Chapter 1: Introduction and Overview

Research reveals that successful second language acquisition requires a complex interplay of cognitive, affective, and sociocultural elements (Brown, 2000). Theories describing communicative competence recognize four interrelated competencies that inform overall communicative aptitude: grammatical competence (ability to use words and grammatical rules), sociolinguistic competence (ability to know when to use appropriate forms for specific contexts or the sociocultural understanding of language use), discourse competence (ability to use language with proper cohesion and coherence), and strategic competence (ability to use communication strategies to avoid communication break-downs) (Canale & Swain, 1980). While it is relatively easy to teach and assess grammatical, discourse, and strategic competency knowledge and skills using traditional language pedagogy, it is challenging to teach sociolinguistic competency, let alone assess it, using these traditional approaches.

Traditional pedagogy tends to focus on textbook learning, which caters to vocabulary and grammar skills development. While most language practitioners incorporate elements of social interaction in the classroom, they are limited by the traditional classroom environment. Most popular language textbooks and programs include canned or student-created dialogues to build strategic competence, but the dialogues are manufactured for classroom use. They artificially recreate authentic language experiences. Even innovative language immersion programs are limited by the classrooms in which they are conducted. Second language students still mostly interact with students and teachers in a classroom environment – they just happen to be

interacting entirely in a second language. As such, most language students never have the opportunity to practice and gain language skills in an authentic language context.

Second language sociolinguistic competency develops when students engage in authentic social interaction in real-world contexts. Sociocultural theory, based on the work of Lev Vygotsky, describes how "the human mind is mediated" by physical and symbolic tools (language) to form meaning (Lantolf, 2000, p. 1). Individuals use language to process the world around them. Thoughts and experiences are transformed into cognitive understanding through social interaction. If students are to gain true sociolinguistic competency, they must practice their language skills in authentic social interactions.

While the constraints of a traditional classroom may account for deficiencies in the development of sociolinguistic competency in language learning, some language teachers have found that providing service-learning opportunities as an integral part of the language classroom curriculum may be an effective means to incorporate sociocultural aspects. Service-learning ties academic content with needed community service. In service-learning projects, students are called to practice classroom content in authentic, real-world environments, benefiting both the student and the community. Good service-learning pedagogy recognizes the individual characteristics of the learners, the learning mediation required by the practitioners, and the role of reflection activities in the learning process (Cone & Harris, 1996). In recent years, service-learning initiatives in the language classroom have been increasingly prevalent in scholarly journals and language conferences due to the added affective and sociocultural aspects they promise language learners (See Chapter 2).

My interest in incorporating these aspects of second language learning led me to research service-learning pedagogy. In the fall of 2005, I submitted a paper as part of a Second Language Acquisition course in the TESOL Program at Indiana University Purdue University – Indianapolis (IUPUI). The subject of my paper, incorporating service-learning pedagogy in a second language classroom, has since become a major research and pedagogical focus for me as a developing English for Academic Purposes (EAP) instructor. As such, I approached the EAP Program about structuring my capstone EAP practicum around a service-learning project and was granted permission to pilot a project in an ENG-G012 Listening and Speaking course in which I was assisting. In the following semester, I was granted permission to pilot a variation of my project in my own section of ENG-12 in the spring semester of 2009.

Despite some weaknesses in the pilot program, the results of implementing service-learning in a listening and speaking class were very encouraging. It was clear to me that the added sociocultural interaction in authentic language environments improved student motivation and second language listening and speaking skills. I witnessed firsthand the tremendous oral language benefits that first piqued my attention in the research, but I became increasingly curious about its impact on complete communicative competence across all language skills. In particular, I questioned how this type of experience would affect second language writing skills. True communicative competence, after all, is more than merely listening and speaking. Most students I had encountered considered second language writing to be the much greater struggle for them. Perhaps it is not surprising, given that traditional writing classes offer even less access to authentic language experiences. Most writing classes that I have ever taken,

taught, or read about have followed the same basic format of learning about writing from the instructor through writing lessons, drafting, and revising with instructor guidance. What would an EAP writing class using service-learning look like? Would it increase student writing skills? How would I know if it did?

While my focus in the pilot course had previously been the broad affective and sociolinguistic benefits of service-learning and managing the elusive administrative aspects of a service-learning project, my curiosity and expanded research also inspired me to address some of the research gaps noted by published professionals in the field for my thesis project – namely, the lack of quantitative, empirical evidence of the academic effectiveness of service-learning pedagogy on second language writing. As documented in the literature review (Chapter 2), most researchers studying service-learning pedagogy have defaulted to highly qualitative research, drawing broad conclusions from student reflective journals and interviews – all very subjectively limited data. In fact, only one study in my research revealed a quantitative approach to assessing this pedagogy in a writing classroom (Wurr, 1999). Wurr incorporated service-learning in his writing classroom and then used rating scales to measure rhetorical writing gains. While this study was promising for my purposes, it was limited as it assessed only one writing sample per student, analyzed persuasive writing only, and only collected writing at the end of the term. Neither long-term academic gains nor short-term personal gains per student was satisfactorily established given these limitations.

Based on this apparent gap in service-learning scholarship, I designed my study to analyze three different types of student texts per student at three different points in the

service-learning experience in order to gain a more comprehensive picture of individual student gains.

As detailed in the methods chapter of this thesis, Service-Learning Case Study Methods and Analysis (Chapter 3), I implemented a service-learning component in my section of a Fundamentals of English (ENG-W001) writing course in order to answer the following research questions:

1. Does service-learning contribute to improving second language writing skills?

2. Are there significant personal gains at different periods in the semester?

3. Does service-learning have an effect on student self-assessment of writing and attitudes towards writing?

Using Wurr's study as a departure point, I studied the impact of service-learning on student writing by analyzing three different texts of varying lengths (paragraph and essay) at three different points in the service-learning experience (before, during, after) for each student. In addition, I surveyed the students regarding their attitudes towards writing and their self-assessments of writing skills before and after the experience.

It is my hope that analyzing this data through this thesis will not only enhance the existing literature, but will also provide a powerful incentive for the implementation of service-learning in the English for Academic Purposes (EAP) Program at IUPUI. While the university at large has embraced service-learning pedagogy, evidenced by the installation of the Center for Service and Learning devoted to service-learning course development and research, the EAP Program has yet to significantly incorporate these service-learning resources into its curriculum. I intend this thesis project to provide initial guidance to both instructors and administrators interested in this movement.

Overview of Thesis

       The second chapter of this thesis will introduce the service-learning approach and review the existing literature on service-learning in both the composition classroom and the second language classroom. The third chapter will provide an overview of the service-learning project, including a description of the quantitative and qualitative methods used to assess the data collected and a discussion of the results as they relate to the three core research questions described above. The fourth and final chapter will summarize the findings and discuss implications and suggestions for EAP practitioners using service-learning as well as suggest directions for future research.

Chapter 2: The Impact of Service-Learning on Second Language Writing

In recent years, service-learning pedagogy has attracted research attention across disciplines based on the perceived positive impact it has on student learning and civic engagement – two key outcomes identified by most liberal arts institutions. The promise of service-learning pedagogy is captured clearly in its definition. Bringle and Hatcher (1996) define service-learning 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 as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility (p. 222).

As the above definition indicates, service-learning appears to be a robust method to engender a wide variety of learning outcomes, irrespective of the discipline in which it is situated. If thoughtfully implemented, service-learning promises to orient students to the discourse community of their specific discipline as well as their larger community.

Despite the recent attention this pedagogical approach has received, it has not resulted in the collaborative cross-disciplinary research one might expect from such a powerful, potentially life-changing approach to teaching and learning. In response to multi-disciplinary interest, the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) sponsored a series on service-learning pedagogy across disciplines from 1998-2000. Contributing book volumes focused on discipline-specific models and outcomes, such as service-learning in psychology, sociology, composition, Spanish, engineering, management, accounting, biology, and nursing. While the AAHE series drew attention to the fact that many disciplines were exploring service-learning, it did little to encourage collaborative research across disciplines. As such, it is necessary for some multi-

disciplinary practitioners, such as second language writing instructors, to synthesize the current scholarship if they desire to incorporate this pedagogy. While service-learning has been explored somewhat in composition studies as well as in second language acquisition, the two disciplines have yet to fully cross-pollinate their findings, leaving practitioners interested in the impact of service-learning on second language composition without strong and clear models.

The following literature review is a synthesis of the current research on the impact of service-learning on the writing skills of second language students. Service-learning research in rhetoric and composition focuses on critical literacy skills, including audience awareness and some affective benefits, which most practitioners believe strengthen student research and writing skills. Research in second language acquisition, on the other hand, tends to focus purely on the social and affective benefits of service-learning which inform the overall communicative competence of second language learners, but does not measure its impact on writing skills. Service-learning practitioners in both disciplines clearly subscribe to the view that literacy, in both a first and second language, is a social action. Therefore, they include service-learning components in their courses as a means to cultivate social interaction beyond the boundaries of a traditional classroom.

In both the fields of rhetoric and composition as well as second language acquisition, there appears to be a basic assumption that students who are asked to write frequent reflections, a core requirement of most service-learning projects, will develop their writing skills simply because they have additional opportunities to practice critical thinking. However, very few researchers in either discipline have actually assessed the linguistic and rhetorical features of the writing product itself, leaving interested

practitioners without documentation that service-learning actually influences writing at all. In addition, the research in both disciplines is overwhelming qualitative, drawing mostly on student reflection journals and culminating course and project evaluations. This lack of quantitative evidence limits the breadth and depth of current research in these two fields.

Despite these criticisms, studies in both disciplines generally report the positive effects of using service-learning with students that allow an initial conclusion to be made: service-learning pedagogy offers several linguistic and motivational benefits to second language writers because literacy development is inherently a social activity. Therefore, second language composition students should benefit from service-learning if projects are structured in a manner that requires reflection of the service activities in a mediated environment.

Service-Learning in Composition: Rationale, Models, and Outcomes

While researchers in the field of rhetoric and composition are far from advancing one all-encompassing definition of literacy, many of the competing theories about literacy and its development showcase the force that community has on individuals in the literacy appropriation process. Brandt (2001) discusses the role of community in literacy development by discussing the importance of sponsors in the process. Brandt defines sponsors as "any agents, local or distant, concrete or abstract, who enable, support, teach, or model, as well as recruit, regulate, suppress, or withhold literacy" for apprentices (p. 556). New learners gain literacy through interacting with these agents.

Likewise, Bartholomae (2001) and Gee (2001) underscore the social dynamics students face when engaging in a secondary discourse. Gee defines primary discourse as the discourse people learn when they are first learning to socialize. Generally, primary discourse is learned within familial units and engenders a sense of belonging to a particular, intimate group or culture. Secondary discourse is the discourse that is gained by engaging in larger, more public spheres outside of the small, family-like units, such as one encounters at church, in the workplace, and in schools. Gee contends that operating in a secondary discourse gives students the meta-knowledge required to critique and more fully understand their primary discourse. Bartholomae describes how student apprentices acquire the language of the community (or "code") through repeated social interactions that they then use to interact with their new discourse communities (p. 521). True engagement in the community can only take place once the students have mastered the specialized language of the secondary discourse community. These overarching literacy theories contend that students attain and shape their literacy through social interaction. Actively participating in a community, therefore, is an essential aspect of literacy development.

Given the importance social interaction plays in literacy development, it is not surprising that service-learning scholarship in rhetoric and composition highlights increased social interaction as a key rationale for its prevalence in rhetoric and composition pedagogy. Deans' (2000) seminal work on service-learning in the composition classroom, *Writing Partnerships: Service-Learning in Composition*, provides a theoretical foundation for how service-learning is used to create ideal social environments for literacy development in a composition classroom. Deans organizes his

book by categorizing the three types of service-learning models and defining their distinct pedagogical goals and discourse focus:

- Writing *about* the community, in which students participate in service activities outside of the classroom and then reflect on their experiences through journal entries and traditional, academic research papers.

- Writing *for* the community, in which students participate in service where writing is the service. Many students undertake internship-like projects in which writing assignments vary, but the primary site of learning is the service site, not the classroom.

- Writing *with* the community, in which students collaborate with community members on writing projects.

It is only through understanding the basic goals and discourse activities of the three models that practitioners can decide which model best suits their intended literacy purpose. In the "writing *about*" model, Deans illustrates how academic literacy as well as critical literacy are central goals, and academic discourse remains the primary discourse. Instructors help students to build conceptual bridges between academic exercises and authentic societal issues, thus reducing the traditionally isolating and decontextualized experience of writing about societal issues in academia. In this model, the primary site of learning is the classroom. By contrast, the "writing *for*" model seeks to expose students to authentic writing environments in which they get a sense for the real-world purpose of writing. The primary discourse is workplace discourse. Finally, the "writing *with*" model desires to move beyond a discourse of critique to a discourse of empowerment through collaborative work. Projects following this model aim to teach participants to be agents of

change in their world through writing. As noted by Deans (2000), all of the service-learning in composition models are experimental and progressive in their teaching methods, but only this third "writing *with*" model is also experimental and progressive in the types of discourse it produces. Goals include teaching students and community members to "negotiate cultural differences and forge shared discourses" (p. 17). As such, hybrid discourses result, such as legal petitions and congressional correspondence, which can be broadly categorized as social advocacy discourse.

Motivation, student satisfaction with writing, and critical literacy.

Service-learning practitioners in composition use qualitative and anecdotal evidence to document positive learning outcomes for students. In particular, Deans documents increased student motivation, student satisfaction with their writing, and critical literacy gains among the projects he studied.

In one example of a "writing *about*" model, Deans reviews the qualitative data he collected through interviews and surveys of Professor Bruce Herzberg and his students at Bentley College who participate in a service-learning project in their first-year composition course. Students serve as literary tutors to local elementary school students, read works intended to guide them in critically analyzing education, and produce term papers which focus on societal issues of education. Deans' findings suggest that students do not automatically start thinking about social justice issues when they are engaged in community service activities. Instructors have to help them bridge the gap by mediating their learning. Herzberg notes, "I want them (the students) to see that these issues are not purely academic, that there is a public policy issue at stake that affects actual lives" (as

cited in Deans, 2000, p. 93). Herzberg stresses to his students how discourse affects change in society, which is his underlying rationale for using service-learning to reinforce literacy goals: "I want them to see the relationship there, how these three types of discourse [professional, popular, public] affect public policy" (as cited in Deans, 2000, p. 98). One student's final course evaluation documents growth in critical literacy as well as self-perceived writing improvement when she writes:

> The most important thing I have learned is that writing is not just something people read or write for amusement, but a powerful medium used to portray important messages that affect our children's education in this country everyday. Writing can make a difference. It can show people what inequalities exist in our educational system and maybe even show them how they can help solve these problems. I think that this course has definitely helped improve my writing style and informed me on the educational issues that exist in this country. It has shown me the different views on curriculum, school funding, ebonics, and much more. I never even cared about these issues before this course. (as cited in Deans, 2000, p. 98-99)

In their book on service-learning in the composition classroom, *Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Composition*, Adler-Kassner et al. (2006) compile the work of several service-learning practitioners who note similar social benefits of service-learning on literacy. In their chapter entitled "Service-Learning: Bridging the Gap Between the Real World and the Composition Classroom", Dorman and Dorman (2006) cite increased autonomous learning, civic responsibility, academic achievement, and increased student satisfaction as reasons to include service-learning components in composition. Brack and Hall (2006) also document increased motivation due to an improved sense of the real purpose for writing in their chapter entitled "Combining the Classroom and the Community: Service-Learning in Composition at Arizona State University." Finally, Arca (2006) reveals an increased sense of authority

for basic writers in her contribution entitled "Systems Thinking, Symbiosis, and Service: The Road to Authority for Basic Writers." Arca finds that basic writers learn to write more complex papers than before that "contain a rich mix of sources – student observations, recalled experiences, interviews, texts – and a wide range of interesting and locally focused topics" (p. 140). Arca believes that service-learning leads basic writers, who traditionally view themselves as powerless, to see themselves as agents for change in their world as a result of participating in service-learning projects. Likewise, Deans believes that the most dramatic impact of service-learning is "motivational not rhetorical" (p. 69). After students adjust to the initial transition difficulties of this new method of learning, they begin to document greater satisfaction with their writing.

According to rhetoric and composition studies, therefore, many of the benefits of service-learning are clearly social. Students gain motivation and self-confidence, which are key to their development of critical literacy skills. Sociocultural theory, based on the work of Lev Vygotsky, claims that "the human mind is mediated" by tools, be they physical or symbolic (like language), which allow individuals to construct meaning (Lantolf, 2000, p. 1). Because language is used to process thoughts and experiences, social interaction becomes crucial to cognitive development. While rhetoric and composition studies seem to recognize the importance of sociocultural aspects of language learning, some neo-Vygotskyian theorists expand its value even further, suggesting that language learning and research should be viewed through an ecological lens - one which recognizes social interaction as not simply *facilitating learning*, but *representing learning itself* (van Lier, 2000). These same socially enhanced literacy benefits, framed in sociocultural theory and documented in composition studies, extend

14

to second language learners as well, as the scholarship on service-learning in second language acquisition demonstrates (See Table 1 which summarizes the benefits of service-learning as documented in composition studies research).

Table 1

Benefits of Service-Learning in Composition Studies

Benefit	Source	Design	Subjects
Sense of authority	Arca (2006)	Community service learning class, one-time service event of student's choice (Foothill College). Data collected via participant reflection journals.	Unpublished
Motivation	Brack & Hall (2006)	First, second, third year composition course, 80-90 hours service as tutors, led literacy and readiness workshops (Arizona State University). Data collected via course research papers.	Unpublished
Critical literacy, student satisfaction with writing	Deans (2000)	First-year composition course serve as literary tutors (Bentley College). Data collected via interviews with professor, class observation, email interviews with students, review of course materials.	Unpublished
Student satisfaction with writing, motivation, academic achievement	Dorman & Dorman (2006)	Composition course, 30-40 hours of volunteer service at community agency of student's choice (Lousiana State University and Southern University). Data collected via survey.	56

Service-Learning in Second Language Acquisition: Rationale, Models, and Outcomes

While rhetoric and composition studies use literacy gains as a rationale for service-learning pedagogy, second language acquisition studies invoke communicative competence theories as justification for its inclusion. Communicative competence theories recognize the four interrelated competencies that inform overall communicative

aptitude: grammatical competence (ability to use words and grammatical rules), sociolinguistic competence (ability to know when to use appropriate forms for specific contexts), discourse competence (ability to use language with proper cohesion and coherence), and strategic competence (ability to use communication strategies to avoid communication break-downs) (Canale & Swain,1980). For second language acquisition researchers, service-learning is justified because it builds sociolinguistic competence, which is difficult to accomplish in a traditional classroom environment.

Similar to scholarship in composition studies, service-learning models in second language acquisition contexts vary. A review of the published research reveal that service-learning projects in second language acquisition tend to follow three basic models:

1) Second language (L2) students providing service abroad in a country which speaks the target language as a first language (Hale, 1999; Heuser, 2000; Kiely & Nielson, 2003; Minor, 2002; Vahlbusch, 2003; Wurr, 1999);

2) L2 students providing service in their home countries in communities that speak the target language as a first language (Arries, 1999; Boyle & Overfield, 1999; Lally, 2009; Polansky, 2004); and

3) L2 students providing service in their home countries in communities that also speak the target language as a second language (Mullaney, 1999).

Despite the differing models, the published studies all overwhelmingly report the social and affective benefits of service-learning on second language acquisition that strengthen student sociolinguistic competence. In particular, studies indicate increases in cultural understanding, empathy, student motivation, and self-esteem (Boyle & Overfield,

1999; Carney, 2004; Grassi, Hanley, & Liston, 2004; Minor, 2002; Morris, 2001; Weldon & Trautmann, 2003).

Cultural understanding.

One of the most often cited gains of service-learning in second language acquisition is an increase in cultural awareness. Second language researchers believe that second culture acquisition is just as important in second language acquisition as learning the language itself. Research reveals that student motivation to learn the target language is impeded if negative stereotypes and attitudes are not challenged (Gardner & Lambert, 1959). Students with negative attitudes distance themselves from using the target language, which decreases their communicative competence in that language. In their article, "Motivational Variables in Second Language Acquisition," Gardner and Lambert (1959) report a positive correlation between attitude toward a language and culture and second language learning success. Second language acquisition practitioners using service-learning demonstrate how exposing language students to authentic cultural experiences greatly enhances student attitudes and motivation to learn.

Morris' (2001) service-learning scholarship focuses on cultural awareness growth. In "Serving the Community and Learning a Foreign Language: Evaluating a Service-Learning Programme," Morris explained how he used a pre-questionnaire to select 95 students who were classified as relatively unmotivated to study Spanish or expressed indifference toward Spanish-speaking cultures before taking part in the service project. Morris assessed his students' cultural awareness growth by comparing reflection journal entries throughout the project. Unmotivated students wrote comments like: "I do not

17

really care about being good in Spanish or Latinos or people who speak Spanish. All I want is to finish" (p. 247). At the end of the project, student entries documented increased cultural sensitivity. One student wrote the following comment: "We, Americans, think we are the best culture and most civilized people. I now realise that we can easily undermine other cultures and people, mostly Latinos who come to the US" (p. 249). The service-learning experience revealed to Morris' students that cultural tensions exist that they did not perceive before.

Morris believes that this cultural awareness transformation takes place because the service-learning participants begin to notice similarities between themselves and those they assist. He shares the reflection entry of one student who wrote: "We are all so similar. We are all people learning from each other and trying to adapt to a different language and culture. We are all struggling to understand each other and learn from each other's cultures" (p. 251). Morris believes that the common tools used to teach about other cultures (books, videos, lectures) are too constructed and, therefore, limiting in a traditional language classroom (p. 252). He concludes that service-learning is a powerful tool for teaching cultural understanding because it maintains the dynamic nature of culture, requiring students on-site to constantly "negotiate meaning" in cultural contexts (p. 252). Morris contends that "attitudinal change occurs through social contact and social practice" in which students began to notice similarities between cultures (p. 252). Empathy allows the learner to understand another by first becoming aware of his / her own feelings and subsequently identifying with another. This understanding and appreciation of another can also increase motivation to communicate in the target

language and make the learning meaningful and relevant to the students as it impacts them on a more personal level.

Carney (2004), likewise, documents an increase in cultural awareness in journals of student service-learning participants at Butler University in her article "Reaching Beyond Borders through Service Learning." Carney's students were assigned to tutor Spanish-speaking students in the local community. Similar to Morris, she relies solely on journal entries to document increased cultural awareness. She notes that students gain "an increased appreciation for the complexities surrounding the Latino population in the United States" and shares a journal entry in which a service-learning student describes being confronted by a Latino student regarding his perceptions of Mexicans. Even though the university student tried to reassure his tutored student that he had no negative feelings regarding Mexicans, the tutored student shared that he hears derogatory comments directed at Mexicans regularly. This reflection documents how the university student increased his social awareness by becoming aware of cultural clashes in his community that he did not see before. Unlike Morris' conclusions; however, Carney does not believe that her students gain cultural awareness by relating to other cultures, but by simply becoming more informed of issues that they did not know previously existed.

In their article "Spanish and Service-Learning: Pedagogy and Praxis," Weldon and Trautmann (2003) also report significant gains in cultural awareness among their service-learning participants. Similar to Carney (2004), Weldon and Trautmann believe their students gain this awareness through the critical thinking exercises inherent in service-learning reflection writing, not through simply relating to other cultures. Their students documented cultural observations and were then prompted to reflect on the

phenomenon they recorded. For example, one student reflected on the priority Latinos seem to place on family life. Another student reflected on the differences between social flirting in the Latino community which she experienced on site versus the norms for flirting in her own culture. Weldon and Trautmann conclude that "students arrived at a much deeper understanding of the concept of culture by learning how intertwined are different areas of life – such as hygiene, income, employment, sexual taboos, gender roles – and how language mediates among them," as seen in the student reflection journals (p. 581).

Interestingly, Minor (2002) is one of the few researchers that documents the cultural gains for international students who participate in service-learning in the United States. Minor reports on a service project at Sacred Heart University in which English Language Learners (ELLs) whose L2 is English participated in an 8-week project of their choosing, including sites at soup kitchens, Habitat for Humanity building projects, and nursing homes. As his students expanded their awareness of American culture beyond the university, his students began to feel more accepted by the dominant American culture. One student wrote: "We not only improved our language, but we became a part of the culture, country and society" (p. 12). Despite the fact that researchers disagree on the cause of increased cultural awareness, evidence supports that increased cultural awareness can be gained in all three types of service-learning models in second language acquisition.

Self-esteem and motivation.

Studies have shown that language students with higher self-esteem consider themselves more capable at learning languages, which correlates to greater motivation and desire to communicate in a second language. High self-esteem decreases inhibition and anxiety and increases risk-taking, which encourages students to practice the language among their peers or with native speakers, increasing their overall literacy skills (MacIntyre, Dörnyei, Clément, & Noels, 1998). Using a second language in an authentic environment, like those provided in service-learning experiences, underlies that the purpose of learning a language is to use it, providing a key rationale for students to learn the language and increasing their motivation to do so.

Morris (2001) indicates that motivation results from cross-cultural interaction and sharing among his service-learning participants. Once his students, American students whose L2 was Spanish, became more comfortable with the target-language group, they were motivated to learn more about them. One student wrote: "The class and the work experience has motivated me to learn more about Hispanics in general…I am…going to change my minor to major so that I can to become more knowledgeable of Hispanic literature and culture" (p. 251). The service-learning activity directly motivated the student to learn more about Hispanic culture, language, and literature and to take immediate action to realize his goal.

Similarly, Grassi, Hanley, and Liston (2004) report on the impact of the Colorado Learn and Serve Programs on student engagement in their article "Service-Learning: An Innovative Approach for Second Language Learners." Using qualitative and quantitative tools to measure student engagement, which included mailed surveys, in-person

interviews, and on-site observations of three school-based service-learning projects, Grassi et al. found that students became more active learners in their education. They believe that student motivation is enhanced in these projects because service-learning participants have a voice in their education and make decisions regarding their projects. "Over 50% of youth reported that it was 'very true' or 'somewhat true' that participation in service-learning helped them attend school more often, be more prompt in their arrival to class, enjoy school more, disrupt class less, and do more homework" (p. 101).

In her article, "Service-learning as a pedagogy to promote the content, cross-cultural, and language-learning of ESL students," Heuser (2000) believes that this increased engagement can be attributed to increased confidence in language abilities. In her service-learning project, students from Tokyo International University participated in short-term projects while studying English at Willamette University. Her conclusions are based on large group oral reflection and a follow-up writing activity in which participants wrote a letter to a friend describing what they did and what they learned. Like other anecdotal, holistic accounts, she reports that "students gained confidence in themselves and their abilities, which was fundamental to their development of higher communication skills" (p. 67). Similarly, Morris (2001) also notes that participants spoke with less apprehension in Spanish after their experience in his projects.

Weldon and Trautmann (2003) find that the authentic learning environment that service-learning projects afford is one of the most important factors that lead to increased motivation among students. Their students, Americans whose L2 is Spanish, interpreted at a local health center through the University of North Carolina-Asheville. These students overwhelmingly named the opportunity to use Spanish in the "real-world" as the

most important reason for participating in the service-learning projects in final course evaluations. In their article "Community-Based Language Learning: Integrating Language and Service," Boyle and Overfield (1999) similarly describe authentic environments as the key factor to increasing motivation. They provide a theoretical foundation for incorporating service-learning, which they call "community-based language learning" or CBL, and conclude that students play a more active role in their language learning when it takes place in an authentic environment. They believe that learners "become more aware of the communicative value of the target language as they use it in authentic situations" (p. 143). Because reflection is required, learners are "given a more active role in the learning process" (p. 143). In a traditional classroom environment, the teacher is often perceived as the expert who is fluent in the target language and, therefore, controls the language environment, resulting in more passive student learning (Brown, 2000). Service-learning, on the other hand, gives students more authority. Service-learning journals become sources of active student inquiry and exploration (See Table 2 which summarizes the benefits of service-learning as documented in second language acquisition research).

Table 2

Benefits of Service-Learning in Second Language Acquisition

Benefit	Source	Design	Subjects
Cultural understanding	Morris (2001)	Third year Spanish service-learning class, placed in Spanish-speaking organizations for minimum of 36 hours, (University of Minnesota). Data collected via participant pre-registration interview, biographical survey, pre- and post- survey.	95
Cultural awareness	Carney (2004)	Third year Spanish students serve as tutors to local Spanish-speaking middle school students ranging 24-36 hours (Butler University). Data collected via reflection journals.	Up to 20 per semester
Cultural awareness	Weldon & Trautmann (2003)	Fourth year Spanish students serve in local health center, 12 hours (University of North Carolina - Ashville). Data collected via interviews with professor, reflection journals	Unpublished
Cultural awareness	Minor (2002)	Various fluency levels of international ESL students in an intensive ESOL course in U.S. serve for 16 hours at 6 different locations (rotated each week), (Sacred Heart University). Data collected via participant reflection journals.	11

Research Gap: Future Directions

Despite the literature on the positive benefits of service-learning in both disciplines, most researchers have found it difficult to empirically assess the outcomes, relying heavily on qualitative measurements, such as reflective journals, student evaluations, and anecdotal evidence. For example, Grassi et al. (2004) do not assess student writing directly, but report instead on student perceptions of their writing gains: "writing skills were reported to be the most prevalent academic skill acquired by youth participants in service-learning programs" (p. 97). The majority of students polled believed that the service-learning project helped them do better in school (61%) and

24

increased their writing ability (p. 97). The second generation of service-learning research

has been particularly critical of this lack of empirical evidence and has called for more

rigorous research models (Eyler, 2002; Furco & Billig, 2002; Overfield, 2007; Wurr,

2007).

Wurr's (1999) study described in his article "A Pilot Study of the Impact of

Service-Learning in College Composition on Native and Non-Native Speakers of

English" stands alone as the only published research that empirically documents the

impact of service-learning on student writing by triangulating student attitudes toward

writing with student self-assessments of their writing and the text-based features of the

student writing. Using holistic as well as analytic assessments of rhetorical appeals, logic,

coherence, and mechanics in the students' persuasive essays, Wurr verifies the positive

impacts of service-learning on student writing in his composition class. Holistic

assessments by independent raters revealed gains of 8% over comparison papers of

nonparticipants while the analytical assessments revealed gains of 13% (p. 56). Student

reflections also showed positive increases in their attitude toward writing and self-

assessments.

His ability to concretely link service-learning outcomes to the content objectives

of his composition course met the basic requirements for incorporating service-learning

in a course in the first place: it met both curricular objectives and a community need.

While other published studies claim to document similar gains in student writing, namely

the large-scale study of over 22,000 undergraduates conducted by Astin, Vogelgesang,

Ikeda, and Yee (2000), Wurr (2002) faults it for analyzing student self-assessments only.

Astin et al. (2000) never actually analyzed the student writing itself – only student

perceptions of their writing. However pioneering, Wurr's study is limited: he assessed only one writing sample per student, analyzed persuasive writing only, and only collected writing at the end of the term. Neither long-term gains nor short-term personal gains per student can be credibly established given these limitations. More research analyzing different types of second language student text at different points in a service-learning project would provide a more comprehensive picture of individual student gains to this growing body of empirical research. More interdisciplinary service-learning research may also inspire continued research collaboration across disciplines.

Chapter 3: Service-Learning Case Study Methods and Analysis

This chapter consists of five sections: 1) a description of the Spring 2009 Fundamentals of English (English W001) writing course in which the case study took place, 2) a description of the subjects that took part in the study, 3) a description of the service-learning project, 4) a description of the quantitative and qualitative methods used to assess the impact of service-learning on second language writing skills, and 5) the results of both the quantitative and qualitative findings as they relate to the three core research questions presented in Chapter 1 and listed in Table 3.

Table 3

Three Core Case Study Research Questions

---

1. Does service-learning contribute to improving second language writing skills?

2. Are there significant personal gains at different periods in the semester?

3. Does service-learning have an effect on student self-assessment of writing and attitude toward writing?

Description of the Spring 2009 Fundamentals of English (English W001) Writing Course

Fundamentals of English (English W001) is a 3 credit prerequisite English for Academic Purposes (EAP) writing course at Indiana University Purdue University – Indianapolis (IUPUI) required of international students whose university placement exams indicate that they need additional writing instruction before taking the university's required introductory writing course, Elementary Composition I (English W131). Students registered for English W001 must have previously taken or be concurrently

enrolled in English as a Second Language II (English G011), which is an academic reading and grammar course, or have tested out of W001 on the EAP Placement Test.

All English W001 courses follow the same standard syllabus which requires 15 weeks of class sessions that meet two times a week for a total of 37.5 hours of in-class instruction time. Students must spend additional time out of class writing and revising written assignments and may choose or be required to meet with writing tutors at the University Writing Center. The standard syllabus includes the following lesson topics: writing for audience and purpose, constructing topic sentences, understanding and formulating paragraph and sentence structures, using supporting details, summarizing and paraphrasing, reading and responding critically, ensuring cohesion within and between paragraphs, and using counterargument and rebuttals in arguments. In addition to the general writing lessons discussed above, students are required to participate in on-line, differentiated, and independent grammar exercises assigned based on a pre-assessment test. Some English W001 instructors structure course readings and writings around a unifying theme. My Spring 2009 course was structured around the theme of literacy and homelessness. As such, I also included a lesson on the *No Child Left Behind* legislation and a primer on the basic differences between public and private elementary and secondary education in the United States (see Appendix A for a copy of my Spring 2009 syllabus).

English W001 requires three major writing projects that culminate in a final portfolio. In preparation for Writing Project 1, students learn four to seven basic rhetorical structures in paragraph form, practice writing four to five of the rhetorical structures, and then submit their four best paragraphs to be assessed for their Writing

Project 1 grade. My Spring 2009 course studied the following five rhetorical structures: process, description, definition, compare and contrast, and cause and effect paragraphs (see Appendix B for my Spring 2009 Writing Project 1 prompts). For Writing Project 2, students are expected to summarize a short scholarly article of one to two pages in a single paragraph, write a thesis statement, and critically respond to the ideas expressed in the article in the form of a five-paragraph summary-response essay. My Spring 2009 students read a 850 word article published in the New York Times regarding private tutoring replacing schools (McMenamin, 2003). For Writing Project 3, students are expected to write a six-paragraph persuasive essay based on the opinions and views expressed in a scholarly article. They must include introduction, conclusion, counterargument, and rebuttal paragraphs. My Spring 2009 students read a 1000 word article published by the Christian Science Monitor regarding an international charter school threatened by the No Child Left Behind Legislation (Wiltenburg, 2008). During the final weeks of the semester, students revise all three major writing projects in order to compile a final writing portfolio. Most English W001 instructors require one-on-one conference appointments with each student before each major writing project is submitted. The Spring 2009 students were required to conference with me individually for each writing project as indicated in the syllabus.

The standard English W001 syllabus also requires that all students complete timed, in-class writer statements four times throughout the semester when submitting major writing projects. These writer statements are used to gauge authentic, unedited student writing ability directly related to the writing project submitted. While some English W001 professors choose a type of self-reflection model for writer's statements,

my Spring 2009 students were required to demonstrate their writing ability by responding to prompts that required the same skills practiced in the writing projects themselves. Two sets of these in-class writer's statements represent my case study data analyzed later in this chapter.

The service-learning syllabus mirrored the standard syllabus in all respects except for the following modifications: service-learning students were excused from six class meetings (totaling 7.5 hours of instructional class time), volunteered eight hours at the service-learning site, and submitted 1-page reflection journals after four of their service experiences and a final tutoring reflection at the end of the experience. The instructional class time missed included one review day, one writer's statement day, one peer-review day of a writing project, and three revision workshop days before the final portfolio. Even though the service-learning students were not required to attend these classes, several of them chose to do so.

Description of the Subjects in the Study

Eighteen students were registered in my Spring 2009 English W001 course and 17 students chose to participate in the case study. Based on an initial survey regarding previous volunteer experience and my assessment of each student's ability to commit to a service-learning project (which included whether students were regularly on time for class, whether they were punctual when submitting assignments, and whether they were able to balance their school work with other commitments), I invited seven students to participate in the service-learning experimental syllabus. Five students accepted and two others approached me requesting to be considered. I accepted one additional student,

using the same standards described above, for a total of six participating students. Eleven remaining students followed the standard syllabus as the control group.

Both the service-learning group and the control group represented relatively equal diversity in native country, language, and time spent in the United States before English W001. In the service-learning group, three were male and three were female, three were Asian (two Chinese and one Japanese), two were from the Middle East (one Iranian and one Saudi Arabian), and one was from India. Four of the six students had studied English for more than five years, and the Saudi had the shortest length of study at two years. The time each student had spent in the United States before starting English W001 varied from 13 days to three years.

For the control group, nine were male and two were female, six were Asian (four Koreans, one Chinese, and one Taiwanese), three were from the Middle East (two Saudis and one Iranian), one was from Central America (El Salvador), and one was from Africa (Nigeria). Six of the eleven students had studied English for more than five years, and one of the Saudis had the shortest length of study at seven months. The time each student had spent in the United States before starting English W001 varied from six months to seven years (see Appendix C for detailed participant statistics).

Description of the Service-Learning Project

I chose *School on Wheels* as a service-learning site to match the literacy and homelessness focus in my Spring English W001 course. School on Wheels is a national, not-for-profit organization that pairs school-aged homeless children with tutors at 12 locations around the city of Indianapolis, including shelters, and public schools. When I

31

began the project, the Indianapolis School on Wheels had been in operation for eight

years, employed 15 paid staff members, and received over 4,700 tutoring hours from

volunteers, according to 2008 data shared on its website

(http://www.indyschoolonwheels.org). The English W001 service-learning participants

tutored six students at the Holy Family Transitional Housing in downtown Indianapolis.

Three of the tutored students were elementary school students and three were high school

students, three were male and three were female, and three were African-American and

three were Caucasian.

Each School on Wheels tutor is matched with one particular student for the entire

semester and meets with the same student once per week for one hour. On occasion,

tutors may be required to take an additional student or a different student based on

student numbers and demand on any particular day. School on Wheels tutors range in

age, nationality, and experience.

The format of each tutoring session has been structured by School on Wheels to

ensure standardized tutoring sessions. For the first five minutes, tutors greet their students

and support their students in a short, timed-writing prompt. For the next 50 minutes,

tutors then assist students with their homework. If students finish their homework early,

tutors can read with them or play games. For the last five minutes, tutors read to or with

their students.

Description of Quantitative and Qualitative Methodology

In order to assess the impact of service-learning on second language writing

skills, I developed both quantitative and qualitative methods to address my three core

research questions. I collected in-class timed-writing samples from all 17 students at three different points in the semester to measure change in second language writing skills across trials (Research Question #1). In addition, I distributed and analyzed course evaluation surveys at the conclusion of the course to measure the effect of service-learning on self-assessments of writing skills, attitudes toward writing, and perceived personal gains (Research Questions #2-3).

The quantitative study.

The first in-class timed writing sample was a response to a descriptive paragraph prompt collected on the first day of class. The second sample was a summary-response paragraph collected after the students submitted Writing Project 3. Students were given a 900-word article, published in the Christian Science Monitor (Wiltenburg, 2009), to read in advance; the article focuses on the disadvantages second-language refugees encounter when taking standardized tests. The third sample was a persuasive four- to five-paragraph essay collected after the students submitted the Final Writing Project on the last day of class. Students were given a 2600-word article, published by Children's Voice Magazine (Kreisher, 2002), to read in advance; this article discussed whether homeless students should attend separate schools designed for the homeless or whether they should remain in mainstream schools. Table 4 lists the specific prompts for each writing sample.

Table 4

In-class Timed Writing Prompts

Sample	Description
Sample One	In one paragraph, describe your favorite book as a child and explain why it was your favorite.
Sample Two	Read the two page article "Tackling the three R's in a second or third language." Summarize the article in one paragraph and end the paragraph with a thesis statement indicating how you feel about the article's issues.
Sample Three	Write a four paragraph persuasive essay in response to the "Educating Homeless Children" article you read. Provide a thesis statement, two main reasons to support your opinion, a counterargument, and a rebuttal. Your essay should answer this focusing question: Should homeless students attend special schools for the homeless or should they attend regular public schools?

Description of the writing scales.

In order to assess change among the writing samples, each writing sample was scored by two groups of trained raters. The first group of raters (described below) scored the writing samples using the Test of Written English (TWE) rating scale, a widely used holistic scale which requires raters to assign one overall score to each piece of writing based on the overall impression of the sample. The TWE assessment measures both rhetorical features and syntax by asking raters to focus on the writing sample's organization, development, focus, elaboration, cohesion, and language use (see Appendix D).

The second group of raters (described below) scored the writing samples using the Michigan Writing Assessment Scoring Guide (MWASG) (1990), an analytic scale which requires raters to assign three scores corresponding to three writing features for each

writing piece: ideas and arguments, rhetorical features, and language control. The ideas

and arguments category assesses how completely each writing sample deals with the

issues in the prompt, how well the position is argued and supported, and how well

multiple viewpoints are taken into account. Rhetorical control is assessed based on the

strength of the sample's organization, cohesion, and logical transitions. Language control

focuses on grammatical structures, diction, and style used to convey ideas (see Appendix

E).

These scales were chosen not only because of their high inter-rater reliability and

validity (they both have wide-spread use for university writing samples based on these

factors), but also due to their relatively easy-to-understand format, which allowed for

efficient rater-training sessions. Two different scales were selected so that a variety of

independent variables could be explored in each writing sample. The analytic scale was

used to analyze if service-learning illustrated an effect on particular writing features.

Analytic scales are particularly useful in ESL settings as some L2 writers may

demonstrate strength in one writing feature, but weakness in another. Instead of pulling

down the overall score, analytic scales allow raters to isolate strengths and weaknesses of

each particular sample. Holistic scales, on the other hand, tend to capture the authentic

nature of the reader–writer interaction because it captures the communicative impression

of a piece without overly focusing on features that might obscure the overall

understanding of the writing sample (Weigle, 2002).

Description of raters and training.

The MWASG rater team was comprised of four experienced EAP writing instructors from IUPUI who had previously taught the English W001 course. Raters were trained using in-class, timed writer's statements from another section of English W001. Once inter-rater reliability was established, the group blind scored each trial set independently and then discussed and negotiated any differences to arrive at one score for each of the three categories (ideas and arguments, rhetorical function, and language control) on each writing sample. Blind scoring allowed for the writing samples to remain anonymous so the raters knew neither the individual student names nor the group (control or study) from which the samples were taken. Because of their common training and teaching experience at IUPUI, determining a final score for each student was not difficult; scores usually fell within a small range. Raters were encouraged to indicate "plus" or "minus" symbols when individually scoring to assist with negotiating differences up or down.

The TWE rater team comprised of eight students in a graduate-level Discourse Analysis course at IUPUI. Raters were trained using in-class, timed writer's statements from another section of English W001. Once inter-rater reliability was established, raters blind scored writing samples in trial sets and then paused briefly to discuss the highest and lowest samples in each set to maintain inter-rater reliability. Due to time limitations, the TWE team did not negotiate score differences to arrive at one final score. After reviewing the rater assessments, the scores of two outlier raters were eliminated because they took significantly more time scoring the tests than the other raters and their scores

regularly deviated from the group by more than two points. I then averaged the scores across the remaining six raters to arrive at the final holistic score per writing sample.

Data analysis method.

Scores for each rater group were then compiled as a panel dataset, indicating the individual scores per student per trial. The data were then used to measure the change between each writing sample per student across all four variables (three analytic writing feature scores and one holistic writing score). Change in scores between Trials 1 and 2, between Trials 2 and 3, and between Trials 1 and 3 were recorded to capture both trial change values as well as overall change values (see Appendix F for sample panel dataset). Change values at each interval were then averaged to allow comparisons to be made between individual student and overall student change per group. In addition, the number of students who demonstrated negative and positive change was recorded and averaged in the same fashion to allow group and individual comparisons to be made. Due to the relatively small sample size (17 students), a statistical analysis was not performed on the data. The data was used only to identify trends and patterns among participants.

The qualitative study.

As discussed above, surveys were also distributed to each student; these required students to self-assess their writing skill gains, their attitudes towards writing, and their perceived personal gains during the semester. Some questions required the students to rate their skills using a likert scale, while others prompted short-answer responses (see Appendix G for the complete questionnaire). Some qualitative data was also gathered

from the final tutoring reflections that the service-learning students submitted at the conclusion of their experience (see Appendix H for the final tutoring reflection prompt). Since no team was compiled or trained to assess the qualitative data, I assessed the responses independently.

Results: The quantitative study.

Research question #1: Does service-learning contribute to improving student writing skills?

Initial findings from both the analytic and holistic assessment tests suggest that service-learning does contribute to improved student writing skills. While both groups exhibited averaged gains in all three categories, the analytic tests indicated a trend that service-learning students exhibited greater gains in the ideas and arguments category and rhetorical features category than the control group. Both groups documented approximately equal gains in the language control category. These results are described below.

Analytic scales: Ideas and arguments category.

In the ideas and arguments category, the service-learning group exhibited higher writing scores throughout the experiment both before and after service-learning was implemented. However, the difference between the averaged writing scores per group did not stay constant and, in fact, increased between each trial throughout the experiment, illustrating a trend that the service-learning group improved its writing scores in the ideas and arguments category more than the control group. The service-learning group

averaged a score of 3.67 points (on a six point scale) on Trial 1 whereas the control group

averaged a score of 3.27 points on Trial 1, indicating an initial difference between the

two groups of 0.39 points. The average service-learning group score for Trial 2 was 3.83

points whereas the control group averaged 3.27 points, indicating a difference of 0.56

points. On Trial 3, the service-learning group averaged 5.00 points whereas the control

group averaged 3.64 points, indicating a difference of 1.36 points (See Table 5).

Table 5

Comparison of Averaged Scores per Trial: Ideas and Arguments Category

Group	Trial 1	Trial 2	Trial 3
Service-Learning Group	3.67	3.83	5.00
Control Group	3.27	3.27	3.64
Difference	0.39	0.56	1.36

The average change between the trials was greater for the service-learning group

as well (See Table 6). Between Trial 1 and 2, the service-learning group exhibited an

average change of 0.17 points whereas the control group exhibited no change. Between

Trial 2 and 3, the service-learning group exhibited an average change of 1.17 points

whereas the control group exhibited an average change of only 0.36 points. Between

Trial 1 and 3, the service-learning group exhibited an average change of 1.33 points

whereas the control group exhibited an average change of only 0.36 points. The service-

learning group again showed more rapid score growth than the control group. Between

Trial 1 and 2, the service-learning group gained 0.17 points on average more than the

control group. Between Trial 2 and 3, the service-learning group gained 0.80 points on average more than the control group. Between Trial 1 and 3, the service-learning group gained 0.97 points on average more than the control group.

Table 6

Comparison of Averaged Change between Trials: Ideas and Arguments Category

Trial Interval	Between 1-2	Between 2-3	Between 1-3
Service-Learning Group Average Change	0.17	1.17	1.33
Control Group Average Change	0.00	0.36	0.36
Difference	0.17	0.80	0.97

When the individual student score changes in each group are compared, the two groups show slightly different results. Between Trial 1 and 2, the control group exhibited slightly higher individual student score growth as 4 of eleven students (representing 36.36% of the total group) showed positive change compared to the 2 of 6 students (representing 33.33% of the total group) who showed positive change in the service-learning group. More service-learning students showed no change between Trial 1 and 2 as 3 of 6 students (representing 50% of the total service-learning group) exhibited no change whereas only 2 of eleven students in the control group showed no change between Trial 1 and 2 (representing 18.18% of the total control group). However, the control group exhibited much higher negative change than the service-learning group between Trial 1 and 2. Five of eleven students in the control group (representing 45.45% of the

total) exhibited negative change whereas only 1 service-learning student of 6

(representing 16.67% of the total group) exhibited negative change (See Table 7).

Table 7

Comparison of Individual Score Change between Trial 1 and 2: Ideas and Arguments

Category

Group	Trial Interval	#Positive Change	Percentage of Total	# No Change	Percentage of Total	# Negative Change	Percentage of Total
Service-Learning	1-2	2/6	33.33%	3/6	50.00%	1/6	16.67%
Control	1-2	4/11	36.36%	2/11	18.18%	5/11	45.45%

Between Trial 2 and 3, the service-learning group exhibited much stronger

individual score growth overall. Both groups recorded positive change for 4 students

between Trial 2 and 3, accounting for 66.67% of the total service-learning group and

36.36% of the total control group. The service-learning group recorded 2 of 6 students

with no change (representing 33.33% of the total group) whereas the control group

recorded 6 of eleven students with no change (representing 54.55% of the total group).

No students in the service-learning group exhibited negative change whereas 1 student of

eleven in the control group exhibited negative change (representing 9.09% of the total

group) (See Table 8).

Table 8

Comparison of Individual Score Change between Trial 2 and 3: Ideas and Arguments

Category

Group	Trial Interval	# Positive Change	Percentage of Total	# No Change	Percentage of Total	# Negative Change	Percentage of Total
Service-Learning	2-3	4/6	66.67%	2/6	33.33%	0/6	0.00%
Control	2-3	4/11	36.36%	6/11	54.55%	1/11	9.09%

The comparison data between Trial 1 and 3 also illustrate stronger growth for the

service-learning group than the control group. Five of 6 students in the service-learning

group (representing 83.33% of the total) recorded positive change whereas 6 of eleven

students in the control group (representing 54.55% of the total) recorded positive change.

The service-learning group recorded 1 of 6 students with no change (representing 16.67%

of the total group) whereas the control group recorded 3 of eleven students with no

change (representing 27.27% of the total group). No students in the service-learning

group exhibited negative change whereas 2 of eleven students in the control group

exhibited negative change (representing 18.18% of the total group) (See Table 9).

Table 9

Comparison of Individual Score Change between Trial 1 and 3: Ideas and Arguments

Category

Group	Trial Interval	# Positive Change	Percentage of Total	# No Change	Percentage of Total	# Negative Change	Percentage of Total
Service-Learning	1-3	5/6	83.33%	1/6	16.67%	0/6	0.00%
Control	1-3	6/11	54.55%	3/11	27.27%	2/11	18.18%

Analytic scales: Rhetorical features category.

The service-learning group exhibited greater writing skill growth in the rhetorical features category (See Appendix E) as well. However, unlike the ideas and arguments category, both groups recorded almost identical initial scores in this category before service-learning was implemented, which suggests that both groups had similar writing skills in this category before the experiment began. The service-learning group averaged 3.33 points on Trial 1 and the control group averaged 3.27 points. The average service-learning group score for Trial 2 was 3.50 points whereas the control group averaged 3.18 points (a lower average than Trial 1), a difference of 0.32 points. On Trial 3, the service-learning group averaged 4.50 points whereas the control group averaged 3.82 points, a difference of 0.68 points (See Table 10).

Table 10

Comparison of Averaged Scores per Trial: Rhetorical Features Category

Group	Trial 1	Trial 2	Trial 3
Service-Learning Group	3.33	3.50	4.50
Control Group	3.27	3.18	3.82
Difference	0.06	0.32	0.68

The average change between the trials was greater for the service-learning group as well. Between Trial 1 and 2, the service-learning group exhibited an average change of 0.17 points whereas the control group exhibited a negative average change of -0.09 points. Between Trial 2 and 3, the service-learning group exhibited an average change of 1.00 point whereas the control group exhibited an average change of 0.64 points. Between Trial 1 and 3, the service-learning group exhibited an average change of 1.17 points whereas the control group exhibited an average change of 0.55 points. Between Trial 1 and 2, the service-learning group gained 0.26 points on average more than the control group. Between Trial 2 and 3, the service-learning group gained 0.36 points on average more than the control group. Between Trial 1 and 3, the service-learning group gained 0.62 points on average more than the control group (See Table 11).

Table 11

Comparison of Averaged Change between Trials: Rhetorical Features Category

Trial Interval	Between 1-2	Between 2-3	Between 1-3
Service-Learning Group Average Change	0.17	1.00	1.17
Control Group Average Change	(0.09)	0.64	0.55
Difference	0.26	0.36	0.62

When the individual student score changes in each group are compared, the control group exhibited slightly higher individual student score gains between Trial 1 and 2, a lower number of students with no change between Trial 1 and 2, but a higher number of students with negative change between Trial 1 and 2. Four of eleven students from the control group (representing 36.36% of the total group) exhibited positive change compared to the 2 of 6 students (representing 33.33% of the total group) who showed positive change in the service-learning group. Both groups recorded 3 students each who exhibited no change, representing 50% of the total service-learning group and 27.27% of the control group. Only 1 of 6 service-learning students exhibited negative change (representing 16.67% of the total service-learning group), whereas 4 of eleven students in the control group exhibited negative change (representing 36.36% of the total control group (See Table 12).

Table 12

Comparison of Individual Score Change between Trial 1 and 2: Rhetorical Features

Category

Group	Trial Interval	# Positive Change	Percentage of Total	# No Change	Percentage of Total	# Negative Change	Percentage of Total
Service-Learning	1-2	2/6	33.33%	3/6	50.00%	1/6	16.67%
Control	1-2	4/11	36.36%	3/11	27.27%	4/11	36.36%

Between Trials 2 and 3, the service-learning group reported greater individual score gains, fewer students with no change, and the same number of students with negative change. Four of 6 students from the service-learning group (representing 66.67% of the total group) exhibited positive change compared to the 4 students (representing 36.36% of the total group) who showed positive change in the control group. Two students in the service-learning group (representing 33.33% of the total group) exhibited no change, whereas 7 students in the control group (representing 63.64% of the total group) exhibited no change. No students exhibited negative change in either of the groups between Trial 2 and 3 (See Table 13).

Table 13

Comparison of Individual Score Change between Trial 2 and 3: Rhetorical Features

Category

Group	Trial Interval	# Positive Change	Percentage of Total	# No Change	Percentage of Total	# Negative Change	Percentage of Total
Service-Learning	2-3	4/6	66.67%	2/6	33.33%	0/6	0.00%
Control	2-3	4/11	36.36%	7/11	63.64%	0/11	0.00%

Between Trials 1 and 3, the service-learning group reported much greater individual score gains, fewer students with no change, and the same number of students with negative change. Five of 6 students from the service-learning group (representing 83.33% of the total group) exhibited positive change compared to the 6 of eleven students (representing 54.55% of the total group) who showed positive change in the control group. One of 6 students in the service-learning group (representing 16.67% of the total group) exhibited no change, whereas 5 of eleven students in the control group (representing 45.45% of the total group) exhibited no change. No students exhibited negative change in either of the groups between Trial 1 and 3 (See Table 14).

Table 14

Comparison of Individual Score Change between Trial 1 and 3: Rhetorical Features

Category

Group	Trial Interval	# Positive Change	Percentage of Total	# No Change	Percentage of Total	# Negative Change	Percentage of Total
Service-Learning	1-3	5/6	83.33%	1/6	16.67%	0/6	0.00%
Control	1-3	6/11	54.55%	5/11	45.45%	0/11	0.00%

Analytic scales: Language control category.

Neither group recorded large gains in the language control category (See Appendix E) which suggests that service-learning is not a significant factor in increasing language control skills, as measured by the Michigan Test. Both groups recorded similar initial scores in this category and showed some improvement, but the improvement was comparable for both groups. The service-learning group averaged 3.33 points on Trial 1 and the control group averaged 2.82 points, indicating a difference of 0.52 points. The average service-learning group score for Trial 2 was also 3.33 points whereas the control group averaged 2.82 points as well, indicating the same difference of 0.52 points. On Trial 3, the service-learning group averaged 4.00 points whereas the control group averaged 3.45 points, indicating a difference of 0.55 points (See Table 15).

Table 15

Comparison of Averaged Scores per Trial: Language Control Category

Group	Trial 1	Trial 2	Trial 3
Service-Learning Group	3.33	3.33	4.00
Control Group	2.82	2.82	3.45
Difference	0.52	0.52	0.55

The average change between trials in language control for both groups was not large either. Between Trial 1 and 2, neither the service-learning group nor the control group exhibited any average change. Between Trial 2 and 3, the service-learning group exhibited an average change of 0.67 points whereas the control group exhibited an average change of 0.64 points. Between Trial 1 and 3, the service-learning group exhibited an average change of 0.67 points whereas the control group exhibited an average change of 0.03 points. Between Trial 1 and 2, the service-learning group and the control group remained equal in the positive gains (no average gain was recorded for either group). Between Trial 2 and 3, the service-learning group only gained 0.03 points on average more than the control group. Between Trial 1 and 3, the service-learning group gained 0.64 points on average more than the control group (See Table 16).

Table 16

Comparison of Averaged Change between Trials: Language Control Category

Trial Interval	Between 1-2	Between 2-3	Between 1-3
Service-Learning Group Average Change	0.00	0.67	0.67
Control Group Average Change	0.00	0.64	0.03
Difference	0.00	0.03	0.64

When the individual student score changes in each group are compared, the control group exhibited slightly higher individual student score gains between Trial 1 and 2, a lower number of students with no change between Trial 1 and 2, but a higher number of students with negative change between Trial 1 and 2. Four of eleven students from the control group (representing 36.36% of the total group) exhibited positive change compared to the 2 of 6 students (representing 33.33% of the total group) who showed positive change in the service-learning group. The service-learning group recorded 3 of 6 students (representing 50.00% of the total group) who exhibited no change, whereas the control group recorded 2 of eleven students (representing 18.18% of the total group) with no change. The service-learning group recorded 1 of 6 students (representing 16.67% of the total group) with negative change, whereas the control group recorded 5 of eleven students (representing 45.45% of the total group) with no change (See Table 17).

Table 17

Comparison of Individual Score Change between Trial 1 and 2: Language Control

Category

Group	Trial Interval	# Positive Change	Percentage of Total	# No Change	Percentage of Total	# Negative Change	Percentage of Total
Service-Learning	1-2	2/6	33.33%	3/6	50.00%	1/6	16.67%
Control	1-2	4/11	36.36%	2/11	18.18%	5/11	45.45%

The results between Trials 2 and 3 also indicate a trend that the service-learning group exhibited greater positive change and less negative or no change than the control group. Four of 6 students from the service-learning group (representing 66.67% of the total group) exhibited positive change compared to the 4 of eleven students (representing 36.36% of the total group) who showed positive change in the control group. The service-learning group recorded 2 of 6 students (representing 33.33% of the total group) who exhibited no change, whereas the control group recorded 6 of eleven students (representing 54.55% of the total group) with no change. The service-learning group did not record any students with negative change, whereas the control group recorded 1 of eleven students (representing 9.09% of the total group) with no change (See Table 18).

Table 18

Comparison of Individual Score Change between Trial 2 and 3: Language Control

Category

Group	Trial Interval	# Positive Change	Percentage of Total	No. No Change	Percentage of Total	# Negative Change	Percentage of Total
Service-Learning	2-3	4/6	66.67%	2/6	33.33%	0/6	0.00%
Control	2-3	4/11	36.36%	6/11	54.55%	1/11	9.09%

The overall change between Trials 1 and 3 also show a trend of greater positive gains for the service-learning group. Five of 6 students from the service-learning group (representing 83.33% of the total group) exhibited positive change compared to the 6 of eleven students (representing 54.55% of the total group) who showed positive change in the control group. The service-learning group recorded 1 of 6 students (representing 16.67% of the total group) who exhibited no change, whereas the control group recorded 3 of eleven students (representing 27.27% of the total group) with no change. Again, the service-learning group did not record any students with negative change, whereas the control group recorded 2 of eleven students (representing 18.18% of the total group) with no change (See Table 19).

Table 19

Comparison of Individual Score Change between Trial 1 and 3: Language Control

Category

Group	Trial Interval	# Positive Change	Percentage of Total	# No Change	Percentage of Total	# Negative Change	Percentage of Total
Service-Learning	1-3	5/6	83.33%	1/6	16.67%	0/6	0.00%
Control	1-3	6/11	54.55%	3/11	27.27%	2/11	18.18%

Holistic scales.

In general, the results of the holistic assessment (See Appendix D) mirrored the same overall data patterns between the service-learning and control groups seen in the analytic tests. Similar to the ideas and arguments results described above, both groups recorded initial scores within 0.10 points of each other before service-learning was implemented, which suggests that both groups had similar writing skills on the holistic scale before the experiment began. The service-learning group averaged 3.43 points on Trial 1 and the control group averaged 3.34 points. The average service-learning group score for Trial 2 was 3.95 points whereas the control group averaged 3.53 points, indicating a difference of 0.42 points. On Trial 3, the service-learning group averaged 4.35 points whereas the control group averaged 3.69 points, indicating a difference of 0.66 points (See Table 20).

Table 20

Comparison of Averaged Scores per Trial: Holistic Rating

Group	Trial 1	Trial 2	Trial 3
Service-Learning Group	3.43	3.95	4.35
Control Group	3.34	3.53	3.69
Difference	0.10	0.42	0.66

The average change pattern between the trials was greater for the service-learning group as well – most notably between Trials 1 and 3. Between Trial 1 and 2, the service-learning group exhibited an average change of 0.52 points whereas the control group exhibited an average change of 0.19 points. Between Trial 2 and 3, the service-learning group exhibited an average change of 0.40 point whereas the control group exhibited an average change of only 0.16 points. Between Trial 1 and 3, the service-learning group exhibited an average change of 0.92 points whereas the control group exhibited an average change of only 0.35 points. Between Trial 1 and 2, the service-learning group gained 0.33 points on average more than the control group. Between Trial 2 and 3, the service-learning group gained 0.24 points on average more than the control group. Between Trial 1 and 3, the service-learning group gained 0.56 points on average more than the control group (See Table 21).

Table 21

Comparison of Averaged Change between Trials: Holistic Rating

Trial Interval	Between 1-2	Between 2-3	Between 1-3
Service-Learning Group Average Change	0.52	0.40	0.92
Control Group Average Change	0.19	0.16	0.35
Difference	0.33	0.24	0.56

When the individual student score changes in each group are compared, the service-learning group again exhibited much stronger trends of positive change between trials, most notably between Trials 1 and 3. Between Trials 1 and 2, 4 of 6 students from the service-learning group (representing 66.67% of the total group) exhibited positive change compared to the 7 of eleven students (representing 63.64% of the total group) who showed positive change in the control group. The service-learning group recorded 2 of 6 students (representing 33.33% of the total group) who exhibited no change, whereas the control group did not record any students with no change. The service-learning group did not record any students with negative change, whereas the control group recorded 4 of eleven students (representing 36.36% of the total group) with negative change (See Table 22).

Table 22

Comparison of Individual Score Change between Trial 1 and 2: Holistic Rating

Group	Trial Interval	# Positive Change	Percentage of Total	# No Change	Percentage of Total	# Negative Change	Percentage of Total
Service-Learning	1-2	4/6	66.67%	2/6	33.33%	0/6	0.00%
Control	1-2	7/11	63.64%	0/11	0.00%	4/11	36.36%

Between Trials 2 and 3, 5 of 6 students from the service-learning group (representing 83.33% of the total group) exhibited positive change compared to the 7 of eleven students (representing 63.64% of the total group) who showed positive change in the control group. The service-learning group did not record any students with no change, whereas the control group recorded 1 of eleven students (representing 9.09% of the total group) with no change. The service-learning group recorded 1 of 6 students with negative change, whereas the control group recorded 3 of eleven students (representing 27.27% of the total group) with negative change (See Table 23).

Table 23

Comparison of Individual Score Change between Trial 2 and 3: Holistic Rating

Group	Trial Interval	# Positive Change	Percentage of Total	# No Change	Percentage of Total	# Negative Change	Percentage of Total
Service-Learning	2-3	5/6	83.33%	0/6	0.00%	1/6	16.67%
Control	2-3	7/11	63.64%	1/11	9.09%	3/11	27.27%

The most conclusive data was collected between Trials 1 and 3 which illustrate

that all 6 of 6 students from the service-learning group (representing 100% of the total

group) exhibited positive change compared to only 5 of eleven students (representing

45.45% of the total group) who showed positive change in the control group. The service-

learning group did not record any students with no change, whereas the control group

recorded 2 of eleven students (representing 18.18% of the total group) with no change.

The service-learning group also did not record any students with negative change,

whereas the control group recorded 4 of eleven students (representing 36.36% of the total

group) with negative change (See Table 24).

Table 24

Comparison of Individual Score Change between Trial 1 and 3: Holistic Rating

Group	Trial Interval	# Positive Change	Percentage of Total	# No Change	Percentage of Total	# Negative Change	Percentage of Total
Service-Learning	1-3	6/6	100.00%	0/6	0.00%	0/6	0.00%
Control	1-3	5/11	45.45%	2/11	18.18%	4/11	36.36%

Research question #2: Are there personal gains at different stages for students

who participate in service-learning?

As the above data suggests, the greatest gains were exhibited between Trials 2 and

3 and 1 and 3. In order to measure change between trials, individual scores were

compared across trials and assigned a change value. For example, if a student scored a

"2" on "Ideas and Arguments" in Trial 1 and then scored a "3" on Trial 2, the change was

recorded in Trial Interval 1-2 as "1". When the service-learning group data is sorted by

highest individual gains per student, it is interesting to note that the greatest personal

gains were attained by students who had spent a year or less in the United States while

the one service-learning student who had spent more than three years in the United States

ranked last or second to last in all three cases for greatest personal gain (see Tables 25-

27).

Table 25

Greatest Gains per Individual Student: Ideas and Arguments (Trial Interval 1-3)

ID	Trial Interval	Ideas and Arguments Change[a]	Time in USA prior to W001	Time in USA Rank[b]
SLN03	1-3	0	3 years	6
SLN01	1-3	1	1 month	3
SLN04	1-3	1	13 days	1
SLN05	1-3	1	3 weeks	2
SLN06	1-3	1	3 months	4
SLN02	1-3	3	1 year	5

[a] Change in score from first to third trial
[b] The student with the most time in the U.S.A prior to W001 was ranked as a "6."
Students were then ranked in decreasing order based on who had spent more time in the
U.S.A.

58

Table 26

Greatest Gains per Individual Student: Rhetorical Features (Trial Interval 1-3)

ID	Trial Interval	Rhetorical Features Change[a]	Time in USA prior to W001	Time in USA Rank[b]
SLN03	1-3	0	3 years	6
SLN01	1-3	1	1 month	3
SLN05	1-3	1	3 weeks	2
SLN06	1-3	1	3 months	4
SLN02	1-3	2	1 year	5
SLN04	1-3	2	13 days	1

[a] Change in score from first to third trial
[b] The student with the most time in the U.S.A prior to W001 was ranked as a "6." Students were then ranked in decreasing order based on who had spent more time in the U.S.A.

Table 27

Greatest Gains per Individual Student: Holistic Scales (Trial Interval 1-3)

ID	Trial Interval	Holistic Change[a]	Time in USA prior to W001	Time in USA Rank[b]
SLN01	1-3	0.5	1 month	3
SLN03	1-3	0.5	3 years	6
SLN04	1-3	0.6	13 days	1
SLN02	1-3	1	1 year	5
SLN06	1-3	1	3 months	4
SLN05	1-3	1.9	3 weeks	2

[a] Change in score from first to third trial
[b] The student with the most time in the U.S.A prior to W001 was ranked as a "6." Students were then ranked in decreasing order based on who had spent more time in the U.S.A.

Results: The qualitative study.

Research question #2: Are there personal gains at different stages for students who participate in service-learning?

While the percentage of students who exhibited positive change between Trials 1 and 3 in the quantitative study suggests that students do reap personal gains when participating in service-learning, the qualitative data provides a more detailed picture of the depth and character of the personal gains. The service-learning experience clearly left a lasting impression on these students and the way they process the world around them as well as how they view and approach their own language struggles.

The final tutoring reflection provides the best data to explore this issue; however, only four of the six students in this group turned in the final tutoring reflections. Service-learning students were prompted to answer the following question: "What, if anything, did you learn about yourself from your service-learning experience?" Sample answers included that the participating students learned about themselves, about how they can interact with others, about how to relate to others who are struggling, and about future careers in teaching. Khalid (all names are pseudonyms), one of the service-learning students from Saudi Arabia noted: "I learned that I am capable to help, support, enjoy working with others not matter what language they are speak, country they are from, and what religion they are believe." Mengyu from China reflected: "I found myself had a lot to improve in my English. What's more, I found myself was too lucky if compared to those children, and I learn bravery and optimistic form they way they suffer from the difficulties." Feng, the other participant from China, expressed: "Yes, I didn't have any experience for work with children before this service-learning. Now I found I have talent to be a teacher." Kameko from Japan noted: "I realized that I love teaching." Many of the same sentiments were shared in informal discussions after tutoring sessions as well.

Research question #3: Does service-learning have an effect on student self-assessment of writing and attitude toward writing?

Qualitative data gathered via the final tutoring reflection also support that service-learning does have an effect on student-assessment of writing and attitude toward writing; however, these results are mixed and somewhat contradictory when compared to the quantitative data collected in the final course evaluation survey.

Two out of the four students who submitted final tutoring reflections believed that the service-learning project had an impact on their attitude toward writing in English. Kameko credited the impact to working with young, homeless writers which allowed her to connect the course content (literacy and homelessness) with her service-learning experience. She answered: "Yes. The topic of writing projects were the issue of tutoring, education by international teachers, education among international students including refugees or education among homeless children. All topics were related to tutoring experiences. So, I developed my ideas about education through my experiences." Khalid credited his service-learning experience with teaching him how to be patient when he writes. He wrote: "Yes, I learned how to be patient when I write. I am a college student and sometimes when I feel that I am not doing as well as I should or when I feel like I am giving up; it helps to see how other people work hard with patient to be as successful as they can even the little children just like what I saw in my service-learning experience."

While the qualitative data illustrates that the service-learning group made greater gains in their self-assessed writing *skills*, it also shows that the control group actually made greater self-assessed gains in their *attitudes* toward writing. The service-learning group reported an average self-assessed writing skills gain of 2.67 points (on a 10 point scale) by the end of the semester whereas the control group reported an average 2.00 points. However, the service-learning group only self-assessed an average of 2.33 points in motivation gains and 2.00 points in enjoyment of writing gains whereas the control group reported self-assessed average gains of 2.90 points in motivation and 3.10 points in enjoyment. In addition, 100% of the service-learning students responded that they did not

feel that they were good writers in English whereas 90% of the control group believed that they were not good writers in English (see Table 28).

Table 28

Qualitative Self-Assessment of Writing Skills and Attitudes Toward Writing

	Average Point Change in Writing Skills	Average Point Change in Motivation	Average Point Change in Enjoy Writing	Believe You Are a Good Writer?
Service-Learning	2.67	2.33	2.00	100% "No"
Control	2.00	2.90	3.10	90% "No" 10% "Yes"

Discussion

Several conclusions can be made based on both the quantitative and qualitative data presented above. First, the data supports that service-learning has a positive impact on second language writing skills. The qualitative data suggests that the true writing benefits of service-learning may be that it increases student background knowledge of the subject area, in this case issues of literacy and homelessness, which allows students to expand and better support their ideas when writing. Students who develop more complex arguments naturally use more rhetorical conventions to communicate those ideas which could explain the simultaneous gains in the rhetorical features category. Second, the largest gains were reported between Trials 2 and 3 and between Trials 1 and 3 which suggests that service-learning must be a long-term, on-going project to be the most

effective. Third, while the data also suggests that the benefits of service-learning may also depend on how long the participating student has been in the United States, only one student in the service-learning group had spent significant time in the U.S., therefore, it is impossible to make any meaningful conclusions regarding the relationship between time spent in the country and the service-learning experience. The service-learning student who had been in the United States for over three years and had attended an American high school showed no change in overall writing gains, whereas the three top individual gains were exhibited in students who had spent significantly less time in the United States (13 days, three weeks, and less than one year). This finding could suggest that service-learning also plays a part in helping international students adjust to the American culture which ultimately helps them develop their writing skills.

While the qualitative data regarding self-assessed attitudes toward writing diverge somewhat from the literature on the affective gains of service-learning, it may reveal that the service-learning students are more critical of their skills due to their extended contact with native speakers. Students who are isolated in the classroom and work with only non-native speakers do not have the same opportunities to compare their skills with native speakers. The service-learning students may have been more realistic regarding their on-going need for continued growth due to their constant comparisons with homeless youth who are significantly disadvantaged, yet fluent native speakers and writers. In addition, the overwhelming belief expressed by the participants in both groups that they are not good writers could be due to cultural norms regarding a student's comfort level speaking highly of himself. The majority of the research conducted on self-perceived writing gains and shared in the literature review was gathered on American groups of service-learning

participants among whom it is more acceptable to speak highly of oneself. In this study, the participants were all international students.

Limitations of this study.

While the results of this study are encouraging with respect to the impact of service-learning on second language writing skills, important limitations should be noted. First, the small sample size of this study (17 students) must be considered when drawing conclusions from the data. While the data suggest a trend that service-learning positively affects second language writing skills, a larger sample size on which a robust statistical analysis could be performed might validate the trends suggested by the quantitative data in this study.

Second, the analytic scoring of the descriptive paragraphs in Trial 1 may not accurately reflect quality descriptive writing due to the unsuitability of the analytic scale used for the task. The Michigan Writing Assessment Scoring Guide is clearly aimed toward scoring persuasive writing and many raters expressed difficulty when scoring the descriptive paragraphs despite the training on how to translate the scale for descriptive writing assessment. To date, no analytic scale tailored to descriptive writing appears to exist in published writing assessment literature. However, even if a scale with high inter-rater reliability had been found, it would have been difficult to compare scores between trials if different scales had been used to arrive at those scores.

Third, the current study did not control for reading skills. Some of the weaker writing samples could have been related to reading difficulties, not necessarily weak writing skills. Students were required to summarize articles in both Trial 2 and 3. If

students struggled to comprehend the articles, they would have struggled to write an effective summary of the articles. A baseline reading assessment prior to the start of the study may have helped to factor in reading difficulties.

Fourth, the current study also did not control for the additional time service-learning students were able to spend with the professor. Even though the commute to and from the service-learning site took approximately 15 minutes, the additional time the service-learning students had to discuss their experience and classroom assignments with their professor could have had an impact on their overall writing gains. Perhaps additional discussion sessions with the control group could have helped to balance this factor.

Finally, but perhaps most importantly, because the service-learning students were invited to participate (with the exception of the one student who asked for permission) instead of being randomly selected, it is possible that the experimental group was quite different than the control group which could have skewed the results of this study. As discussed above, students who were reliable, punctual, and able to balance their school and life commitments were invited to participate in the service-learning experience because those skills would be needed to successfully participate off-campus in this type of project. However, these same characteristics are required for students to achieve academically. While the data may suggest a cause and effect relationship (i.e. that service-learning does improve writing skills), it must be tempered by the fact that the service-learning group had naturally strong academic skills which might have allowed them to succeed at a faster rate than the control group.

Chapter 4: Discussion and Conclusion

The primary purpose of this thesis project was to determine whether service-learning pedagogy had an impact on the writing skills of second language learners. In addition to answering this primary question, this project also explored whether there were significant personal gains at different periods in the semester and whether service-learning had an effect on student self-assessment of writing skills and attitudes toward writing. While this project initially started as a personal curiosity, its findings provide important direction for English for Academic Purposes (EAP) practitioners who would like to incorporate this type of pedagogy into their classrooms.

This final chapter consists of five sections: 1) a brief review of the key findings of this study, 2) a discussion of their implications, 3) suggestions for how other academic writing courses might successfully incorporate service-learning projects into their curriculum, 4) a discussion of the broader problems and limitations of incorporating service-learning projects, and 5) future research directions.

Brief Review of Key Findings

Greatest writing category growth.

The data collected and discussed in the previous chapter suggest that service-learning has a positive impact on second-language writing skills as participating students tended to perform better on their writing projects. When scored using holistic assessments, the service-learning students outperformed their control group peers scoring an average of 0.92 points of positive change over the control group's average positive change of 0.35 points from the start of the project to the end of the project (between

Trials 1 and 3). While the service-learning group also exhibited higher gains in all three analytic categories (Ideas and Arguments, Rhetorical Features, and Language Control), the most growth was documented as a group and as individuals in the Ideas and Arguments category between Trials 1 and 3. The service-learning group gained an average of 1.33 points of positive change while the control group only gained an average of 0.36 points of positive change. Neither group made large gains in the Language Control category, which suggests that service-learning projects may not have much of an impact on language control.

Period of greatest gains.

While the data suggest overall growth between Trials 1 and 3 noted above, it also indicates that the largest score gains were recorded between Trials 2 and 3 for all of the analytic categories. In the Ideas and Arguments category, the service-learning students gained an average of 1.17 points between Trials 2 and 3, an average of 1.00 point in the Rhetorical Features category, and 0.67 points in the Language Control category. Interestingly, the holistic scores noted the greatest positive growth between Trials 1 and 3, not Trials 2 and 3. The service-learning students gained an average of 0.92 points between Trials 1 and 3 and only 0.40 between Trials 2 and 3. This comparison of greatest gains between Trials 2 and 3 suggests that students gained the most benefit from the semester-long project between Week 9 and Week 15.

Impact on student self-assessment of writing.

The data presented in the previous chapter indicate that service-learning students reported a higher average self-assessed writing skills gain than the control group by the end of the semester. The service-learning group reported self-assessed growth of 2.67 points (on a 10 point scale) whereas the control group reported an average 2.00 points. However, 100% of the service-learning students responded that they did not feel that they were good writers in English whereas 90% of the control group believed that they were not good writers in English. This data diverges somewhat from the literature on service-learning that overwhelming supports that participants believe their writing skills improve after participating in service-learning projects.

Impact on student attitude toward writing.

Interestingly, the data indicated that the service-learning group self-assessed lower levels of motivation gains and enjoyment of writing in English than the control group. The service-learning group only self-assessed an average gain of 2.33 points in motivation and 2.00 points in enjoyment of writing whereas the control group reported self-assessed average gains of 2.90 points in motivation and 3.10 points in enjoyment. This data also contradicts the existing scholarship on the increase in motivation and enjoyment of writing as a result of service-learning.

Implications of Key Findings

       Importance of context and real language.

One theory for the positive growth trend, particularly in the Ideas and Arguments category, may be because service-learning projects increase the background knowledge of the student writers by providing an enhanced understanding of both cultural context and its specialized vocabulary. In this study the service-learning students had first-hand experience with homelessness and literacy through their service project which initiated them not only to the vocabulary used to discuss homelessness, but also to a deeper understanding of how homelessness can affect academic achievement. This vital background information could be responsible for their stronger performance on the writing samples pertaining to the broader topics of homelessness and literacy. Scholarship on the importance of context and real language discussed in the literature review of this thesis (Chapter 2) supports this key finding (Bartholomae, 2001; Brack & Hall, 2006; Arca, 2006; Gardner & Lambert, 1959; Weldon & Trautmann, 2003; Boyle & Overfield,1999). As background knowledge is enhanced, student writing becomes stronger because students directly connect language for specific and contextualized use to the topics about which they are learning and writing.

       Importance of long-term service-learning projects.

The data discussed in the previous chapter also suggest that service-learning projects must be long-term, on-going projects to be the most effective in improving student writing skills, or, at a minimum, last longer than nine weeks as the greatest gains in this study were documented between Weeks 9 and 15. The scholarship presented in the

literature review (Chapter 2) also support this finding, as practitioners who used semester-long projects documented greater gains in motivation due to increased cultural awareness and understanding than those who used more short-term projects (Morris, 2001; Carney, 2004; Weldon & Trautmann, 2003; Minor, 2002).

Importance of on-going support for service-learning participants.

Perhaps the most surprising finding of this project was the lower self-assessed attitudes toward writing by the service-learning group as it did not reflect the scholarship on the affective gains of service learning documented in the literature review (Chapter 2). As discussed, researchers overwhelmingly cite an increase in service-learning participant attitudes toward writing (Deans, 2000; Dorman & Dorman, 2006; Arca, 2006; Heuser, 2000; Minor, 2002). One theory for this finding is that service-learning students may be more critical of their writing skills because they have the opportunity to compare their skills with native speakers and can more easily sense their weaknesses. Language students in a traditional classroom tend to only interact with other second language speakers who often make the same language mistakes they themselves are making. This effect could also have been exaggerated in this thesis project by the fact that the native population consisted of disadvantaged youth, not highly educated and successful individuals. If the service-learning students believed that their skills were not even as good as the disadvantaged youth they were serving, it could have had a greater impact on their self-confidence in the second language and decreased their enjoyment and motivation to write in English.

The cultural norm against speaking highly of oneself could also have played a factor in the lower ratings in both the service-learning and control groups. Americans, who made up the majority of the published research on service-learning, may be much more comfortable assessing their own writing skills and speaking highly of themselves than the international students in this study. No currently published studies were reviewed to help measure how this cultural factor could have skewed the results of this aspect of the study. Regardless, the low scores for both groups indicate that service-learning students may need more support from teachers as they participate in service-learning projects and reflect on their writing gains.

Suggestions for Incorporating Service-Learning into Academic Writing Programs

  Connect writing topics to the service-learning context.

  In order to maximize the benefits of service-learning pedagogy for improving academic writing proficiency, teachers must tie the writing topics to the service itself. While this recommendation may seem obvious, since service-learning inherently requires that service be tied to academic course content, the data above suggest that simply connecting the project to general writing goals in an academic writing course is not sufficient. Teachers must work to connect the specific writing topics to the service itself in order to provide opportunities for students to practice specialized vocabulary gained on-site and build arguments using their enhanced cultural understanding of the context. To satisfy this requirement, teachers could apply a more discipline-specific focus to the writing courses. While EAP is considered one type of English for Specific Purposes

(ESP), perhaps an "English for a Specific Discipline Purpose" approach could be implemented.

Currently, most undergraduate EAP students at universities throughout the United States are not grouped according to their program of study. Music majors, nursing majors, and business majors may all be grouped together in the same writing course because the purpose of these programs is to teach the broad academic writing skills necessary for success in a liberal arts program. Many undergraduate programs require a general foundation of academic writing in the first two years of study before students begin taking more formal, discipline-specific writing courses, such as business writing. Once students have mastered the broader writing courses, they then leave the EAP programs to take the specialized writing courses in their own departments. While there are certain academic writing skills that transcend a particular course of study, a deeper understanding of contextualized language use particular to a specific field of study specifically tailored for second language learners is not often possible in this popular writing course model. Just when students are expected to act as knowledgeable contributors in their field of study, they are separated from the support of the EAP programs which have provided the majority of their writing instruction.

If EAP programs moved toward a more discipline-specific approach to EAP writing, students in the same program could maximize service-learning projects because they would be tied to their particular course of study. Students would also benefit from specific genre instruction tailored to their field of study. For example, business majors could volunteer at local non-profit organizations and focus their writing assignments on business practices and theories and produce business memos and proposals. Nursing

students could volunteer at local clinics and undertake writing assignments that delve into healthcare challenges and solutions. While certain administrative obstacles may prohibit this type of arrangement, more integration between the EAP programs and the specific colleges could make this alignment possible. It may also alleviate some of the scheduling challenges students in particular majors face when attempting to follow the recommended EAP course sequence because the sections would be designed and scheduled in collaboration with the respective colleges.

Alternatively, if such wide-spread programmatic changes were not possible, EAP writing teachers could differentiate writing topics and service-learning projects within their classrooms. Teachers could form discipline-specific groupings within the classroom and tailor each writing assignment and service-learning project to the specific field of study for each group. Because creating multiple writing topics and service-learning sites would significantly increase the workload and supervisory responsibilities for the teacher, it would be good practice to incorporate a service-learning assistant in the classroom. Teachers could use previous service-learning participants or graduate students studying to become EAP professionals. If such low cost options were not available, it would also be worth exploring some of the service-learning grants which would allow teachers to employ and pay classroom assistants. Several EAP teachers with multiple sections of the same course could also partner together on the service-learning projects and thus divide the responsibilities. Each instructor could volunteer to be the lead supervisor on certain discipline-specific writing topics and projects, which would relieve each teacher from oversight on all projects.

Require a minimum amount of time on-site.

As the data above suggest, EAP practitioners desiring to incorporate service-learning should aim to provide projects that require a minimum amount of hours at the same service-learning site. Based on this study, somewhere between nine and fifteen hours would be recommended. While more hours would be ideal, it is often difficult for EAP students to travel to the project site due to lack of transportation. In addition, many EAP students are already overwhelmed by scheduling difficulties when balancing courses required in their field of study with EAP course requirements.

However, if the EAP programs adopted service-learning as a critical pedagogy, they could overcome these time issues by designing service-learning projects that spanned multiple EAP courses. For example, an EAP student could participate in the same service-learning project in both his writing course and his listening and speaking course. If the EAP programs adopted the discipline-specific approach outlined above, this type of coordination should be fairly easy to accomplish. With each passing semester, the student's on-going participation at the same service-learning site tailored to his particular course of study would provide an on-going, more long-term experience. The administrative issues inherent in managing a service-learning project would also be reduced as the department could focus on several key relationships with limited service sites instead of spreading resources across multiple sites.

Schedule frequent conference time with students.

The lower self-assessed writing skill and motivational gains reported in the study suggest that service-learning students may need more support from teachers to maximize

these types of affective gains. If it is indeed true that service-learning students are self-assessing lower skill growth because they are comparing themselves with native speakers, teachers could mitigate this side effect by implementing regular conference time with the service-learning students. If instructors met regularly with the participants, they would be better able to reassure the students of their developing skills. Instructors could also give them periodic quantitative assessments like those used in this study and share the data with their students during conferences to convince them that they were indeed making language gains. The service-learning students in this thesis study were clearly making gains between trials, but that data was never shared directly with them so they had no way to empirically gauge their skill growth.

Teach students to self-assess their own writing growth.

Teachers could also make the assessment of writing progress throughout the project much more personal for each student. Most students, regardless of nationality, view assessment as falling primarily within the teacher's purview. Teachers could instruct students how to measure their own personal gains more regularly to help them gain self-confidence and possibly overcome the hesitancy to speak highly of themselves.

Problems and Limitations for Doing Service-Learning Projects

While the above recommendations and suggestions may seem straightforward and easy to implement, they have been offered in the spirit of creating an ideal program. Clearly, incorporating service-learning projects is not easy due to certain significant administrative and economic considerations, many of which have been carefully

76

documented in the published literature on this field and some of which have already been referenced in this chapter, such as the difficulty in scheduling and securing transportation to and from the project site for international students.

Teachers who choose to incorporate service-learning projects must prepare themselves and their students for the additional work it will entail. In addition to the regular responsibilities of planning lessons and grading student work, teachers must oversee the projects and maintain a strong working relationship with the project sites. Ideally, teachers would be on-site with students for every meeting; however, it might not be possible if teachers decided to manage several projects within one course or offer it across multiple course sections. Managing a working relationship with non-profit organizations can also be time-consuming and frustrating as many of the key players at these organizations are themselves volunteers. Both teachers and participating students should be prepared for the fact that responses to questions or problems are not always prompt. Finally, both students and teachers must be prepared to be flexible in the event of changes on site. If a student decided to drop a service-learning course mid-semester, the supervising teacher or other students on the project team may need to volunteer more time to fulfill any agreements made to the service site. If teachers were unable to deliver services promised in a given semester, it could jeopardize the partnership with the project site.

Likewise, students should prepare themselves for the additional time and effort required of service-learning participants. While being late for a class may not be a significant issue for many students, it can be quite disruptive for students participating in service-projects. Students must treat their service-learning projects as important

responsibilities – as they would a job for which they received pay. The beneficiaries of many of the service-learning projects depend on the participating students. Students chosen for such a project should be mature and able to balance the demands of school, life, and their service project.

Despite these notable challenges, teachers and students with a passion for authentic language and writing instruction should explore incorporating service-learning into their teaching and learning. While the issues may seem great, the potential reward is well-worth the risk.

Future Research Directions

This service-learning case study represents a promising step toward assessing the impact of service-learning on second language writing skills and translating key findings into implementation suggestions; however, important further research is necessary to fully explore these initial results and make EAP program changes. First, a larger sample size would be required to measure the statistical significance of incorporating this pedagogy. Including several sections of a writing course could help to achieve the minimal number of participants required for such a study.

Second, in order to eliminate any possible academic inequality between groups, it would be important for the next study to contain randomly selected students to control for academic success characteristics to ensure that the trends documented correlate to the service-learning activity and not natural academic success characteristics.

Third, due to the variety of rhetorical genres new writing students are asked to master in the current EAP writing courses (descriptive, summary-response, and

persuasive writing), a future study that controlled for genre types would help writing instructors to assess the best class in which to incorporate service-learning if a discipline-specific approach to EAP courses were not possible. Due to the range of writing genres in English W001, it would be important to pilot a service-learning project in the other writing courses that focus on more narrow writing genres. Graduate ESP courses could be good choices for this type of continued study.

Finally, if social interaction is crucial to cognitive development, as the research suggests, it would also be important to develop a case study that could explore the sociocultural impact of service-learning. While the current study certainly made progress in documenting the gains in the writing *product*, it did little to document gains in the writing *process* that may develop as a result of service-learning interactions. A study designed to measure sociocultural gains of student interaction on site at the service-learning facilities would help to provide researchers with an in-depth perspective that interaction plays in the process of writing development. Using sociocultural data collection methods, such as videotaping and transcribing communicative exchanges would help researchers evaluate sociocultural issues. Researchers interested in this type of data would face many obstacles, namely the time it would take to document, capture, transcribe, and analyze the data as well as the difficulties faced when attempting to collect data from protected communities, such as children and at-risk populations, the very subjects non-profit organizations target. However, until this type of study is undertaken, the true sociocultural impact of service-learning on second language writing skills will remain unknown.

Conclusion

Successful second language acquisition requires that EAP practitioners provide students opportunities to gain skills in the four key communicative competence categories: grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competencies (Canale & Swain, 1980). While traditional classrooms are primarily limited to the grammatical and strategic competence categories by design, incorporating service-learning projects can enhance the final sociolinguistic competence by providing students authentic language experiences in authentic contexts. The scholarship on service-learning contends that service-learning is beneficial to general second language acquisition; however, the key findings discussed in this thesis suggest that service-learning pedagogy may have important implications for second language writing instruction in particular. Whether or not the suggested practices and areas for future research discussed in this thesis are implemented and explored, second language students can be hopeful that the continued international interest in service-learning may find its way to their own university and degree programs so that they can be the judge.

Appendix A

Standard Course Syllabus

ENGLISH W001: FUNDAMENTALS OF ENGLISH – SPRING 2009
TU/TH :10:30-11:45AM, NU 215

INSTRUCTOR:	Miki Hamstra	**OFFICE:**	Cavanaugh Hall 313J
E-MAIL:	mhamstra@iupui.edu	**OFFICE HOURS:**	9:00-10:00AM, Tues/Thurs
PHONE:			Or by appointment

Welcome to English W001. This syllabus outlines my specific expectations, requirements, and suggestions for making the most out of our time this semester.

Required Materials:
1. Textbook: <u>SF Writer, 4th Edition,</u> Ruskiewicz, Seward, and Hairston, ISBN: 136148220
2. One 2-pocket folder for submitting work

Course Description:
The focus of English W001 is on academic writing skills, including the ability to develop ideas in writing as well as practice strategies for organization and revision. The course will also include grammar review and instruction as needed. Students who successfully complete this course will be able to:

- write unified, coherent paragraphs, with good supporting information
- connect paragraphs to a thesis statement
- select and narrow a topic, resulting in a strong thesis statement
- focus and shape a piece of writing based on the text's purpose and audience
- organize and develop different styles of compositions appropriate to purpose
- revise and edit to improve the quality of writing
- work with other writers, offering and receiving responses, critique and support
- use various grammatical structures and punctuation correctly
- read critically
- reflect on and assess writing choices

Course Policies

Format Requirements: Except for some in-class assignments, all work must be typed and formatted according to requirements on each assignment sheet.

Oncourse: We will be using Oncourse, IUPUI's web-based course environment, for this course. To use Oncourse, you must have an active IUPUI network account. You are required to check our course page in Oncourse regularly for messages and class assignments. You can access Oncourse from any IUPUI computer lab or from home via the web at: http://oncourse.iu.edu.

My Comp Lab: We will be using My Comp Lab, a companion website to our textbook, for writing exercises and grammar review in this course. Instructions for how to login to this website are included in your textbook and will be explained in class.

Class Participation/Attendance: Preparation, attendance and participation are essential to your success in this course. There are no excused absences. If you need to be absent from a class, you should discuss it with me via e-mail or during my office hours before your absence. I will be happy to tell you what will be covered in the class; however, you will not receive points for attendance. Points for attendance are only

awarded if you are present in class. *You may not make up in-class work*; instead, you must be present to receive credit.

Just as you are expected to complete homework every day, you are also expected to be in class on time every day. If you are more than 10 minutes late or leave more than 10 minutes early from a class without prior permission, you will be marked absent.

Homework: To get the most out of our class time, you should plan on spending at least two-three hours writing [or preparing to write] for every hour that you are in class. This means that you should be prepared to write at least 6-9 hours per week outside of class. You are required to complete all assigned work, including all homework, drafts, and exercises. Because we will often revise your homework in class, it is important that you do it, do it on time, and bring it to class.

Deadlines: All work is due at the beginning of class on the due date. Late Writing Project packets will be reduced one grade (e.g., B to C) for each day they are late, and no final portfolios will be accepted late. If you fail to hand in the final portfolio, you will receive an F for the semester, regardless of your other grades.

Assessment: With each assignment, you will receive a clear set of guidelines as well as a handout detailing my grading standards. During this semester, you will complete daily in-class exercises, other out of class exercises, three Writing Projects (including multiple drafts), and other informal pieces of writing related to the specific assignment. At the end of the course, you will submit a final portfolio containing revisions of Writing Projects 2 and 3.

Your final grade in this course will be comprised of the following:
- ✓ Writing Project #1   10%
- ✓ Writing Project #2   15%
- ✓ Writing Project #3   15%
- ✓ Final Portfolio   40%
- ✓ Participation and Exercises 20%

Your performance will be evaluated according to University guidelines:
- "A" work is **excellent**, interesting, and relevant to course requirements.
- "B" work is interesting and **significantly better** than basic course requirements.
- "C" work meets the basic course requirements and is of **average** quality.
- "C", "D" and "F" work does not satisfy the course requirements, and students must repeat W001 before taking W131 or G013.

Grading Scale:

A+	98-100	B+	88-89	C+	78-79	D+	68-69
A	92-97	B	82-87	C	72-77	D	62-67
A-	90-91	B-	80-81	C-	70-71	D-	60-61

Writing Conferences: You will meet individually with me 4 times this semester to discuss your progress and any specific concerns you may have. See the course schedule for the week in which writing conferences are planned. Drafts for writing conferences will be due prior to the conference so that I have time to review your draft and make comments. You may also see me any time during my office hours or e-mail me to schedule an appointment outside of my office hours. Additionally, you may also e-mail me at any time with questions or concerns.

Writing Center: In addition to writing conferences with me, you are also encouraged to visit the University Writing Center for help with your writing. The Writing Center is an outstanding free resource provided by the University. Students who work with tutors over the course of the semester normally see dramatic improvements in their writing, and a tutor can help you at any stage of progress, from brainstorming to final revisions. The Writing Center is located in two locations: call 274-2049 to make an

appointment in Cavanaugh Hall, Room 427 and 278-8171 for appointments in the University Library, Room 2125. The Writing Center's website is: http://www.iupui.edu/~uwc/. *You may only seek writing assistance from me or from the Writing Center.*

Academic Integrity: The purpose of this course is to help you learn to formulate and express your own ideas; all writing you turn in should be your own. Over the course of the semester, we will discuss the correct ways in which you may incorporate other people's ideas into your writing. However, knowingly submitting someone else's words as your own is a violation of Indiana University's Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct. Depending on the nature of the offense, the penalty for plagiarism may include receiving an F on an assignment, failing this course, or being expelled from the university.

Adaptive Educational Needs: Let me know if you have special needs that relate to your ability to perform well in this course. In addition, it is important that you register with Adaptive Educational Services, which works with eligible students to request both special consideration and special accommodations in courses. They can be reached at 274-3241 or AES@iupui.edu.

Course Expectations:
As a student in this class, you are expected to
- Be physically and mentally present and prepared for every class session
- Treat your classmates and me with respect, even when differences of opinion make this a challenge
- Be willing to share your writing with others and to respond honestly to the writing of your peers
- Be able to work independently, but willing to ask for help when you need it
- Be honest in spoken and written word, avoiding all forms of plagiarism
- Accept personal responsibility for your achievement in this class, be it on-time or late, complete or incomplete, well-crafted or hastily thrown together.

As your instructor, I am expected to
- Maintain open lines of communication with you
- Treat you, your background, and your work with respect
- Provide clear assignments which advance your understanding and practice of writing
- Be available to help you on an individual basis
- Read and respond to your work in a timely manner
- Evaluate your work fairly.

COURSE SCHEDULE: W001, Spring 2009
The course schedule is subject to change. Changes will be announced in class and on Oncourse.

DATE		*READING DUE	WRITING ASSIGNMENT AND EXERCISES DUE	CLASS DISCUSSION
WEEK 1	JAN 13			INTRODUCTION TO COURSE IN-CLASS WRITING ASSESSMENT
	JAN 15	PP. 1-30, SYLLABUS, ONCOURSE	READING QUIZ #1	AUDIENCE AND PURPOSE, INTRODUCTION TO WP1
WEEK 2	JAN 20	PP. 30-52, 101-112 WP1 ASSIGNMENT GUIDELINES	PARAGRAPH 1 READING QUIZ #2	CHEATING, PART 1; PARAGRAPH STRUCTURES TOPIC SENTENCES AND SUPPORTING DETAILS
	JAN 22			MEET IN CA436 – MY COMP LAB CREATING A STRUCTURE AND OUTLINE, DRAFTING
WEEK 3	JAN 27	PP. 65-95	MY COMP LAB #1 PARAGRAPHS 2 AND 3 READING QUIZ #3	SENTENCE STRUCTURE AND PUNCTUATION
	JAN 29		MY COMP LAB #2	MEET IN CA436 – FORMAT WORKSHOP PARALLELISM, CONCLUDING SENTENCES
WEEK 4	FEB 3		MY COMP LAB #3 PARAGRAPHS 4 AND 5	COHESION WITHIN PARAGRAPHS
	FEB 5	NO CLASS: WRITING CONFERENCE #1 – REVISIONS OF ALL 5 PARAGRAPHS DUE BY **12:00PM FEBRUARY 4TH**		

WEEK 5	**FEB 10**			
	FEB 12		MY COMP LAB #4 WRITING PROJECT #1	IN-CLASS WRITER'S STATEMENT INTRODUCTION TO WRITING PROJECT #2
WEEK 6	FEB 17	ASSIGNED ARTICLE WP2 ASSIGNMENT GUIDELINES	SUMMARY WORKSHEET	SUMMARY PRACTICE
	FEB 19	PP. 113-115, 173-181	MY COMP LAB #5 READING QUIZ #4 ASSIGNED	READING AND RESPONDING CRITICALLY
WEEK 7	FEB 24		MY COMP LAB #6 DRAFT BODY PARAGRAPHS 2-4	SUMMARIZING, PARAPHRASING & QUOTING
	FEB 26	PP. 257-266, 114-115 STUDENT CODE OF CONDUCT	MY COMP LAB #7 E-PARA 2-4 (FEB. 25TH 8PM) READING QUIZ #4 DUE	CLOSING PARAGRAPHS THESIS STATEMENTS
WEEK 8	MAR 3		COMPLETE DRAFT OF WP2	PEER EDITING
	MAR 5	NO CLASS: WRITING CONFERENCE #2 – COMPLETE DRAFT OF WP2 DUE BY **12:00PM MARCH 4TH**		
WEEK 9	**MAR 10**		WRITING PROJECT #2	IN-CLASS WRITER'S STATEMENT
	MAR 12	PP. 182-209 ASSIGNED ARTICLE		INTRODUCTION TO WRITING PROJECT #3 NCLB BACKGROUND PRESENTATION REVERSE OUTLINE
		NO CLASSES: MAR 17-19 – SPRING BREAK		
WEEK 10	MAR 24		REVERSE OUTLINE SUMMARY, BP1, BP2	STRATEGIES OF ARGUMENT COUNTERARGUMENT AND REBUTTAL/REFUTATION
	MAR 26	PP. 103-105 - REVIEW	BP3, BP4	COHESION WITHIN AND BETWEEN PARAGRAPHS
WEEK 11	MAR 31	NO CLASS: WRITING CONFERENCE #3 – COMPLETE DRAFT OF WP3 DUE AT CONFERENCE		
	APR 2	NO CLASS: INDEPENDENT REVISION		
WEEK 12	**APR 7**	.	COMPLETE DRAFT OF WP3	PEER EDITING SESSION
	APR 9		WRITING PROJECT #3	IN-CLASS WRITER'S STATEMENT INTRODUCTION TO FINAL PORTFOLIO
WEEK 13	APR 14	FP ASSIGNMENT GUIDELINES	MY COMP LAB #8	REVISION WORKSHOP
	APR 16			REVISION WORKSHOP
WEEK 14	APR 21			REVISION WORKSHOP
	APR 23	NO CLASS: WRITING CONFERENCE #4 – REVISED PORTFOLIO ESSAYS DUE AT WRITING CONFERENCE.		
WEEK 15	**APR 28**			
	APR 30		FINAL PORTFOLIO	IN-CLASS RETROSPECTIVE ESSAY COURSE EVALUATION

ALL READING ASSIGNMENTS REFER TO PAGE NUMBERS IN THE REQUIRED TEXTBOOK, EXCEPT FOR ASSIGNED ARTICLES.

Appendix B

English W001 Spring 2009 Writing Project 1 Writing Prompts

Process Paragraph: Describe the process you follow when you encounter a difficult

reading passage? (What do you do to comprehend it?)

Descriptive Paragraph: Describe your favorite writing project.

Definition: How do you define second language "fluency?"

Compare and Contrast: Compare your best writing instructor with your worst writing

instructor.

Cause and Effect: Using a cause and effect format, choose three factors (the most

important) which led you to study your chosen field in college.

Appendix C

Case Study Participant Statistics

Group	Native Country	Gender	L1	L2, L3	Where study English?	How long study English?	Time in USA before W001
Control	China	M	Mandarin	Mandarin, English	school	8 years	6 months
Control	El Salvador	F	Spanish	English	school	5.5 years	7 years
Control	Iran	M	Persian	English	school	5 years	4 months
Control	Korea	M	Korean	Korean	Korea, Minnesota	8 years	1 year
Control	Korea	M	Korean	English	high school	3 years	7 months
Control	Korea	M	Korean	English	ELS Indy	4 years	9 months
Control	Korea	M	Korean	English	high school	4 years	9 months
Control	Nigeria	F	Esan	English	N/A	N/A	1 year
Control	Saudi Arabia	M	Arabic	English	ELS Indy	7 months	8 months
Control	Saudi Arabia	M	Arabic	English	Tampa, FL	9 months	9 months
Control	Taiwan	M	Mandarin	Cantonese, English	Taiwan	10 years	1 year
SL	China	M	Mandarin	English	high school, college	5 years	1 month
SL	China	M	Mandarin	English	school	8 years	13 days

Group	Native Country	Gender	L1	L2, L3	Where study English?	How long study English?	Time in USA before W001
SL	India	F	Gujarati	Hindi, Spanish, English	India, USA high school private	6 years	3 years
SL	Iran	F	Persian	English	teacher language academy in	6 years	3 weeks
SL	Japan	F	Japanese	English	Japan country and	3 years	3 months
SL	Saudi Arabia	M	Arabic	English	USA	2 years	1 year

Appendix D

Test of Written English (TWE) Scoring Guide
From the *Newbury House TOEFL Preparation Kit, Planning for the Test of Written English*

Score	Description
6	Clearly demonstrates competence on both the rhetorical and syntactic levels, though it may have occasional errors. A paper in this category --is well organized and well developed --effectively addresses the writing task --uses appropriate details to support a thesis or illustrate ideas --shows unity, coherence, and progression --displays consistent facility in the use of language --demonstrates syntactic variety and appropriate word choice
5	Demonstrates competence in writing on both the rhetorical and syntactic levels, though it will have occasional errors. A paper in this category --is generally well organized and well developed though it may have fewer details than does a 6 paper. --may address some parts of the task more effectively than others --shows unity, coherence, and progression --demonstrates some syntactic variety and range of vocabulary --displays facility in language, though it may have more errors than does a 6 paper
4	Demonstrates minimal competence in writing on both the rhetorical and syntactic levels. A paper in this category --is adequately organized --addresses the writing topic adequately but may slight parts of the task --uses some details to support a thesis or illustrate ideas --demonstrates adequate but undistinguished or inconsistent facility with syntax and usage --may contain some serious errors that occasionally obscure meaning

Score	Description
3	Demonstrates some developing competence in writing, but it remains flawed on either the rhetorical or syntactic level, or both. A paper in this category may reveal one or more of the following weaknesses: --inadequate organization or development --failure to support or illustrate generalizations with appropriate or sufficient detail --an accumulation of errors in sentence structure and/or usage --a noticeably inappropriate choice of words or word forms.
2	Suggests incompetence in writing. A paper in this category is seriously flawed by one or more of the following weaknesses: --failure to organize or develop --little or no detail or relevant specifics --serious and frequent errors in usage or sentence structure --serious problems with focus
1	Demonstrates incompetence in writing. A paper in this category will contain serious and persistent writing errors, may be illogical or incoherent, or may reveal the writer's ability to comprehend the question. A paper that is severely underdeveloped, or one that exhibits no response at all, also falls into this category.

Appendix E

Michigan Writing Assessment Scoring Guide

From the *Newbury House TOEFL Preparation Kit, Planning for the Test of Written*

English

Score	Ideas and Arguments	Rhetorical Features	Language Control
6	The essay deals with the issues centrally and fully. The position is clear, and strongly and substantially argued. The complexity of the issues is treated seriously and the viewpoints of other people are taken into account very well.	The essay has rhetorical control at the highest level, showing unity and subtle management. Ideas are balanced with support and the whole essay shows strong control of organization appropriate to the content. Textual elements are well connected through logical or linguistic transitions and there is no repetition or redundancy.	The essay has excellent language control with elegance of diction and style. Grammatical structures and vocabulary are well-chosen to express the ideas and to carry out the intentions.
5	The essay deals with the issues well: the position is clear and substantial arguments are presented. The complexity of the issues or other viewpoints on them have been taken into account.	The essay shows strong rhetorical control and is well managed. Ideas are generally balanced with support and the whole essay shows good control of organization appropriate to the content. Textual elements are generally well connected although there may be occasional lack of rhetorical fluency: redundancy, repetition, or a missing transition.	The essay has strong language control and reads smoothly. Grammatical structures and vocabulary are generally well-chosen to express the ideas and to carry out the intentions.
4	The essay talks about the issues but could be better focused or developed. The position is thoughtful but could be clearer or the arguments could have more substance. Repetition or inconsistency may occur occasionally. The writer has clearly tried to take the complexity of the issues or viewpoints on them into account.	The essay shows acceptable rhetorical control and is generally managed fairly well. Much of the time ideas are balanced with support, and the organization is appropriate to the content. There is evidence of planning and the parts of the essay are usually adequately connected, although there are some instances of lack of rhetorical fluency.	The essay has good language control although it lacks fluidity. The grammatical structures used and the vocabulary chosen are able to express the ideas and carry the meaning quite well; although readers notice occasional language errors.

Score	Ideas and Arguments	Rhetorical Features	Language Control
3	The essay considers the issues but tends to rely on opinions or claims without the substance of evidence. The essay may be repetitive or inconsistent; the position needs to be clearer or the arguments need to be more convincing. If there is an attempt to account for the complexity of the issues or other viewpoints this is not fully controlled and only partly successful.	The essay has uncertain rhetorical control and is generally not very well managed. The organization may be adequate to the content, but ideas are not always balanced with support. Failures of rhetorical fluency are noticeable although there seems to have been an attempt at planning and some transitions are successful.	The essay has language control which is acceptable but limited. Although the grammatical structures used and the vocabulary chosen express the ideas and carry the meaning adequately, readers are aware of language errors or limited choice of language forms.
2	The essay talks generally about the topic but does not come to grips with ideas about it, raising superficial arguments or moving from one point to another without fully developing any fully. Other viewpoints are not given any serious attention.	The essay lacks rhetorical control most of the time, and the overall shape of the essay is hard to recognize. Ideas are generally not balanced with evidence, and the lack of an organizing principle is a problem. Transitions across and within sentences are attempted with only occasional success.	The essay has rather weak language control. Although the grammatical structures used and vocabulary chosen express the ideas and carry the meaning most of the time, readers are troubled by language errors or choice of language forms.
1	The essay does not develop or support an argument about the topic, although it may 'talk about' the topic.	The essay demonstrates little rhetorical control. There is little evidence of planning or organization, and the parts of the essay are poorly connected.	The essay demonstrates little language control. Language errors and restricted choice of language forms are so noticeable that readers are seriously distracted by them.

Appendix F

Sample Panel Dataset for Ideas and Arguments Score (Analytic Scale)

ID	Trial	Ideas and Argument Score	Trial Interval	Change between Interval
CON01	1	3	1-2	1
CON01	2	4	2-3	0
CON01	3	4	1-3	1
CON02	1	3	1-2	0
CON02	2	3	2-3	1
CON02	3	4	1-3	1
CON03	1	3	1-2	1
CON03	2	4	2-3	0
CON03	3	4	1-3	1
CON04	1	4	1-2	-1
CON04	2	3	2-3	0
CON04	3	3	1-3	-1
CON05	1	3	1-2	0
CON05	2	3	2-3	0
CON05	3	3	1-3	0

ID	Trial	Ideas and Argument Score	Trial Interval	Change between Interval
CON06	1	3	1-2	-1
CON06	2	2	2-3	0
CON06	3	2	1-3	-1
CON07	1	3	1-2	1
CON07	2	4	2-3	0
CON07	3	4	1-3	1
CON08	1	5	1-2	-1
CON08	2	4	2-3	1
CON08	3	5	1-3	0
CON09	1	2	1-2	2
CON09	2	4	2-3	-2
CON09	3	2	1-3	0
CON10	1	4	1-2	-1
CON10	2	3	2-3	2
CON10	3	5	1-3	1
CON11	1	3	1-2	-1
CON11	2	2	2-3	2

ID	Trial	Ideas and Argument Score	Trial Interval	Change between Interval
CON11	3	4	1-3	1
SLN01	1	3	1-2	1
SLN01	2	4	2-3	0
SLN01	3	4	1-3	1
SLN02	1	3	1-2	1
SLN02	2	4	2-3	2
SLN02	3	6	1-3	3
SLN03	1	4	1-2	0
SLN03	2	4	2-3	0
SLN03	3	4	1-3	0
SLN04	1	4	1-2	0
SLN04	2	4	2-3	1
SLN04	3	5	1-3	1
SLN05	1	4	1-2	-1
SLN05	2	3	2-3	2
SLN05	3	5	1-3	1
SLN06	1	4	1-2	0

ID	Trial	Ideas and Argument Score	Trial Interval	Change between Interval
SLN06	2	4	2-3	1
SLN06	3	5	1-3	1

Appendix G

Student Final Evaluation

Name (Given name and Family name): _____

Describe yourself as a student:

_____

_____

Do you think you're a good writer in your first language? Why or why not?

_____

_____

Do you think you're a good writer in English? Why or why not?

_____

_____

One a scale of 1 to 10 (10 being the highest) circle your response to the questions below.

Before this class, how would you evaluate your English writing skills? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

After this class, how would you evaluate your English writing skills? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Before this class, how motivated were you to practice English writing? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

After this class, how motivated are you to practice English writing? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Before this class, how much did you enjoy writing in English? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

After this class, how much do you enjoy writing in English? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

What particular lessons or assignments were most beneficial to your growth as an English writer? Why?

_____

_____

_____

What particular lessons or assignments were not beneficial to your growth as an English writer? Why not?

_____

_____

_____

Did you consult the Writing Center on your writing projects? If yes, how often? If no, why not?

_____

_____

What motivates you the most when writing in English?

_____

_____

_____

As you know, several students in this class were invited to participate in an "alternative W001 syllabus" in which they participated in a service-learning project outside of class. Service-learning projects are designed to help reinforce classroom learning by participating in community service projects that relate to classroom lessons or skills. Students in this class volunteered approximately 10 hours at a local homeless shelter tutoring homeless children. Please answer the following questions regarding this opportunity. (When a scale is indicated, please use the same scale as above – 10 being the highest and 1 being the lowest)

How interested would you be in participating in a service-learning project in a W001 class?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

How interested would you be in participating in a service-learning project in a W131 class?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Explain your answers above

_____

_____

_____

How many total semester hours would you be able to dedicate to this type of project outside of class? _____

What limitations would you have which may make it difficult for you to participate? (i.e. time, transportation, safety concerns, etc…)

_____

_____

_____

Do you think a service-learning project could improve your classroom learning? Why or why not?

_____

_____

_____

Appendix H

Final Tutoring Reflection

The final tutoring reflection is your chance to tell me what you gained from this experience and provide me with ideas on how to make it better for future students.

Please answer the following questions and place one check mark in one of following columns for each question: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, UN=Undecided, D=Disagree, SA=Strongly Disagree

QUESTION	SA	A	UN	D	SD
1. The requirements for this project were reasonable (i.e. 8 tutoring sessions @1 hour each, reflection journals)					
2. I enjoyed participating in my volunteer activities.					
3. My English listening and speaking skills were improved through my service-learning experience.					
4. My English writing skills were improved through my service-learning experience.					
5. The skills obtained in this project will help me in my future academic courses or career.					
6. I plan to continue volunteering at my service-learning site.					
7. I plan to volunteer at another organization in the future.					

Please complete the following questions with a short answer in sentence or paragraph form. Please try to be specific when providing examples and explanations.

8. What, if anything, did you learn about writing from your service-learning experience?
9. Did your service-learning experience help you prepare your writing projects? Why or why not?
10. What, if anything, did you learn about American culture from your service-learning experience?
11. What, if anything, did you learn about yourself from your service-learning experience?
12. How did the service-learning experience impact your attitude about the W001 class?
13. Did the service-learning experience impact your attitude about writing in English?
14. If IUPUI offered a service-learning graduation certificate in the EAP Department which required you to participate in a service-learning project in all of your EAP classes, would you be interested? Why or why not?
15. What surprised you the most about your service-learning experience?
16. What was the best part of this project and why?
17. What was the worst part of this project and why?
18.What suggestions would you make to improve this project for a future W001 class?

19. How would you define service-learning? How would you define volunteering? What do you feel is the main difference between them?

20. Would you be willing to be interviewed for my research project? If yes, please provide me with your phone number, address, and email where I can reach you this summer.

References

Adler-Kassner, L., Crooks, R., & Watters, A. (2006). Service-learning and composition at the crossroads. In L. Adler-Kassner, R. Crooks & A. Watters (Eds.), *Writing the community: Concepts and models for service-learning in composition*. Sterling, Virginia: Stylus.

Arca, R. L. (2006). Systems thinking, symbiosis, and service: The road to authority for basic writers. In L. Adler-Kassner, R. Crooks & A. Watters (Eds.), *Writing the community: Concepts and models for service-learning in composition* (pp. 133-142). Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Arries, J. (1999). Critical pedagogy and service-learning in Spanish: Crossing borders in the freshman seminar. In J. Hellebrandt & L. T. Varona (Eds.), *Construyendo puentes (Building Bridges): Concepts and models for service-learning in Spanish* (pp. 33-48). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. (2000). *How service learning affects students*. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles. (HERI)

Bartholomae, D. (2001). Inventing the university. In E. Cushman, E. R. Kintgen, B. M. Kroll & M. Rose (Eds.), *Literacy: A critical sourcebook* (pp. 511-524). Boston: Bedford / St. Martin's.

Boyle, J. P., & Overfield, D. (1999). Community-based language learning: Integrating language and service. In J. Hellebrandt (Ed.), *Construyendo puentes (building bridges): concepts and models for service learning in Spanish* (pp. 137-147): American Association for Higher Education.

Brack, G. W., & Hall, L. R. (2006). Combining the classroom and the community: Service-learning in composition at Arizona State University. In L. Adler-Kassner, R. Crooks & A. Watters (Eds.), *Writing the community: concepts and models for service-learning in composition* (pp. 143-152). Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Brandt, D. (2001). Sponsors of literacy. In E. Cushman, E. R. Kintgen, B. M. Kroll & M. Rose (Eds.), *Literacy: A critical sourcebook* (pp. 555-571). Boston: Bedford / St. Martin's.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1996). Implementing Service Learning in Higher Education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 67*(2), 221-239.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4 ed.). White Plains, New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1-47.

Carney, T. M. (2004). Reaching Beyond Borders through Service Learning. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 3*(4), 267-271.

Cone, D., & Harris, S. (1996). Service-Learning Practice: Developing a Theoretical Framework. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3*(Fall), 31-43.

Deans, T. (2000). *Writing partnerships: Service-learning in composition*. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.

Dorman, W., & Dorman, S. F. (2006). Service-learning: Bridging the gap between the
real world and the composition classroom. In L. Adler-Kassner, R. Crooks & A.
Watters (Eds.), *Writing the community: Concepts and models for service-learning
in composition* (pp. 119-132). Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Eyler, J. (2002). Stretching to meet the challenge: Improving the quality of research to
improve the quality of service-learning. In S. H. Billing & A. Furco (Eds.),
Service-learning through a multidisciplinary lens. Greenwich, Connecticut:
Information Age Publishing.

Furco, A., & Billig, S. H. (2002). Establishing norms for scientific inquiry in service-
learning. In S. H. Billig & A. Furco (Eds.), *Service-learning through a
multidisciplinary lens*. Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. (1959). Motivational Variables in Second Language
Acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology, 13*, 266-272.

Gee, J. (2001). Literacy, discourse, and linguistics: Introduction and what is literacy? In
E. Cushman, E. R. Kintgen, B. M. Kroll & M. Rose (Eds.), *Literacy: A critical
sourcebook* (pp. 525-544). Boston: Bedford / St. Martin's.

Grassi, E., Hanley, D., & Liston, D. (2004). Service-Learning: An Innovative Approach
for Second Language Learners. *Journal of Experiential Education, 27*(1), 87-110.

Hale, A. (1999). Service-learning and Spanish: A missing link. In J. Hellebrandt & L. T.
Varona (Eds.), *Construyendo puentes (building bridges): Concepts and models
for service-learning in Spanish* (pp. 9-32). Washington, DC: American
Association for Higher Education.

Heuser, L. (2000). Service-learning as a Pedagogy to Promote the Content, Cross-Cultural, and Language-Learning of ESL Students. *TESL Canada Journal, 17*(1), 54-71.

Kennedy, D. B., & Hamp-Lyons, L. (1989). *Newbury House TOEFL Preparation Kit, Planning for the Test of Written English*: HarperCollins Publishers Ltd.

Kiely, R., & Nielson, D. (2003). International Service Learning: The importance of partnerships. *Community College Journal*, 39-41.

Kreisher, K. (2002). Educating Homeless Children. *Children's Voice Magazine*.

Lally, C. G. (2001). Service / Community Learning and Foreign Language Teaching Methods: An Application. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 2*(1).

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 1-26). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MacIntyre, P. D., Dörnyei, Z., Clément, R., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *Modern Language Journal, 82*(4), 545-562.

McMenamin, B. (2003). Business; Turning to Tutors, Instead of Schools. *New York Times*.

Minor, J. (2002). Incorporating Service Learning into ESOL Programs. *TESOL Journal, 11*(4), 10-14.

Morris, F. A. (2001). Serving the Community and Learning a Foreign Language: Evaluating a Service-Learning Programme. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 14*(3), 244-255.

Mullaney, J. (1999). Service-learning and language acquisition theory and practice. In J. Hellebrandt & L. T. Varona (Eds.), *Construyendo puentes (building bridges): Concepts and models for service learning in Spanish.* (pp. 49-60). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Overfield, D. (2007). Conceptualizing service-learning as a second language acquisition space: Directions for Research. In A. J. Wurr & J. Hellebrandt (Eds.), *Learning the language of global citizenship*. Bolton, Massachusetts: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Polansky, S. G. (2004). Tutoring for Community Outreach: A course model for language learning and bridge building between universities and public schools. *Foreign Language Annals, 37*(3), 367-373.

Vahlbusch, J. (2003). Experiential Learning in the University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire's Program in Wittenberg, Germany*, 34*(2), 33-35.

van Lier, L. (2000). From input to affordance: Social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 245-260). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weldon, A., & Trautmann, G. (2003). Spanish and Service-Learning: Pedagogy and Praxis. *Hispania, 86*(3), 574-585.

Wiltenburg, M. (2008). "No Child" Leaving Charter School Behind? *Christian Science Monitor*.

Wiltenburg, M. (2009). Tackling the three R's in a second or third language. *Christian Science Monitor*.

Wurr, A. (1999). A Pilot Study on the Impact of Service-Learning in College

    Composition on Native and Non-Native Speakers of English. *Academic Exchange*

    Quarterly, 3(4), 54-61.

Wurr, A. (2002). Service-learning and student writing. In S. H. Billig & A. Furco (Eds.),

    Service-Learning through a multidisciplinary lens (pp. 103-121). Greenwich, CT:

    Information Age Publishing.

Wurr, A., & Hellebrandt, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Learning the language of global citizenship:*

    Service-learning in applied linguistics. Bolton, Massachusetts: Anker Publishing

    Company, Inc.