted a study using test-retest methodology to measure academic development in three ways: course grades, an assignment directly testing course-specific comprehension, and self-reported improvement. They found that students who participated in SL self-reported greater improvement in civic responsibility, interpersonal skills, and academic development.

Bowman et al. (2010) conducted a longitudinal study where they gave first-year students the College Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman survey in the fall of 1990. They were then asked to complete a follow up survey during their senior year, the CIRP College Senior Survey in the spring of 1994, and a survey 13 years later called the Alumni Survey in 2007. The findings showed that taking a SL course was positively associated with adult volunteering and that time spent volunteering and taking at least one SL course was positively related to well-being 13 years after graduation. In a four-year longitudinal study, Astin et al. (2000) asserted that SL added significantly to the benefits associated with community service on four outcome measures: academic performance (GPA, writing skills, critical thinking skills), values (commitment to activism and to promoting racial understanding), choice of a service career, and plans to participate in service after college, but not on interpersonal skills, self-efficacy, or leadership. They also suggested that a student's degree of interest in the subject matter is the most important factor associated with a positive service-learning experience.

Generalization

However, previous research is limited in addressing if these results are generalizable to underrepresented college students. Previous studies often fail at providing demographic information on their participants. This has led to an ongoing problem for researchers attempting to further understand the interaction between the proposed benefits of SL and student identity. To fill this gap, Langhout and Gordon (2021) conducted a study where the majority of the participants were underrepresented college students. They defined underrepresented students as, “students who are members of a social group that are present in academia at a reduced rate, disproportionate to their presence in the U.S. population, primarily as a result of historic disparities in opportunities and resources” (Langhout & Gordon, 2021, p. 409). They considered a process model by looking into SL and civic engagement literature that addressed SL and student success at a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI).

Out of 250 participants, most identified as underrepresented with 41.6% identifying as Latinx ($n = 104$) and 24% identifying as Asian ($n = 60$). Using responses from the Schreiner’s Thriving Quotient (2010), which is used to assess academic, social, and psychological factors, they found positive outcomes resulting from SL when the SL activity was linked with classrooms that engaged students in the work of developing their social insights, which was connected to academics, personal insights, and civic responsibility. This means that students who can connect their own community into service-learning activities show the positive outcomes that are associated with SL.

Because research done on SL often does not mention ethnicity or cultural backgrounds, it is hard to say what role SL opportunities generally play in student development for underrepresented students. Given that students of color often experience hybrid identities due to

their contrasting home and academia cultures (Carrillo, 2013; 2016), it is possible that universities measure success differently from how underrepresented students conceptualize success (Langhout & Gordon, 2021). There is a belief that universities highlight neoliberal notions of success and individuality whereas underrepresented students, like those who are first-generation students, are more likely to come from cultural backgrounds where interdependence and mutuality are of most importance. If this is the case, it is important for universities to take into account what those differences in perspectives are and properly apply the information during course creation and content planning as previous research has shown that underrepresented, both racial minority (Latino) and first-generation, students performed better on cognitive assessments when their cultural identities were affirmed by faculty (Engle & Tinto, 2008). This suggests that being culturally aware and presenting students with opportunities to connect their identities back to course content results in positive outcomes.

The issue of lack of diversity in SL implementation and research was also noted by Green (2003), who wrote that SL is being implemented mostly by White faculty with mostly White students at predominantly White institutions to serve mostly poor individuals and mostly people of color. This is true for many universities in the US as the majority are predominantly White institutions (PWI). The concern presented by Green (2003) is that the current implementation of SL could lead to misunderstandings regarding the reasons why students are aiding the community and to students of color feeling alienated or out of place. It could also lead to misunderstandings of only a certain demographic needing aid or assistance and ignorance of the role that systemic injustices play in the lack of resources for underrepresented communities. The current study aims to assess student perceptions of their SL experiences and if students of

different ethnicities and varying levels of family education found SL beneficial based on the variables of social responsibility and personal development.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The benefits of service-learning have been shown in a number of previous studies ranging from kindergarten to post-undergraduate and those benefits have often been categorized into two separate categories of personal development and social responsibility. For the current study, personal development is defined as improvements in self-efficacy and other skills related to student success such as problem-solving, communication, and decision making (Miller et al., 2018). These personal development benefits can be examined in increases in empathy, personal values, leadership skills, and overall perceived personal growth (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995; Celio et al., 2011). Social responsibility is often used interchangeably with phrases like civic responsibility, which can be defined as the belief that it is one's duty as a citizen to engage in the community and help implement and encourage improvements. SL outcomes commonly associated with social responsibility are increases in civic knowledge, identifying social justice issues, and adult volunteering (Astin et al., 2000; Bowman et al, 2010; Eyler et al., 2001).

Scales and Measures

The goal of previous studies has been to further delve into each benefit individually and as components of service-learning as a pedagogical tool. While results for benefits like positive attitude and increased interpersonal skills have been consistent across studies regarding SL, there are still inconsistencies on what some of the perceived benefits are. There is not one scale that is universally agreed upon and used that measures SL benefits, which is one reason why these inconsistencies in results exist. In an attempt to clarify previous mixed results, researchers have developed their own scales and measures intended to assess the impact and perceived benefits of SL.

For example, Olney and Grande (1995) designed the Scale of Service-Learning Involvement (SSLI). The scale is used to measure the development of students' sense of social responsibility through the categories of explanation/clarification, realization, and activation/internalization. Reeb et al. (1998) developed the Community Service Self-Efficacy Scale which measures individuals' confidence in their ability to make significant contributions to the community through service. The Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire, introduced by Moely et al. (2002), measures attitudes, skills, and behavioral intentions that may be affected by SL participation as well as skills useful in civic endeavors, values related to civic engagement, and involvement in community issues.

In the current study, the Benefits of Academic Community Engagement (BACE) scale (Miller et al., 2018) was used to examine students' perceived benefits of their service-learning experiences by analyzing the score related to personal development and social responsibility. This measure was selected by the researchers who provided us with the archival data we will use for the current study. This will further be described in the upcoming methods sections.

Service-Learning Involvement

Although there are many measures and scales that assess the perceived benefits of SL, not all of the previous literature on SL and its impact uses a SL scale. In some cases, researchers have found it best to define SL and compare its impact from those who have participated in SL to those who have not. In these cases, researchers are often looking to answer questions beyond only personal development and social responsibility and are hoping to expand and highlight research on other cognitive and social outcomes.

To determine effects on students' academic performance, Conway et al. (2009) utilized a repeated measures design to measure academic development in three ways: course grades, an

assignment that directly tested course-specific comprehension, and self-reported improvement. They also measured improvements in civic responsibility, interpersonal skills, and practical skills via self-report. Data was collected over the span of two years with students who had previously taken a SL course and those who had not, even if they did not participate in all components of the study. Seventy-eight studies were included in the meta-analysis based on the criteria of having a pretest-posttest design and qualitative measures, participation in community service between pre and posttest, enough information to classify the measure used, and reporting of pretest and posttest SD and sample size (Conway et al., 2009). They found that students who participated in SL did not show improved academic performance compared to those who had not done SL, but SL participants did show an increased understanding of the content overall and reported greater improvements in academic development, civic responsibility, and interpersonal skills. The SL participants only demonstrated more academic development in terms of concrete course concepts, but no difference in final examination marks or generation of detailed experiences. These results differ from what other researchers such as Astin et al. (2000) have previously demonstrated.

Astin et al. (2000) conducted a study with the goal of exploring the comparative effects of SL and community service on the cognitive and affective development of college undergraduates. Longitudinal data collected from 22,236 freshman undergraduates from 3 different universities was assessed by the impact of SL and community service on 11 dependent measures: academic outcomes (3), values (2), self-efficacy, leadership (3), career plans, and plans to participate in further service after college. Individual and group interviews with faculty and students and classroom observations were conducted at each university. Standardized test scores were also examined only for those whose SAT or ACT scores were available during

freshman year. It was determined that service as part of a SL course adds significantly to the benefits associated with community service on seven outcomes: academic performance (GPA, writing skills, critical thinking skill), values (commitment to activism and promoting racial understanding), choice of service career and plans to participate in service after college, but not on interpersonal skills, self-efficacy, and leadership. By assessing both qualitative and quantitative data, Astin et al. (2000) determined that the two most important factors associated with a positive service-learning experiences were students' degree of interest in the subject matter and whether the professor encouraged class discussion.

Personal Development Outcomes

The following studies demonstrate community service volunteering increases self-efficacy as a product of personal development. Service-learning has been gaining more attention as a teaching method over the decades, but for Celio et al. (2011) it was still unclear what student outcomes are associated with SL programs and what factors are related to more effective programs. The researchers conducted a meta-analysis of 62 studies including 11,837 students and found that students showed significant gains in five outcome areas: attitudes toward self, attitudes toward school and learning, civic engagement, social skills, and academic performance. More specifically, students showed enhanced self-efficacy and self-esteem, more positive attitudes toward school and education, an increase in positive attitudes and behaviors related to community involvement, and gains in social skills relating to leadership and empathy.

Previous research has consistently shown mixed results in personal, social, and citizenship outcomes. To combat this, Conway et al. (2009) also conducted a meta-analysis with the goal of summarizing evidence of the types of change in participants, specific program elements that affect change, and the generalizability of results across educational levels. The

researchers conducted a meta-analysis on 78 separate sources that met the following criteria: pretest-posttest design and qualitative measures, participation in community service between pre and posttest, enough information to classify the measure used, and reporting of pretest and posttest SD and sample size. They found that SL was associated with positive changes in academic, personal, social, and citizenship outcomes. The largest changes came from academic outcomes and for beliefs, knowledge, or attitudes toward those being served.

Participating in service-learning can link students with their communities. Billig (2002) stated that service-learning was more likely to be adopted when instructors had a clear understanding of what SL is and its practices, when SL was within the context of youth development, and when service-learning was linked with strongly held local values. Furthering the idea of the link to community resulting in positive outcomes, Billing (2002) also explained that students in a social justice course who worked in a soup kitchen were more engaged in political-moral issues and showed higher levels of civic knowledge and cognitive complexity when discussing social issues compared to prior to the experience.

Fleck and colleagues (2017) suggested that an enhanced sense of civic responsibility and a link between class and community can be created through SL. The reasoning behind this is that SL exposes students to groups and social issues that they might not experience otherwise. In this experiment, two sections of a course were taught traditionally, and two sections were taught using the SL paradigm. The question they set to answer was how learning outcomes compared to students taking a traditional course and the SL course. Both groups were given the Community Self-Efficacy scale and a content knowledge test at the beginning and end of the course. Results revealed that students viewed SL as beneficial and helpful for their comprehension of the

material. These findings suggest that SL was a useful paradigm that developed meaningful connections between students, faculty, and the community.

Social Responsibility Outcomes

Developing a positive civic attitude is one personal and societal benefit linked to SL. Previous research suggests that SL outcomes are also dependent on students' attitude toward the activity (Yeh, 2010). Eyler (2002) stated that many of the outcomes associated with reflective SL such as personal and social commitment have been linked to increased community engagement over time. One of the processes that Eyler (2002) insists on students or teachers taking on before starting a SL project is taking time to explore assumptions about the community, the issues that are being addressed and to identify gaps in understanding. Mitchell et al. (2012) states that SL courses are often enrolled by Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich and Democratic (WEIRD; Henrich et al., 2010) populations who often are not juggling jobs, debt, and family responsibilities. Because of this, Butin (2006) argues that "there is a distinct possibility that SL may ultimately come to be viewed as the "Whitest of the White" enclave of postsecondary education... a luxury available only to the privileged few" (p.482). Mitchell et al. (2012) stated that there are more minorities being enrolled in postsecondary education, so as the enrollment demographics change, educators should examine how SL is being implemented by paying attention to bias, expectations, and traditions. If instructors are not careful, SL can become a part of what is referred to as a pedagogy of Whiteness, or strategies of instruction that consciously or unconsciously reinforce norms and privileges developed by, and for the benefit of, White people in the United States. Mitchell et al. (2012) gives two important tips on how to prevent misunderstandings or misleading ideas.

One of the ways mentioned to avoid misunderstandings is by not using language that could conflict with the overall goal of the project. Using words like “underprivileged” and “at risk” for example, can reinforce stereotypes based in White supremacy along with defining White, middle-class students as automatically capable of serving. Mitchell et al. (2012) discussed statements like “I don’t see color” or “people are the same” being exclusively a privilege of Whiteness. Statements that follow a color-blind ideology stigmatizes attempts to have genuine and productive discussions regarding the community. Phrases like “urban youth” and “inner city schools” are often used as code to talk about race without saying a race. Because of this, discussions can quickly divert from issues based on race to issues of socioeconomics which is a more comfortable topic than race for some White students and faculty. Michell et al. (2012) also states that framing social problems is important as well. When problems are framed as the result of individual circumstances such as drug addiction, rather than political and social processes like immigration policies, it denies students the opportunity to realize that discrimination is not the result of past mistakes but, instead, a result of intentional processes that are ongoing. Accordingly, Langhout and Gordon (2021) posit service-learning as a borderland pedagogy.

Langhout and Gordon (2021) argued that resources for underrepresented students should not be limited to resource centers and co-curricular opportunities. Instead, culturally inclusive structures should be included in the academic curriculum because classes are the central resource for students. They argue that all students should have access to credit-bearing curricula that allows them to “explore differences, confront assumptions, engage in deep inquiry to address broad social problems that affect all, and gain tools to collectively confront oppressive systems,” (Langhout & Gordon, 2021, p.409) which can be understood as a border pedagogy. Border pedagogy is defined as a “pedagogy that presupposes an acknowledgment of the shifting borders

that both undermine and reterritorialise different configurations of culture power and knowledge” (Giroux, 1991, p.510; Langhout & Gordon, 2021).

One way that this can be achieved is through community engagement through SL because it necessitates students to participate in border crossing. A border in this case refers to the distinction between “us” and “them,” so border crossing refers to the act of participating on both sides of the coin. The goal is for students to become more aware of how power relationships are produced in families, communities, and on campus. Langhout and Gordon (2021), state that for a lot of underrepresented students, this is already a constant reality that requires them to straddle the artificial social divide. SL gives underrepresented students a chance to strengthen social justice practices and effectively flow between home and academic cultures. By considering their own intersectionalities, students can better understand how power is distributed locally and globally (Langhout & Gordon, 2021).

Since Langhout and Gordon (2021) showed positive outcomes when related back to social insight, there is a concern that the cultures of the students are not taken into consideration when selecting SL activities since, as Henrich and colleagues (2010) have noted, the activities that are often suggested are backed by research done on predominantly WEIRD populations. Langhout et al. (2021) found that a model which considered how students talk about their success, border crossing and border pedagogy, and civic engagement with youth of color was found to be the best fit for underrepresented students at an HSI. The researchers suggest that classrooms should facilitate social insights because a classroom that helps students achieve social insights may be more academically engaging and yield more personal insights for underrepresented students. Being able to connect and identify with the issues at hand lessens the fissure between university cultural community and home culture community (Langhout &

Gordon, 2021).

Underrepresented Students

There are very few resources on SL and its impact on underrepresented students. Colvin and Tobler (2013) utilized the same concept of border pedagogy in their study describing changes made to a higher education Latino public speaking course. There were 18 participants in this study, all Latino/a with the exception of one Native American and one Spanish speaking Caucasian. For the service-learning aspect of their public speaking course, students were tasked with delivering motivational speeches to classes K-9 with a high population of Latino youth. Students also acted as mentors to Latino youth for a semester. After conducting interviews, Colvin and Tobler (2013) found that students felt that they could learn the material and connect it to their community through SL. There were three points that stood out in these results. First, students appreciated including cultural elements, such as speaking Spanish, and felt that the course gave them the opportunity to connect speech topics with cultural issues (Colvin & Tobler, 2013). Next, they noted that students felt connected to the students they were mentoring because of shared ethnicity and experiences. Lastly, participants felt that they learned a lot about themselves, the students they mentored and their community. This study demonstrated the effectiveness of utilizing culturally relevant pedagogy in higher education classrooms (Colvin & Tobler, 2013).

Shaddock-Hernandez (2006) also called into question the traditional border-crossing models wherein White middle-class students cross the 'border' to interact with unfamiliar communities and reflect on their experiences. In this qualitative study, a small group of immigrant and refugee students participated in a service-learning course in which they mentored youth from familiar or similar ethno-cultural contexts. Findings showed that students developed

critical perspectives on challenging the status quo, confirming and affirming their identities, empowering themselves and their communities, and recognizing their artistic potential for social change (Shaddock-Hernandez, 2006). From these results, Shaddock-Hernandez (2006) argued that while minority students do benefit from interacting with diverse communities, a stronger model would allow minority students to interact among themselves “to develop identity, to revitalize cultural values, and to maintain a buffer when encountering possibly culturally insensitive students” (p. 82).

Einfeld and Collins (2008) recruited 9 participants, 7 who were White, who had completed 300 service hours to discuss their perceived changes in civic engagement over the volunteering period which did vary in length. According to the self-reports, all participants increased their awareness of social inequality, but this did not automatically cause participants to feel responsible for promoting social justice and equality. Einfeld and Collins (2008) found that understanding of civic engagement was influenced by high multicultural competence and commitment to social justice and that participants who had previously experienced inequality generally had a better understanding of how inequality impacts individuals on a day-to-day basis than those who had not. Ultimately, this study showed that individuals have varying definitions of civic engagement because of their differing attitudes, backgrounds, and goals. Einfeld and Collins (2008) stated that “lack of commitment to pursue systemic social change by the participants in this study is evidence that being exposed to situations of inequality and serving underprivileged populations does not automatically foster a commitment to social justice” (p. 106).

Other than ethnic minorities, another group that has been highly underrepresented in literature regarding the effectiveness of SL is first-generation students. First-generation students

are seen to be less prepared, less supported by family, and less engaged in their studies (Taylor et al., 2019), yet there are very few quantitative studies that have addressed first-generation students' experiences with SL and its proposed benefits. The studies that do examine first-generation students treat students as monolithic and reduce learning to an input environment output (IEO) model that often disregards sociocultural diversity and the extent to which learning involves students' identities (Taylor et al., 2019).

Yeh (2010) explored how low-income, first-generation (LIFG) students experience SL and the impact it might have on persistence to graduate or continue studying. Before moving forward, it is important to note that low-income and racialized minority students, especially Black and Hispanic/Latino, are more likely to be first-generation (Taylor et al. 2019). Yeh (2010) states that because a large percentage of LIFG students are from racially diverse backgrounds, socioeconomic status and race are usually compounded making it harder to separate theories that apply to students of color vs low-income or first-generation students. According to Pelco et al. (2014), it is also worth mentioning that although a correlation between minority and low-income backgrounds and first-generation status exists, there are many first-generation students who are neither students of color nor low-income.

Yeh (2010) interviewed 6 students of color who were first-generation, lower-middle income background, and who worked for more than 30+ hours per week on their SL experiences. The questions focused primarily on the participants' educational background, feelings and thoughts about college, and the SL experience. All students reported that SL was a vital part of their college experience and it helped enhance their knowledge and learning in the classroom, enabled further development of academic skills, and linked them to new educational opportunities (Yeh, 2010). Students had a newfound value in their role in society and recognized

the importance of becoming more engaged citizens. According to Yeh (2010) students who found a connection between their personal values and their academics were more motivated to succeed and finish college which showed persistence.

In one of the few quantitative studies done on first-generation students, Pelco et al. (2014), examined the effects of service-learning on student growth. Participants for this study were 321 first-generation students and 782 non-first-generation or continuing-generation students. Pelco et al. (2014) hypothesized that much like previous studies, first-generation students would show improvement in academic skills and professional development similarly to continuing-generation students. They also hypothesized that there would be demographic differences in growth. They tested this hypothesis by having students fill out a survey consisting of questions about demographics, SL and their community engagement experiences, and the student growth instrument which consisted of five items that were scored on a 5-point Likert scale. Two items focused on skills essential to post-secondary academic success and the other three items focused on skills fundamental to professional development. Results of this study showed that all students perceived their SL classes positively and believed that SL promoted academic and professional growth. The results indicated that the response of first-generation students was mediated by gender. Regardless of generation, race, or financial status, females reported high levels of growth (Pelco et al., 2014). Non-first-generation males from minority and low-income backgrounds reported the least growth, while first-generation males from minority and low-income backgrounds reported the most growth. This shows that for males there was a generational difference. Pelco et al. (2014) suggests that these results are in contention that first-generation students believe that SL can facilitate personal and professional development.

The Current Study

The current study aimed to determine if students benefit from SL as assessed with the BACE, and if students who are a part of underrepresented populations gain the same benefits that previous research has shown. The current study examined students' perceptions of their SL experiences in relation to their personal development and social responsibility at a mid-level, public university in the southeastern United States where 58.5% of students enrolled and 81.5% of faculty/staff are White (see Table 1 and Table 2). We hypothesized that, as shown in some previous research, all students will benefit from their experience, but we expect to see that vary as a function of ethnicity and highest level of education attained in the family. This study will extend previous research on the benefits of SL and assess how service-learning experiences vary over different demographics. It is important to examine how different demographics experience SL because they may have a different point of view on what a positive experience is and what the outcomes are. For instance, Carillo (2013, 2016) found that ethnic minority students defined success as navigating and contesting oppressive institutional structures, excelling academically, and strengthening their social justice commitments and practice. This is different from how universities may define success which focuses on civic mindedness and engagement which typically involve things like voting and contacting public officials (Langhout & Gordon, 2021). In order for SL to be impactful for underrepresented students and not only represent the majority goal, faculty should consider the expectations and goals of all students during the conceptualization of SL activities and objectives.

Langhout and Gordon (2021) found significant evidence of a different framework of service-learning being more beneficial to Hispanic participants than the framework that is typically used. This suggests that cultural influences might play a role in the perceived benefits

that students gain from SL. Similarly, Einfeld and Collins (2008) concluded that individuals have varying definitions of civic engagement because of their differing attitudes, backgrounds, and goals. More specifically they found that participants who had previously experienced inequality, people of color and one woman, had a better understanding of civic engagement and how inequality impacts individuals. This leads to the hypothesis that ethnic minority students will display higher scores on the social responsibility subscale of the BACE as compared to the ethnic majority students, as the ethnic minority students are more likely to already have a more developed level of social responsibility prior to their SL experience.

We also expect ethnic minorities to score about the same on the personal development subscale of the BACE as non-ethnic minorities as there is little research to suggest otherwise. Pelco et al. (2014) stated that all students, including ethnic minorities, perceived their SL classes positively and believed that SL promoted academic and professional growth. Einfeld and Collins (2008) also reported that all participants, both ethnic minority and non-ethnic minority, increased their awareness of social inequality. Therefore, we expect both groups to score about the same on the personal development subscale.

Lastly, we hypothesize that first-generation students will score higher on both the personal development subscale and the social responsibility subscale, compared to continuing-generation students based on studies done by Yeh (2010) and Pelco et al. (2014). Yeh (2010) found low-income and first-generation (LIFG) students reported SL being an important factor in their college experience. It was noted that the students had a newfound value in their role in society and recognized the importance of becoming more engaged citizens, which in this case equates to a growth in social responsibility. Results of Pelco's et al. (2014) study showed that all students perceived their SL classes positively and believed that SL promoted academic and

professional growth, but the group that showed the most growth in these areas were first-generation, minority, and low-income males. This leads to the hypothesis that compared to continuing-generation students, first-generation students will score higher on the personal development subscale.

There are two independent variables with two levels each. The first variable is ethnicity with the categories being ethnic minority and ethnic majority and the second variable is student generation with the groups being first-generation and continuing-generation. The dependent variables are personal development and social responsibility from the BACE measure. Since previous studies involving underrepresented students suggest they may experience or perceive university expectations and content differently than the majority (Langhout & Gordon, 2021), finding out how underrepresented students receive SL and if it is different from the majority can aid in re-evaluating the effectiveness of current courses and the development of relevant course content and impactful opportunities within SL.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Participants

Participants were students enrolled in a service-learning course at a public university in the southeastern United States. The archival data available for the current study includes data collected between the fall of 2017 to the fall of 2019. Section C of the overall survey (see Appendix A) included demographics questions pertaining to gender, age, ethnicity, academic rank, employment, volunteering, and social status factors.

For the purpose of the current study, we focused on comparing students in underrepresented populations. Underrepresented is defined as “students who are members of a social group that are present in academia at a reduced rate, disproportionate to their presence in the U.S. population, primarily as a result of historic disparities in opportunities and resources” (Pyne & Means, 2013; Langhout and Gordon, 2021, p.409). Underrepresented includes any student who is first-generation, underrepresented minority, Pell eligible, or nontraditional. For the current study, we compared participants in an underrepresented minority and who are first-generation. Individuals were grouped based on self-reported demographic information.

Participants include those with no missing data in the subsequent analyses, which resulted in a total of 898 participants. Of those 898 participants, 84.5% (759) were female, 15.5% (138) were male and the mean age was 21.8 ($SD = 2.8$, range = 18 - 43). The participants, as categorized by the BACE, were 516 Caucasian/White, 304 African American, 21 Hispanic/Non-White, 12 Asian American, 26 mixed race, and 19 who identified as other. This sums to 57.5% (516) in the ethnic majority and 42.5% (382) in the ethnic minority. This is similar to the distribution found at the mid-level public university in the southeastern United States where the

data was collected, as the ethnic majority or White students make up 58.5% (14, 981) of the student population and the ethnic minority make up the other 41.5% (10, 558) (see Table 1). Ethnic majority refers to White students and the ethnic minority were the remaining participants. Many researchers cited in the current study either compared White to non-White participants (Colvin & Tobler, 2013; Pelco et al., 2014), or did not mention ethnicity at all (Olney & Grande, 1995; Hébert & Hauf, 2015). However, some studies did mention demographics in detail such as Langhout and Gordon (2021), Fleck et al., (2017), and Bowman et al. (2010) where they detailed the ethnic makeup of the participants in their respective studies for within group research.

Of our participants, 28.5% (256) were first-generation students compared to the 71.3% (640) continuing generation students (see Table 3). The public southeastern university offers demographic information on underrepresented students. Their definition of underrepresented includes students that are first-generation, minority, Pell eligible, or nontraditional, but they do not detail how many specifically represent first-generation students (Table 1). This makes it difficult to make a fair comparison on how many first-generation students are enrolled overall compared to how many participated in the current study. Additionally, there were 423 seniors, 235 juniors, 109 sophomores, 48 freshmen, and 69 others regarding year in school. Students were not compensated by the principal investigators for their participation in this study.

Measures

The Benefits of Academic Community Engagement (BACE) scale was designed to assess the extent to which students' personal development and social responsibility were positively impacted by SL. The BACE includes two subscales of personal development and social responsibility, and all questions were measured on a five-point Likert scale with one representing strongly disagree and five being strongly agree. The developers of the scale confirm that the

BACE measures the impact of community engagement on students and has both validity and reliability (Miller et al., 2018). Specifically, they note the subscale for personal development has a Cronbach's alpha of 0.91 and social responsibility has a Cronbach's alpha of 0.86. Please see Appendix A and note the personal development subscale is composed of items two through twelve and the social responsibility subscale is composed of items thirteen through eighteen in section A of the overall survey. The BACE has 17 total items with 6 items in the social responsibility subscale and 11 items in the personal development subscale. If a person answered 1 for every item their score would be 17, and if someone answered 5 for every item their score would be 85, so the range of possible scores is 17 to 85, and subsequently 11 to 55 for personal development and 6 to 30 for social responsibility. Table 4 displays the group and overall BACE scores for the current sample.

In addition to administering the BACE, the researchers also included two questions to evaluate students' perceptions pre-semester ("at the beginning of the semester, I was uneasy about the service-learning component of the course") and post-semester ("at the end of the semester, I thought that the service-learning aspect of this course was valuable"). In section B, intended social responsibility and perceived benefits to the community was measured with one item each on a scale of one to ten. These three questions were not analyzed in the current study, as they are not included in the BACE. Participants were also asked to then answer questions regarding their demographic characteristics.

Procedure

After obtaining approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB), the survey along with consent forms were emailed at the end of each semester to professors teaching undergraduate and graduate level courses that included service-learning. Professors printed and

distributed the survey and consent forms. Students were told that their participation was voluntary. Completed surveys were then returned to the researchers and the researchers' department that was responsible for data input via intra-campus mail. Researchers collected data at the end of the following semesters: fall 2017, spring 2018, fall 2018, spring 2019, and fall 2019.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

A MANOVA was used to compare the ethnic minority group to the ethnic majority group on the social responsibility subscale, the personal development subscale, and the overall BACE. A MANOVA analysis was chosen for this study because it reveals if levels of the dependent variables are statistically significantly different between the groups comprising the levels of the independent variable. In this case, a MANOVA reveals if there are statistically significant differences between the ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups on personal development, social responsibility, and the BACE overall. The results revealed statistically significant differences were found on BACE scores based on ethnicity (ethnic majority or ethnic minority), Wilk's $\lambda = .990$, $F(3, 894) = 3.03$, $p = .028$, $\eta_p^2 = .010$.

This analysis addressed the hypothesis that ethnic minority students would display higher scores on the social responsibility subscale compared to ethnic majority and that ethnic minorities would score about the same on the personal development subscale as the ethnic majority. There was a statistically significant difference in personal development, $F(1, 896) = 7.03$, $p = .008$, $\eta_p^2 = .008$. Ethnic minorities ($M = 45.34$, $SEM = .42$) scored higher on personal development compared to those in the ethnic majority ($M = 43.78$, $SEM = .4$). There was also a statistically significant effect of ethnicity on social responsibility, $F(1, 896) = 8.5$, $p = .004$, $\eta_p^2 = .009$. Ethnic minorities ($M = 25.88$, $SEM = .22$) also scored higher on the social responsibility variable compared to the ethnic majority ($M = 24.99$, $SEM = .21$). The results for the overall BACE also showed a significant difference, $F(1, 896) = 8.26$, $p = .004$, $\eta_p^2 = .009$. Scores were higher for those in the ethnic minority ($M = 71.33$, $SEM = .61$) compared to the ethnic majority ($M = 68.87$, $SEM = .58$).

A second one-way MANOVA was used to determine whether there was a difference between first-generation students and continuing generation students on social responsibility, personal development subscale, and the overall BACE. The findings revealed no statistically significant differences in BACE scores based on family education, Wilk's $\lambda = .996$, $F(3, 892) = 1.27$, $p = .284$, $\eta_p^2 = .004$.

This analysis addressed the hypothesis that first-generation students would score higher on both the personal development subscale and the social responsibility subscale, compared to continuing-generation students. The results were not statistically significant for family education on personal development scores, $F(1, 894) = 2.88$, $p = .090$, $\eta_p^2 = .003$. The first-generation students ($M = 45.22$, $SEM = .51$) did not statistically significantly differ from the continuing-generation students ($M = 44.12$, $SEM = .35$). There was also no effect of family education on social responsibility scores, $F(1, 894) = 1.46$, $p = .228$, $\eta_p^2 = .002$. Social responsibility scores were also not statistically significantly different for first-generation ($M = 25.65$, $SEM = .28$) and continuing-generation ($M = 25.25$, $SEM = .18$) students. The same was found for the overall BACE scores, $F(1, 894) = 2.09$, $p = .148$, $\eta_p^2 = .002$. The first-generation students ($M = 70.88$, $SEM = .76$) did not differ statistically significantly from the continuing-generation students ($M = 69.52$, $SEM = .51$). This revealed that both first-generation and continuing-generation students found their SL experiences equally as beneficial.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Service learning has been associated with a bevy of positive outcomes including increased personal development, social and civic responsibility, self-confidence, interpersonal skills, tolerance, learning, and adult volunteering (Astin et al., 2000; Bowman et al, 2010; Conway et al., 2009; Eyler et al., 2001). The current study sought to extend previous research done on these benefits to examine what group differences can be found on BACE scores as a function of ethnicity (majority or minority) and family education completed (first-generation or continuing-generation). It is important to understand how underrepresented students perceive SL and the outcomes associated with the experiences, because it may differ from how the majority or non-underrepresented students perceive SL and its benefits. Those potential differences are important to study because SL should be considered as a unique learning tool and resource for underrepresented students as well. The planned SL activity may not be as effective if it targets a different definition of success than how an underrepresented student would conceptualize success.

In the current study, personal development was defined as increases in, and skills related to self-efficacy (Miller et al., 2018). This was measured by BACE items that asked participants if taking the SL course helped them think critically, analyze problems, and enhance communication skills, which are all skills reported as perceived benefits of SL in previous research (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995; Celio et al., 2011). In addition, participants were also asked if the SL course helped define personal strengths, weaknesses, and type of work interested in as well as develop organizational skills. These questions were seemingly geared toward “real world” application and developing workplace skills.

Social responsibility, or the sense of responsibility in contributing to the community, was measured by items that specifically asked about participants' attitudes serving in the community. Some of these items asked participants if they felt that it was their responsibility and if they will continue to serve the community following the course. These questions explicitly ask about the participants' attitudes in involving themselves in the community through service and of their awareness of social issues after participating in SL.

Ethnic Majority and Minorities

We hypothesized that ethnic minorities would score higher on social responsibility and the same on personal development compared to those in the ethnic majority. This hypothesis was partially supported by our results as ethnic minority students did score higher on social responsibility. We also found they scored higher on personal development and overall. These results suggest that ethnic minorities found their SL experience to be even more beneficial than those in the ethnic majority.

We hypothesized that both ethnic minority and majority students would score about the same on the personal development subscale as previous research has shown all students found SL beneficial, despite race (Einfeld & Collins, 2008; Pelco et al., 2014). However, that was not the case in the current study. One possible explanation for ethnic minorities scoring higher than the majority is offered by Colvin and Tobler (2013) who found that minority students, specifically Latino students, found that they could learn the material and connect it back to their community through SL which is considered a feature of personal development. The participants in the current study were involved in a variety of service-learning projects, but most, if not all, were completed within their school or home communities. This gave students the opportunity to relate to community members, but especially students of color due to shared culture or ethnicity

and experiences. Making the connections between community and course can increase students' willingness to participate, susceptibility to the message or lesson at hand, and inspiration to use their education for social change, which are signs of personal development (Yeh, 2010).

Another possible explanation for why there were differences found within ethnicity lies in the BACE items. Of particular interest were the personal development items that leaned heavily into workplace preparedness. It has been demonstrated that people of color, Black in this case, are less likely to get a call-back from employers despite having all of the same qualifications as their White counterparts (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004). Given how competitive the workforce is and the noted discrimination within the hiring process, it is possible that students in the ethnic minority found it more imperative to develop these skills to have a fighting chance at their desired employment roles. Participants may have felt like they need to overcompensate in skill development to make up for characteristics employers might not see as desirable, like their ethnicity.

For social responsibility, we hypothesized that ethnic minority students would score higher than the majority, which was supported by our results. One explanation for these results is in line with previous research findings such as those found in Einfeld and Collins' (2008) study. They suggested that a person's attitude toward civic engagement, or their social responsibility, is impacted by their lived experiences. Their results showed that minority students may have greater levels of social responsibility or civic engagement than majority students due to having previously experienced inequality. It is discussed that since these underrepresented adults, people of color and women, know how impactful it can be to be discriminated against, there was a higher commitment to social justice which is a leading aspect of social responsibility.

Overall, the finding showed that ethnic minority students benefited more overall from their SL experiences possibly due to their ability to connect with the community and/or the emotional impact of experiencing inequalities themselves. Personally, experiencing discrimination and the brute of some systematically flawed processes allows a student to challenge their own social insights. This might have led to ethnic minority students feeling more empathetic toward those being served and subsequently feeling like it is their responsibility to help those who are still at a disadvantage in a variety of aspects.

First-Generation and Continuing-Generation

There were not, however, any statistically significant differences based on family education level. We hypothesized that first-generation students would score higher on both personal development and social responsibility subscales compared to continuing-generation students, but there were no statistically significant differences. These results are particularly interesting as previous researchers (Taylor et al., 2019; Yeh, 2010) suggested that ethnic minorities and first-generation student groups overlap heavily. Due to unequal educational opportunities in the United States (Green, 2012), ethnic minorities are more likely to be the first person in their family to attend or complete a professional degree making them a first-generation student. A large number of first-generation students come from racially, financially, educationally diverse backgrounds which often makes it difficult to isolate certain characteristics from the other during studies (Yeh, 2010).

As explained and supported by Pelco et al. (2014), although there is a large correlation between minority students and first-generation status, many first-generation students are not people of color. The sample in the current study, however, did not adhere to that expectation as the number of ethnic minority students (129) and the number of ethnic majority students (127)

was actually comparable within the first-generation group, thus possibly explaining our difference in results between ethnic and educational analysis.

Yeh (2010) found that low-income and first-generation students reported SL as encouraging newfound value in their role in society and recognized the importance of becoming more engaged citizens. Similarly, Pelco et al. (2014) found that all groups benefited from SL, but the group that showed the most growth in developing skills related to SL were first-generation, minority, and low-income males. This suggests that family education may not be a factor in the extent to which students found SL important and impactful, but rather the factor of family income may play a larger role in student perceptions than initially anticipated. Previous researchers, like Yeh (2010) and Pelco et al. (2014) found it difficult to separately analyze the identities/demographics of students because they have historically been known to overlap. Results have previously been accredited to a combination of these identities, but given our results, it is possible that one piece of their identities (i.e., family income) played a much larger role in how SL was perceived.

Implications

The current study contributes to a better understanding of how impactful SL is for underrepresented students. Overall, students found their experience beneficial and high social responsibility scores suggest that participants are wanting and willing to participate in future experiences of volunteering or helping their communities. Specifically, students of color, or those in the ethnic minority group, scored the highest on the BACE measure suggesting they had positive interactions that furthered their development. Our sample demographics for ethnicity of the students in SL courses in the current study (57.5% ethnic majority, 42.5% ethnic minority) is comparable to the overall demographics at the public southeastern university (58.5% White,

41.5% minority). However, there is room for improvement for more equal opportunities as although ethnic minorities scored the highest, they did not make up even half of our sample size. This suggests that there is either a lack of relevant courses involving service-learning or those that do involve SL are not accessible enough to ethnic minorities. This could mean that SL courses are majorly represented in only a few subjects or that they are offered with a certain number of prerequisites that are not obtainable to all. One of these prerequisites is academic class as most of our participants had enough credits to qualify as a senior or higher. Although this makes sense for certain areas of study such as health care, previous studies also show that volunteering early or participating in SL made students more engaged in learning and encouraged student retention (Celio et al., 2011).

Another reason we may see disproportion in higher-level courses is due to varying student retention rates. It has been noted by Yeh (2010) that minority and first-generation students are less likely to graduate due to a plethora of reasons including financial trouble and lack of support and resources. But the retention rate at this public southeastern university does not show unequal retention rates based on race/ethnicity. This leaves us to the belief that SL courses are primarily done in a few subjects rather than across subjects. In the current study, 43% (386) of participants were from the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences and 23.4% (210) were from the College of Public Health suggesting these colleges are where the majority of SL courses take place. Since all students are expected to eventually engage and participate in the development of our society, there should be more SL or courses that have a SL aspect across disciplines. This would ensure at least the offering of a SL course no matter what subject underrepresented students are studying.

Langhout and Gordon (2021) previously stated that resources for underrepresented students should not be limited to resource centers and co-curricular opportunities and that could potentially be the case at the participating university. Inviting more students of color to participate in these roles also comes with the responsibility of being more conscious and careful of the SL activities that are selected for a course. Service-learning experiences could act as a mirror for some students if they relate to the community or task at hand, but it can also act as a window for students considered to be a part of the outgroup to connect with another culture or circumstance. While being able to experience both is ideal, Shaddock-Hernandez (2006) suggests that while minority students do benefit from interacting with diverse communities a stronger model would allow minority students to interact among themselves “to develop identity, to revitalize cultural values, and to maintain a buffer when encountering possibly culturally insensitive students” (p. 82).

This should be a call for involving more students of color in service-learning courses and project opportunities. Given this information, universities should make it a priority to involve ethnic minorities as previous participants have expressed how impactful it was in their skill development. Educators should also be more considerate in choosing activities or projects. Involving culture and the community should not be viewed as something scary, but as an opportunity for everyone, minority or not, to learn something they may not have known enough details about.

When SL projects are being developed, educators should consider what the best structure is for their specific course. SL courses should be structured in such a way that the SL project can easily be tied back to the course content and aligns with the set goals of the course. Educators should consider the learning outcomes for their SL courses as well as the emotional impact these

experiences may have on students. Students should feel safe and supported during their SL experiences so asking questions and giving students the opportunity to express how they felt during and after the experience can give better insight on what factors make for a good SL project. Having a chance to reflect emotionally on their experiences could also allow for conversations surrounding discomfort and empathy. Instructors should also consider the importance of proper preparation before students participate in SL activities. Poorly structured and implemented SL projects have the potential to reinforce negative stereotypes and be a source of fear garnered toward a community. Therefore, students should be properly informed about the people in the community they will be working with and guided on how to have respectful interactions before taking part in SL activities. This can be done by clearly introducing the topic and the link back to the literature. This gives the instructor the opportunity to address microaggressions and differences in cultural values and for students to ask questions in a low-risk environment.

Limitations and Future Directions

There are limitations to the current study and recommendations for future research in this area. As previously mentioned, our sample did lack diversity. Although we had a large number of African American or Black students, it would extend and refine the research in this field if the sample more widely represented ethnic groups outside of European or African American. This acted as a limitation because due to severely unequal populations, we ran analysis by splitting participants into what is essentially White vs. non-White groups, which makes it difficult for the results of this study to be generalizable to ethnic minorities that are not African American. Future studies should aim to include a larger variety of participants from varying ethnic identities.

Another limitation for this study was the wording or categorization of demographics. Since we utilized archival data, we had no control over the details of the survey. Wording, specifically regarding ethnicity, is outdated and left some students unknowing of how to label themselves. For instance, one of the options for ethnicity was African American. African American is defined as those of American nationality and African descent (Merriam-Webster, 2024). This left Black students that are not American, but Caribbean, Hispanic, etc. to either choose a category they do not resonate with or sustain from picking an option. The same could be said for those who had “mixed” as their option for representing who they are. Mixed or mixed race is not an ethnicity, but a mixture of more than one ethnicity, so it may have left participants feeling that their choices of representation included choosing a side of their ethnicity or not really being represented by ethnicity at all. Attempts at future research in this field should be more conscious and considerate when choosing categories of representation and deeply reflect on how groups are being represented and if it is fair.

Another limitation is that students participated in a large variety of service-learning projects. While some courses did have a uniform system with everyone attending the same place, others let students choose what they thought was the best fit. For example, in a junior level public relations course all students participated in the LEAP program, but in a senior level public health course, students participated in a range of activities including Habitat for Humanity, Action Pact, and local learning centers. This made it difficult to analyze what practices or objectives were the most effective and where students found their time the most valuable. Future research should examine what types of SL activities are associated with positive outcomes and what qualities can be attributed to a successful program.

Finally, there is a possibility that our results display a ceiling effect with BACE scores. A ceiling effect means that there is failure to accurately compare group means because a large percentage of participants scored high. The range of possible scores was 17 to 85 for the overall BACE, 11 to 55 for personal development and 6 to 30 for social responsibility. Across all four groups, the means for all three subscales were above the midpoint and near the highest value (see Table 4). While there were some significant differences found between groups, objectively the sample displayed high scores on all scales, suggesting a positive experience overall. Measures of the impact of SL with a broader range of scores would be less likely to have this potential issue of a ceiling effect.

Most of the previous studies mentioned in the current study chose one or a few benefits of SL to focus on. Since there is an abundance of information on the benefits and outcomes, but not so much on the foundational aspects of SL, future research in this area should evolve past only looking at outcomes associated with SL. Future researchers should examine what objectives and goals make for a successful SL plan to give universities and educators insight on how to implement a worthwhile SL project. Future research should also consider the use of more subjective measures. This would allow students to express their feelings about their experiences in SL projects and allow researchers to address more complex topics regarding involvement in unfamiliar spaces or communities such as empathy and microaggressions.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

This study furthers research done on the benefits of SL by focusing on the impacts of SL on underrepresented students. Our findings showed that SL was a useful tool for developing personal development and social responsibility for everyone, but especially for ethnic minority students. SL has proven to be useful and beneficial, so it is imperative to ensure that all students have the opportunity to connect course work with their community. Langhout and Gordon (2021) stated that on top of civic engagement and personal development, SL allows minority students “to strengthen their social justice practices, and more effectively straddle the borders between home and academia” (p. 410). This is important because while university success is expected, students have their own personal and communal goals that require skills that can be developed through SL. Because of this, SL can act as a resource and a chance at personal development for some so there should be more opportunities for underrepresented students to utilize these resources.

One stated goal of the current university regarding student success is to challenge students to create their own definition of success. While this is a progressive step in some ways, it may also make it more difficult for educators to create standards of what should be gained from students' participation in SL. At the university level it is understandable to have general goals, but when it comes to the course level, having objectives and goals based on the students enrolled in the course can enhance the learning that everyone experiences. If students have these opportunities, they develop skills that are imperative for making educated decisions about their community and country including voting and making social justice changes.

The results of this study should encourage university staff and professors to investigate ways to get more students of color involved in SL and develop opportunities for SL that are available for all academic classifications. Butin (2006) stresses that SL could be viewed as a luxury only available to a privileged few, the “Whitest of White”, and one way to divert this from happening is to be intentional about underrepresented students’ participation in SL. Not only are the benefits associated with school success, but also with citizenship. Having skills like social responsibility are necessary to actively participate in our democratic society as an adult (Fleck et al., 2017). Having SL experience has made students more likely to participate in things like voting and social justice movements (Langhout & Gordon, 2021).

REFERENCES

- African American. 2024. In Merriam-Webster.com. Retrieved March 2, 2024, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/African%20American>.
- Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. (2000). How service learning affects students. Higher Education Research Institute, University of California.
- Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *American Economic Review*, 94(4), 991-1013.
- Billig, S. H. (2002). Support for K–12 service-learning practice: A brief review of the research. *educational HORIZONS*, 80(4), 184-189.
- Bowman, N., Brandenberger, J., Lapsley, D., Hill, P., & Quaranto, J. (2010). Serving in college, flourishing in adulthood: Does community engagement during the college years predict adult well-being?. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 2(1), 14-34.
- Bingle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1995). A service-learning curriculum for faculty.
- Butin, D.W. (2006). The limits of service-learning in higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 29(4), 473–49.
- Carrillo, J. F. (2013). I always knew I was gifted: Latino males and the Mestiz@ Theory of Intelligences (MTI). *Berkeley Review of Education*, 4(1).
- Carrillo, J. F. (2016). I grew up straight ‘hood: Unpacking the intelligences of working-class Latino male college students in North Carolina. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 49(2), 157-169.

- Celio, C. I., Durlak, J., & Dymnicki, A. (2011). A meta-analysis of the impact of servicelearning on students. *Journal of Experiential Education, 34*(2), 164-181.
- Colvin, J., & Tobler, N. (2013). Cultural speak: Culturally relevant pedagogy and experiential learning in a public speaking classroom. *Journal of Experiential Education, 36*(3), 233-246.
- Conway, J. M., Amel, E. L., & Gerwien, D. P. (2009). Teaching and learning in the social context: A meta-analysis of service learning's effects on academic, personal, social, and citizenship outcomes. *Teaching of Psychology, 36*(4), 233-245.
- Einfeld, A., & Collins, D. (2008). The relationships between service-learning, social justice, multicultural competence, and civic engagement. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*(2), 95-109.
- Engle, J., & Tinto, V. (2008). Moving beyond access: College success for low-income, firstgeneration students. *Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education*.
- Eyler, J. (2002). Reflection: Linking service and learning—Linking students and communities. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*(3), 517-534.
- Eyler, J., Giles, D., Stenson, C. M., & Gray, C. J. (2001). *At a glance: What we know about the effects of service-learning on college students, faculty, institutions, and communities, 1993-2000*. Washington, DC: Learn and Serve America National Service Learning Clearinghouse.
- Fleck, B., Hussey, H. D., & Rutledge-Ellison, L. (2017). Linking class and community: An investigation of service learning. *Teaching of Psychology, 44*(3), 232-239.
- Green, A. E. (2003). Difficult stories: Service-learning, race, class, and whiteness. *College*

Composition and Communication, 55(2), 276–301.

Giroux, H. A. (1991). Border pedagogy and the politics of postmodernism. *Social Text*, 28, 51–

67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/466376>.

Hébert, A., & Hauf, P. (2015). Student learning through service learning: Effects on academic development, civic responsibility, interpersonal skills and practical skills. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 16(1), 37-49.

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world?.

Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 33(2-3), 61-83.

Kenworthy-U'Ren, A. L. (2000). Management Students as Consultants: A Strategy for Service-

Learning in Management Education 1. *In Working for the common good* (pp. 55-68).

Routledge.

Kohl, H. (1984). Growing minds: On becoming a teacher. *Childhood Education*, 60(4), 273-273.

Langhout, R. D., & Gordon, D. L. (2021). Outcomes for underrepresented and misrepresented

college students in service-learning classes: Supporting agents of change. *Journal of*

Diversity in Higher Education, 14(3), 408.

Miller, L., McCauley, J., & Mehta, S. (2018). The BACE scale: A new measure for assessing the

benefits of community engagement. *International Journal of Research on Service-*

Learning and Community Engagement, 6(1), Article 4.

Mitchell, T. D., Donahue, D. M., & Young-Law, C. (2012). Service learning as a pedagogy of

whiteness. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 45(4), 612-629.

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).
- Olney, C., & Grande, S. (1995). Validation of a scale to measure development of social responsibility. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2, 43-53.
- Pelco, L. E., Ball, C. T., & Lockeman, K. (2014). Student growth from service-learning: A comparison of first-generation and non-first-generation college students. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 18(2), 49-66.
- Pyne, K. B., & Means, D. R. (2013). Underrepresented and in/visible: A Hispanic first-generation student's narratives of college. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 6(3), 186.
- 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.
- Shadduck-Hernández, J. (2006). Here I am now! Critical ethnography and community servicelearning with immigrant and refugee undergraduate students and youth. *Ethnography and Education*, 1(1), 67-86.
- Taylor, A., Yochim, L., & Raykov, M. (2019). Service-learning and first-generation university students: A conceptual exploration of the literature. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 42(4), 349-363.
- Yeh, T. L. (2010). Service-learning and persistence of low-income, first-generation college students: An exploratory study. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 16(2), 50-65.

Table 1*Race/Ethnicity of Students Enrolled at Public Southeastern University- Fall 22'*

Race/Ethnicity		<i>n</i>	%
White	Total Enrolled	14,981	58.5%
	Total Underrepresented	6,292	24.7%
African American/Black	Total Enrolled	6,518	25.6%
Hispanic (of any race)	Total Enrolled	2,006	7.9%
Two or more races	Total Enrolled	1,115	4.4%
	Total Underrepresented	680	2.7%
Asian	Total Enrolled	656	2.6%
	Total Underrepresented	329	1.3%
Unknown	Total Enrolled	188	0.7%
	Total Underrepresented	97	0.4%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	Total Enrolled	76	0.3%
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Total Enrolled	29	0.1%

Note. Underrepresented- includes any student who falls into one or more of the following categories: first-generation, underrepresented minority, Pell eligible, or nontraditional. Total enrolled for racial minorities represents total underrepresented according to university definition.

Table 2*Faculty Race/Ethnicity and Positions at Public Southeastern University- Fall 22'*

Race/Ethnicity	Position	<i>n</i>	%
	Leadership	300	81.5%
White	Non-Leadership	2,072	62.7%
	Leadership	41	11.1%
African American/Black	Non-Leadership	748	22.6%
	Leadership	18	4.9%
Hispanic/Latino	Non-Leadership	126	3.8%
	Leadership	—	
Asian	Non-Leadership	179	5.4%
	Leadership	—	
Two or more races	Non-Leadership	54	1.6%
	Leadership	—	
Race and Ethnicity Unknown	Non-Leadership	82	2.5%
	Leadership	—	
Nonresident alien	Non-Leadership	40	1.2%

Note. Leadership positions- “management occupations” or staff whose job it is to plan, direct, or coordinate policies and programs, and may include some supervision of other workers.

Table 3*Demographic Characteristics of Participants*

Ethnicity	Family Education					
	First-generation		Continuing-generation		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Majority	127	49.6	387	60.5	516	57.4
Minority	129	50.4	253	39.5	382	42.6
Total	256		640		896	

Table 4*BACE Scores and Ranges*

Range of Scores	BACE Subscales								
	Personal Development			Social Responsibility			Overall BACE		
	11-55			6-30			17-85		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	range	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	range	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	range
Ethnic Majority	43.78	9.13	16-55	24.99	4.69	8-30	68.87	13.24	28-85
Ethnic Minority	45.34	8.13	14-55	25.88	4.25	6-30	71.33	11.86	20-85
First-generation	45.22	8.20	19-55	25.65	4.54	7-30	70.88	12.09	27-85
Continuing-generation	44.12	8.95	14-55	25.25	4.52	6-30	69.52	12.97	20-85
Total Sample	44.44	8.75	14-55	25.37	4.53	6-30	69.90	12.73	20-85

APPENDIX A

BENEFITS OF A SERVICE-LEARNING COURSE COMPONENT

Section A: This section is intended to help us determine your attitude toward service-learning in general.

Please use the scale below to answer the following questions.

Strongly Disagree 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 -----5 Strongly Agree A

1. At the beginning of the semester, I was uneasy about the service-learning component of the course.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

2. Participating in the community helped enhance my leadership skills.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

3. The service- learning I did in this course helped me to analyze problems.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

4. The service- learning I did in this course helped me to think critically.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

5. The service- learning in this course helped me to develop workplace skills.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

6. The service- learning in this course has made me more employable.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

7. The service- learning in this course assisted me in defining the type of work I want to do in the future.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

8. Participation in the community helped enhance my communication skills.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

9. The service- learning in this course helped me to develop organizational skills.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

10. The service- learning in this course helped me to connect theory with practice.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

11. Working in the community helped me to define my personal strengths and weaknesses.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

12. The service- learning in this course helped me to apply the subject matter in a “real world” situation.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

13. This course helped me understand my responsibility to serve the community and develop my citizenship skills.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

14. This course helped me understand that I can make a difference in my community by being involved.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

15. The service- learning aspect of this course showed me how I could become more involved in my community. 1 2 3 4 5 N/A

16. The service- learning aspect of this course helped me to become more aware of the needs in my community.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

17. This course helped me understand the differences (i.e., cultural, racial, economic, etc.) that exist in our community.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

18. I probably will continue to serve the community after this course.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

19. I would recommend this course to a friend, specifically because of the service- learning aspect.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

20. At the end of the semester, I thought that the service- learning aspect of this course was valuable.

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

Section B: The following questions deal specifically with this service-learning course.

1. On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is a bad experience and 10 is an excellent experience, I would rate my service- learning experience in this class/course as a _____.

2. Describe 3 things you learned from your experience.

3. Professor's Name: _____ Course Number:

4. Name of the community partner/agency with whom you worked:

5. How many service-learning courses have you taken other than this current course?

6. How would you say this course was in comparison to any other service-learning courses you have taken (or are taking) on a scale of 1 (lower quality) to 10 (greater quality) or N/A?

Section C: Classification and Demographic Questions. Because disparities have been identified in how students from different classifications and demographic groups benefit from their servicelearning experiences, we ask you to respond to the following questions.

1. What is your GENDER? (circle) 1. Male 2. Female

2. What is your age? _____ YEARS.

3. Which of the following best describes your ETHNIC ORIGIN? (circle)

1. Caucasian (White) 2. Hispanic (Non-White)

3. African-American 4. Asian-American

5. Mixed Race 6. Other _____

4. How many college credit hours are you CURRENTLY registered/enrolled for THIS semester?

5. What is your current OVERALL GPA? _____ / 4.00

6. What is your CURRENT academic classification? (circle)

1. Freshman (<30 hours) 2. Sophomore (30-59 hours)

3. Junior (60-89 hours) 4. Senior (\geq 90 hours)

5. Graduate student 6. Other _____

7. What is your MAJOR?

8. On average, how many HOURS A WEEK do you typically work for PAY? _____
HOURS/WEEK

9. On average, how many HOURS A WEEK do you typically volunteer WITHOUT PAY on
behalf of a student organization or local public/non-profit organization? _____
HOURS/WEEK

10. What is the highest level of education attained in your family? (circle)

1. Less than Completed HS/GED 2. Completed HS/GED

4. Some College or Technical School 5. Completed College or Technical School (2 year or 4
year)

6. Some Graduate Level Education 7. Completed Graduate Level Education

11. What is the zip code of your family of residence (US zip code or City, State, Country)

12. What do you perceive to be your family's level of income? (circle)

1. Low 2. Low Middle

3. Upper Middle 4. Upper