Not All Service Is the Same: How Service-Learning Typologies Relate to Student Outcomes at a Hispanic-Serving Institution

Regina D. Langhout, Miguel A. Lopezzi, and Yu-Chi Wang

Abstract

This multimethod study used a sample of eight courses and 220 students from a single Hispanic-serving institution (HSI) to ask whether this HSI had distinctive conceptualizations of service-learning or an association between course conceptualizations (operationalized through course materials) and student outcomes. Adapting Britt's (2012) service-learning typologies, we created a rubric to assess whether service-learning course materials reflected a focus on advancing students' personal responsibility, critical citizenship, and/or social justice. Course materials were often rooted in more than one conceptualization. Examining the relationship of course typology to student outcomes, we found that students in courses grounded in critical citizenship and/or social justice orientations had more positive outcomes related to academic engagement, social insights, personal insights (as a trend), and civic responsibility. These results advance theory development in service-learning by suggesting a more nuanced relationship between service-learning courses and student outcomes.

Keywords: service-learning, typologies, Hispanic-serving institutions, student outcomes

Service-learning courses are well-known to be associated with positive undergraduate student outcomes. So many studies have been conducted that at this point there have been four large-scale meta-analyses linking service-learning to student outcomes (Celio et al., 2011; Conway et al., 2009; Warren, 2012; Yorio & Ye, 2012). Relatedly, another meta-analysis examined the associations between experiential learning more broadly and student outcomes (Burch et al., 2019). These meta-analyses produce consistent results. Specifically, students show improvements related to their academic engagement, social insights (their understanding of the social world and how social identities matter with respect to lived experience), personal insights (how they view themselves in relation to others and their social networks), and civic responsibility (how they understand and practice civic engagement; Celio et al., 2011; Conway et al., 2009; Yorio & Ye, 2012). Participation in experiential learning, which includes service-learning and other possibilities like project-based learning, is also related to gains in academics and social insights, and less so into personal insights (Burch et al., 2019).

Despite these consistent results across hundreds of studies, the research largely describes outcomes for students who have taken service-learning courses or not (Warren, 2012; Whitley, 2014). Indeed, most examinations assess whether there are differences in student outcomes for those enrolled versus not enrolled in service-learning coursework. These assessments, however, rarely delve into specifics about the class or how aspects of the class might relate to student outcomes. Moreover, most of this research uses White, middle-class, continuing-generation students as the sample (Mitchell et al., 2012; Pearl & Christensen, 2017), or the study does not provide demographic information, thereby challenging claims of generalizability. For

example, the five meta-analyses (four service-learning and one experiential learning) provided no information about the service-learning courses and no demographic information about the student samples. At other times, scholars assume White, middle-class, young, single, cisgender women are the students (Butin, 2006).

The purpose of this multimethod study is to begin the work of differentiating service-learning courses and how these differences may be related to student outcomes. We reviewed course syllabi and other course materials. We also examined if and how the instructors conceptualized civic engagement via the course materials and whether these conceptualizations were related to outcomes for students who took a service-learning course at a Hispanic-serving institution (HSI). In the literature review, we discuss types of civic engagement and why these types matter at an HSI. Next, we discuss the context of this study and the methods employed, followed by the results and discussion. We also outline implications for service-learning courses.

Types of Civic Engagement in Service-Learning

Although most service-learning courses in the United States have some connection to the participatory democracy and/or liberation traditions of John Dewey and Paulo Freire (Whitley, 2014), service-learning classes can have different goals, which are often implicit and therefore uninterrogated (Britt, 2012). Such characteristics are perhaps unsurprising, given the different and somewhat contradictory foundations of service-learning in the U.S. university, with some connecting it to the National and Community Service Trust Act (1993), rooted in personal responsibility, and others connecting it to Freire, Dewey, and other related schools of thought grounded in social transformation and the development of critical consciousness (Giles & Eyler, 1994; Whitley, 2014).

Differing goals for service-learning can be rooted in different conceptualizations of civic engagement. Accordingly, some service-learning courses may consider service as a tool for charity, or for social justice (Clifford, 2017; Mitchell, 2007; Morton, 1995), and some classes may have components of both (Butin, 2006). In contrast, other instructors may eschew

this continuum and view service-learning as a way to increase cultural competence while developing a sense of civic identity (Mitchell, 2015; Vargas & Erba, 2017). Beyond individual faculty, some institutions promote civic engagement and connect these engagement practices to their mission to foster a civic-mindedness in students (Battistoni, 2017). For example, Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis has made civic engagement one of its institutional goals (Bringle et al., 2011), and the Center for Service and Learning at this institution is working on the civic-minded graduate initiative to motivate students to learn and engage civically (Steinberg et al., 2011). They define a civic-minded graduate as having the desire and ability to engage in democracy and work with others to improve the world (Bringle et al., 2011). Bringle et al. (2019) suggested that implementing the civic-minded graduate model—which integrates activities that focus on the student's identity, educational, and civic experiences—in service-learning courses creates a more effective pedagogy that results in more positive civic outcomes in students.

Even with this varied service-learning past, and both faculty and institutional ideas regarding the goals of service, most empirical studies of service-learning draw no distinctions and provide no information about the goals of the course (Britt, 2012). These course distinctions are important because when conceptualized as a form of charity, the class may reinforce a deficit-based approach and power hierarchies, but when taught from a social justice lens, the course can work to facilitate transformative social change, or shift the distribution of power within a community (Clifford, 2017; Mitchell, 2007). These distinctive approaches to service have been conceptualized by Westheimer and Kahne (2004a, 2004b) and Morton (1995), as well as others.

Westheimer and Kahne described three ways of understanding citizenship, which has implications for civic engagement practices. The three forms of citizenship are the personally responsible citizen, the participatory citizen, and the justice-oriented citizen (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004a, 2004b). Concerning civic engagement practices, the personally responsible citizen is likely to work in ameliorative ways to help alleviate individual need, without questioning social structures or the distribution of power in a community. For example, this person might

donate to a food drive. The participatory citizen, on the other hand, might engage civically and/or socially to amplify the effect that only one person can have on the issue at hand. This person might, for example, organize a food drive. Finally, the justice-oriented citizen might call attention to why an injustice exists and use a strategy to work toward justice-oriented goals, thereby altering power within a community. This person might study why people are hungry in the first place and then work to address root causes by helping to develop a community garden or organizing for a living wage ordinance in their community. Morton (1995) described similar paradigms, on a continuum from low to high investment in developing community relationships and low to high concerns with systemic or institutional causes, calling them charity, project, and social change.

In examining the differences and relations among typologies of citizenship, we can shift away from a research framework of service–learning versus no service–learning. Instead, we can move our focus toward the goals of the course and how conceptualizations of service can help us provide better support in developing diverse student knowledge of citizenship so that students are supported in being actively engaged in their communities (Bringle et al., 2019; Kahne et al., 2000). This shift in empirical focus is also important for theory development in service–learning, as it helps researchers and practitioners nuance our discussions, and may inform best practices.

Britt (2012) created a framework to assess service–learning pedagogical typologies by reviewing the service–learning literature, including prior conceptualizations by Morton and Westheimer and Kahne. The typology lists six factors to be used to assess the service type of the class: the rationale/goals, foundation, focus, desired outcome, role of service, and the desired development of the student. The rationale outlines the end goals of the course, be it to deeply consider what it means to be in relation to others (participatory or critical citizenship) or to work with others to transform oppressive systems (social justice activism). The foundation is related to the philosophical roots of the course (e.g., pluralistic democracy, antiracism). The focus concerns the domain of action (e.g., values, systems change). The desired outcome is about who or what is supposed to change based on the class (e.g., the student becomes more communitarian, social change). The role of the service interrogates the work of the student (e.g., relational development, behaviors to address oppression). Finally, the development of the student centers the type of identity development the course facilitates (e.g., a civically engaged person, a change agent).

Britt (2012) viewed the forms of service–learning as "distinctive" from one another (p. 81). Critical citizenship and social justice activism are included, paralleling the participatory and justice-oriented citizen (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004a, 2004b). Britt included a third category, skill–set practice and reflexivity, in the framework. We, however, view skill–set practice and reflexivity as separate from a type of service–learning. In our reading, each service–learning class should include skill–set practice and reflexivity. Instead, we understand skill–set practice and reflexivity as aspects of quality, not a distinctive conceptualization of service. We do not think we are alone in this conceptualization (Lorenzo Moledo et al., 2021; Martín García et al., 2018; Matthews et al., 2023).

There was no parallel for the personally responsible citizen in Britt's (2012) conceptualization. Although laudable to assume that no service–learning courses could be conceptualized as fitting into a personally responsible framework, this seems unlikely, given that some U.S. universities implemented service–learning in response to the National and Community Service Trust Act (1993), and most American universities operate in a U.S.-based neoliberal cultural context. Neoliberalism is the belief system that community wellness is best achieved via the free market and competition, which privileges individual choice and individual responsibility over public infrastructure and social welfare. When operating within a neoliberal framework, service–learning curricula are likely to support narratives around charity and individual responsibility, which is a common trope of neoliberalism (Clifford, 2017). Furthermore, scholars have written about service–learning as a pedagogy of whiteness (Mitchell et al., 2012). A pedagogy of whiteness upholds power hierarchies, conceptualizes the student (who is often understood as a White, single, middle-class, cisgender woman) as a "helper" and as dominant, with service understood as "helping" someone who is "at risk."

For these reasons and more, some posit that service-learning conceptualizations are related but distinct, and therefore the courses may combine aspects of differing approaches (Butin, 2006). Moreover, because whiteness and neoliberalism are such strong cultural foundations in the United States, conceptualizations that veer from this framework, such as critical citizenship and social justice, may be less distinctive from each other; their focus is on moving away from whiteness and neoliberal tropes of charity and personal responsibility.

Service-Learning and Hispanic-Serving Institutions

The typologies of service-learning may be of special interest for HSIs. HSIs are defined as institutions with at least 25% of full-time enrolled students identifying as Latinx. Most HSIs also serve a plurality of other students of color, with a large portion of these students also being first generation and from working-class families (Cuellar, 2012; Garcia & Cuellar, 2018). HSIs have more significant numbers of Latinx students than predominantly White institutions (PWIs). However, service-learning research has historically been performed with mostly White student populations or with student populations where the ethnicity/race of the samples is not specified (Butin, 2006; Mitchell et al., 2012). Creators of service-learning courses thus often have in mind White, middle-class students who often have experienced few of the social issues that their service-learning experience involves (Mitchell & Donahue, 2017). Latinx students or students of color engaging in service-learning courses might have different motivations from their White counterparts. For example, if students with white privilege feel safer and more comfortable in charity types of service-learning (Mitchell et al., 2012), students at institutions with diverse student populations may be motivated by specific types of civic engagement, especially models that are based in social justice. Moreover, students' motivation for engaging in service-learning courses may affect their outcomes (Sze-Yeung Lai & Chi-Leung Hui, 2021). In this study, students who had an intrinsic motivation when participating in service-learning were more likely to engage in future positive civic behaviors. Campuses that serve a critical mass of Latinx students, or a plurality of students of color and first-generation college students, may be especially called to ensure opportunities for civic engagement for social change. Indeed, researchers who focus on HSIs have called for a turn (back) to civic-mindedness and engagement (Garcia, 2018; Garcia & Cuellar, 2018; Hurtado et al., 2012). These calls bring a renewed urgency to previous calls, such as the Wingspread Statement (Brukardt et al., 2004), the Kellogg Commission (1999, 2002), and scholars who call on U.S. educational systems to bring more awareness to "practices in civic education" and increased attention to the "highly unequal access to and opportunity for school-based citizenship education," as these are key areas to sustained democratic engagement (Battistoni, 2013, p. 1136). This call from HSI scholars is for engagement opportunities that shift power within communities and align with social justice (Garcia, 2018; Garcia & Cuellar, 2018; Hurtado et al., 2012). Moreover, these researchers call for scholars to link student support, such as curricula, to academic and civic outcomes. We take up this call in this article.

We pose two research questions. (1) Do service-learning classes at this HSI tend to fall into a single category of service-learning, as might be suggested by Britt (2012), Morton (1995), and Westheimer and Kahne (2004a, 2004b), or do they have characteristics of multiple categories, as might be suggested by Butin (2006)? Relatedly, how might the courses be distributed across the three typologies? (2) Does the service-learning type, as discerned through course materials, relate to student academic engagement, social insights, personal insights, and civic responsibility? This study was exploratory, so we did not generate many hypotheses, although we did anticipate that civic responsibility outcomes would be associated with critical citizenship and social justice typologies because civic engagement moves beyond the individual and seeks community wellness, as does critical citizenship and social justice.

Method

Participants

This broader study included 227 students from seven service-learning courses. All attended an HSI on the West Coast. With respect to gender, 68.3% identified as women, 26.4% as men, 1.3% as nonbinary, gender expansive, or preferred another option, and 4% did not answer the gender question. The largest group of students identified as

Latinx (41.9%), then Asian American (25%), White (23.4%), Black (6.6%), chose not to respond (2.7%), and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (0.4%). Just over half the students were first generation to college (53.5%) and were served by the campus educational opportunity program (EOP; 51.1%). EOP serves first-generation, low-income, and undocumented students. Chi-square tests examining these participant demographics compared to campus demographics revealed that women were overrepresented ($\chi^2(1)$ = 11.44, $p < .001$), as were students served by EOP ($\chi^2(1)$ = 5.29, $p < .05$). This gender representation is aligned with other studies, which indicate that women are more likely to take service-learning courses (Frederickson, 2000).

For RQ1, we analyzed materials from eight service-learning courses. Syllabi and materials are from six courses where students filled out the questionnaire. Two of the five instructors who provided course syllabi and materials also volunteered materials from one additional course each. RQ1 analysis is therefore based on eight course syllabi and materials. For RQ2, we were unable to obtain one syllabus, for a class where seven students had completed the questionnaire. Therefore, we were able to link six service-learning courses, taught by five instructors, with student outcome data for 220 students.

The final sample used for RQ2 analyses was 220 students from six service-learning courses, as we did not receive course materials for the seventh course.

Design

This HSI achieved its designation in the 2010s. It has a very high undergraduate population and very high research activity, according to its Carnegie classification. The campus is selective and residential, with the majority of students being from outside the county. The surrounding community is much whiter and wealthier than the students. Campus faculty and staff are also majority White (65% ladder rank and 72% lecturers; 58% staff).

This study was reviewed by the University of California, Santa Cruz Institutional Review Board and found to be exempt. All participants were treated in accord with American Psychological Association ethical guidelines. Students were recruited through their service-learning class, which they took in one of four distinct interdisciplinary colleges

across the university, meaning the class was open to all students, regardless of major. Each of the colleges was unique in that each subscribed to a distinctive theme. For example, one college's theme reflects power and representation. Classes at this college focus on students' intersectional identities and their relation to their community. In contrast, another college is themed around social justice and community issues. The classes at this college focus on how students can get involved in addressing social injustices affecting their community and society. Since each college has its own theme, each service-learning class at this institution may have a different civic engagement focus and address different social issues. Because of the colleges' willingness to offer classes to all students, regardless of major, the colleges were approached rather than academic departments.

The first author approached these four colleges because they were known for having robust service-learning offerings, and for serving a plurality of students of color and/or first-generation college students. The four colleges were excited to participate and granted access to students in seven classes, which were all of the classes keyed as service-learning by the four colleges at the time these data were collected.

Furthermore, six instructors taught the seven courses, each being part of a different college and having been trained in various academic disciplines. All service-learning classes met the criteria outlined in the National and Community Service Trust Act (1993). For example, students were active in projects that met a community need (e.g., tutoring), the service was connected to course material, and the classroom space required service-related reflection. Students were encouraged to fill out the questionnaire by their instructor during the last week of the quarter. They were given the option of filling it out online or via pen(cil) and paper. The overall response rate was 62%, and individual course response rates ranged from approximately 12.5% to 90%, with a median response rate of 41.4%. Due to variance in questionnaire distribution timing, format, and lack of course roster information, some response rates are approximated by the person who administered the questionnaire in classrooms.

Each service-learning course had a distinctive focus and aim. For instance, a syllabus for a service-learning class taken at the col-

lege with a social justice and community theme described the course as providing opportunities to experience and volunteer for cultural and social justice issues through placing students in nearby schools and non-profit agencies. Learning outcomes for this class were around helping students understand social problems and how they affect their community. Another course focused on developing citizenship to create space for students to cultivate personal growth. This course's service component was based on poverty issues and aimed to support local unhoused people. Yet another course focused on exposing students to effective activism within a political context. This course aimed to position students to continue their social justice activist role and to be current and future agents of social change. Lastly, a fourth course had a social geography and justice focus. This course aimed to teach students how different places may have distinct meanings, and how their geography may impact intersecting identities, distribution of resources, and society as a whole.

Measures

Service-Learning Typologies

We modified the typologies of service-learning pedagogical frames (Britt, 2012). Specifically, we made slight alterations to the typologies for critical citizenship and social justice activism, and added a column for an individual responsibility typology, which better represents the varied roots of service-learning in the United States. See Table 1 for the typologies rubric. Each of the six factors within the three different typologies was scored from 0 to 3 for level of implementation, with 0 indicating that the factor was not present and 3 indicating an exemplary implementation. The scores for the six factors within each typology were summed to create three aggregate typology scores for each course. These scores were based on the course syllabus and supporting materials provided by the instructors. When we had multiple syllabi or materials for the same course (reflecting slight modifications from different implementations of the course), we assigned a score after considering all relevant materials.

Outcomes

For three outcomes (i.e., academic, social insights, and personal insights), we used scales mostly from Schreiner's Expanded Thriving Quotient (Schreiner et al., 2012).

The Thriving Quotient assesses academic, psychological, and social features (Schreiner et al., 2013). The instrument has been refined through assessment with over 25,000 undergraduates from more than 45 universities (Schreiner, 2010; Schreiner et al., 2013). An important aspect of the thriving quotient is that thriving is conceptualized as statelike, meaning it can be facilitated through classes and other institutional structures (Schreiner, 2014). However, it is important to note that the thriving quotient has been used primarily with White students (approximately 75%) and continuing-generation college students (approximately 76%; Schreiner, 2010; Schreiner et al., 2013). The response options follow a Likert-type scale and range from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*).

Academics. We used two measures to assess academic engagement, both from the Thriving Quotient. Academic Determination is a five-item scale that assesses motivation, effort, efficacy, and time regulation. A sample item is "I am confident I will reach my educational goals." Cronbach's alpha was .79. Engaged Learning is a four-item scale designed to examine cognitive engagement with classes. A sample question is "I find myself thinking about what I'm learning in class even when I'm not in class." Cronbach's alpha was .82. We classified these as academic outcomes because the scales are explicitly about academic engagement.

Social Insights: Diverse Citizenship. This six-item scale from the Expanded Thriving Quotient examines students' openness to others, and their willingness and desire to be agents of change. Sample items are "It is important to become aware of the perspectives of individuals from different backgrounds" and "I know I can make a difference in my community." Cronbach's alpha was .74. Diverse citizenship is about social insights because it focuses on understanding diversity and social beliefs.

Personal Insights. We assessed personal insights with three scales. The first two are from the Expanded Thriving Quotient. The six-item Social Connectedness scale examines students' connections to their friendship network. A sample statement is "I feel content with the kinds of friendships I currently have." Cronbach's alpha was .83. The second scale, School Continuance, is five items and measures the student's intention to persist until graduation. A sample

Table 1. Service–Learning Typologies Rubric

Component	Personal Responsibility	Critical Citizenship	Social Justice
Rationale/goal/definition[a]	Exploring what it means to act responsibly in a community and to help others who are less fortunate. This goal is to build sympathy.	Using civic values to explore what it means to exist in relation to others in the community; used to raise awareness of and critical thinking about social issues and students' values and moral choices/responsibilities as societal members. This goal is to build empathy.	Working with others to transform systems of oppression used to help students take action to address human needs often related to societal injustices/power imbalances. Seeks to develop critical consciousness of the complexity of social issues.
Foundation[a]	Materials allow liberal notions of community, character education, development of compassion. Students' activities enable them to reflect on themselves and to be in contact with those who are less fortunate. Projects help reduce stereotypes held by students.	Materials allow for learning to happen in the community "at the point where democracy and education intersect." Materials demonstrate that students' service activities become a vehicle through which students investigate their own civic identities.	Involves service-learning pedagogy focused on social justice activism. Materials merge influences of at least one of the following: social movements, community organizing, direct or indirect focus on politically empowering the powerless.
Focus[a]	Materials aim to deepen student relationships with the community and forge new connections that involve developing compassion for others.	Materials aim to deepen student relationships with the community and forge new connections that involve a "sense of caring for others," which may include, but is not limited to, compassion.	Materials help students gain insight into how structural and systemic forces shape and reproduce social issues and begin to assume an activist orientation addressing those issues.
Outcomes/level of change[a]	Materials indicate a focus on increasing volunteerism in charity-based organizations; develops student integrity, honesty, hard work, and compassion.	Materials indicate a focus on developing students as participatory citizens in relation to others in their communities.	Materials indicate that students participate in correcting power imbalances and advocating for marginalized and oppressed groups, and collectively engage in solving social problems at a systemic level.
Role of service[a]	Materials highlight direct contact with individuals who are less fortunate and focus on providing a charitable service (e.g., soup kitchen) or changing the individual (e.g., tutoring).	Materials highlight engaging students in communities to instill a range of values that enable them to be informed and committed citizens in a democratic system.	Materials highlight opportunities to engage in efforts that begin to correct systemic social disparities.
Development of student[a]	The course materials provide a framework for the student as a citizen for being a responsible individual, as an individual in relation to a community.	The course materials provide a framework for the student as a citizen for being an individual in relation to a collective community.	The course materials involve the student as a change agent, encouraging critical consciousness of structural inequalities and marginalization.
Student reflection activities[a]	Course materials provide activities (journals or papers) that engage students in reflection on the service-learning experience. The course also fosters connections between civic values/citizenship and individual responsibility and/or charity and/or compassion.	Course materials provide activities (journals or papers) that engage students in reflection on the service-learning experience. The course also fosters connections between civic values/critical citizenship and course learning goals/objectives.	Course materials provide activities (journals or papers) that engage students in reflection on the service-learning experience. The course also fosters connections between social justice activism and course learning goals/objectives.

Note. Scoring Key: We scored based on four levels of implementation: 0 if the component was absent, 1 if the component was present to some extent, 2 for adequate implementation, and 3 for exemplary implementation.

[a] Similar to the concepts addressed by Kahne et al. (2000) and Britt (2012).

item is "I really enjoy being a student here." Cronbach's alpha was .75. The third measure was the eight-item General Mattering Scale (Tovar et al., 2009), which examines how much the student thinks they matter to and feel seen by the broader campus community. A sample item is "People on campus are generally supportive of my individual needs," and Cronbach's alpha was .88. We classified these three scales as personal insights because the scales assess how the students view themselves in relation to others and their social networks.

Civic Responsibility: Borderlands. This nine-item scale assesses a student's ability to culturally straddle between home and academe and engage in social justice work (Langhout et al., 2022). Items are on a 5-point Likert-type scale, from *never* to *always*, and start with the root phrase, "Since starting college, how often have you . . ." Sample items are "Felt you could be a contributor to the social change you wanted to see?" and "Drawn on your knowledge of your history or cultural strengths in order to create your future?" Cronbach's alpha was .83. We labeled Borderlands as civic responsibility because it assesses one's ability to take—and experience with taking—action in the world.

Data Analytic Procedures

Service-Learning Typologies

The three authors initiated the scoring process by each individually and independently scoring the same course; this course was chosen by one author because a moderate quantity of course materials was available for evaluation, compared to the quantity of course materials available for all evaluated courses. Afterward, as a group, we arrived at final scores through discussion and consensus. After reviewing the one course together, all other courses were randomly assigned to and scored by two of the authors individually, and a final score was assigned again through discussion and consensus between the two scorers. During the discussion, all coders first presented their scores and evidence for those scores; if there were any discrepancies between the coders' scores, the evidence was rereviewed and a final score for each factor was assigned that was agreed upon by both coders. We focused on a consensus-based coding procedure that prioritized iterative discussion, grounded in evidence from course materials, to reach a greater holistic mutual understanding than

was possible for any one individual's limited perspective of the materials (e.g., McDonald et al., 2019; Richards & Hemphill, 2017). This process can promote a more valid understanding. Once we finalized the scoring for each course, we reached out to the five instructors, whose course syllabi and materials we were evaluating, to review our scoring, as a member check. We heard back from three instructors who taught five of the eight total courses for which we evaluated materials and syllabi. One agreed with the scoring and the other two provided additional information, after which the two scorers for the relevant course initiated a second round of scoring with all original and new materials and arrived at a new comprehensive final score, again through discussion and consensus. In both of these cases, the additional information led to increased scores, as the supplementary material suggested a greater degree of implementation than was evident in the original materials. Adjusted rubric scoring was reshared with instructors, as a final member check, after which we did not have additional disagreements or other adjustments.

We then created three aggregate typology scores per course by summing the scores for the six factors within each typology, resulting in three scores between 0 and 18. To answer RQ1, we applied a cutoff score of 12 or more (66% of the potential total) for each typology to categorize each course as meeting or not meeting the criteria for each of the three typologies (e.g., if a course had a total score of 12 or higher on the "social justice" typology, then it would meet the criteria for this typology). Absent any other scoring criteria, we rationalized that a score of 66% or higher indicated course materials had sufficient rooting in the specific typology. This was our rationale because a score of 2 for an individual factor was considered adequate per our rubric, and a score of 66% is the equivalent to a score of 2 for each item. Based on these cutoff scores, any course could be classified as zero, one, two, or all three of the typologies.

Outcomes

To assess for missing data patterns, we followed procedures described by Schlomer et al. (2010). These procedures first require assessing the amount of missing data for each scale. In our case, the amount of missing data was minimal. For example, for the academic determination scale, there were three missing data points out of 990. Given the

small amount of missing data, we moved on to the second step, which was to evaluate patterns of missingness via chi–square analyses. We discerned that for at least one scale (Diverse Citizenship), data were missing at random (MAR; Schlomer et al., 2010). Because outcome data were MAR, we were able to compute outcome scale scores using available item analysis, allowing scale scores to be computed if there was no more than one scale item missing for the scales with six or fewer items, and no more than two items missing for the scale with eight items. This procedure is recommended when data are MAR (Parent, 2013). All scales were multivariate normal.

Results

Service–Learning Typologies

Before addressing RQ1 regarding whether service–learning courses tend to fall into more than one category, we first provide some descriptive statistics on the typology scores for the eight courses we evaluated. We provide this information in order to give more context on these courses and the typologies rubric. See Table 2 for this information. First, aggregate scores varied most for Social Justice, with a range of 1–17, followed closely by Personal Responsibility, ranging 1–15, and then Critical Citizenship, ranging 8–18. By looking at the maximum values of the aggregates, we concluded that Critical Citizenship and Social Justice were implemented to a higher degree than was Personal Responsibility. Further, when examining the minimum values, all courses had at least some implementation of Critical Citizenship, which was not the case for Personal Responsibility and Social Justice.

Across the eight courses evaluated, three courses met criteria for Social Justice, seven for Critical Citizenship, and five for Personal Responsibility. Two courses were categorized as Personal Responsibility only, two courses were Critical Citizenship and Personal Responsibility, and three courses

were Social Justice and Critical Citizenship. Furthermore, one course did not meet the criteria to be classified as any of the typologies, no courses were Social Justice or Critical Citizenship only, and none of the courses met all three classifications. Thus, to answer RQ1 about whether the service–learning courses at an HSI fall distinctly into one typology, most (seven of eight courses) met criteria for at least one typology, but only two of the eight courses we evaluated fell distinctly into only one typology (i.e., Personal Responsibility). See Table 3 for the course breakdown.

Service–Learning Typologies and Outcomes

In answering RQ2, we explored whether service–learning typologies were related to any of the outcomes. For this analysis, we looked at the six courses for which we had student–level outcome data. Based on the literature, we expected to see differences in outcomes for students who were enrolled in courses that were categorized as critical citizenship and/or social justice compared to those courses that did not meet the criteria for either of these typologies, as both critical citizenship and social justice move away from neoliberal and whiteness frameworks. Because so few courses were categorized as one type of service–learning, and none were Critical Citizenship or Social Justice only, we grouped courses that met the criteria for either Critical Citizenship or Social Justice. As described above in the distribution of the course typologies, this included courses that either had both Personal Responsibility and Critical Citizenship or both Critical Citizenship and Social Justice; no courses were Critical Citizenship only, Social Justice only, or all three. We compared student outcomes for these courses (n = 4) to student outcomes for courses that were classified as either Personal Responsibility only or no typology (n = 2 courses). Because of the nonnormality of errors in these regressions, we conducted the Mann–Whitney U rank test, a nonparametric comparison test

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Aggregate Typology Scores

	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Median
Personal Responsibility	1	15	15	12
Critical Citizenship	8	18	11	14
Social Justice	1	17	17	11

Note. N = 8 courses. Minimum possible score: 0, Maximum possible score: 18.

between independent samples, to evaluate whether the outcomes differed between the typologies. Given that the students in the sample came from six different courses, we needed to evaluate the students' outcomes for potential dependency by calculating the intraclass correlation (a measure of the between-course variance compared to the total variance); a larger intraclass correlation denotes greater similarity between than within courses, pointing toward dependency. All outcomes had intraclass correlations less than 10%, supporting the use of student outcomes as independent observations. We excluded observations with missing data on a test-by-test basis.

Due to the exploratory nature of the question, we did not adjust p-values (i.e., to control for Type I errors; see Jafari & Ansari-Pour, 2018 for review). Furthermore, we report all findings, including trends, to paint a full picture of this exploratory study in Table 4. The largest effects of Social Justice/Critical Citizenship typology regarding academic outcomes are for engaged learning such that the courses categorized with Social Justice/Critical Citizenship had higher means ($M = 4.92$, $SE = .08$) than those courses that were not Social Justice/Critical Citizenship ($M = 4.49$, $SE = .09$), $U = 4434.5$, $z = -3.256$, $p = .001$. In all of the outcomes, there are trends of the students in courses categorized as Social Justice or Critical Citizenship having higher scores than those in the courses not categorized as Social Justice or Critical Citizenship.

Discussion

Through an empirical examination, this study moves forward theory development related to service-learning, an area that would benefit from more conceptually rich frameworks (Warren, 2012; Whitley, 2014). Specifically, rather than assessing for differences in outcomes based on whether students took a service-learning course or not, we discerned whether there were distinctive service-learning typologies based on course material and differential outcomes based on these typologies. To engage in this assessment, we first scored course material against a typologies rubric. Through this process, we concluded that little course material followed a "pure" typology (RQ1). Indeed, with respect to course material, more courses were mixed in their typologies than not, and the only typology that had a "pure" type was personal responsibility. Perhaps this is not surprising, given that the dominant cultural paradigm in the United States is one of neoliberalism and whiteness (Clifford, 2017; Mitchell, 2007; Mitchell et al., 2012), which values personal responsibility, even if personal responsibility is losing its centrality in more contemporary and mature forms of service-learning. It may therefore be unsurprising that the distinction between the alternative conceptual frameworks of critical citizenship and social justice were less clear. Because critical citizenship and social justice are less rooted in neoliberalism and whiteness, they may be more distinctive from personal responsibility than they are from each other. Their most salient feature is that they move away from personal responsibility and charity.

It is noteworthy that Personal Responsibility and Critical Citizenship cooccurred in our sample (for two classes), just as Critical Citizenship and Social Justice did (for three classes), but Personal Responsibility and Social Justice did not. If we consider the typologies as a sort of continuum regarding who or what needs to change (individual people for personal responsibility to systems and structures for social justice), perhaps it is unsurprising that Personal Responsibility and Social Justice do not cooccur (e.g., Morton, 1995). These conceptual frameworks may be too distinct from one another to share a focus in this way.

It is also important to note that only two of

Table 3. Course Typology Classifications

Typologies	*n* Courses	*n* Students (%)
None	1	53 (24.1)
Personal Responsibility	1	66 (30)
Personal Responsibility and Critical Citizenship	2	40 (18.2)
Critical Citizenship and Social Justice	2	61 (27.7)

Table 4. Mann–Whitney U Test Results

Outcome	n	Not Critical Citizenship/ Social Justice Mean (SE)	Critical Citizenship/ Social Justice Mean (SE)	U	Z	p	Effect Size (h^2)
Academic							
Engaged Learning	219	4.49 (.09)	4.92 (.08)	4434.5	-3.26	<.01	.05
Academic Determination	210	4.46 (.08)	4.712 (.09)	4452.5	-2.27	.02	.03
Social Insights							
Diverse Citizenship	211	4.84 (.06)	5.07 (.07)	4271	-2.79	.01	.04
Personal Insights							
Mattering	201	3.15 (.09)	3.39 (.08)	4275	-1.76	.08	.02
Social Connectedness	210	3.97 (.11)	4.26 (.97)	4630.5	-1.85	.06	.02
School Continuance	210	4.35 (.09)	4.41 (.07)	5319	-0.28	.78	<.01
Civic Responsibility							
Borderlands	194	3.51 (.06)	3.72 (.07)	3678	-2.46	.01	.03

Notes. n = 6 courses. Missing data deleted on a test-by-test basis. *N* = 220 students.

the eight courses fit the typology of Personal Responsibility only. We view this as significant, given this research took place at an HSI and the plurality of students were students of color (especially Latinx students) and/or were first–generation college students. It is important for curricular spaces to be culturally relevant for students of color and first–generation college students, and service–learning courses that are conceptualized as critical citizenship and/or social justice may be one intervention. Further, courses that are more culturally relevant may garner greater student interest, which we know to be related to student outcomes (Moely et al., 2008). Of course, other curricular interventions are also needed.

Our second area of inquiry examined whether different types of service–learning courses were differentially associated with academic, social, personal, and/or civic responsibility outcomes. Because of the lack of empirical distinction between critical citizenship and social justice types, we combined these typologies to assess this question. In this case, we investigated whether an alternative typology—one rooted in the radical historical strand of service–learning—was associated with student outcomes. Results suggested that there were differences based on the course type for most outcomes. Specifically, those who were enrolled in a service–learning course that used materials aligned with Critical Citizenship and/or Social Justice reported higher levels of academic outcomes via engaged learning and academic determination, social insights via diverse citizenship, personal insights via social connectedness (trending difference) and mattering (trending difference), and civic responsibility via Borderlands. There was no difference, however, for school continuance based on the typology of the service–learning materials. Issues of college persistence and how one "fits in" to their university may be broader than one class or pedagogy, or take more time to develop than one quarter.

Two aspects are notable with these results. The first is that the effect sizes for the personal insights variables are the smallest, which is consistent with the meta-analyses examining service–learning and experiential learning (Burch et al., 2019;

Celio et al., 2011; Conway et al., 2009; Yorio & Ye, 2012). Our results of trending differences in personal insights are important to highlight because they mirror the broader literature, especially in consideration of this study being exploratory and conducted with a limited sample of students. Specifically, although the broader service-learning literature suggests that some of the strongest impacts from service-learning participation are in the development of students' personal (i.e., self-efficacy, self-esteem) and social (i.e., relationship with peers) development, these studies report the largest gains for academic outcomes and social insights, with smaller effects for personal insights and civic responsibility. Furthermore, given that Burch et al. (2019) discerned no relationship with personal insights, we report trending differences because in our study, the effect sizes appear roughly equivalent for academic engagement, social insights, and civic responsibility. Because this sample is from an HSI, this pattern of effect sizes is understandable. Indeed, research indicates that Latinx students, as well as students of color (more broadly) and first-generation college students, are more likely to flourish when in an environment that supports who they are and enables a praxis cycle of reflection and socially just action (Garcia & Cuellar, 2018; Hurtado et al., 2012; Langhout et al., 2014; Langhout & Gordon, 2021; Schwartz & Suyemoto, 2013; Watts et al., 2003; Wray-Lake et al., 2017). Therefore, critical citizenship and social justice typologies may facilitate simultaneous reflection, action, and academic growth.

A second noteworthy aspect of these results is that two classes were coded as a combination of Personal Responsibility and Critical Citizenship, which meant these three classes were categorized as meeting the criteria for a Critical Citizenship or Social Justice typology and analyzed accordingly. Despite these courses also meeting the criteria for the Personal Responsibility typology, we see consistent trends for outcomes between students in these courses and courses that were coded as Critical Citizenship and Social Justice. It may be that a class that has a solid rooting in a Critical Citizenship or Social Justice typology provides a strong foundation for positive academic, social, personal, and civic outcomes, even if the course includes more mainstream conceptualizations of service.

These differences in outcomes move us beyond simply investigating whether there are differences for students who take service-learning courses. With inquiries like this one, researchers begin to add nuance to understanding whether processes within service-learning courses matter. Our results indicate that courses that align with more transformational typologies for service, such as Critical Citizenship and Social Justice, are associated with better outcomes for students attending an HSI.

Limitations, Future Directions, and Implications

Like all studies, this one has limitations. First, the study is cross-sectional, so we are unable to know with more certainty whether the differences in outcomes are based solely or primarily on the typology of the service-learning course. Studies using longitudinal designs and that evaluate outcomes for more students are needed. The sample size that we used was limited but appropriate for an exploratory study such as this one, so we reported on not only significant findings but also trends with marginal significance. The trends of personal insights suggest that we as a field need further research with a more robust sample to better understand these relationships within HSI institutions. Second, the sample was from one school only, although students were from different service-learning classes. Future research should assess typologies at other universities and examine whether different typologies are associated with different outcomes. Just as it would be useful to know if courses at other HSIs would yield similar results, it would be just as important to study conceptualizations of service-learning courses at PWIs.

A third limitation is that we examined course materials only, which may be an incomplete representation of the entire course. We did, however, conduct a member check with each instructor, sharing the scoring rubric with them and asking if they thought we misunderstood any materials. We heard back from three of the five instructors. However, a more comprehensive approach would be to also visit classes and service sites, and interview instructors, site supervisors, and students regarding how they understood the course conceptual framework. This is an area for future research. Relatedly, it may be possible to differentiate courses based on other factors in addition to the typology of the course, such as quality, course credits, time at the service site, and so on. Future research should examine additional

factors that might help us understand what facilitates positive outcomes for students. Future research could also examine whether outcomes differ for students who are first-generation and/or students of color, but rather than from a deficit framework that uses White continuing-generation college students as normative, from a social justice perspective that focuses on how changing university structures and university culture can better support students of color and/or first-generation college students. Furthermore, studies should provide more comprehensive demographic information when possible so that researchers and practitioners have a better sense of who is enrolling in service-learning courses (e.g., EOP students, first-generation college students) and how these student characteristics may be related to relevant outcomes, above and beyond the course aspects discussed in this article. For example, we know from the literature that there are different rates of service-learning participation across different genders (e.g., Frederickson, 2000) and that individuals who prefer certain types of service-learning activities are likely to get more benefit from courses aligned with these interests (Moely et al., 2008).

These results may be especially meaningful for students attending an HSI, the plural-ity of whom are often students of color and/or first-generation college students. The fact that different outcomes were associated with alternative service-learning typologies is a reminder that not all service is equivalent. Indeed, service-learning courses that are aligned with typologies of neoliberalism and whiteness may not have the same beneficial effects on academic engagement, social and personal insights, and civic responsibility because they do not speak to socially just change. Part of the call by HSI researchers is to focus on civic-mindedness and engagement for socially just change (Garcia, 2018; Garcia & Cuellar, 2018; Hurtado et al., 2012). To take this call seriously, it is important to be deliberate and explicit regarding service opportunities. However, PWIs should also be deliberate and explicit in their service-learning typologies. It would be valuable to investigate whether service-learning courses that are conceptualized as personal responsibility and that are taken by a plurality of White and continuing-generation students may reinforce dominant narratives of power, white supremacy, and neoliberalism, which would be a disservice to the communities in which they engage in service and White students themselves.

Author Note

Acknowledgment

About the Authors

Regina Day Langhout is a professor in the Psychology Department at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

Miguel Angel Lopezzi is a social psychology doctoral student in the psychology department at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

Yu-Chi Wang, Ph.D., is the school climate research manager at GLSEN.

References

Battistoni, R. M. (2013). Should political scientists care about civic education? *Perspectives on Politics, 11*(4), 1135–1138. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592713002867

Battistoni, R. M. (2017). *Civic engagement across the curriculum*. Campus Compact.

Bringle, R., Brown, L., Hahn, T., & Studer, M. (2019). Pedagogies and civic programs to develop competencies for democratic culture and civic learning outcomes. *Bordón, 71*(3), 27–43. https://doi.org/10.13042/Bordon.2019.72003

Bringle, R., Studer, M., Wilson, J., Clayton, P., & Steinberg, K. (2011). Designing programs with a purpose: To promote civic engagement for life. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 9*(2), 149–164. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-011-9135-2

Britt, L. L. (2012). Why we use service-learning: A report outlining a typology of three approaches to this form of communication pedagogy. *Communication Education, 61*(1), 80–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2011.632017

Brukardt, M. H., Holland, B., Percy, S. L., & Zimpher, N., on behalf of Wingspread Conference Participants. (2004). *Wingspread statement: Calling the question: Is higher education ready to commit to community engagement?* University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee.

Burch, G. F., Giambatista, R., Batchelor, J. H., Burch, J. J., Hoover, J. D., & Heller, N. A. (2019). A meta-analysis of the relationship between experiential learning and learning outcomes. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, 17*(3), 239–273. https://doi.org/10.1111/dsji.12188

Butin, D. W. (2006). The limits of service-learning in higher education. *Review of Higher Education, 29*(4), 473–498. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2006.0025

Celio, C. I., Durlack, J., & Dymniki, A. (2011). A meta-analysis of the impacts of service-learning on students. *Journal of Experimental Education, 34*(2), 164–181. https://doi.org/10.1177/105382591103400205

Clifford, J. (2017). Talking about service-learning: Product or process? Reciprocity or solidarity? *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 21*(4), 1–13. https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1357

Conway, J. M., Amel, E. L., & Gerwien, D. P. (2009). Teaching and learning in the social context: A meta-analysis of service learning's effects on academic, personal, social, and citizenship outcomes. *Teaching of Psychology, 36*(4), 233–245. https://doi.org/10.1080/00986280903172969

Cuellar, M. (2012). Hispanic-serving institutions. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of diversity in education* (pp. 1067–1069). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452218533.n335

Fredericksen, P. J. (2000). Does service learning make a difference in student performance? *Journal of Experiential Education, 23*, 64–74. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/105382590002300204

Garcia, G. A. (2018). Decolonizing Hispanic-serving institutions: A framework for organizing. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 17*(2), 132–147. https://doi.org/10.1177/1538192717734289

Garcia, G. A., & Cuellar, M. (2018). Exploring curricular and co-curricular effects on civic engagement at emerging Hispanic-serving institutions. *Teachers College Record, 120*(4), 1–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811812000404

Giles, D., & Eyler, J. (1994). The theoretical roots of service-learning in John Dewey: Toward a theory of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1*, 77–85.

Hurtado, S., Alvarez, C. L., Guillermo-Wann, C., Cuellar, M., & Arellano, L. (2012). A model for diverse learning environments: The scholarship on creating and assessing conditions for student success. In J. Smart & M. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, Vol. 27*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-2950-6_2

Jafari, M., & Ansari-Pour, N. (2018). Why, when and how to adjust your P values? [Letter to the editor]. *Cell Journal, 20*(4), 604–607. https://doi.org/10.22074/cellj.2019.5992

Kahne, J., Westheimer, J., & Rogers, B. (2000). Service-learning and citizenship: Directions for research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Special issue No. 1, pp. 42–51. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.spec.106

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. (1999). *The engaged institution: Returning to our roots*. National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. (2002). *Renewing the covenant: Learning, discovery, and engagement in a new age and different world*. National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Langhout, R. D., Collins, C., & Ellison, E. R. (2014). Examining relational empowerment for elementary school students in a yPAR program. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 53*(3–4), 369–381. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-013-9617-z

Langhout, R. D., & Gordon, D. L. (2021). Outcomes for underrepresented and misrepresented college students in service-learning classes: Supporting agents of change. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education 14*(3), 408–417. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000151

Langhout, R. D., Rosales, C. E., & Gordon, D. L. (2022). "Success" in the Borderlands: Measuring success for underrepresented and misrepresented college students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000444

Lorenzo Moledo, M., Sáez-Gambín, D., Ferraces Otero, M. J., & Varela Portela, C. (2021). Reflection and quality assessment in service-learning projects. When, with whom, and why. *Frontiers in Education, 5.* https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.605099

Martín García, X., Puig Rovira, J. M., Palos Rodríguez, J., & Rubio Serrano, L. (2018). Enhancing the quality of service-learning practices. *Enseñanza & Teaching, 36*(1), 111–128. https://doi.org/10.14201/et201836111128

Matthews, P. H., Lopez, I., Hirt, L. E., Brooks, S. O., & Furco, A. (2023). Developing the SLQAT (Service-Learning Quality Assessment Tool), a quantitative instrument to evaluate elements impacting student outcomes in academic service-learning courses. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 27*(2), 163–182.

McDonald, N., Schoenbeck, S. & Forte, A. (2019). Reliability and inter-rater reliability in qualitative research: Norms and guidelines for CSCW and HCI practice. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction, No. CSCW, 72*, 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1145/3359174

Mitchell, T. D. (2007). Critical service-learning as social justice education: A case study of the citizen scholars program. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 40*(2), 101–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665680701228797

Mitchell, T. D. (2015). Using a critical service-learning approach to facilitate civic identity development. *Theory Into Practice: Critical Service-Learning Initiatives, 54*(1), 20–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2015.977657

Mitchell, T. D., & Donahue, D. M. (2017). Ideal and real in service learning: Transforming the ideal based on the real. In C. Dolgon, T. Mitchell, & T. Eatman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of service learning and community engagement* (Cambridge Handbooks in Psychology, pp. 458–469). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316650011.044

Mitchell, T. D., Donahue, D. M., & Young-Law, C. (2012). Service learning as a pedagogy of Whiteness. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 45*(4), 612–629. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2012.715534

Moely, B. E., Furco, A., & Reed, J. (2008). Charity and social change: The impact of individual preferences on service-learning outcomes. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 15*(1), 37–48. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0015.103

Morton, K. (1995). The irony of service: Charity, project, and social change in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 2*(1), 19–32. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0002.102

National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993, Pub. L. No. 103-82, 107 Stat. 785 (1993). https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-107/pdf/STATUTE-107-Pg785.pdf

Parent, M. C. (2013). Handling item-level missing data: Simpler is just as good. *The*

Counseling Psychologist, 41(4), 568–600. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000012445176

Pearl, A. J., & Christensen, R. K. (2017). First-year student motivations for service-learning: An exploratory investigation of minority student perceptions. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 21*(4), 117–137. https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1361

Richards, K. A. R., & Hemphill, M. A, (2019). A practical guide to collaborative qualitative data analysis. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education 37*(2), 1-20. https://10.1123/jtpe.2017-0084

Schlomer, G. L., Bauman, S., & Card, N. A. (2010). Best practices for missing data management in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018082

Schreiner, L. A. (2010). The "thriving quotient": A new vision for student success. *About Campus: Enriching the Student Learning Experience, 15*(2), 2–10. https://doi.org/10.1002/abc.20016

Schreiner, L. A. (2014). Different pathways to thriving among students of color: An untapped opportunity for success. *About Campus: Enriching the Student Learning Experience, 19*(5), 10–19. https://doi.org/10.1002/abc.21169

Schreiner, L. A., Louis, M. C., & Nelson, D. D. (2012). *Thriving in transitions: A research-based approach to college student success*. University of South Carolina Press.

Schreiner, L. A., McIntosh, E. J., Kalinkewicz, L., & Cuevas, A. E. P. (2013). *Measuring the malleable: Expanding the assessment of student success* [PDF document]. Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education, St. Louis, MO. https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/27a499_7033adbe328c4149a077e119a3d1c657.pdf

Schwartz, S., & Suyemoto, K. (2013). Creating change from the inside: Youth development within a youth community organizing program. *Journal of Community Psychology, 41*(3), 341–358. http://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21541

Steinberg, K. S., Hatcher, J. A., & Bringle, R. G. (2011). Civic-minded graduate: A North Star. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 18*(1), 19–33. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0018.102

Sze-Yeung Lai, C., & Chi-Leung Hui, P. (2021). Service-learning: Impacts of learning motivation and learning experience on extended social/civic engagement. *Higher Education Research and Development, 40*(2), 400–415. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1756748

Tovar, E., Simon, M. A., & Lee, H. B. (2009). Development and validation of the College Mattering Inventory with diverse urban college students. *Measurement & Evaluation in Counseling & Development, 42*(3), 154–178. https://doi.org/10.1177/0748175609344091

Vargas, L. C., & Erba, J. (2017). Cultural competence development, critical service learning, and Latino/a youth empowerment: A qualitative case study. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 16*(3), 203–216. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348431.2016.1229614

Warren, J. L. (2012). Does service-learning increase student learning? A meta-analysis. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 18*(2), 56–61. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0018.205

Watts, R. J., Williams, N. C., & Jagers, R. J. (2003). Sociopolitical development. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 31*(1–2), 185–194. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023091024140

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004a). Educating the "good" citizen: Political choices and pedagogical goals. *Political Science and Politics, 37*(2), 241–247. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096504004160

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004b). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(2), 237–269. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312041002237

Whitley, M. A. (2014). A draft conceptual framework of relevant theories to inform future rigorous research on student service-learning outcomes. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 20*(2), 19–40. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0020.202

Wray-Lake, L., Tang, J., & Victorino, C. (2017). Are they political? Examining Asian

American college students' civic engagement. *Asian American Journal of Psychology, 8*(1), 31–42. https://doi.org/10.1037/aap0000061

Yorio, P. L., & Ye, F. (2012). A meta-analysis on the effects of service-learning on the social, personal, and cognitive outcomes of learning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 11*(1), 9–27. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2010.0072