SERVICE LEARNING ASSIGNMENTS: THE INTERSECT BETWEEN ASSIGNMENT

FRAMING, STUDENT MOTIVATION, AND PERCEIVED RELEVANCE

A Thesis
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of the
North Dakota State University
of Agriculture and Applied Science

By

Tori Kae Benders

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

Major Department:
Communication

June 2018

Fargo, North Dakota

North Dakota State University
Graduate School

Title

SERVICE LEARNING ASSIGNMENTS: THE INTERSECT BETWEEN

ASSIGNMENT FRAMING, STUDENT MOTIVATION, AND

PERCEIVED RELEVANCE

By

Tori Kae Benders

The Supervisory Committee certifies that this ***disquisition*** complies with North Dakota

State University's regulations and meets the accepted standards for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

Dr. Carrie Anne Platt

Chair

Dr. Catherine Kingsley Westerman

Dr. Melissa Vosen Callens

Dr. Erika Beseler Thompson

Approved:

July 27th, 2018	Dr. Stephenson Beck
Date	Department Chair

ABSTRACT

Although learning has traditionally happened within the four walls of a classroom, as service learning courses become more prevalent, instructors are challenging their students to take learning outside of the classroom and into the community. Service learning has the potential to transform students and their learning, it is not widely known how to ensure students are motivated to complete these assignments and see them as relevant to their futures. This study used social determination theory and a 2X2 experimental design to survey 271 students about their motivation to complete a service learning project presented to them in an assignment sheet and perceived relevance of the assignment and overall attitude toward service learning. Findings indicate that overall students have positive attitudes toward service learning, are moderately motivated to complete service learning assignments, and see them as relevant. How the assignment sheet is framed largely does not have implications for these feelings.

Keywords: *service learning, social determination theory, assignment framing, motivation, relevance*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

have been incredibly grateful to have someone so dedicated to teaching and knowledgeable about pedagogy on my committee.

Dr. Erika Beseler Thompson, my committee member. Your knowledge of teaching practice and pedagogy and research experience was invaluable to this project. Thank you for your time, your effort, your feedback, and your advice. I learned so much from you even in our brief meetings.

I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge my past professors at Concordia College and their contribution to my education, as they are the people who first ignited in me a passion for the field of Communication.

Dr. Stephanie Ahlfeldt, Dr. Cindy Larson-Casselton, Dr. Kai Western, and **Dr. Aileen Buslig,** you four started it all. Thank you for the foundation in communication research and theory and a passion for the field. This foundation is what everything else was built from. You each taught me so much about this field and perhaps more importantly taught me how to approach this world with grace, joy, and light. If it were not for each of your advice and pushing I would have never ended up in graduate school. I am lucky to have crossed paths with each of you.

Next, I would like to express profound gratitude to my family and friends.

To my sisters **Leah** and **Jennifer,** and my "adopted" grandparents **Chyrel** and **Bruce,** thank you for providing unfailing love and support for the last 24 years of my life. To my partner **Brady** and **friends,** thanks for listening to me vent about research, teaching, and thesis writing without batting an eye. The wine nights and venting sessions will never be forgotten. Without each of you this accomplishment would not be possible.

Finally, I would like to thank my colleagues and NDSU friends.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

All institutions of higher learning should aim to deliver high quality education to their students, and instructors should aim to assign and implement high impact assignments. Quality education insures the development of the whole person, including his or her growth in cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains of learning (Alcartado, Camarse, Legaspi, Mostajo, & Buenaventura, 2017). The ways in which instructors communicate assignments and course material to their students plays an important role in facilitating this growth. While learning and development has traditionally happened within the four walls of a classroom, as service learning courses become more prevalent, university instructors are challenging their students to take their learning outside of the classroom and into the community. Service learning is a high impact and potentially powerful pedagogical practice (Kuh, 2008) in which students participate in credit-bearing service requirements with partner community agencies (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996). The practice has the potential to transform students and their approach to learning, but while it is not necessarily a new social and educational concept, it does largely lack a well-defined and articulated theoretical and conceptual framework and in terms of pedagogical practices, is relatively new in its implementation (Giles & Eyler, 1994; Alcartado et al., 2017).

As service learning becomes more prevalent in higher education, it is of increasing importance that it is mutually beneficial for all parties involved including the students, instructors, community partners, and universities as a whole (Lewis, 2004). This paper aims to fill important gaps in educational, communication, motivational, and service learning literature by answering questions regarding how instructors use assignment sheets to communicate with their students and the implications that goal framing and communication style can have on a student's perceived relevancy of and motivation to complete a service learning assignment.

Research such as this study has the potential to answer important practical questions regarding how to communicate about assignments in ways that will better prepare students to be motivated, committed, and engaged individuals ready and well prepared to serve their communities.

Despite the fact that service learning has a rich history in and traces its roots to John Dewey's (1938) theory of experiential learning, it is a relatively new in its implementation as a pedagogical practice in higher learning (Alcartado et al., 2017; Billig, 2000; Quezada & Christopherson, 2005). Research is not scarce, however, in the benefits and challenges of service learning for students, instructors, and community partners (Anderson, 2003; Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000; Dreuth & Dreuth-Fewell, 2005; Greenberg, 2000; Joiner, 2000; Jones & Abes, 2004; Kraft & Kielsmeier, 1995; Quezada & Christopherson, 2005; Turner, 2002; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2000). A major selling point of service learning is its potential to enhance student learning while also benefitting the wider community. Community agencies that utilize service learners are also quick to point out the benefits of partnering with service learning courses which range from the valuable resources they provide to the energy of college students (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Edwards, Mooney, & Heald, 2001; Ferrari & Worrall, 2000; Schmidt & Robby, 2002; Vernon & Foster, 2002).

Despite its multitude of benefits for both students and community agencies, service learning as an educational tool is not without its own set of inherent challenges for students, instructors, and community agencies. At the faculty level, instructors report feeling skepticism about the educational value of service learning in relation to its costs (Schelbe, Petracchi, & Weaver, 2014). Students commonly cite a lack of time as the biggest perceived challenge to participating in a service learning course (Tande & Wang, 2013), followed closely by concerns about the experience that include inadequate work space, insufficient organizational structure,

lack of clarity about staff roles, and a need for additional training (Poulin, Kauffman, & Silver,

2006). Finally, while community agencies are grateful for the added resources and energy that

student service learners add to their organization (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Edwards et al., 2001;

Ferrari & Worrall, 2000; Vernon & Foster, 2002) they are just as quick to point out that they

often struggle to manage student service learners (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Vernon & Ward, 1999;

Vernon & Foster, 2002). The biggest challenge reported by agencies is unreliability and lack of

motivation and commitment (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Vernon & Foster, 2002).

  In any facet of education, high levels of motivation are the primary drivers towards deep

and lasting learning and are often the driving force to sustain students through the long and

tedious learning process (Skinner & Belmont, 1993). Motivation is especially important for

students participating in the often difficult and time consuming service learning activities

assigned to them. Highly motivated students are easy to identify: they are enthusiastic, interested,

involved, and curious, they try hard and persist, and they actively cope with challenges and

setbacks (Skinner & Belmont, 1993). Furthermore, motivation has been found to determine a

number of adaptive outcomes such as school completion, career, success, and mental and

physical health (Archambault, Janosz, Morizot, & Pagani, 2009; Guay, Ratelle, & Chanal, 2008).

All of the above are imperative factors for a successful service learning experience for both the

student and the agency that they are serving, especially when considering the fact that

unmotivated or unengaged students present the biggest challenge for community partners

(Blouin & Perry, 2009; Vernon & Foster, 2002).

  An important primary driver of student motivation is the levels of relevance that students

perceive each particular assignment, exam, or lecture might have for their futures (Bean, 1983;

Frymier & Shulman, 1995; Keller, 1979, 1983, 1987; Metzner & Bean, 1987). Relevance is the

perception of personal needs being met by instructional activities or as a highly desired goal being perceived as related to instructional activities (Keller, 1983). While portraying relevancy to a wide array of diverse students in one classroom has its challenges (Frymier & Shulman, 1995; Keller, 1987; Shulman & Luechauer, 1993), it often pays off in dividends in regards to increasing student motivation (Frymier & Shulman, 1995), persistence toward achievement of academic goals (Bean, 1983; Metzner & Bean, 1987), overall course satisfaction (Richardson, Slater, & Wilson, 2007), and higher levels of participation in class (Fedesco, Kentner, & Natt, 2017). Because of the inherent and unique difficulties and time-consuming nature of service learning assignments, it is particularly important that students perceive assignments to be highly relevant to their future or personal goals. Only then will students be more likely to persist through the challenges and reap the rewards.

Service learning pedagogy has the potential to benefit students, communities, and universities as a whole. However, it is imperative that this body of literature continues to evolve in order to remain rigorous, advance educational knowledge, and guide better creation and implementation of high-impact pedagogical tools such as service learning. Higher education is in a time of increased accountability and need to prove that students are being well and completely prepared for life after graduation (Lewing & York, 2017) and service learning as a pedagogical tool has the potential to do this. However, in order to make this a real possibility, research must move to connect established theoretical frameworks to the relatively new concept of service learning. This will help to extend knowledge and build understanding of experiential learning experiences overall. This study has the potential to provide instructors resources and information to better communicate through their assignment sheets, in order to motivate students toward higher achievement, engagement, and dedication in their service learning projects. To date, there

is still room for scholarly work to explore the impact of communication style and goal framing through the medium of assignment sheets on student motivation and perceived assignment relevance.

It is true that researchers have identified many of the benefits and challenges associated with designing and implementing service learning assignments for all parties involved. However, there are still gaps exploring students' motivations towards service learning or how an instructor's communication through assignment sheets and instructions might have implications for that motivation. Research shows that the underlying implication of student motivation and success lie in the process of "how" students are taught, rather than "what" they are taught (Hall, 1996) and research should advance from "what" the positive benefits of service learning are to "how" these benefits can actually be attained. This paper aims to fill these important gaps in literature by using Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2000) to examine how instructors can better frame their service learning assignments to increase student motivation and perceived relevance for the task at hand and in-turn create a better, more well-rounded, and more powerful service learning experience. Armed with these potential answers, instructors will be equipped to create service learning assignments that are beneficial for all parties involved including the students, community, and university as a whole.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Service Learning

Service learning is a high impact pedagogical practice (Kuh, 2008) that has the potential to be a transformational experience for students, communities, instructors, and higher learning institutions as a whole (Clayton, Bringle, & Hatcher, 2013). While service learning traces its roots to the writings and ideas of John Dewey (1938) it is still a relatively new topic in educational research. As such, it largely lacks a well-defined theoretical and conceptual framework for implementation (Billig, 2000; Giles & Eyler, 1994). For the purposes of this paper, service learning will be defined as:

> A credit-bearing educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and reflect on the service activity in such a way to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility. Unlike practica and internships, the experiential activity in a service learning course is not necessarily skill-based within the context of professional education. (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996)

Bringle and Hatcher's (1996) definition is useful and important in that it explicitly notes that service-learning is neither field education nor volunteerism, but falls within a unique subfield of experiential learning all its own. Field education requires an extended, supervised practice experience designed to meet specific learning goals associated with degree requirements, such as student-teaching or nursing practicums. While service learning *does* provide practical experience and complements classroom education, it is unique in that it addresses a community-identified *need* that is connected to course concepts but not necessarily driven by curriculum requirements (Schelbe et al., 2014).

6

History of Service Learning. Service learning originates from a long and rich tradition of experiential learning practices designed to encourage public scholarship and civic responsibility (Boyer, 1990; Dewey; 1938). Largely, the concept can be traced back to John Dewey's (1938) theory of experiential learning. Dewey argued that in order for students to truly be prepared for the present and future, there was a need for them to do more than study facts in a classroom. They needed to get out of the four walls and take control of their own learning in a non-academic environment, which is exactly what service learning does. Despite the fact that service learning lies in theories developed over 75 years ago, it has gained traction in the field of education largely within the last 20 years (Lewing & York, 2017). Service learning is currently a major national movement at every educational level, including undergraduate education (Alcartado et al., 2017). Because it attempts to connect academic study with community service through structured reflection, it ultimately has the potential to make learning deeper, longer lasting, more portable, and meaningful. In the context of community engagement and education, service learning represents one of the largest pedagogical innovations of the past three decades (Ehrlich, 2005; Lewing & York, 2017; O'Meara, Sandmann, Saltmarsh, & Giles, 2011). While there has been no comprehensive attempt to measure the prevalence of service learning across higher education contexts, some scholars argue that it has become a focus in many universities today and a practice in at least some classrooms in almost every university nationwide (Blouin & Perry, 2017; Fisher, Sharp & Bradley, 2017; Lewing & York, 2017).

Perceptions of Students. As service learning in higher education becomes more prevalent, it is of increasing importance to ensure that the practice is beneficial to all parties involved (Blouin & Perry, 2009), but perhaps especially the students, who serve as the front line of the experience as a whole. To that end, previous literature has focused primarily on the

benefits, perceptions, and challenges of service learning for students themselves. Several studies have documented the benefits of service learning for students, which include a deeper understanding of course concepts (Greenberg, 2000; Joiner, 2000; Quezada & Christopherson, 2005; Schaffer & Peterson, 1998; Turner, 2002), improved cognitive skills (Jones & Abes, 2004; Vogelgesang, 2000), satisfaction of helping others (Kraft & Kielsmeier, 1995), personal and professional growth (Anderson, 2003; Dreuth & Dreuth-Fewell, 2005; Kraft & Kielsmeier, 1995), heightened civic engagement (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2000), enhanced appreciation of social problems (Garman, 1995; Warren, 1998; Werner, Voce, Openshaw, & Simons, 2002), and career exploration (Jones & Abes, 2004; Kraft & Kielsmeier, 1995). In their research regarding how service learning affects students, Astin et al. (2000) discovered that participation in service learning showed significant positive effects on all 11 outcome variables for which they measured, including academic performance (GPA, writing skills, critical thinking skills), values (commitment to activism, promoting racial understanding), self-efficacy, leadership (leadership activities, self-rated leadership ability, interpersonal skills), choice of service-oriented career, and plans to persist through college after the course was completed. A meta-analysis conducted on the impact of service learning on students noted that benefits to those who participated in service learning programs often fell into one of five outcome areas: (1) attitude toward self; (2) attitude toward school and learning; (3) civic engagement; (4) social skills, and (5) academic performance (Alcartado et al., 2017).

Student participants tend to have a more limited view of how they benefit from service learning, with research on student perceptions indicating strong external motivations for participation. Tande and Wang (2013) found that a large majority (69%) of their undergraduate student participants believed that service learning was important largely because it improved

their competitiveness for awards, scholarships, internships, and job positions in the future. Furthermore, Alcartado et al. (2017) found that the highest student rated area of benefits of service learning was "Preparation for Real Life." The student participants believed that involvement in community service activities was a good training ground for them to become better employees and more responsibility engaged citizens someday. Research also shows that college students' initial reasons for participating in service opportunities are often external, such as enhancing their resume (Chesbrough, 2011). In one study, students reported that they thought their exposure to real-world experiences through service learning primarily equipped them for careers later on in life, the same reason students reported they would recommend their peers also explore service-learning programs and courses (Overall, 2010).

Despite its reported and perceived benefits to students, service learning comes with its own set of challenges for students. Burke and Bush (2013) report that while students found service learning experiences beneficial in theory, the barriers of limited time and family obligations prevented many students from participating. When asked to elaborate, 40% of respondents said not having time to participate was the biggest issue impeding their ability to take a course that incorporated service learning, followed by not having transportation, and lastly, mental and physical health barriers. Not surprisingly, in most studies of service learning challenges, time is the most frequent limitation reported by students (Burke & Bush, 2013; Darby, Chenault, & Haglund, 2013; Rosing, Reed, Ferrari, & Bothne, 2010). Students often report that they want to spend more time with their community partners, but are concerned with how to manage this commitment on top of their already busy schedules (Rosing, Reed, Ferrari, & Bothne, 2010). Students, especially those with full-time jobs and/or family responsibilities, have found it too difficult to balance their service-learning activities, which took place outside of

required class time, with their other responsibilities (Schelbe et al., 2014). Besides scheduling difficulties and limited time, students also reported concerns with inadequate work space, insufficient organizational structure, lack of clarity and communication between instructor and community partner, and a need for additional training and preparation in their service learning experiences (Poulin et al., 2006). Alcartado and colleagues (2017) discovered that when students were asked for recommendations for bettering service learning experiences, they often reported more frequent communication between instructors and community partners and better planning on the part of the instructor overall.

Perceptions of Faculty. While students are the frontline of a service learning project, faculty facilitators play an integral role in the success or failure of the project. Instructors understand that there are benefits to service learning. In a study of faculty perceptions of service learning as a pedagogical tool, respondents reported that the positive outcomes they had personally witnessed for their students included increase in civic responsibility, acceptance of diversity, increased leadership skills, and an increase in assuming roles in their communities as engaged citizens (Strage, 2000). Faculty also report that service learning helps students develop better problem-solving skills, which they bring to other coursework or classes (Ferrari & Worrall, 2000), and is an important contributor to students' engagement in and commitment to school (Astin & Sax, 1997; Scales, Roehlkepartain, Neal, Kielsmeier, & Benson, 2006). In another study, faculty reported networking and community connections, application of theory and skills, exposure to diverse populations, and increased self-awareness as added benefits to their students when service-learning was incorporated as part of coursework (Schelbe et al., 2014).

While some instructors do acknowledge the perceived benefits of service learning for their students, they are still skeptical of the educational value of service learning in relation to its costs (Fisher et al., 2017). In a study of federally funded service learning programs, Gray, Ondaatje, & Zakaras (1999) point out that, "at the institutional level, the most serious obstacle to expanding and sustaining service programs is faculty resistance to service learning as a pedagogical tool" (p. 19). Teaching a class that incorporates service learning takes considerable planning and flexibility on the part of the instructor (Penn, 2003). In line with student-reported challenges, faculty are often resistant to the time required to organize and implement a successful service learning project in their classroom (Donaldson & Daughtrey, 2011; Lemieux & Allen, 2007; Schelbe et al., 2014). Another challenge frequently cited by faculty is the difficult logistics of arranging placements and coordinating individual activities. Securing appropriate agency sites and transportation, student site supervision, and coordination for nontraditional students have been reported as especially difficult and time consuming tasks for faculty members (Schelbe et al., 2014).

Perceptions of Community Partners. In order for service learning courses to meet their intended goals of addressing community needs while also giving students practical experience and encouraging civic responsibility, research should also work to better understand the community partners and what can be done to better serve them. A major selling point of service learning is that it enhances student learning *and* provides services to the wider community (Blouin & Perry, 2009). Community partners of university level service learning projects report a number of benefits that students provide for their organization. Community agencies report valuing the skills, commitment, fresh perspectives, and high energy levels of student service learners (Edwards et al., 2001; Ferrari & Worrall, 2000; Vernon & Foster, 2002; Vernon &

Ward, 1999). Highly motivated students can inspire staff, offer new ideas to improve

organizational operations, and provide additional human resources that help community agencies

expand their services (Leiderman et al., 2003). They can also help community agencies advance

their missions and expand benefits to their clients (Schmidt & Robby, 2002; Vernon & Foster,

2002). Community agency representatives of youth services note that college-aged service

learning students often connected very well with their young clients, act as important role

models, and help to improve the youth's grades and self-esteem (Vernon & Foster, 2002). The

principal advantage to community agencies, however, was the assistance that service learning

students provide in the form of labor and resources. Student learners often fill volunteer slots

needed to keep programs, especially those with small budgets, running. (Blouin & Perry, 2009).

Community agencies also experience predicable sources of dissatisfaction with service

learning courses and students. Challenges reported by community agencies who had partnered

with service learning students generally fell into two categories: risks to the organization and

investments of resources that do not yield tangible returns (Blouin & Perry, 2009). Community

agencies' biggest complaints relating to service learning often have to do with students'

unreliability, low levels of motivation, and lack of commitment to the project (Gelmon, Holland,

Seifer, Shinnamon, & Conors, 1998; Vernon & Foster, 2002; Vernon & Ward, 1999). These

factors manifest themselves when students do not show up for shifts, miss appointments, or fail

to follow through on tasks or projects assigned to them. Blouin and Perry (2009) found that

community agencies struggled with students lacking professionalism, strong work ethic, and

motivation, and that students were largely unprepared to confront issues related to poverty, race,

mental illness, substance abuse or homelessness. Community agencies believed this lack of

commitment and motivation was the result of service learning being driven by assignments and

not personal goals (Blouin & Perry, 2009). Vernon & Foster (2002) reported that community

agencies found this lack of motivation, commitment, professionalism, and work ethic troubling

because of the disappointment this caused their clients who depended on and looked up to the

university students. To that end, the current study investigates how the framing service learning

assignments could be used to increase student motivation and create a greater correspondence to

personal goals.

Student Motivation and Service Learning

With time and resources scarce in higher education and for many service agencies, it is

important that service learning students enter their assigned roles as engaged, motivated, and

committed individuals. This is important not only because community agencies have listed

unmotivated students as their biggest challenge related to service learning (Boulin & Perry,

2009; Gelmon et al., 1998; Vernon & Foster, 2002; Vernon & Ward, 1999), but also because

motivation itself has been shown to be a factor in students' educational persistence and retention

(Allen, 1999; Morrow & Ackermann, 2012). Highly motivated students will not only be better

partners to community agencies but will also gain more from the learning experience itself

(Archambault et al., 2009; Guay et al., 2008; Meece, Blumenfeld, & Hoyle, 1988).

Motivation is the primary impetus for one to initiate deep learning in higher education

and the driving force to sustain the long and sometimes tedious learning process (Dornyei, 2005).

As such, it is a topic of continued interest in both educational and instructional communication

research. Motivation has been defined as "the level of effort an individual is willing to expend

toward the achievement of a certain goal" (Brennen, 2006, p. 4). In other words, motivation

refers to the initiation, direction, intensity, and persistence of a behavior (Greensberg, 1999).

Theories related to motivation attempt to explain nothing less than why humans behave the way

they do (Guilloteaux & Dornyei, 2008). Without sufficient motivation, individuals with the most remarkable abilities cannot accomplish long-term or even short-term educational goals (Guilloteaux & Dornyei, 2008).

While many factors can contribute to a student's poor academic performance, lack of motivation has a significant impact (Archambault et al., 2009; Guay et al., 2008; Spinath, Spinath, Harlaar, & Plomin, 2006). Educational motivation specifically is associated with positive adaptive outcomes such as school completion, career success, and mental and physical health (Archambault et al., 2009; Guay et al., 2008). Motivation has been shown to be a factor in students' academic persistence and retention. Research indicates significant relationships between motivation – especially motivations and goals related to future jobs – and students' willingness to continue through their college education (Allen 1999; Hull-Blanks et al., 2005; Morrow & Ackermann, 2012). Research even shows that motivation can influence students' creativity (Amabile, 1996), adaptive coping strategies (Boggiano, 1998), and deep conceptual learning (Meece et al., 1988). The achievement of any task often depends on the extent to which individuals strive to attain their purpose (Bolkan, Goodboy, & Kelsey, 2016). As such, a service learner's motivation could be a significant factor for success within the service learning setting, not only for the student, but for the community agency and instructor as well.

Content and Course Relevance and Student Motivation

Students often question how the material in a course relates to them or why there is value in completing a particular assignment. As such, assignment and course relevancy are closely related to student motivation and an important component of implementing successful service learning projects. Keller (1983) defines relevance as a perception of personal needs being met by instructional activities and as a highly desired goal in the classroom. Keller (1979, 1983, 1987)

identified relevance as an imperative factor in increasing students' motivation to complete

assignments and finish the coursework. Keller's (1987) ARCS model provides educators with

strategies that can be used to enhance student motivation and identifies relevancy as one of these

conditions. The model suggests that in every lecture, assignment, or activity, instructors should

actively be attempting to answer students' implicit question, "Why should I have to learn or do

this?" When students seek relevancy in their academic work, they are most concerned with

whether they can directly apply the knowledge or skills resulting from this work to addressing

their own personal concerns, as well as social concerns that are important to them (Pisarik &

Whelchel, 2018). Service learning is time consuming, often difficult, and full of inherent

challenges for students (Burke & Bush, 2013; Darby, Chenault, & Haglund, 2013; Rosing et al.,

2010), so in the case of these unique assignments, it is particularly important that instructors are

communicating assignment relevance and benefits to their students.

Making course content and assignments relevant to every student sitting in a class is often

an unrealistic expectation, especially in large-enrollment courses. However, instructors can use

several strategies to increase perceived relevance (Frymier & Shulman, 1995). Keller's (1987)

ARCS model suggests explicitly linking instruction to present and future academic and career

opportunities. A notable way to enhance perceived relevance is to explicitly state the rationale of

each activity or assignment and to connect content to current events, providing examples drawn

from situations the students are likely to have experienced, or explaining why a subject matter is

important (Keller, 1987). Instructors should strive to relate classroom content to students' goals,

values, and behaviors in order to increase relevance (Weaver & Cottrell, 1988). Shulman and

Luechauer (1993) recommend an integrative approach where instructors involve students in

course design to ensure a match between course content and the goals and needs of the students, which in turn increases the relevance students perceive from their coursework.

Effort and time put into communicating content and assignment relevance pays off. When students perceive the course content and assignments of a class to be relevant they report feeling more empowered (Frymier et al., 1996), more satisfied with the course as a whole (Richardson et al., 2007), more likely to participate in class (Fedesco et al., 2017), and more motivated to engage with the material (Fedesco et al., 2017; Frymier & Shulmann, 1995). Career relevance seems to be particularly important, with students' perceptions of how well their academic experience prepared them for future employment positively associated with educational persistence (Metzner & Bean, 1987).

Because motivation could be one of the most crucial factors in creating and implementing a successful service learning assignment, relevancy must also be considered. Of course, instructors should be proactive about making the relevance of any assignment clear to students. With the additional time and challenges involved with service learning assignments, it is particularly important that students' perceived levels of relevance be as high as possible when they are introduced to a service learning project. Higher levels of perceived relevance is often related to higher levels of student motivation to complete the assignment (Frymier et al., 1996; Fedesco et al., 2017) and so it is of particular importance that instructors communicate assignment relevance through assignment sheets. This study aims to decipher more successful assignment framing tactics to increase perceived relevance.

Theoretical Framework

Research has demonstrated the importance of motivation to student learning in general (Archambault et al., 2009; Guay et al., 2008; Spinath et al., 2006). While researchers and

educators can agree that motivation is important for student success, there is less agreement on how motivation should be promoted. While most researchers emphasize the value of intrinsic motivation for learning (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Kasser & Ryan, 1993; McHoskey, 1999; Sheldon & McGregor, 2000; Vansteenkiste, Simons, Lens, & Sheldon, 2004), some researchers recommend emphasizing extrinsic motivation (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000), and still others advocate a combination of both extrinsic and intrinsic motivation strategies (Elliot & Moller, 2003; Lepper, Corpus, & Iyengar, 2005). The current study is grounded in self-determination theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2000), which has proven itself very useful in explaining the variation in student learning strategies, performance, and persistence. Because the goals of this study are to better understand how an instructor's communication style and goal framing has implications for their students' perceived assignment relevance and motivation, SDT lends itself as a strong theoretical framework to guide the present research by offering researchers a framework for manipulating assignment goals (extrinsic v. intrinsic) and communication style (autonomous-support v. controlling).

Self-Determination Theory. Self-Determination Theory (SDT) is primarily concerned with the type of motivation that underlies learning behavior (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Vansteekiste, Lens, & Deci, 2006). Specifically, SDT posits that the type of motivation (intrinsic v. extrinsic) and the way that those motivations are communicated (autonomy-supportive v. controlling) explain variance in students' motivation and school performance (Vansteekiste et al., 2006). In short, people's goals vary and one way to explain this difference is to describe one's motivations as either intrinsic or extrinsic (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Kasser & Ahuvia, 2002; Kasser & Ryan, 1996). When intrinsically motivated, individuals engage in an activity simply for the enjoyment and excitement it brings, rather than to get a reward or to satisfy a requirement (Deci & Ryan,

1985; Deci & Ryan, 2000). Extrinsically motivated behavior is performed not out of interest, but for the results or consequences it will or could yield (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Deci & Ryan, 2000). In education, extrinsic motivation would prompt behavior to attain an outcome separate from the learning itself (Deci, 1971; 1975).

SDT concerns itself not only with motivations, but also with both intrinsic and extrinsic goals (Williams, Cox, Hedberg, & Deci, 2000). It is important to note that the concept of intrinsic versus extrinsic goal pursuits is conceptually different than the classical motivational constructs of intrinsic versus extrinsic motivations (Deci & Ryan, 2000). In SDT, the term *goals* reflect the differential content or types of goals that people can pursue in their daily behavior, in other words the "what" of goal pursuits, and the term *motivation* pertains to a person's motives or reasons for pursuing a particular goal, or the "why" of goal pursuits (Vansteenkiste et al., 2005). Intrinsic goals include things such as community contribution, affiliation, health, and self-development or things that are said to reflect people's natural growth tendencies. On the other hand, extrinsic goals often include things that create an outward orientation, such as physical and social attractiveness, financial success, power, and image (Williams et al., 2000). Previous studies have demonstrated that an excessive focus on extrinsic relative to intrinsic life goals is associated with lower well-being, increased ill-being, and less socially adaptive functioning (Kasser & Ryan, 1993, 1996; McHoskey, 1999; Sheldon & McGregor, 2000). Research has shown that service learning as the potential to facilitate students in the achievement of intrinsic goals such as community involvement and personal growth (Alcartado et al., 2017), but largely students indicate external goal achievement through service learning projects, such as career development and networking (Alcartado et al., 2017; Chesbrough, 2011; Overall, 2010; Tande & Wang, 2013). This study, however, is particularly concerned with how a service learning

assignment sheet is framed in regards to internal or external goals and how it is communicated in terms of autonomous-support or controlling styles, and what implications these differences have for students' initial perceptions of assignment relevance and motivation.

Self-Determination Theory and Communication Style. SDT is not only concerned with the *type* of goals and goal motivations, but also in how these goals are framed and communicated about. People can be pressured to pursue a goal, or they can decide for themselves whether it is worthwhile to pursue such a goal (Vansteenkiste et al., 2005). According to self-determination theory, goals can be framed in an autonomy-supportive or controlling style (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Controlling styles are further divided into external and internal regulation. In external regulation the behavior is prompted by external contingencies, such as rewards, punishments, and deadlines; this style involves communication that is overtly pressuring, such as "you should" or "you have to" (Deci & Ryan, 2000). In these instances, the reasons for performing the behavior have not been internalized (Vansteenkiste, Lens, & Deci, 2006). Because externally motivated action is experienced as being determined by external factors, it represents an external perceived locus of causality (deCharms, 1969). Internal regulation, on the other hand, happens when people take an action in response to internal pressure, either in the pursuit of self-worth or in avoidance of feelings of guilt and shame. Internal regulation can be evoked with phrases such as "everyone else is doing it, so you should too," and "if you don't do it you might look bad to the rest of your peers" (Vansteenkiste, Lens, & Deci, 2006). In direct contrast, autonomy-supportive styles emphasize a level of personal choice in pursuing the goal and are communicated with phrases such as "you can," and "we suggest that you" take an action (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Vansteenkiste et al., 2006).

Educational researchers have used SDT to study the impact of framing particular learning activities in terms of intrinsic or extrinsic goal attainment, and communicating goals in an autonomy-supporting vs controlling style (Vansteenkisteet al., 2005; Vansteenkiste et al., 2004; Deci et al., 1993). Instructions emphasizing the attainment of an extrinsic goal were found to undermine deep processing of the material, with researchers arguing that extrinsic goals impede deep absorption in the learning task by shifting focus away from the learning task itself to external indicators of success and self-worth (Vansttenkiste et al., 2004). By contrast, intrinsic goal framing promoted deep-level processing, leading to better test performance in this condition (Vansttenkiste et al., 2004). In terms of communication style, research shows that pressuring communication styles can undermine persistence in students (Deci, Driver, Hotchkiss, Robins, & Wilson, 1993). One explanation could be that controlling communication produces an external locus of causality (deCharms, 1968), thereby frustrating students' basic need for self-determination (Vansteenkiste et al., 2005).

Instructors sending student service learners into the community should be particularly concerned with how to motivate their students and set them up for success, given that community partner agencies have identified unmotivated, unengaged, and uncommitted students as the biggest challenges they face when partnering with service learning courses (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Gelmon et al., 1998; Vernon & Foster, 2002; Vernon & Ward, 1999). While research seems to be consistent on the benefits of intrinsic goal framing and autonomy-supportive communication styles on rote or conceptual learning, ability to recall information, and test performance (Deci et al., 1993; Vansteenkiste et al., 2005; Vansteenkiste et al., 2004) it has largely failed to explore whether there are certain unique cases which are more suited to or respond better towards one type of goal framing over another. Assignment sheets generally

represent students' first exposure to a particular project in a class, and have the potential to serve an important role in motivating service learners from the beginning. The current study aims to fill gaps in the literature regarding service learning, assignment framing of goals, and assignment sheet communication styles to better understand the role of service learning assignment sheets and motivated and engaged service learners. Answers to these questions can be important tools for instructors to use throughout their assignment sheets and overall facilitation of the assignment to foster the highest impact from the assignment as possible.

Hypotheses and Research Questions

Research within educational psychology and communication studies has shown the benefits of using the autonomous-support style to communicate with students (Vansteenkiste et al., 2005) and the detrimental effects a controlling communication style can have on students, including undermining persistence to complete certain educational tasks (Vansteenkiste et al., 2005). As DeCharms (1968), explains, exerting this kind of control through communication style frustrates students' basic need for self-determination or autonomy, which could be especially important in a service learning project that requires added time commitments and presents logistical challenges for some students (Burke & Bush, 2013; Darby et al., 2013; Rosing et al., 2010). Previous research has found that students like the freedom to complete assignments in ways that they see as most valuable (Alcartado et al., 2017) and it is likely that a service-learning project would be no different. As such, the first hypothesis posits that an autonomous-support communication style will be positively associated with students' initial motivation to complete a service learning assignment:

H1: Students presented with a service learning project assignment sheet that uses an

autonomous-support communication style will report higher levels of motivation than

those presented with an assignment sheet that uses a *controlling* communication style.

Research regarding goal framing does indicate that presenting academic instructions with a focus

on intrinsic goals promotes deep-level processing, increases test performance, and improves

recall of information (Vansteenkiste et al., 2004). However, research regarding student

perceptions of service learning projects suggest there are benefits in framing this particular type

of assignment in terms of extrinsic goals. Students largely indicate external goals such as

enhancing resumes as the number one thing that prompted them to participate in a service

learning course (Chesbrough, 2011) and a large majority of students in one study believed that

service learning was important largely because it improved their competitiveness for job

positions and internships (Tande & Wang, 2013). The service learning literature indicates that

framing assignments in terms of extrinsic goals could be more effective in motivating students.

Consequently, the second hypothesis posits that framing an assignment in terms of extrinsic

goals will be positively associated with students' initial motivation to complete a service learning

assignment:

H2: Students presented with a service learning project assignment sheet that emphasizes

extrinsic goals will report higher levels of motivation than those presented with an

assignment sheet that emphasizes *intrinsic* goals.

The third hypothesis predicts that the most successful way to frame a service learning assignment

to students in order to increase motivation would be to emphasize the extrinsic goals of the

assignment, while using an autonomous-support communication style. This powerful

combination not only allows students to have a role in shaping their experience (or at least

perceive to have that role), but also emphasizes those extrinsic goals, which past research has shown are important to service learners (Alcartado et al., 2017; Anderson & Erickson, 2003; Chesbrough, 2011; Dreuth & Dreuth-Fewell, 2005; Jones & Abes, 2004; Kraft & Kielsmeier, 1995; Overall, 2010) :

> **H3:** Students presented with a service learning project assignment sheet that emphasizes *extrinsic goals* and uses an *autonomous-support* communication style will report higher levels of motivation and engagement with the assignment than any of the other three conditions.

This research is also concerned with assignment relevance and how instructors can communicate about service learning assignments to increase relevance of course content, which should in turn increase student motivation. While research explicitly examining SDT and students' perceived relevance is scarce, past research has investigated what strategies are best for instructors to implement in their courses to increase students' perceived relevance. Most explicitly, Keller's (1987) ARCS model suggests that the most successful relevancy strategies include clearly linking instruction to present and future academic and career goals and opportunities and Frymier and Shulman's (1995) work agrees. According to SDT, these would be considered extrinsic goals (Deci & Ryan, 2000). As such, the fourth hypothesis predicts a positive relationship between extrinsic goal framing and perceived relevancy of the assignment:

> **H4:** Students presented with a service learning project assignment sheet that emphasizes *extrinsic goals* will report higher levels of perceived assignment relevance than those presented with an assignment sheet that emphasizes *intrinsic* goals.

Until now, research has largely failed to explore how communication style can have implications for students' perceived levels of relevancy of an assignment. However, research has

recommended that when developing any assignment, instructors utilize an integrative approach where students are directly involved in the course design of the class, which increases perceived course relevance (Shulman & Luechauer, 1993). This style of integration would lend itself closely to an autonomous-support communication style (Deci & Ryan, 2000), in which students are better able to mold their service learning assignment to their preferences. As such the fifth hypothesis predicts the following:

> **H5:** Students presented with a service learning assignment sheet that uses an *autonomous-support* communication style will report higher levels of perceived assignment relevance than those presented with an assignment sheet that uses a *controlling* communication style.

It might also be beneficial to better understand what implications goal framing and communication style has on a student's overall attitude towards service learning as a pedagogical tool in general. Because research is too limited to predict a relationship in this area, the final statement is written as a research question.

> **RQ1:** How do the type of goal emphasized and communication style used in an assignment sheet interact to impact students' attitudes toward service learning?

CHAPTER 3. METHOD

In order to test the proposed hypotheses and research questions, participants were presented with an assignment sheet describing a service learning class project and asked to report levels of motivation to complete the assignment, perceived relevance of the assignment, and overall attitude toward service learning after reading. Participants will be randomly assigned to one of four conditions in a 2(*intrinsic v. extrinsic goal framed)* X 2 (*autonomous-support v. controlling communication style)* experiment, with each condition corresponding with a particular goal emphasis and communication style. The following chapter details the proposed research design including participants, procedures, measures, and data analysis.

Recruitment

After approval from the university IRB, participants were recruited from a lower-level communication course at a mid-size, midwestern public university, which stood at an enrollment of just under 1,000 students the semester that responses were collected. This class is a required general education course, which all undergraduate students at the university must complete before graduation. Students were notified about the survey through the course learning website (see Appendix A) and were given 5 points of research participation credit for the course to participate in the research. Instructors also offer alternative assignments to ensure that no student feels pressured or coerced to participate in this particular study or in any research study presented to them. Participants were also recruited through the university's research listserv email list. Students have the option to opt in to this email list and received an email briefly explaining the research and an invitation to participate. These students received no compensation for their participation.

Participants

A total of 284 responses were collected, however, thirteen responses were discarded due to incompleteness. The final number of responses, which were analyzed, was 271 (n= 271). Of the sample, 50.6% (= 137) were male and 46.1% (n= 125) were female, 1.1% (n= 3) of participants reported "other" for their gender and 2.2% (n= 6) did not respond. The sample was comprised of 53.9% (n= 146) first-year students, 19.9% (n= 54) sophomore students, 11.1% (n= 9) junior students, 3.3% senior students (n= 26), and 9.6% (n= 30) reported as other, 2.2% (n= 6) did not respond. Participants were given an open-ended question regarding their major. For ease of analysis and reporting, the reported majors were grouped into one of the university's seven disciplinary colleges. Of the 271 participants, 7.38% (n= 20) reported majors in Agriculture, Food Systems, and Natural Resources, 27.68% (n= 75) reported majors in Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences, 18.45% (n = 50) reported majors in Business, 16.24% (n= 44) reported majors in Engineering, 8.86% (n= 24) reported majors in Health Professions, 6.64% (n= 18) reported majors in Human Development and Education, 13.65% (n= 37) reported majors in Science and Math, and 1.11% (n= 3) reported undecided. Of the 271 participants, 83% (n=225) reported that they had participated in some kind of community service before, but only 31% (n= 84) reported participating in service learning as part of academic coursework before. Regarding whether service learning could be a valuable part of higher education coursework, 17% (n=46) reported "definitely yes", 41.3% (n= 112) reported "probably yes", 24.4% (n= 66) reported "might or might not", 10% (n= 27) reported "probably not", 5.2% (n= 14) reported "definitely not", and 2.2% (n= 6) chose not to respond.

Procedures

The recruitment email (see Appendix B) contained a link to an online survey. Students who clicked to proceed with the survey were indicating their consent to participate. Participants were welcome to discontinue their participation at any time during the survey. After consenting to participate in the research, students were first presented with one of four assignment sheets representing each of the four experimental conditions (*extrinsic/autonomous support; extrinsic/controlling; intrinsic/autonomous-support; or intrinsic/controlling).* Before reading the assignment sheet, students were prompted to imagine they were participating in a course at their university in which the instructor assigned the following project. They were asked to read the assignment sheet carefully before moving on to the next part of the survey.

Following the presentation of the assignment sheet, students were asked to complete a manipulation check, which is used to insure that the goal type and communication style were clear to the participants (see Manipulation Check below and Appendix F). Following the manipulation check, participants were asked to complete three measures. The first measured a students' motivation to complete an assignment and was preceded by the following statement: "Imagine that you are required to complete the assignment presented to you as part of your coursework. Please rate your feelings about the assignment on the scales below." The second measured students' perceived relevance of the service learning assignment. The following statement preceded it: "Imagine that you are required to complete the assignment presented to you as part of your coursework. Please rate your feelings about the assignment on the scales below." The final questionnaire measured students' overall attitudes towards service learning in general. The following statement preceded it: "Think about service learning in general and rate

your feelings about service learning on the scales below." The survey concluded with a series of questions regarding relevant demographic characteristics.

Materials

Manipulation. Participants were randomly assigned to one of four experimental conditions – *extrinsic/autonomous support; extrinsic/controlling; intrinsic/autonomous-support; or intrinsic/controlling.* The two assignment sheets that emphasize *extrinsic* goals included clear statements framing the value of the assignment as helping students achieve *extrinsic* goals such as career development, networking opportunities, and resume building. In the two conditions in which *intrinsic* goals are emphasized, assignment sheets were framed to emphasize the value of the assignment as one that helps students achieve *intrinsic* goals such as personal growth, community awareness, and the joy of helping others. Assignments were also framed using one of two communication styles. The first style, *autonomous-supportive,* emphasized more freedom in how students complete the assignment by using phrases such as "You should…"; "I recommend that you…"; "It's a good idea to…". The second style, *controlling* style emphasized closed parameters through controlling language such as "You have to…"; "You will…"; "This is required…" (see Appendix C for assignment sheets). The four conditions of the experiment combine these variables, creating a 2X2 experimental design.

Manipulation Check. After reading the assignment sheet, participants responded to a series of questions regarding the assignment sheet to ensure the manipulation was successful. The first scale measured the degree to which the assignment sheet was perceived *autonomous-supportive* versus *controlling*. Using a 7-point semantic differential scale, participants read the statement "For this assignment the instructor is…." and then asked to respond to six items with opposing words such as "Flexible in structure/Rigid in structure" and "Restrictive/Allows me

freedom." Higher scores indicated a controlling communication style. The scale had an reliability of (Cronbach's alpha) of .75.

The second scale measured the degree to which the assignment sheet was perceived as emphasizing *extrinsic* or *intrinsic* goals. Using a 7-point semantic differential scale participants were presented with the statement "This assignment…" and asked to respond to five items with opposing statements such as "Will help me be a better person/Will help me add a line to my resume" and "Will be satisfying because I am making a difference/Will help advance my career. Higher scores indicated a perception of extrinsic goals (see Appendix F). The scale had a reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of .71.

Motivation to Complete Assignment. To measure participants' motivation to complete the service learning assignment presented to them in the assignment sheet, Christophel's (1990) student motivation scale was used. Following the lead-in statement, participants responded to a twelve-item, seven-point semantic differential scale, with higher scores representing greater motivation to complete the assignment. Some sample items include: uninterested/interested, unmotivated/motivated, and uninspired/inspired. The scale had a reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of .93.

Perceived Knowledge Transfer Scale (PKTS). A modified version of the Perceived Knowledge Transfer Scale (PKTS; Levesque-Bristol, Zissimopoulos, Richards, Wang, & Yu, 2016) was used to measure students' perceived relevance of each version of the service learning assignment (see Appendix G). Items were modified to refer to the particular assignment presented to students in the survey, rather than the course as a whole. The PKTS includes eight items on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from (1) *Strongly Disagree* to (7) *Strongly Agree,* with higher scores representing greater perceived relevance of the assignment. Items include

statements such as "I feel as if this assignment will be relevant to my future career" and "I believe the things learned in this assignment will be important to my future life." The scale had a reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of .94.

Voluntary Functions Inventory (VFI). A modified version of the Voluntary Functions Inventory (VFI) scale by Clary et al. (1998) was used to measures students' overall attitude toward service learning (see Appendix E). The Voluntary Functions Inventory includes 30 items weighted on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from *(1) Strongly Disagree* to *(7) Strongly Agree,* with higher scores representing more positive feelings toward service learning. The original scale has four factors, which include the following: *career, social, enhancement, and values*. The only factors included in this study were *career, enhancement*, and *values* as they were the most relevant to answer the hypotheses and research questions at hand. The *social* factor of the scale included items which measured one's friends and family members as motivators towards volunteering, such as "I volunteer because my friends do." Because a service learning assignment would be one that a student would be required to do whether their friends do them or not, made this particular factor obsolete to this study and its goals. The remaining 15 items were modified to place an emphasis on service learning specifically rather volunteering in general. Items include statements such as "I am concerned with those less fortunate than myself"; "Service learning makes me feel important"; and "Service learning allows me to explore different career options" (Clary et al., 1998). The scale had a reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of .96.

Pilot Study. In order to confirm that the independent variables were successfully manipulated in the assignment sheets, a pilot study was conducted. Students enrolled in an upper-level communication course (independent of the main study population) were given either

the first or last 10 minutes of class time to complete a survey to test perceptions of the manipulations. Participants completed two 7-point semantic differential scales, which were identical to the ones used in the main study for manipulation checks (see above). The first scale measured the degree to which participants perceived either and *autonomous-support* or *controlling* communication style. The second scale measured the degree that participants perceived an emphasis on either *intrinsic* or *extrinsic* goals. Forty total responses were collected in the pilot study portion of the survey (*n*=40).

Both scales had acceptable reliabilities. The communication style scale had a reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of .75. An independent samples *t*-test was run to test whether the participants who received an assignment sheet using a *controlling* communication style scored significantly higher on this manipulation check scale than did the participants who received an assignment sheet communicated in an *autonomous-support* style. The results were significant with participants in the *controlling* communication style condition (*M*=4.17, *SD*=1.11) scoring significantly higher on the manipulation check scale than participants in the autonomous-support communication style condition (*M*=3.42, *SD*=.69), *t*(40)=2.64, *p*=.012. Results indicate the communication style conditions were successfully manipulated.

The goal type scale had a reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of .70. An independent samples *t*-test was run to test whether the participants who received an assignment sheet emphasizing *extrinsic* goals would score significantly higher on this manipulation check scale than participants who received an assignment sheet that emphasized *intrinsic* goals. The results were not significant. Participants in the *extrinsic* goal condition (*M*=3.82, *SD*=1.17) scored largely the same as participants in the *intrinsic* goal condition (*M*=4.20, *SD*=1.04), *t*(40)=.25, *p*=.33. Results

31

indicate that assignment sheets were not perceived differently in terms of emphasizing *extrinsic* or *intrinsic* goals.

Following these results, assignment sheets were adjusted to emphasize *extrinsic* and *intrinsic* goals more obviously and a second round of pilot study surveys were distributed to two upper-level communication courses in the hopes that participants would be better able to distinguish the differences in goal emphasized after further manipulation. This sample consisted of 34 participants. For the second round, the goal type scale had a reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of .70. An independent samples *t*-test was run a second time on the new set of data to find out whether participants with the *extrinsic* focused assignment sheet scored significantly higher than participants in the *intrinsic* condition after further manipulation. The results were once again not significant with participants in the *extrinsic* goal condition (*M*=3.82, *SD*=.77) scoring largely the same as participants with the *intrinsic* focused assignment sheet (*M*=3.65, *SD*=.70), *t*(32)=.89, *p*=.45. Results of the second round of pilot study responses again indicated that despite the added manipulations regarding goal content, participants were unable to significantly distinguish the difference between assignment sheets emphasizing *extrinsic* or *intrinsic* goals. In the interest of time and in the hope that a larger sample size would garner significant differences in each of the goal content conditions, surveys were distributed to the main study population despite the problematic manipulation.

CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to better understand the impact that service learning assignment framing can have on a students' motivation to complete the assignment, overall perception of the assignment's relevance, and overall attitude toward service learning. Specifically, the study used a 2x2 experimental design grounded in social determination theory (SDT; Ryan & Deci, 2001) to examine the effect of communication style (*controlling* vs. *autonomous-support)* and emphasized goal content (*extrinsic* vs. *intrinsic)* on the above variables. The following chapter outlines the results of this study.

Manipulation Check

Independent samples *t*-tests were run to decipher to what degree participants perceived either an *autonomous-support* or *controlling* communication style and the degree to which participants perceived and emphasis on *extrinsic* or *intrinsic* goals. Higher scores on the goal type manipulation check scale indicated that participants perceived an emphasis of *extrinsic* goals in the assignment sheet and higher scores on the communication style manipulation check scale indicated that participants perceived a *controlling* communication style through-out the assignment sheet.

The results were significant for communication style, with students who received an assignment sheet with a *controlling* communication style (*M*=4.39, *SD*=.93) scoring significantly higher on this manipulation check scale than students who received an assignment sheet with an *autonomous-support* communication style (*M*=3.46, *SD*=.97), *t*(269)=8.05, *p*<.001. Much like the pilot study, these results indicate that participants were able to identify the style with which their particular assignment sheet was communicated.

The results were not significant for goal type emphasized, with students who received an assignment sheet that emphasized *extrinsic* goals (*M*=3.94, *SD*=1.06) reporting largely the same scores as students who received an assignment sheet that emphasized *intrinsic* goals (*M*=3.77, *SD*=1.16), *t*(269)=1.23, *p*=2.19. Again, much like the pilot study, these results indicate that participants were unable to identify the specific type of goal that was emphasized in their particular assignment sheet.

In order to continue to use the data collected for further analysis, we decided to treat the goal type scale as a continuous variable, with scores indicating the participants' perceptions of the level of focus toward *extrinsic* versus *intrinsic* goals. As such, hypothesis 2, 3, and 4 could not be tested and instead post hoc analysis was done using correlations between goal type, motivation, and perceived relevance.

Main Study Data

An independent samples *t*-test was run to test hypothesis 1, which predicted that participants who received an assignment sheet using an *autonomous-support* communication style would score higher in terms of motivation to complete the assignment than would participants who received an assignment sheet using a *controlling* communication style. Results were not significant with participants in the *autonomous-support* communication style condition (*M*=4.27, *SD*=1.13) reporting virtually the same motivation to complete the assignment as students in the *controlling* communication style condition (*M*=4.34, *SD*=1.18), *t*(269)=-.48, *p*=.63. The data were not consistent with hypothesis 1.

While generally a *t*-test would be run to test the second hypothesis as well. However, due to the nonsignificant *t*-test results in regards to goal emphasized in the manipulation check portion of the we were unable to test hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 3, which predicted that participants who received an assignment sheet that emphasized *extrinsic* goals and was communicated in an *autonomous-support* communication style would report the highest levels of motivation to complete the assignment, would normally be tested with a factorial ANOVA which can decipher whether there is an interaction effect between goal emphasized and communication style. However, due to the nonsignificant *t*-test results in regards to goal emphasized in the manipulation check portion of the study, we could also not test hypothesis 3.

Again, generally a *t*-test would be run to test the hypothesis 4. But as with the others due to the nonsignificant *t*-test results in regards to goal emphasized in the manipulation check portion of the we were unable to test hypothesis 4.Again, a Pearson's correlation was used to test hypothesis 4, which predicted that students who received an assignment sheet that emphasized *extrinsic* goals would report higher levels of perceived assignment relevance than those who received an assignment sheet that emphasized *intrinsic* goals, resulting in a positive relationship between the goal type emphasized manipulation check score and the assignment relevance scale. There was a significant relationship between the score on the goal type emphasized scale (*M* =3.85, *SD* =1.11) and the score on the perceived relevance scale (*M* =5.06, *SD* =1.16), however the relationship was *negative* rather than positive, *r* =-.43, *p*<.001. Therefore the data were not consistent with hypothesis 4.

An independent samples *t*-test was run to test hypothesis 5, which predicted that participants who received an assignment sheet that was communicated in an *autonomous-support* communication style would report higher levels of perceived assignment relevance than would participants who received an assignment sheet communicated in a *controlling* communication style. Results were not significant, with students who received an *autonomous-support*

communication style condition (M =5.06, SD =1.19) reporting almost exactly the same score of perceived assignment relevancy as participants in the *controlling* communication style condition (M =5.07, SD =1.12), $t(266)$ =.05, p =.96. Therefore, data were not consistent with hypothesis 5.

In order to better understand the implications that communication style might have on one's overall attitude toward service learning, which research question 1 explored, an independent samples t-test was run. Results were not significant, with students who received an assignment sheet communicated in a *controlling* style reporting virtually the same score regarding overall attitude toward service learning (M =5.23, SD =1.09) as students who received an assignment sheet communicated in an *autonomous-control* communication style (M =5.26, SD =.99).

In order to continue to examine research question 1, which asked whether type of goal emphasized and communication style used in a service learning assignment sheet had implications for students' overall attitudes towards service learning, Pearson's correlations were run and a zero-order correlation table was created to examine relationships between each of the variables. Results are displayed in Table 1.

Post-Hoc Analysis

In order to allow further analysis regarding goal type, the goal type scale was treated as a continuous variable with higher scores indicating perceived higher levels of *extrinsic* goals. As such, Pearson's correlations were run to better understand the implications that goal type emphasized might have for student motivation and perceived relevance. Using research and guidance from hypothesis 2 and 4 it was predicted that the goal manipulation check score would be positively correlated with motivation levels to complete the assignment. In other words, the more *extrinsic* the participant perceived the assignment sheet to be, the more motivated they

would be to complete the assignment. There was a significant relationship between the goal type

score (M =3.85, SD =1.11) and the motivation score (M =4.31, SD =1.15), however the

relationship was *negative* rather than positive, r =-.51, p <.001.

Table 1

Correlation matrix with means and standard deviations

	Goal Emphasis	Motivation to Complete	Perceived Relevance	Attitude to Service Learning
Goal Emphasis				
Comm. Style	.26**			
Motivation to Complete	-.51**			
Perceived Relevance	-.42**	.73**		
Attitude to Service Learning	-.43**	.62**	.75**	
M	3.85	4.31	5.06	5.25
SD	1.11	1.15	1.16	1.04

Note. ** indicates p <.01, * indicates p <.05. M and SD are meant to represent mean and standard deviation respectively.

Again, a Pearson's correlation was used to analyze implications that goal type can have

on perceived relevance. It was predicted that there would be a positive relationship between the

goal type scale score and the assignment relevance scale. In other words, the more *extrinsic* a

student perceives the assignment sheet to be the more relevant they will perceive the assignment

to be. There was a significant relationship between the score on the goal type emphasized scale

(M =3.85, SD =1.11) and the score on the perceived relevance scale (M =5.06, SD =1.16),

however the relationship was *negative* rather than positive, r =-.43, p<.001.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION

This study was designed to better understand service learning and how assignment framing, communication style, and goal type emphasized impact students' motivation to complete the assignment, perceived relevance of the assignment, and overall attitude towards service learning. It sought to continue educational and communication research grounded in social determination theory (SDT; Ryan & Deci, 2001), specifically how instructors can better communicate through their assignment sheets to help students succeed not only in service learning assignments, but hopefully in a variety of assignments.

Despite several pilot studies and revisions of the manipulations in the assignment sheets, despite which condition of goal emphasis they received, participants did not perceive any difference between and emphasis on *extrinsic* or *intrinsic* goals. The assignment sheets were clearly manipulated to either emphasize career growth, networking, and resume building (*extrinsic* emphasis) or to emphasize personal growth, helping the community, and building confidence (*intrinsic* emphasis), but participants scored largely the same mean score on the goal type manipulation check scale regardless of which condition they were randomly assigned to. It might be that service learning is often equated with volunteering which often tends to be associated with intrinsic motivations and benefits by nature. It is likely that participants are either intrinsically or extrinsically inclined as a personality or social trait and how an assignment is framed in an assignment sheet cannot change some of these deep-seated beliefs and traits. In fact, research has shown that individual's temporary motivational orientation towards certain activities can differ based on the social contexts with which they have engaged in these activities (Amabile, DeJong & Lepper, 1976; Deci, 1971; Lepper, Greene, & Nisbett, 1973). In other words, if a participant has engaged in some kind of volunteering before, which 83% ($n=225$)

had, their motivational orientation towards service learning assignments might be contingent on the context their previous volunteering experience was in. For example, if they had been required to participate in volunteering by a parent, teacher, or pastor, or had been required to participate as part of a punishment for a juvenile crime, they might be more likely to inherently have an *extrinsic* orientation towards the activity whether or not the assignment sheet they received emphasized *extrinsic* or *intrinsic* goals. Specifically, three programs of research have treated *intrinsic* and *extrinsic* motivational orientation as variables that are, to some extent, trait like, in other words these orientations are relatively stable across time and across situations (deCharms, 1981; Deci & Ryan, 1985; Harter, 1981). It is likely that a students' preconceived beliefs and experiences would have serious implications for their view of service learning despite which goal emphasis condition they were in.

Interestingly, results indicate that while participants were able to perceive which communication style was being used in their assignment sheet (*autonomous-support* versus *controlling)* it did not seem to predict their motivation or perceived relevance of the assignment. While past research shows that using an *autonomous-support* communication style to communicate with students has its benefits, such as promoting deep-level processing, increasing test performance, and improving recall (Vansteenkiste et al., 2005) and the detrimental effects that a *controlling* communication style can have on conceptual and rote learning (Vansteenkiste et al., 2005), it did not seem to have implications for one's initial motivation or perceived relevance of this particular assignment. Again these results could be indicative of participants' deep-seated beliefs about volunteering and service learning, rather than which assignment sheet condition they were assigned to. According to Hustinx & Lammertyn (2003) willingness to volunteer seems to depend more on personal interests than on which goal type was emphasized

and which communication style was used in an assignment sheet. Much like one's orientation towards a certain motivational context, it is unlikely that one assignment sheet could change a participants' views of service learning (which a large majority of participants did believe could be useful in higher education, which was shown by the majority of participants choosing "Definitely Yes" and "Probably Yes" in the question regarding whether service learning should be implemented in higher education coursework) and volunteering regardless of how the assignment sheet was communicated.

While correlations were not the original plan for studying the impact of goal type emphasized, the results suggest that the framing of assignment goals does impact one's motivation to complete the assignment and perceived relevance. There were significant correlations between perceived extrinsic goal emphasis and motivation to complete the assignment, as well as perceived relevance, but the relationships were both negative. This means that as one's perception of the assignment as having *extrinsic* goals increases, one's motivation to complete the assignment, as well as one's perceived relevance of the assignment, *decreases*.

These results are in line with past research indicating the benefits of presenting assignment instructions with a focus on *intrinsic* goals for a students' deep-level processing, test performance, and recall of information (Vansteenkiste, Simons, Lens, & Deci, 2004). Despite the fact that students largely indicate external goals, such as enhancing resumes, as the number one thing that prompts them to participate in a service learning course (Chesbrough, 2011), *extrinsic* goal emphasis did not have a positive impact on motivation and perceived relevance in this study. These findings call for more research to better understand how goal emphasis affects students' motivation and thoughts about that assignment's relevance for their future.

In order to better understand how each of the variables is related to the others and what implications the experiment conditions have on one's overall perception of service learning (which was asked in the study's research question) a Pearson's zero-order correlation was run. The Pearson's zero-order correlation table can give insight into how each of the study's continuous variables are related. Interestingly, all of the continuous variables were significantly correlated and several demonstrated high levels of correlation. The only research question this study posed was how communication style and goal emphasized were related to general attitudes toward service learning. Both correlations were negative, meaning that as perceptions of a *controlling* communication style increased, students' general attitude toward service learning became less positive. Students also reported less positive attitudes toward service learning as their perceptions of *extrinsic* value to the assignment increased. This points to the fact that students probably connect *intrinsic* value to service learning project due to its inherent connection to volunteering and serving others and students are generally more perceptive to an *autonomous* communication style, but especially in terms of a service learning type assignment.

It is probably not surprising that overall attitude toward service learning was strongly and positively correlated with motivation to complete the assignment and perceived relevance of the assignment. The more relevant students found the assignment to be, the more highly they rated service learning in general, and the more motivated they were to complete the assignment the more positively they rated service learning in general. These correlations show that this area is ripe for research in order to better understand why these variables might be related.

Implications

While many of the results were not consistent with what hypotheses predicted, they nonetheless offer a deeper look at students' perceptions of service learning. While motivation to

complete the assignment and perceived relevance scores did not seem to vary by the condition each participants' assignment sheet fell in, the mean scores are telling of the possibilities that service learning holds as an educational tool. The mean scores of perceived relevance (M= 5.06, SD =1.16) and attitude toward service learning (M =5.25, SD =1.04) are particularly high, showing that students' general attitudes toward service learning are positive and that students believe these types of projects are relevant to both their future careers and future academic work. This finding is largely consistent with past research that indicates students understand the benefits that service learning can have (Greenberg, 2000; Ikeda, 2000; Joiner, 2000; Quezada & Christopherson, 2005; Schaffer & Peterson, 1998; Turner, 2002). Participants' mean score on the motivation to complete assignment scale (M =4.31, SD =1.15) was closer to the middle of the 7-point scale, which could indicate that while students see the benefits of service learning and generally have a positive attitude toward the idea, they are also aware of its challenges. As such, they might report lower motivation scores than perceived relevance and overall attitude toward service learning. Again, these results are largely consistent with past research on student motivation to complete assignments (Burke & Bush, 2013; Darby, Chenault, & Haglund, 2013; Rosing, Reed, Ferrari, & Bothne, 2010). These results show that students are open to the idea of service learning, but faculty and scholars should continue to study how to most effectively communicate with their students in order to better address motivation and perceived relevance.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

While this study did yield some interesting results, it was not without some limitations. First, the sample consisted almost completely of first year students in an introduction to communication course, which could have implications for the participants' familiarity with service learning. While a large majority of the sample reported that they had participated in some

kind of community service before (83%, *n*=225), a majority of students reported that they *had not* participated in service learning *as part of academic coursework* (31%, *n*=84). There might have been more variety in the responses to each of the scales if participants had greater familiarity with the idea and concept of service learning in higher education.

Probably the most glaring limitation of this particular study was the fact that, despite multiple pilot studies, multiple revisions to the manipulations, and a large sample, participants did not report significantly different scores on the goal content manipulation check scale. While the possible reasons for this lack of difference were explained above, a qualitative or mixed method approach to this topic could be useful in understanding students' perceptions of and motivations to participate in service learning projects. In-depth interviews could offer researchers an answer to *why* the nature of goals emphasized did not seem to affect student perceptions of the service learning assignment.

A second limitation was the fact that attempting to create a clear dichotomy between *extrinsic* and *intrinsic* goal emphasis on a service-learning assignment sheet was nearly impossible due to the nature of assignments and of service learning. It could be argued that service learning is my nature, intrinsic due to its "volunteering" or "service" nature. Further, at some level, any kind of assignment, even one that focuses on service, is inherently extrinsic. Assignments are things that students are *required* to do in order to earn points or a grade, which are extrinsically motivated factors and ultimately extrinsic goals. It proved nearly impossible to create clear manipulations for each goal condition due to the oppositional nature of assignments and of service-learning.

Survey research in and of itself holds inherent weaknesses including respondent fatigue and social desirability bias (Jones, Baxter, & Khanduja, 2013). It is possible that students did not

take the time to read the assignment sheet or scales carefully, or were unable to take it seriously as an assignment they might be asked to complete someday. While social desirability is often a factor to take into consideration on any research study, with a topic like service learning, it is especially important to consider. Social desirability is the tendency of some respondents to report an answer in a way they deem more social acceptable than how they actually feel (Lavrakas, 2008) which is highly likely with a project related to community service such as this one.

Regardless of research methodology, this area is ripe for further research. If faculty and universities are serious about implementing service learning or other experiential learning into coursework, it is important that researchers continue to work towards a better understanding of how to communicate these assignments to students, in order to increase motivation and perceived relevance and create a more positive experience for all involved. While assignment sheets are students first exposure to an assignment and thus very important they are obviously not the only exposure or instructions to an assignment that a student receives. Future research on this topic could be conducted in an actual classroom, where a professor is orally communicating the assignment to their students using one of the two communication styles (*autonomous-control* vs. *controlling)* and emphasizing one of the two goal types (*extrinsic* vs. *intrinsic).* While this experiment might be more difficult to complete logistically, it would have the possibility of yielding interesting and important results. It could be also be interesting to interview students already involved in service learning coursework to better understand their motivations to take the class and complete the coursework, as well as continue to experiment with different communication channels (rather than just written in an assignment sheet). These research findings could be generalized outside of service learning as a set of best practices for

communicating about *any* assignment presented to students, but especially experiential learning assignments such as service learning.

Wherever scholars take this research, it is important that it continues. Experiences such as service learning can be highly valuable for all parties involved. The data in this study show that students are open to the idea of service learning, find it relevant, and have a fairly positive view of it being implemented in university coursework, but still need an extra push to be motivated to complete it. As such, it would be beneficial for researchers to continue to focus on students' motivation and how to increase it.

REFERENCES

Alcartado, P. S., Camarse, M. G., Legaspi, O. M., Mostajo, S. T., & Buenaventura, L. C. (2017). Developing a pedagogical model of service learning: The De La Salle University-Dasmarinas experience. *Journal of Institutional Research in South East Asia, 15*(2), 31-56.

Allen, D. (1999). Desire to finish college: An empirical link between motivation and persistence. *Research in Higher Education, 40*(4), 461-485.

Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in context.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Amabile, T. M., DeJong, W., & Lepper, M. R. (1976). Effects of externally imposed deadlines on subsequent intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *34*(1), 92-98. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.34.1.92

Anderson, J. B., & Erickson, J. A. (2003). Service-learning in preservice teacher education. *Academic Exchange Quarterly, 7*(2), 111-115.

Archambault, I., Janosz, M., & Pagani, L. (2009). Adolescent behavioral, affective, and cognitive engagement in school: Relationship to dropout. *Journal of School Health , 79*(9), 408-415.

Astin, A., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Higher Education, 7*, 251-263.

Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. (2000). How service learning affects students. *Journal of Higher Education, 144,* 1-6.

Bean, J. P. (1983). The application of a model of turnover in work organizations to the student attrition process. *The Review of Higher Education, 6*(2), 129-148.

Billig, S. H. (2000). Research on K-12 school-based service learning: The evidence builds. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81*(9), 658-664.

Blouin, D. D., & Perry, E. M. (2009). Whom does service learning really serve? Community organizations' perspectives on service learning. *Teaching Sociology, 37*(2), 120-135.

Boggiano, A. K. (1998). Maladaptive achievement patterns: A test of diathesis-stress analysis of helplessness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(6), 1681-1695.

Bolkan, S., Goodboy, A. K., & Kelsey, D. M. (2015). Instructor clarity and student motivation: Academic performance as a product of students' ability and motivation to process instructional material. *Communication Education, 65*(2), 129-148.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate.* Princeton, MA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brennen, A. M. (2006). *Enhancing students' motivation.* Retrieved March 1, 2018, from http://www.soencouragement.org/enhancing-students-motivation.htm

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 67*(2), 1-17.

Burke, A. S., Bush, M. D. (2012). Service learning and criminal justice: An exploratory study of student perceptions. *Educational Review, 65*(1), 55-69.

Chesbrough, H. W. (2011). Bringing open innovation to services. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 52*(2), 85-90.

Christophel, D. M. (2009). The relationship among teacher immediacy behaviors, student motivation, and learning. *Communication Education, 39*(4), 323-340.

Clayton, P. H., Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2013). *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessments.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. R., 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*(6), 1516-1530.

Darby, A., Longmire-Avital, B., Chenault, J., & Haglund, M. (2013). Students' motivation in academic service-learning over the course of the semester. *College Student Journal, 47*(1), 185-191.

deCharms, R. (1969). Origins, pawns, and educational practice. In G. S. Lessor (Ed.), *Psychology and the educational process.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Deci, E. L. (1971). Effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 18*(1), 105-115. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0030644

Deci, E. L. (1975). *Intrinsic motivation.* New York: Plenum Press.

Deci, E. L., Driver, R. E., Hotchkiss, L., Robbins, R. J., & Wilson, I. M. (1993). The relation of mothers' controlling vocalizations to children's intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 55*(2), 151-162.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior.* New York: Plenum.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and the "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11,* 227-268.

Dewey, J. (1938. *Experience and education.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Donaldson, L. P., & Daughtery, L. (2011). Introducing asset-based models of social justice

    into service learning: A social work approach. *Journal of Community Practice, 19*(1),

    80-99.

Dornyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second*

    language acquisition. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dreuth, L., & Dreuth-Fewell, M. (2005). A model of student learning in community service

    field placements: Voices from the field. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 3,* 251-

    264.

Edwards, B., Mooney, L., Heald, C. (2001). Who is being served? The impact of student

    volunteering on local community organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector*

    Quarterly, 30(3), 444-461.

Ehrlich, R. (2005). Loewald's approach to psychoanalytic theory. *The Psychoanalytic*

    Quarterly, 74(3), 633-933.

Elliot, A. J., & Moller, A. C. (2003). Performance-approach goals: Good or bad forms of

    regulation?. *International Journal of Educational Research, 39*(4), 339-356.

Fedesco, H. N., Kentner, A., & Natt, J. (2017). The effect of relevance strategies on student

    perceptions of introductory courses. *Communication Education, 66*(2), 196-209.

Ferrari, J. R., & Worrall, L. (2000). Assessments by community agencies: How "the other

    side" sees service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 6,* 35-

    40.

Fisher, E. E., Sharp, R. L., & Bradley, M. J. (2017). Perceived benefits of service learning: A

    comparison of collegiate recreation concentrations. *Journal of Experiential*

    Education, 40(2), 187-201.

Frymier, A. B., & Shulman, G. M. (1995). "What's in it for me?": Increasing content relevance to enhance students' motivation. *Communication Education, 44*(1), 40-50.

Frymier, A. B., Shulman, G. M., & Houser, M. (1996). The development of a learner empowerment measure. *Communication Education, 45*(3), 181-199.

Garman, P. (1995). Civic education through service learning. In J. J. Patrick & L. A. Pinhey (Eds.), *Resources on civic education for democracy: International perspectives yearbook.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing.

Gelmon, S., Holland, B., Seifer, S., Shinnamon, S. S., & Conors, K. (1998). Community-university partnerships for mutual learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 5,* 97-107.

Giles, D. E., & Eyler, J. (1994). The theoretical roots of service-learning in John Dewey: Toward a theory of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1*(1), 7-85.

Gray, M., Ondaatje, E., & Zakaras, L. (1999). *Combining service and learning in higher education: Summary report.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Greenberg, J. S. (1999). Need for service and service-learning. In J. Greenberg (ed.), *Service Learning in Health Education,* 133-137. Reston, VA: AAHE.

Guay, F., Ratelle, C. F., & Chanal, J. (2008). Optimal learning in optimal contexts: The role of self-determination in education. *Canadian Psychology, 49*(3), 233-240.

Guilloteaux, M. J., & Dornyei, Z. (2011). Motivating language learners: A classroom-oriented investigation of the effects of motivational strategies on student motivation. *Tesol Quarterly, 42*(1), 55-77.

Harter, S. (1981). A new self-report scale of intrinsic versus extrinsic orientation in the

    classroom: Motivational and informational components. *Developmental Psychology,*

    17(3), 300-312. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.17.3.300

Hull-Blanks, E., Robinson Kurpius, S. E., Befort, C., Sollenberger, S., Nicpon, M. F., & Huser,

    L. (2005). Career goals and retention related factors among college freshman. *Journal of*

    Career Development, 32(1), 16-30.

Hustinx, L., & Lammertyn, F. (2003). Collective and reflexive styles of volunteering: A

    sociological modernization perspective. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit*

    Organization, 14(2), 167-187.

Joiner, L. L. (2000). Learning to serve: Community service meets curriculum objectives.

    American School Board Journal, 187(11), 32-34.

Jones, S. R., & Abes, E. S. (2004). Meaning-making capacity and the dynamics of lesbian

    college students' multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student*

    Development, 45, 612-632.

Jones, T. L., Baxter, M. A. J., & Khanduja, V. (2013). A quick guide to survey research. *Ann R*

    Coll Surg Engl, 95, 5-7.

Kasser, T., & Ahuvia, A. (2002). Materialistic values and well-being in business students.

    European Journal of Social Psychology, 32, 137-146.

Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (1993). A dark side of the American dream: Correlates of financial

    success as a central life aspiration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*(2),

    410-422.

Keller, J. M. (1979). Motivation and instructional design: A theoretical perspective. *A*

    Journal of Instructional Development, 2(4), 26-34.

Keller, J. M. (1983). Motivational design of instruction. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), *Instructional design theories: An overview of their current status* (pp. 383-434). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Keller, J. M. (1987). Development and use of the ARCS model of instructional design. *Journal of Instructional Development, 10*(3), 2-10.

Kraft, R. J., & Lielsmeier, J. (1995). *Experiential learning in schools and higher education.* Dubuque, IA: Kendall Publishing Co.

Kuh, G. D. (2003). What we're learning about student engagement from NSSE. *Change 35(*2), 24-32.

Lavrakas, P. J. (2008). Social desirability. *Encylopedia of Survey Research Methods, 1,* 15-24.

Leiderman, S., Furco, A., Zap, J., & Goss, M. (2003). *Building partnerships with college campuses: Community perspectives.* Washington, DC Council of Independent Colleges. Online monograph at website: www.cic.edu.

Lepper, M. R., Corpus, J. H., & Iyengar, S. S. (2005). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivational orientations in the classroom: Age differences and academic correlates. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 97*(2), 184-196.

Lepper, M. R., Greene, D., & Nisbett, R. E. (1973). Undermining children's intrinsic interest with extrinsic reward: A test of the "overjustification" hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 28*(1), 129-137. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0035519

Lemieux, C. M., & Allen, P. D. (2007). Service learning in social work education: The state of knowledge, pedagogical practicalities, and practice conundrums. *Journal of Social Work Education, 43*(2), 309-326.

Levesque-Bristol, C., Richards, K. A. R., Zissimopoulos, A., Wang, C., & Yu, S. (2016). *Creation and validation of the perceived knowledge transfer scale (PKTS).* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Lewis, T. L. (2004). Service learning for social change? Lessons from a liberal arts college. *Teaching Sociology, 32*(1), 94-108.

Lewing, J. M., & York, P. E. (2017). Millennial generation faculty: Why they engage in service-learning. *The Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education, 9*(3), 35-47.

McHoskey, J. W. (1999). Machiavellianism, intrinsic versus extrinsic goals, and social interest: A self-determination analysis. *Motivation and Emotion, 23*(4), 267-283.

Meece, J. L., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Hoyle, R. H. (1998). Students' goal orientations and cognitive engagement in classroom activities. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*(4), 514-523.

Metzner, B. S., & Bean, J. P. (1987). The estimation of a conceptual model of nontraditional undergraduate student attrition. *Research in Higher Education, 27*(1), 15-38.

Morrow, J. A., Ackermann, M. E. (2012). Intention to persist and retention of first-year students: The importance of motivation and sense of belonging. *College Student Journal, 46*(3), 483-491.

Okun, M. A., Barr, A., & Herzog, A. R. (1998). Motivation to volunteer by older adults: A test of competing measurement models. *Psychology and Aging, 13*(4), 608-621.

O'Meara, K., Sandmann, L. R., Saltmarsh, J., & Giles, D. E. (2010). Studying the professional lives and work involved in community engagement. *Innovative Higher Education, 36*(2), 83-96.

Overall, P. M. (2010). The effect of service learning on LIS students' understanding of

    diversity issues related to equity of access. *Journal of Education for Library and*

    Information Science, 51(4), 251-266.

Penn, E. B. (2003). Service-learning: A tool to enhance criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal*

    Justice Education, 14(2), 371-383.

Pisarik, C., & Whelchel, T. (2018). Academic relevance: College students' perspective.

    International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 30(1), 26-35.

Poulin, J., Kauffman, S., & Silver, P. (2006). Field notes: Serving the community and training

    social workers. *Journal of Social Work Education, 42*(1), 171-184.

Quezada, R. L., & Christopherson, R. W. (2005). Adventure-based service learning:

    University students' self reflection accounts of service with children. *Journal of*

    Experiential Education, 28(1), 1-16.

Richardson, J. T. E., Slater, J. S., & Wilson, J. (2007). The national student survey:

    Development, Findings, and Implications. *Studies in Higher Education, 32*(5), 557-

    580.

Rosing, H., Reed, S., Ferrari, J. R., & Bothne, N. J. (2010). Understanding student complaints

    in learning pedagogy. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 46*(3), 472-481.

Scales, P. C., Roehlkepartain, E. C., Neal, M., Kielsmeier, J. C., & Benson, P. L. (2006).

    Reducing academic achievement gaps: The role of community service and service-

    learning. *Journal of Experiential Education, 29*(1), 38-60.

Schelbe, L., Petracchi, H. E., & Weaver, A. (2014). Benefits and challenges of service-learning

    in baccalaureate social work programs. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 34*(5),

    480-495.

Schmidt, A., & Robby, M. A. (2002). What's the value of service-learning to the community?. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 9*(1), 27-33.

Sheldon, K. M., & McGregor, H. A. (2008). Extrinsic value orientation and "The Tragedy of the Commons". *Journal of Personality, 68*(2), 383-411.

Shulman, G., & Luechauer, D. (1993). The empowering educator: A CQI approach to classroom leadership. In D. Hubbard (Ed.), *Continuous quality improvement: Making the transition to education* (pp. 424-453). Maryville, MO: Prescott Publishing.

Skinner, E. A., & Belmont, M. J. (1993). Motivation in the classroom: Reciprocal effects of teacher behavior and student engagement across the school year. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 85*(4), 571-581.

Snyder, M., & Cantor, N. (1998). Understanding personality and social behavior: A functionalist strategy. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (pp. 635-679). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Spinath, B., Spinarth, F. M., Harlaar, N., & Plomin, R. (2006). Predicting school achievement from general cognitive ability, self-perceived ability, and intrinsic value. *Intelligence, 34*(4), 363-374.

Strage, A. (2000). Service-learning: Enhancing student learning outcomes in a college level lecture course. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 7*, 5-13.

Tande, D. L., & Wang, D. J. (2013). Developing an effective service learning program: Student perceptions of their experience. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behaviors, 45*(4), 377-379.

Turner, C. S. V. (2002). Women of color academe living with multiple marginality. *The Journal of Higher Education 73*(1), 74-93.

Vansteenkiste, M., Lens, W., & Deci, E. L. (2006). Intrinsic versus extrinsic goal contents in self-determination theory: Another look at the quality of academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist, 41*(1), 19-31.

Vansteenkiste, M., Simons, J., Lens, W., Sheldon, K. M., & Deci, E. L. (2004). Motivating learning, performance, and persistence: The synergistic role of intrinsic goals and autonomy-support. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87,* 246-260.

Vansteenkiste, M., Simons, J., Lens, W., Soenens, B., & Matos, L. (2006). Examining the motivational impact of intrinsic versus extrinsic goal framing and autonomy-supportive versus internally controlling communication style on early adolescents' academic achievement. *Child Development, 76*(2), 483-501.

Vernon, A., & Foster, L. (2002). Community agency perspectives in higher education service-learning and volunteerism. In S. H. Billig & A. Furco (Eds.), *Service-learning through a multidisciplinary lens* (pp. 153-175). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Vernon, A., & Ward, K. (1999). Campus and community partnerships: Assessing impacts and strengthening connections. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 6*(1), 30-37.

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

Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2000). Community-centered service learning: Moving from doing for to doing with. *American Behavioral Scientist, 43*(5), 767-780.

Warren, K. (1998). Educating students for social justice in service learning. *Journal of Experiential Education, 21*(3), 134-139.

Weaver, R. L., & Keller, J. M. (1990). The clinical use of motivational messages: An inquiry into the validity of the ARCS model of motivational design. *Instructional Science, 19,* 467-500.

Werner, C. M., Voce, R., Gaufin, K., & Simons, M. (2002). Designing service-learning to empower students and community: Jackson Elementary builds a nature study center. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*(3), 557-579.

Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2000). Expectancy-value theory of achievement motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 68-81.

Williams, G. C., Hedberg, V. A., Cox, E. M., & Deci, E. L. (2006). Extrinsic life goals and health- risk behaviors in adolescents. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*(8), 1756-1771.

APPENDIX A. RECRUITMENT EMAILS

Dear NDSU COMM 110 students:

We are conducting a study on service-learning in higher learning. Our goal is to gain a better understanding of how to create successful service learning projects. We are very interested in your perspectives and feelings towards these kinds of projects.

You are receiving this email, because you qualify to participate in our survey. This survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes of your time to fill out. When you finish the survey, please print off the "Thank You" page, and bring it to your small group public speaking class in order to receive your research credit. To take the survey, please click the URL link (insert URL link).

The NDSU Institutional Review Board (IRB), approval number, has accepted this study #(insert number). If you have any questions about the rights of human research participants, or if you would like to report a problem, please contact the NDSU IRB Office at (701) 231-8995 or email at ndsu.irb@ndsu.edu. In addition, if you have any questions regarding this study or would like additional information, please contact me at carrieanne.platt@ndsu.edu.

Thank you,

Carrie Anne Platt
Associate Professor of Communication
North Dakota State University
Department #2310
P.O. Box 6050 • Minard 338B12
Fargo, ND 58108-6050
Phone: 701-231-7294

Dear NDSU Students,

We are conducting a study on assignment sheets in college courses. Our goal is to gain a better understanding of how to create successful classroom assignments. We are very interested in your perspectives on this important subject!

You are receiving this email, because you qualify to participate in our survey. This survey will only take 10-15 minutes of your time to fill out and can be found at the following link: (insert link). We sincerely appreciate your time and participation!

The NDSU Institutional Review Board (IRB) has accepted this study (#HS18230). If you have any questions about the rights of human researchparticipants, or if you would like to report a problem, please contact the NDSU IRB Office at (701) 231-8995 or email at ndsu.irb@ndsu.edu. In addition, if you have any questions regarding this study or would like additional information, please contact me at carrieanne.platt@ndsu.edu.

Thank you,

Carrie Anne Platt
Associate Professor of Communication
North Dakota State University
Department #2310
P.O. Box 6050 • Minard 338B12
Fargo, ND 58108-6050
Phone: 701-231-7294

NDSU **North Dakota State University**
Department of Communication
PO Box 6050; Fargo, ND 58108-6050
(701) 231-7705; Fax: (701) 231-7784

Title of Research Study: Student Motivation for Service Learning in Higher Education

This study is being conducted by: Dr. Carrie Anne Platt, Associate Professor, Department of Communication at NDSU.

Why am I being asked to take part in this research study?

You are invited to take part in this research study because you are currently enrolled in COMM 110 and are over 18 years of age.

What is the reason for doing the study?

The purpose of this study is to better understand students' attitudes and feelings towards service learning projects in higher education.

What will I be asked to do?

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to take a short survey regarding a service learning project and your feelings regarding the project. The survey should take no more than 10-15 minutes of your time.

What are the risks and discomforts?

Given the nature of the questions we are asking, we do not anticipate harm or discomfort for participants. Your answers to the questions will be kept completely confidential and your anonymity will be protected, as no personal identifying questions will be asked of you. However, you may refuse to answer any question, for any reason, or you may stop the survey at any point.

What are the benefits to me?

By participating in this study, you will be offered 5 research participation points from your small-group instructor.

What are the benefits to other people?

This study has the potential to reveal new information about service learning projects. This information will contribute to the knowledge about how students are motivated and learn best. This could potentially redefine how teachers implement service learning projects and others like it.

Do I have to take part in the study?

Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. If you decide to participate in the study, you may change your mind and stop participating at any time.

Who will have access to the information that I give?

We will keep private all research records that identify you, to the extent allowed by law. Survey files will be stored in a password protected file on a computer that is only accessible to the primary investigator and the co-investigators. Data and records created by this project are owned by NDSU and the researchers. You may view information collected from you by making a written request to the researchers. You may only view information collected from you, and not information collected about others participating in the project.

What if I have questions?

If you have any questions about the study, you can contact the lead researcher, Dr. Carrie Anne Platt, at carrieanne.platt@ndsu.edu.

What are my rights as a research participant?

You have rights as a participant in research. If you have questions about your rights, or complaints about this research, you may talk to the researcher or contact the NDSU Human Research Protection Program at:

- Telephone: 701.231.8908 ·
- Email: ndsu.irb@ndsu.edu
- Mail: NDSU HRPP, 1735 NDSU Research Park Dr., NDSU Dept. 4000, PO Box 6050, Fargo, ND 58108-6050

The role of the Human Research Protection Program is to see that your rights are protected in this research; more information about your rights can be found at: www.ndsu.edu/research/irb.

Documentation of Informed Consent:

You are freely making a decision whether to be in this research study. Continuing with this survey means that:

1. You have read and understood this consent form

2. You have decided to be in the study.

You may contact Dr. Carrie Anne Platt to request a copy of this consent form to keep if you so choose.

CLICKING THE "CONTINUE" BUTTON BELOW SIGNIFIES THAT YOU HAVE READ THE INFORMED CONSENT AND AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY.

APPENDIX C. MANIPULATED ASSIGNMENT SHEETS

Note: assignment sheets are highlighted for ease in identifying manipulations. These highlights will not be present in assignment sheets presented to students. The key is as follows:

XXXX = Extrinsic Goal Framing

XXXX = Intrinsic Goal Framing

XXXX = Autonomous-Support Communication Style

XXXX = Controlling Communication Style

Extrinsic/Controlling Condition.

Service Learning Assignment

Due Date: May 1, 2018
Purpose: Your main assignment in this course will be to participate in a service-learning project for an organization in the community, which will offer you the opportunity to add impressive experience to your resume and aid you in your future career.

This assignment will help you prepare for your future career and increase your salary earning potential by:
· Serving as an opportunity to network
· Helping you build your resume
· Providing experience that will be valuable to you as you begin your career after graduation

Volunteering is a rewarding experience that research shows increases one's likelihood of being hired at top companies. Often times, students find that through their volunteer experience they are offered the opportunity to explore a possible career field, meet people who serve as important contacts and references once they start their careers, and offer valuable experiences for their resumes. I know you will find this project just as useful for your future career as they have!

This project will last the duration of the semester and make up a significant portion of your total points for your final grade, so you need to take it seriously.

At the end of the semester, you will be required to write a final paper reflecting on your time volunteering in your organization and how it connects to course concepts and theories. You also must prepare a presentation of your experience for your classmates. Details for these assignments will be given later in the semester. Keep in mind that they will be worth a lot of the points that make up your grade for the semester.

Requirements:

1. You must spend at least 30 hours at your community agency over the course of the semester.
     *This time must be split equally throughout the semester, with service lasting three hours a week for the 10 weeks of the semester. You will be filling out a time sheet, which must be signed by your agency contact and turned in every Friday.

2. This semester you will be assigned to the community agency at which you will be working. I have gathered a list of community agencies in need in the area and will be assigning you each to one of the agencies.
     *Once you receive your community agency, you must email the contact person I provide you with immediately to set up a time to be oriented with the organization and CC me on the email.

3. You are required to write a final paper at the end of the semester about this assignment, how it relates to our course content, and how this experience will play a role in your future career.

*In order to assist you in this paper, it is essential that you write weekly journals documenting your time serving. You will not formally turn these in for points, but I reserve the right to check in randomly to ensure that these are being done.

Intrinsic/Controlling Condition.

Service Learning Assignment

Due Date: May 1, 2018
Purpose: Your main assignment in this course will be to participate in a service-learning project for an organization in the community, which will offer you the opportunity to grow as a person and as a community member.

This assignment will help you to learn more about yourself and make a difference by:
· Allowing you to take your learning outside of the classroom
· Offering much needed insight and services to a valuable cause
· Learning more about how your personal strengths can serve community needs

Volunteering is a rewarding experience that will allow you to not only grow as a student, but as a whole person as well. Often times, students find that their outlooks on certain causes, people, or issues are changed as a result of volunteering in the community, and many find the activity so rewarding they choose to continue volunteering long after the assignment is finished. I know you will find this project just as rewarding as they have!

This project will last the duration of the semester and will be a time of huge personal growth for you as an individual, so you need to take it seriously.

At the end of the semester, you will be required to write a final paper reflecting on your time volunteering in your organization and how it connects to course concepts and theories. You also must prepare a presentation of your experience for your classmates. Details for these assignments will be given later in the semester and will offer you a time to truly reflect on all that you've experienced and the growth you've felt personally.

Requirements:

1. You must spend at least 30 hours at your community agency over the course of the semester.
    *This time must be split equally throughout the semester, with service lasting three hours a week for the 10 weeks of the semester. You will be filling out a service time sheet, which must be signed by your agency contact and turned in every Friday.
2. This semester you will be assigned your community agency at which you will be serving. I have gathered a list of community agencies in need in the area and will be assigning you each to one of the agencies.

*Once you receive your community agency, <mark>you must</mark> email the contact person I provide you with immediately to set up a time to be oriented with the organization and CC me on the email.

3.<mark>You will write</mark> final reflection paper at the end of the semester about your time serving, how it relates to our course content, <mark>any people or situations you found particularly moving, and how you grew as a person and scholar through out the experience</mark>.

    *In order to assist you in this paper, <mark>it is essential</mark> that you write weekly journals reflecting on your time serving. You will not formal turn these in for points, but <mark>I reserve the right to check in</mark> randomly to ensure that this is being done.

<mark>Extrinsic</mark>/<mark>Autonomous-Support</mark> Condition.

Service Learning Assignment

Due Dates: May 1, 2018

Purpose: Your main assignment in this course will be to participate in a service-learning project for an organization in the community, which will offer you the opportunity <mark>to add impressive experience to your resume and hopefully aid in starting your career in the future.</mark>

This assignment will help you <mark>prepare for your future career</mark> and <mark>increase your salary earning potential by:</mark>
·   <mark>Serving as an opportunity to network</mark>
·   <mark>Helping you build your resume</mark>
·   <mark>Providing experience that will be valuable to you as you begin your career after graduation</mark>
·

This project will last the duration of the semester and make up a significant portion of your total points for your final grade, <mark>so I recommend that you take it seriously</mark>. Volunteering is a rewarding experience that research <mark>shows increases one's likelihood of being hired at top companies</mark>. Often times, <mark>students find that through their volunteer experience they are offered the opportunity to explore a possible career field, meet people who serve as important contacts and references once they start their careers, and offer valuable experiences for their resumes.</mark> I know you will find this project just <mark>as rewarding and valuable for your future career as they have!</mark>

At the end of the semester, <mark>you will write</mark> a final paper reflecting on your time volunteering in your organization and how it connects to course concepts and theories. <mark>You will also be asked</mark> to prepare a presentation of your experience for your classmates. Details for these assignments will be given later in the semester. Keep in mind that they will be worth a lot of the points that make up your grade for the semester.

<mark>Tips for Success:</mark>

1. <mark>You will spend</mark> a total of 30 hours at your community agency over the course of the semester.

     * It is a good idea to split these hours up equally throughout the weeks of the semester, but it is largely up to you how you spend them

2. I will provide a list of service agencies in the community and you are welcome to choose one that you find most interesting or are most passionate about.
     *Please notify me through email once you have chosen an agency and contacted that agency.

3. You'll write a final paper at the end of the semester about your time working, how it relates to our course content, and how this experience will play a role in your future career. Largely, you have the creative freedom to include what you find important or valuable about this experience in your paper.
     *It is a good idea to keep a regular journal and jot down some notes about your experience after each time you serve. This journal could serve as a valuable tool once you start writing the final paper, I may check in from time to time to see if you are completing this

Intrinsic/Autonomous-Support Condition.

Service Learning Assignment

Due Dates: May 1, 2018

Purpose: Your main assignment in this course will be to participate in a service-learning project for an organization in the community, which will help you grow as a person and as a community member. This project will last the duration of the semester and should be a time of huge personal growth for you as an individual.

This assignment will help you to learn more about yourself and make a difference by:
· Allowing you to take your learning outside of the classroom
· Offering much needed insight and services to a valuable cause
· Learning more about how your personal strengths can serve community needs

Volunteering is often a very rewarding experience, which will allow you to not only grow as a student, but as a whole person as well. Often times, students find that their outlooks on certain causes, people, or issues are changed as a result of volunteering in the community, and many find the activity so rewarding they choose to continue volunteering long after the assignment is finished. I hope you will find this project just as rewarding as they have!

At the end of the semester, you will write a final paper reflecting on your time volunteering in your organization and how it connects to course concepts and theories. You will also be asked to prepare a presentation of your experience for your classmates. Details for these assignments will be given later in the semester and will offer you a time to truly reflect on all that you've experienced and the growth you've felt personally.

Tips for Success:

1. You will spend a total of 30 hours at your community agency over the course of the semester.
       * It is a good idea to split these hours up equally throughout the weeks of the semester, but it is largely up to you how you spend these hours

2. I will provide a list of service agencies in the community and you are welcome to choose one that you find most interesting or are most passionate about.
       *Please notify me through email once you have chosen an agency and contacted that agency.

3. You will write a final reflection paper at the end of the semester about your time serving, how it relates to our course content, and how you grew as a person and scholar through out the experience. Largely, you have the creative freedom to include what you find important or valuable about this experience in your paper.
       *It is a good idea to keep a regular journal and jot down some notes about your experience after each time you serve. This journal could serve as a valuable tool once you start writing the final paper. I may check in from time to time to see if you are completing this.

APPENDIX D. MOTIVATION SCALE

Imagine that you are required to complete the assignment that was just presented to you as part of your required coursework. Please rate how you feel about completing this assignment on the scales below.

1. *Motivated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unmotivated
2. *Interested	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Uninterested
3. *Involved	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Uninvolved
4. Not Stimulated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Stimulated
5. Don't want to do it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Do want to do it
6. *Inspired	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Uninspired
7. Unchallenged	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Challenged
8. Uninvigorated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Invigorated
9. Unenthused	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Enthused
10. *Excited	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not excited
11. *Aroused	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not aroused
12. Not Fascinated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Fascinated

Note: items denoted with a "" are reverse coded.*

APPENDIX E. MODIFIED VOLUNTARY FUNCTIONS INVENTORY (VFI)

Please think about service learning assignments in general and rate your feelings about the following statements on the scales provided, with 1= Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3= Somewhat Disagree; 4=Neither Agree or Disagree; 5= Somewhat Agree; 6= Agree; 7= Strongly Agree.

1. Service learning can help me get my foot in the door at a place where I would like to work. (*Career*)

2. I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself. *(Values)*

3. Service learning makes me feel important. (*Enhancement*)

4. No matter how badly I've been feeling, service learning helps me forget about it. *(Protective)*

5. I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving in a service learning project. *(Values)*

6. By participating in service learning I feel less lonely. (*Protective*)

7. I can make new contacts that might help my business or career. *(Career)*

8. Participating in service learning relieves me of some of the guilt of being more fortunate than others. (*Protective*)

9. Service learning helps me to learn more about the coursework which I am learning *(Understanding)*

10. Participating in service learning increases my self-esteem. *(Enhancement)*

11. Service learning allows me to gain a new perspective on coursework. *(Understanding)*

12. Service learning allows me to explore different career options. *(Career)*

13. I feel compassion toward people in need. *(Values)*

14. Service learning lets me learn through direct, hands-on experience. *(Understanding)*

15. I feel it is important to help others. *(Values)*

16. Participating in service learning helps me work through my own personal problems. *(Protective)*

17. Service learning will help me to succeed in my chosen profession. (*Career*)

18. Through service learning, I can do something for a cause that is important to me. *(Values)*

19. Service learning is a good escape from my own troubles. *(Protective)*

20. Through service learning projects I can learn how to deal with a variety of people. (*Understanding*)

21. Service learning makes me feel needed. *(Enhancement)*

22. Service learning makes me feel better about myself. (*Enhancement*)

23. Service learning experience will look good on my resume. *(Career)*

24. Service learning is a good way to make new friends. *(Enhancement)*

25. By participating in a service learning project, I can explore my own strengths. *(Understanding).*

APPENDIX F. MANIPULATION CHECK AND PILOT STUDY

Goal Content Emphasized

Imagine that you are required to complete the assignment that was just presented to you as part of your required coursework. Please rate how you feel about completing this assignment on the scales below.

"For this assignment…"

1. Will help me be a better person	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Will help me add a line to my resume
2. Will help me grow as an overall person	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Will help me get a job someday
3. Will be satisfying because I'm making a difference	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Will help advance my career
4. *Mostly helps my resume look good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Helps me grow personally
5. Is worth doing for the points	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Is worth doing because it's for a good cause.

Note: items denoted with a "" are reverse coded.*

Communication Style Used:

Imagine that you are required to complete the assignment that was just presented to you as part of your required coursework. Please rate how you feel about completing this assignment on the scales below.
"For this assignment, the instructor is…"

1. *Is restrictive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Allows me freedom
2. Will allow me to complete as I wish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Will make me complete as they wish
3. Has loose guidelines	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Has tight guidelines
4. Is flexible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Is very structured
5. *Sets a schedule for me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Allows me to choose my own schedule
5. *Let's me be creative in completing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Restricts my creativity in completing

Note: items denoted with a "" are reverse coded.*

APPENDIX G. PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER SCALE (PKTS)

Please think about the service learning assignment you were just presented and rate your feelings about the following statements on the scales provided, with 1= Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3= Somewhat Disagree; 4=Neither Agree or Disagree; 5= Somewhat Agree; 6= Agree; 7= Strongly Agree.

1. I feel confident in my ability to apply what I will learn from this assignment to other classes I have.

2. I feel confident in my ability to apply what I learn from this assignment in my future professional life.

3. I feel as if the experiences I will have in this assignment will be relevant to my future.

4. Given the future career I want to pursue, it is important for me to learn from this experience.

5. I understand how I will use what I learn from this assignment in my professional life.

6. Information learned from this assignment will inform my future learning experiences.

7. I believe it is important for me to learn the information included in this assignment.

8. The information learned from this assignment will help me become a more well-rounded individual.

APPENDIX H. DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Gender
>   a. Male
>   b. Female
>   c. Other

2. Year in School
>   a. First-Year
>   b. Sophomore
>   c. Junior
>   d. Senior
>   e. Other

3. Major

_____

4. Have you participated in community based volunteer work before?
>   a. Yes
>   b. No

5. Have you participated in service learning for a college course before?
>   a. Yes
>   b. No

6. Do you think service learning is valuable in higher education?
>   a. Definitely No
>   b. Probably No
>   c. Undecided
>   d. Probably Yes
>   e. Definitely Yes