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Abstract

With more college students going abroad to developing countries for research and service work, it is important to understand the possible benefits and harms that can occur during such an experience. When professors take their students abroad, they need to facilitate student learning to enhance benefits and lessen harms. Student reflection has proven to be a way to assess student learning; there needs to be an approach to assessing reflection during service learning experiences to ensure the effectiveness of an ethical experience. This study is a replication of a pilot study using a Service Learning Engagement Rubric to assess student writing. Students’ connections to various perspectives and levels of cognitive engagement were assessed before, during, and after their participation in a global service learning experience. Results show that student connections changed as a result of the experience, but further research needs to be completed to understand how the perspectives specifically changed as a result of the experience, as well as how to encourage students to make connections to high levels of cognitive engagement.
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Service Learning

Various undergraduate college programs across the country require their students to do volunteer work with the hopes of shaping them to become well-rounded global citizens. The importance of establishing connections between the community and the college became increasingly evident when Boyer (1990) called on universities to reexamine their practices to connect theory and experience with the intention of serving. In order to truly make an impact, Boyer believed that service must connect to the knowledge and research being done at universities. “Such a view of scholarly service---one that both applies and contributes to human knowledge is particularly needed in a world in which huge, almost intractable problems call for the skills and insights only the academy can provide” (Boyer, 1990, p. 23). These are the principles upon which service learning (SL) was created.

In its most basic terms, SL can be defined as an academic program designed to integrate service into coursework with the inclusion of significant reflection. Service learning opportunities are created with the intention to equally benefit the provider and recipient of the service as well as to maintain equal focus on the service provided and the learning that occurs (Furco, 2003, p. 5). This connection between experience and education has the opportunity to enhance student learning as past scholars have noted. According to a study by Eyler, Giles and Braxton (1997), students who chose to participate in a service learning experience (SLE) had higher citizenship confidence, values, and skills; and higher perceptions of social justice compared to those who did not participate. Participation in service has also shown to have positive effects on academic performance, values, self-efficacy, leadership, choice of a service career, and plans to participate in service post-college (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000, p. ii). Various other scholars have completed similar research, finding that students have overall

While it is possible to inquire on the benefit that SL brings to the students serving, there is a lack of literature on the benefits of SL to the organization being served. The majority of research that does exist focuses on community perspectives in local SL instead of global SL; although some of this research can be utilized for both groups, it is important to realize that there may be distinctions due to cross-cultural differences.

Often when SL occurs, a partnership is created with an organization in the community. Service learning allows students to bring in fresh perspectives on problems, free up staff time for organizations served; and allow organization resources, most importantly money for paid workers, to be allocated elsewhere (Blouin & Perry, 2009). Some communities interviewed reported that the students were able to learn more about the culture and community they served (Steimel, 2013), and SL with universities led to community partnerships and equitable engagement with the host community (Nelson & Klak, 2012). When SL is effective, these partnerships can mutually benefit the students as well as the community.

Crabtree describes how a SL project in El Salvador that gained attention from the government eventually led to the United States Agency for International Development (U.S.A.I.D.) and the Salvadorian government providing housing to an area in need. However, Crabtree points out that this instance did not cause the government or organization to rethink their policies regarding housing, and while their responsiveness helped one area, many other communities were still left in need (Crabtree, 1998).
An Anthropological Approach to Service Learning

Many researchers have criticized SL for serving the student more so than the community, a proposal that has existed for many decades. In 1968, Ivan Illich made a call for faculty to recognize the faults in their programs, and to halt overseas volunteering:

It is incredibly unfair for you to impose yourselves on a village where you are so linguistically deaf and dumb that you don’t even understand what you are doing, or what people think of you. And it is profoundly damaging to yourselves when you define doing something that you want to do as ‘good,’ a ‘sacrifice’ and ‘help’. (p. 8)

If done poorly, SL programs can teach misconceptions about service work, and misuse crucial resources that can cause harm to communities (Crabtree, 1998). With SL required for classwork in some instances, students may complete SL primarily with the intention to fulfill the necessary graduation requirements, or to make themselves appear culturally sensitive and worldly to future employers. This takes the focus of the SL away from the people and communities being served and places it on the students, reinforcing their belief that they are fulfilling a deficit in the community and that the communities should be providing every opportunity and resource for the students.

Crabtree (2013) describes a scenario, based on previous research and personal experiences, of a community center built by a group of students in a Spanish-speaking country. Some of the students were unaffected by their experience and still continued to view those in third world countries as lesser citizens of the world. Some students romanticized the idea of village life, despite having an increasingly complex understanding of poverty and global
perspectives. When students returned to their campus, their postgraduate activities are pursued with little divergence from their newly acquired understandings of privilege. Additionally, the center built by the group caused conflict in the village and is left untouched long after the students depart for home (Crabtree, 2013). Despite the students being present in the community for a short time, this scenario shows the impact that SL can have on a host community, as well as the people involved in the experience. When university faculty are implementing their service learning programs, it is important for them to keep in mind both the benefits and harms, unintended and intended, that can affect the student and community.

Some of these benefits and harms appear only when completing international SL, as there are cross-cultural experiences that occur in an international setting, but not in a local setting with participants and hosts sharing similar cultural and life experiences along with general values. While there are opportunities to do local SL, international SL provides growth in cross-cultural learning and civic engagement in ways that local SL cannot. Some scholars have argued that cross-cultural learning can still occur in the United States; other research done on this subject has refuted this claim. Researchers have found that students reported significantly higher levels of community and staff interaction, community engagement, learning from the community, and learning about social issues, to name a few (Niehaus & Crane, 2013).

When going abroad as a tourist, it is inevitable that there will be intercultural exchange between those traveling and the hosts of the country. Tourism also has an undeniable impact on the social, economic, and environmental aspects of local communities. The discipline of anthropology can be used as a lens in order to better understand the how tourism can impact a host community, and for tourists to understand the deeper implications behind their travel. In the past, anthropologists were hesitant to have any association with the tourism industry. Until the
1970s, few anthropologists considered it a legitimate field of study. Today, anthropologists recognize the importance of documenting the impacts of tourism and developing the field of anthropological tourism. According to Stronza (2001):

Several factors make tourism especially relevant to anthropology…. tourism occurs in most, if not all, human societies…. people in nearly every society have been touched in some way by tourism…. tourism seems to occupy at least a subsection in many studies that otherwise have little to do with tourism per se. Places off the beaten path—the kinds of places often of most interest to anthropologists—are increasingly opening to tourism as the international economy globalizes, and as transnational networks of transportation and communication are improved. (p. 264)

Along with the increasing interconnectedness that emerges with international tourism, there are some issues that arise that can harm the host country, as well as the tourists. Anthropological terms can be used to better understand these harms, and how they can be lessened while touring foreign countries. While many terms can be used in relation to volunteer tourism (VT), only a few will be highlighted. In order to avoid these potential issues when serving abroad, SL as a discipline needs to acknowledge that SL is inherently VT. Both, when done effectively, are done in an effort to better the communities and organizations served. When the global SL community is able to recognize that SL and VT are one in the same, the potential harms presented here can be recognized and addressed in an effective and ethical manner.
Ethnocentrism

In the 1988 documentary, *Cannibal Tours*, director and cinematographer Dennis O’Rourke follows a group of European and American tourists as they travel through the Sepik River area in Papua New Guinea. The film reveals that there is a disparity between what the tourists see and the native’s true beliefs. One older man explained when New Guinean people saw German colonists they exclaimed, in reaction to their pale complexions, “Our dead ancestors have arrived! Our dead have come back.” He continues with a smile to say; “Now when we see tourists, we say the dead have returned. That’s what we say. We don’t seriously believe they are our dead ancestors – but we say it” (O’Rourke, 1988). O’Rourke shows the tourists as what they are – the true cannibals consuming the culture of Papua New Guinea on their quest for an *authentic* cultural experience.

*Ethnocentrism* is the act of judging another culture’s beliefs and values according to the standards of one’s own culture (Ethnocentric, n.d.). O’Rourke shows in *Cannibal Tours* how ethnocentrism can cause false assumptions about cultural differences. What is important to one group may not be important to another and vice versa. VT, when approached with an ethnocentric lens, can therefore have the potential of harming both the community served and the volunteers.

Neocolonialism

*Neocolonialism* is defined as the use of economic, political, cultural or other pressures to control or influence other countries. It has been argued that VT, when done only for the benefit of those volunteering, is essentially this new form of colonialism (Butcher & Smith, 2015). When American college students go to impoverished countries without any cultural knowledge and with the intention of “helping”, as Illich described (1968, p.8), this perpetuates the idea that
the Global North, the countries of the United States, Canada, Western Europe and developed East Asia, need to help in order for the Global South, meaning Africa, Latin America, developing Asia and the Middle East, to survive (Palacios, 2010, p. 863). While it is preferred to believe that VT is done for purely altruistic reasons, oftentimes there are ulterior motives for volunteers.

When VT exploded in the 1960s, there were clearly political and almost colonial intentions behind the Peace Corps. The Peace Corps was created by the Kennedy foundation during the Cold War era, with the intent of asserting American values in developing countries (Butcher & Smith, 2015). This is alarming because researchers have found the perceptions of sending organizations can reinforce or break existing stereotypes. Organizations that develop programs of genuine value for the communities, approach VT as a learning process, and facilitate cultural interaction can break these stereotypes (Raymond & Hall, 2008). Today with an emphasis on increased cultural understanding, the preferred belief would be that volunteers are empathetic to other cultures and would not be harmful when traveling. However, the image of a Global North twenty-something on the back of an elephant while being led around by a Global South individual has strong connections to colonial times.

**White Privilege and the White Savior Complex**

Neocolonialism also contributes to the still present and harmful idea of *white privilege* and the *white industrial savior complex*. Colonialism was originally presented to citizens as the “white man’s burden” (Butcher & Smith, 2015, p. 106), meaning that there was a moral obligation for the benevolent white man to bring happiness to those in the Global South. The current VT industry does not address issues of western privilege and power, which must be
understood in order to diverge from the binary of *us* versus *them* that promotes colonial inequalities (Lyons et al., 2012).

The damaging effects of what can occur when a white savior goes to help others are not only a piece of past history. The Kony 2012 campaign, while not a VT effort, was showcased as a way for those in the West to make a real difference and end the terrorism led by Joseph Kony. In 2012, the Invisible Children, Inc. released a short film to promote the Stop Kony movement, which sought to globalize the crimes committed by Ugandan militia leader and indicted war criminal Joseph Kony in the hope of having him arrested by the end of 2012 (Curtis & McCarthy, 2012). In reality, the campaign oversimplified the real events that were happening in Uganda and focused more on the “Whites in Shining Armor” (Schimmelpfenning, 2011, p. 1) than the Ugandans themselves. While the Invisible Children organization may have had good intentions, the campaign was met with backlash for its racist and colonial undertones. The “white savior industrial complex” (Cole, 2012, p. 7), as coined by Cole, means that when the white savior sees a need and fills it, he does not understand the patterns of power and politics behind the problems. There is no quick fix for the problems occurring in Uganda and many other global south countries, which activists and volunteer tourists alike must realize when they attempt to fund or volunteer their time to lessen the many burdens that exist in developing areas.

**Sustainability**

Unfortunately, there is no ultimate framework to cure poverty or a lack of education. This can be problematic when volunteers arrive for a few days with the intention of helping, only to realize they cannot complete what they expected in a matter of a few days. *Sustainability* is a key issue in VT. Alexander (2012) found that there were more benefits when volunteers stayed five to twelve weeks rather than shorter or longer periods of time. This time period allowed
voluntourists to become more immersed in the culture and have a better understanding of their work. While a longer program period may contribute to the sustainability of the program, the development and upkeep ultimately lies with the organization. For sustainability to exist, local communities need to be given more control of VT programs, particularly because they are the ones receiving the services and best understand how the programs can be modified to respect their culture and needs. Additionally, higher community involvement also empowers the host community (Wearing & McGehee, 2001). Despite these potential benefits, tourism can cause the host community to become polluted and congested with high number of volunteers and degrade the value of the work due to a lack of legitimate interests.

**Cultural Commodification**

Cultural exchange may be one of the highlights of a global VT experience, but it can also foster the problematic practice of *cultural commodification*. Cultural commodification is the idea that culture can be marketed, packaged and sold to the dominant, or most powerful, culture. Tourism as a whole, particularly to areas targeted as indigenous, is susceptible to the commodification of culture (Sheperd, 2002, p. 183). Cultural artifacts and experiences created solely for the purpose of tourism are fairly common in many groups. While there are many examples, one that is particularly striking comes from Native American tour guides in Sitka, Alaska who are trained in the “commodification of hospitality” (Bunten, 2008, p. 386). The tour guides create an experience molded for the benefit of the tourists. Tourists who do not take the time to understand the difference between commercialized experience and culture can contribute to misappropriation of culture, leading to a misuse and distortion of cultural heritage (Sheperd, 2002). Cultural commodification is not an easy conversation to have, as it also brings into question the authenticity of cultures.
While culture does evolve and change, only the cultural group can define what is truly authentic. One study conducted with two Ngadha villages in Indonesia (Cole, 2007) found that tourists preferred to visit villages that appeared more impoverished and enjoyed exotic experiences such as slaughter rituals, which can have an economic burden on a small village. Because of the influx of tourists in the area, the main village created a committee whose specific purpose was to oversee tourist activities. Locals believed that tourism brought pride not only to them, but their ancestors as well; tourism also brought a new self-awareness of traditional culture, which the Ngadha have used to bring them economic and political power (Cole, 2007).

Much like cultural commodification has grown, VT has become vulnerable to commodification. VT in the past has been presented as a way to avoid the commodification of cultures by tourism – but tourism scholars have found that despite best efforts, VT is still prone to commodification. One study found that VT organizations in Thailand and Vietnam not only had elements of commodification, but also reinforced the stereotypical impacts of tourism as a whole, undermining the intention of VT to avoid commodification (Coren & Gray, 2012). Large tour operations competing within the VT market have shifted the market from non-profit to commercial, leading to shallow volunteer tourism. With increased research and exposure of the problems that can occur with big scale VT, acknowledgement of potential harms can provide a new guideline of social ethics to follow during VT (Wearing & McGeehee, 2013). In general, individuals need to recognize the difference that will occur between cultures, and the potential dangers they can bring to their host communities.

There are numerous reasons why tourists decide to embark on VT experiences. Researchers have discovered that some top motivations for tourists to volunteer include a desire for cultural experiences, the ability to broaden knowledge, re-evaluate personal values and
perceptions of the world, and to facilitate personal growth and development (Ooi & Laing, 2009). Bailey and Russell (2010) measured student’s personal growth in relation to a volunteer tourist experience and found that students showed an increase in the ability to be open to new situations, overall civic attitude, and wisdom. Voluntourist motivations behind service are strikingly similar to the motivations of those who go abroad in the name of SL.

Chesbrough (2011) found that students’ initial reasons for participating in SL were for their own benefit, such as enhancing their resume, or gaining academic credit; however, as time goes on they become more internally motivated; motivations included a commitment to social justice, the desire of learning about others and oneself, and wanting to give back to the community. These similarities in motivation for SL or VT demonstrate that it is important to consistently evaluate the work that is being done, not only to reach the desired outcomes, but also to ensure that not only the students are benefitting from the experience, but also the community and organization being served. The detrimental effects of VT, and therefore SL, can be hazardous to all those involved.

Review of Literature

What separates SL from VT is the academic coursework that is included, more often than not to demonstrate to students the harms that can be done during SL work. When professors lead their students in SL, reflective journal work is often used to aid students in thinking critically about their academic learning and to assess their learning over time. Service learning needs an approach for reflection in order to maximize benefits and minimize harms. In 1933, Dewey (as cited in Rodgers, 2002) outlined criteria for a meaningful reflective experience:

- Reflection is a meaning-making process that moves a learner from one experience into the next with deeper understanding of its relationship with and connections to other
experiences and ideas. It is the thread that makes continuity of learning possible, and ensures the progress of the individual and, ultimately, society. It is a means to essentially moral ends.

- Reflection is a systematic, rigorous, disciplined way of thinking, with its roots in scientific inquiry.
- Reflection needs to happen in community, in interaction with others.
- Reflection requires attitudes that value the personal and intellectual growth of oneself and others. (p. 845)

While much research has been done on the importance of reflection in a SLE, very little research has been done on how to assess student reflection in a way that will increase student learning and how to measure that learning. Researchers found “that structured reflection is the most common strategy used to connect the service with the academic course material” (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000, p. 59). Additionally, the ability to reflect in settings with peers and professors, along with reflection in response to specific questions allowed for a deeper connection to personal values and achievement of outcomes (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000).

Other research has found that reflection is the most meaningful way to teach SL. Peters completed a review of literature to find if desired outcomes occurred during an SL program for undergraduate CSD students. Peters found that through structured reflection, he was able to assess student outcomes, perceptions of the experience, and overall effectiveness of his SL program (Peters, 2011). Despite being highly recommended as a tool to analyze student growth, there is no rubric for professors to use to gather and understand student reflection in a way that would be useful for grading purposes as well as a general assessment of growth.
Correia and Bleicher (2008) recommend that student reflections should be assessed for evidence that students are connecting the experience to their self, to a similar setting, and to the world. This type of analysis assumes that the more connections a student makes in their SLE, the more their learning is deepened. Ash and Clayton (2004) proposed organizing student reflection with three categories: personal, civic, and academic. These categories should then be further analyzed to determine the level of reflection the student has shown. Higher level abilities such as analyzing, predicting, hypothesizing are evidence of advanced stages of learning.

Many SL program approaches are informed from Kolb’s model of experiential learning. The experiential learning style theory is typically represented by a four-stage cycle: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. Kolb theorizes that effective learning occurs when an individual is able to progress through the four stages, and then uses the experience to inform new ones (Kolb & Kolb, 2005). SL requires students to travel through this cycle, using their knowledge to inform their experiences. This cycle also addresses the amount of reflection scholars believe is necessary for attaining cognitive outcomes.

Eyler (2002) proposes that reflection should be done prior to service, during service, and after service. By having teachers check in on student learning at various points during the experience, teachers can ensure that their methods are effective and that they are providing the resources and experience necessary to ensure a meaningful and effective SL program. The experiential learning cycle also pushes students to be thinking deeply about their learning and experience. Scholars also suggest that students’ critical thinking should be assessed with the idea that if students are thinking deeply, they will be increasing the benefits of their work and decreasing harmful behaviors and thoughts. Bloom’s Taxonomy (as cited in Krathwohl, 2002)
uses action verbs to categorize lower thinking ideas from higher thinking ideas. Action verbs such as define, remember, state and repeat designate lower level thinking while generate, design, and collaborate designate higher level thinking (Krathwohl, 2002).

This research and informed knowledge can be used to understand how students connect to SLEs, and how their thinking changes over the course of such an experience. The present study aims to assess the effectiveness of an international SL program, which intended to explore the benefits and harms in SL, involving nineteen undergraduate students over roughly sixteen weeks. This study will seek to assess the perspectives taken by participants in reflection essays to identify their engagement in the program and overall understanding of SL. The development of SL engagement is analyzed with both student connections and the level of cognitive thinking displayed by participants.

Method

Participants

Nineteen undergraduate students at Augustana College volunteered for this study. The participants were chosen based on their participation in one offering of the College’s study abroad programs, Cambodia Winter Term. Students elected to partake in this study after the student researcher and faculty advisor gave an explanation of the project. Students were informed that if they declined to participate in the project, their decision would not have a negative effect on their grade for the SL portion of the program. All students in the study abroad program volunteered to be a part of the project, with the exception of two students who participated in the pilot study and one who was unable to complete the full term of coursework. The informed consent document signed by each participant can be found in Appendix A.
Service Learning Experience

For the first five weeks of Cambodia Winter Term, students were on campus learning specifically about Cambodian history, culture, and language. The last six weeks of the term, students traveled to Cambodia for an immersive SLE. Students enrolled in the program complete three 3-credit classes and one 1-credit class for a total of 10 credits. The first class, Special Topics in Sociology, allowed students to examine and discuss the demographic, political, and social changes that have taken place in Cambodia from 1993 to the present. The second class, Life Writing, was taught to increase student knowledge and understanding of Cambodian culture and history through life narratives. The one credit class, Seminar on Cambodian Culture, was team taught to provide the students general information about culture, and health and safety while traveling abroad. The SL class, Cultural Phonetics, created the foundation for this study. Throughout the on-campus learning, the students and faculty advisor for Cultural Phonetics met twice a week for an hour and 50 minutes. The class time was split between cultural phonetics, to help aid the students in understanding how to tutor non-native English speakers in the English language, and SL. The SL curriculum for this class intended to have students critically examine SL and explore potential benefits and harms in the name of SL. This was achieved through several assigned readings and journal entries throughout the five weeks, which can be found in Appendix B.

As part of the readings for Cultural Phonetics, the students were given one of three books to have read by Week 3 of the term, in addition to a specific set of questions related to the book. Two of the books, *Behind the Beautiful Forevers* (Boo, 2012) and *Strength in What Remains* (Kidder, 2009), were offered with the intention of expanding the students’ knowledge of poverty and genocide, both of which are vital for an understanding of Cambodia’s history and the cause
for need. After completing the readings, students answered their specific set of questions for the class and participated in discussion about the readings. The other supplementary texts were assigned with the intent to create discussion about SL among the students. The syllabus for Cultural Phonetics can be found in Appendix B, as well as texts read for the other classes. During their time in Cambodia for the SLE, students completed daily journal work about their service. The faculty advisor provided specific prompts for the students to complete journal exercises most of the time, although other times the students participated in free writing exercises.

Students completed their service learning work for two weeks at Angkor Thom Junior High in Siem Reap, Cambodia, for a total of three days a week for two and a half hours each day. After every day at the school, the students met as a group to discuss their experiences and to discuss positive and negative experiences while volunteering. Additionally, students completed SL at the Elephant Valley Project in Mondulkiri, Cambodia. Students assisted the project in building bridges, collecting banana trees for the elephants, and watering plants.

Assessment Essays

The pilot study for this project was completed in summer 2015 with three students, also in Cambodia. It was determined this would be a useful rubric tool to carry out with a larger group. For the purposes of this study, the students wrote three sets of essays to assess their engagement in various perspectives and cognitive levels over the course of the project. The first set of essays (T1) was completed by the students week one of winter term prior to any formal teaching or knowledge of service learning. The second set of essays (T2) was completed after the five weeks of on-campus teaching, and the last set of essays (T3) were written after the students completed their service learning and full trip experience. Essay questions were changed to reflect past tense for the post-trip set of essays. Essay prompts can be found in Appendix C. The faculty advisor
created prompts based on the preexisting SL literature. Students were provided the rubric to aid in their understanding of how the perspectives and levels of cognitive engagement related to their writings.

The essays were evaluated by a rubric created by Janko (2015) based on previous SL literature. The levels of cognitive learning are based on Bloom’s Taxonomy, which provides a general framework for categorizing educational goals. The rubric addressed the following questions:

1. At each time period, how did the participants engage and/or connect the SLE to a personal, civic, and academic student perspective?
2. At each time period, at what level of cognitive learning did the participants relate the SLE to a personal, civic, and academic area?

Data Collection

Quantitative data was obtained from essays written by participants at three time periods during the SLE. Essays were analyzed using a Service Learning Engagement rubric, which can be found in Appendix D. According to Janko, “The objective of the rubric is to assess the level of sophistication of the skills of students regarding students learning in respect to three different viewpoint areas: service learning experience to personal area, service learning experience to civic area, and service learning experience to academic area” (2015, p. 17). Tallies were taken to collect the number of references each participant made to each of the perspectives, and others were taken to measure the level of cognitive thinking when references to perspectives were made. Over the three time periods, both additions and original parts to the original essays were tallied. Each set of essays contained six prompts and was submitted three separate times by each of the nineteen participants yielding 342 writing samples to be evaluated. For the last time
period, the researcher did not evaluate five sets of essays due to a lack of follow-through by the participants. Therefore, the researcher evaluated 312 essays. The faculty advisor coded time periods and essay authors in an effort to protect the identity of participants and avoid bias, with the exception of T3 due to the essays being analyzed on paper instead of electronically.

**Data Analysis**

The tallies from perspectives and levels of cognitive thinking were analyzed separately. The tallies were then converted into percentages, out of the total number of tallies for that author during that single time period. The totals for each time period are the total number of all participants’ tallies for a given perspective or cognitive level. Reliability checks were completed with the faculty advisor from the Cultural Phonetics course.

**Reliability**

The researcher and faculty advisor checked 20% of the samples for each time period. For T1, there was 90% topic agreement and 92% rating agreement, T2 had a 92% topic agreement and 91% rating agreement, and T3 had 98% topic agreement and 99% rating agreement. While T1 and T2 were checked by individual writing sample, the researcher and faculty advisor checked the entire set of essays as a whole for each participant. Both coders reread and reanalyzed the writing to address discrepancies. In the end there was 100% agreement by consensus. There was no overall pattern of disagreement, which may be an indication of the subjective nature of this metric. Some ratings were the same but had different topics, and vice versa.
Results

Engagement in Perspectives

Engagement in personal, civic, and academic student perspectives was assessed using the Service Learning Engagement Rubric found in Appendix D. Due to the number of participants only the overall totals for engagement in each perspective will be discussed. Initially, the majority of comments were of the personal perspectives for all participants. Academic was the second most commonly addressed, followed by Civic. During the T2, Personal perspectives decreased while Civic and Academic perspectives both increased. At T3, Civic perspectives increased while Personal and Academic perspectives decreased for the group.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Civic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Total student perspectives engagement types (reported in percentages).
Engagement in Bloom’s Taxonomy Cognitive Levels

The Service Learning Engagement rubric was used to identify how frequently each student engaged at three levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy of cognitive thinking: Describe, Analyze, and Create. Describe was the most commonly used cognitive level at T1, followed by Analyze. There were no examples of the Create level found during T1. At T2, student engagement at the Describe level decreased while engagement at the Analyze level increased. There was a slight increase in engagement at the Create level. At T3, Analyze was the most commonly used level, followed by Describe. Connections at the Create level increased slightly compared to T2.

Table 2
Percentage of Engagement in Cognitive Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Describe</th>
<th>Analyze</th>
<th>Create</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Total student cognitive engagement levels (reported in percentages).
Examination of Individual Engagement

To understand how engagement changed for individual participants, two participants with an initial high number of comments at high engagement levels, IJ and LM, and two participants with initial low number of comments at high engagement levels, BC and NO, were tracked throughout all time periods. The researcher chose these participants first by their number of engagement comments at high levels during T1, and then by the availability of T3 essays.

The participants with initial high numbers of engagement in higher cognitive levels had changes in their cognitive engagement between T1 and T2. IJ’s level engagement slightly increased in at the higher cognitive levels while LM’s decreased. Between T2 and T3, IJ’s number of engagements at higher levels increased significantly as did LM’s. Both IJ and LM reached the Create level at T3, with LM having the greatest number of engagements in Create of all participants. IJ’s number of comments in Create was not as noticeable as other participants despite having an initially high number of comments at high cognitive engagement levels.

The participants with an initial low number of comments at higher engagement levels displayed greater changes than the participants with initial high numbers of comments at higher engagement levels. From T1 to T2, BC and NO had a noticeably greater amount of connections at the Analyze level. Additionally, NO reached the Create level in T2, being one of only five participants to do so. From T2 to T3, NO’s number of comments decreased in high level engagement in comparison to the previous time periods; NO had a high number of comments in Analyze, but did not reach the Create level. BC had a greater number of connections at Analyze from T2 to T3, but did not reach the Create level at any time period.
Figure 3. Participant IJ’s cognitive engagement (reported in percentages).

Figure 4. Participant LM’s cognitive engagement (reported in percentages).

Figure 5. Participant BC’s cognitive engagement (reported in percentages).

Figure 6. Participant NO’s cognitive engagement (reported in percentages).
Summary of Results

Overall, findings suggest that student engagement in perspectives varied over T1, T2, and T3. Comments reflecting Personal reflections decreased over time while Civic connections increased. Academic connections remained relatively the same over the three time periods. Over the three time periods, student engagement in the Describe level decreased while engagement in the Analyze level increased. This can be seen as evidence that over the course of the experience, students writing reflected a deeper level of thinking. Because student connections to the Civic perspective increased along with a greater number of connections at higher levels of cognitive thinking, the SLE was effective at allowing students to think on deeper levels about cultural experiences, group opinions, and various worldviews in their reflection.

Discussion

Engagement in Perspectives

The decrease in Personal perspectives and increase in Civic perspectives may indicate that over the length of the experience, students were more likely to connect to cultural ideas after having had coursework related to SL and real life experiences within the country. Academic perspectives did not vary with the exception of a small increase of engagement at T2, after formal teaching on SL was given to the students.

Variances in student perspectives could also be due to coding differences. During reliability checks, the researcher and faculty advisor often approached coding from different perspectives, but were able to agree how the idea could fit into more than one category. Because of the subjective nature of the rubric and the possibility of experiences being attributed to dual perspectives, it was often difficult to have perspectives not overlap during the writing.
Engagement in Bloom’s Taxonomy Cognitive Levels

The faculty advisor gave feedback on each set of essays after their completion, aiding in student’s understanding of how to reach the higher cognitive levels in their writing. The Create level had the lowest number of engagements, with no students reaching the Create level in T1, five students in T2, and nine students in T3.

There was a pattern for individual student growth in reflection regarding the student’s ability to engage at higher levels of cognition. Students who had an initial high number of connections at higher cognitive levels tended to increase in their number of connections at higher levels compared to the rest of the group. Students with initial low numbers of engagement at higher cognitive levels tended to have fewer connections to higher cognitive levels by T3 when compared to the rest of the group. However, there were students who did not match this pattern. One of the students with an initial high number of comments at high cognitive levels, IJ, did not have the greatest percentage of comments in high cognitive levels by T3 when compared to the rest of the group. Additionally, it is important to note that students vary in writing strength; the researcher observed that a student with initial low cognitive engagement at higher levels might never reach the Create level.

Future Directions for the Service Learning Engagement Rubric

Overall, reflection is difficult to quantify in an effective and reliable way. While there are general patterns to the data, coders may interpret perspectives differently which leads to different results. One way to control this would be to modify the rubric to ensure that there are clear definitions for Personal, Civic, and Academic connections, along with specific examples for each perspective. Having formal instruction in reflection may help students understand how to engage at higher levels of thinking and with multiple perspectives. It would also be beneficial to
examine how exactly the perspectives changed in regard to what kind of comments were made and how the experience impacted those changes.

This study provides support for the idea that reflection helps strengthen student engagement with different perspectives and increases cognitive engagement in writing. Research has also shown that ethical SL should include feedback from the receivers of the SLE work in order to measure the effects made on the community and organization to ensure that the experience was mutually beneficial. This study lacked this component, and future use of this rubric should include organization and community perspectives in an effort to complete ethical SL work.

**Future Directions for the Assessment of SL**

In order to assess how exactly students’ perspectives and cognitive engagement can change over the course of a SLE, more research needs to be completed. One of the main benefits of global SL is the potential for students to grow in their intercultural sensitivity and skills. While this study did not assess student growth in sensitivity and skills, this could be another way in which to ensure the effectiveness of a global SL project. This study also discovered that students reflect at different levels, and that there are overall patterns of how students reflect.

Additionally, it is important to note that while students may express through their reflection their willingness to continue SL work or make changes to their lives based on their experiences, this rubric does not allow for follow up to see if said changes really occur. It would be advantageous to complete follow up with students to see if the SLE had a recognizable impact on how they interact with others and how they live their daily lives.
This study showed that student perspectives and levels of cognitive thinking during written reflection changed as a result of a SLE. Future research using this rubric should be modified to include clear definitions of perspectives, how exactly student understanding changed in relation to the perspectives, formal instruction in reflection, and inclusion of community and individuals’ perspectives to ensure mutually beneficial SL work. While there are multiple ways that assessment of SL can be completed, using this rubric is a way to begin evaluating the effectiveness of a global SL project.
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Table 1

*Percentage of Student Engagement Types during T1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Civic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JK</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Percentage of Student Engagement Types during T2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Civic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JK</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Percentage of Student Engagement Types during T3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Civic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JK</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Dash indicates data was not collected for this participant.
Table 4

*Percentage of Engagement in Cognitive Levels for T1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Describe</th>
<th>Analyze</th>
<th>Create</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JK</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

*Percentage of Engagement in Cognitive Levels for T2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Describe</th>
<th>Analyze</th>
<th>Create</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JK</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

*Percentage of Engagement in Cognitive Levels for T3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Describe</th>
<th>Analyze</th>
<th>Create</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JK</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Dash indicates data was not collected for this participant.
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TITLE OF STUDY: Assessing an Ethical Service Learning Experience

STUDENT INVESTIGATOR: Chelsey Peterson, Senior CSD Major

FACULTY ADVISER: Kathy Jakielski, Ph.D., Professor of CSD

PURPOSE
The purpose of this study is to assess the service learning program that was developed by Dr. Jakielski to help increase your intercultural awareness, sensitivity, and skills before, during, and after your participation in the Cambodia service learning experience in winter 2015-16.

PARTICIPANTS
You are being asked to be a participant in this study because you are one of 21 students who elected to participate in Cambodia term for six weeks in winter 2015-16 and have not previously worked with Life and Hope Association in Siem Reap, Cambodia. All 21 students will be asked to participate.

PROCEDURES
If you choose to participate, all of the service learning assignments that you will be asked to complete before, during, and after Cambodia term will be assessed for evidence of intercultural awareness, sensitivity, and skills.

RISKS
The risk of participating is minimal. You could have responses that you do not want to share with the group; in such an instance, you can talk to the faculty adviser and she can de-identify any such responses or omit them from group discussions or analysis.

BENEFITS
We hope to learn about the most effective ways to prepare and work with students who are embarking on an international service learning project. Findings may inform future service learning program planning.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Your identity will be fully protected. All of the essays will be coded with a code that you designate, as below. Only the faculty adviser will have access to the codes; the student researcher will see only the coded data and will not know the author of any essay. You will not be identified personally in any reports or publications that may result from this study. The only people who will have access to the essays obtained for this study will be the student investigator and faculty advisor. All data will be stored on a password-protected laptop that belongs to the student investigator and/or faculty adviser.

COSTS/COMPENSATION
There will be no cost to you nor will you be compensated for participating in this study.

**RIGHT TO REFUSE OR WITHDRAW**
You may refuse or withdraw from this study at any time, and your refusal or withdraw will have no impact on your ability to participate in Cambodia term nor on your grade for the class.

**QUESTIONS**
If you have any questions now, please ask us now. If you have additional questions later, please contact the student investigator at chelseypeterson12@augustana.edu, or the faculty advisor, Dr. Kathy Jakielski, at (309) 794-7386 or kathyjakielski@augustana.edu. You may report (anonymously, if you so choose) any complaints or comments regarding the manner in which this study is being conducted to the Augustana College Institutional Review Board, which can be contacted at IRB@augustana.edu.

MY SIGNATURE BELOW INDICATES THAT I HAVE DECIDED TO PARTICPATE AS A RESEARCH PARTICIPANT AND THAT I HAVE READ AND UNDERSTAND THIS CONSENT FORM. I WILL BE OFFERED A COPY OF THIS FORM FOR MY REFERENCE AFTER ALL SIGNATURES HAVE BEEN COLLECTED.

_______________________________________________________________________
Name of Student

__________  My initials signify that I AGREE to participate in this study.

__________  My initials signify that I will NOT participate in this study.

The code I elect to use for the reflective essays is ______________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________
Signature of Student

____________________________________________________________________________
Date

____________________________________________________________________________
Signature of Faculty Adviser

____________________________________________________________________________
Date
Description of Books

*Behind the Beautiful Forevers* profiles the lives of individuals who live in Mumbai, the “under cities” of India, over several years.

*Strength in What Remains* is the story of a Burundi refugee and his journey to America.

*Three Cups of Tea: One Man’s Mission to Promote Peace...One School at a Time* is the story of one mountaineer’s inspiration to offer education to impoverished girls in Pakistan.

Augustana College  CSD 440-03: Special Topics – Cultural Phonetics 2015-16 Winter Cambodia Term  - Kathy J. Jakielski, Ph.D.  - Syllabus

Course Description

This course is designed to help you develop academically, culturally, and personally. On-campus coursework during the first five weeks is designed to engage you in the academic study of applied phonetics, human values, and ethical service learning. The last six weeks of the course will be spent in Cambodia, where you will continue to study and be asked to reflect on these studies and your experiences, as well as apply the information you learned in the first five weeks.

Phonetics, the study of speech sounds comprising the world's languages, involves developing both knowledge and skills. We will begin by studying the phonetics of American English, and as your understanding grows, we will expand to study the basic phonetic structure of Khmer. You also will learn fundamental skills, including those involved in reading and writing symbols in the International Phonetic Alphabet; phonetically transcribing words in English and Khmer; and applying phonetics to teaching English to speakers of other languages. Ultimately, you will develop into a student phonetician—one who understands fundamental concepts and gains basic proficiency in transcription to apply those concepts and skills to novel, real-life situations, such as those we will encounter during our service learning work in Cambodia.

Also in the first five weeks, discussions of what our service work in Cambodia will entail will be detailed, as will the expectations for completing your service work. Because the individuals with whom we will work come from impoverished backgrounds, have disabilities, and/or have traumatic histories, in this class we frequently will be considering information taught in the three companion courses, tying together the coursework for service learning application. You will be required to reflect on a wide variety of cultural beliefs, including your own personal beliefs about inequality, poverty, war, and disability, and identify discriminatory actions in social, cultural, legal, and economic realms that individuals worldwide are facing. We will investigate social inclusion and exclusion policies and practices. We will use Cambodia as a case study to understand how these concepts and practices affect Cambodians. We will study the concepts and principles underlying service learning, as well as become aware of long-standing and current challenges to typical practices. We will explore what it means to serve individuals in developing countries, and how to do so ethically.
We will spend the last six weeks of the term in Cambodia. You will be required to reflect on your personal expectations and coursework prior to going abroad, as well as during and after our travels. While in Cambodia, you will work in several different settings, but the majority of your work will be completed in the Life and Hope Association programs. You will apply your newly-developed phonetics knowledge and skills in your English language service learning assignments; you also will apply what you have learned about ethical global service learning. We anticipate that each student will accrue approximately 40 SL hours over our six weeks in Cambodia, but you will be required to complete a minimum of 25 SL hours.

Learning Objectives

This course has been designed so you can achieve the following outcomes by the end of the term.

With regard to phonetic science, you will be able to:

- Differentiate among the major branches of phonetics and the contributions of each branch to the study of languages, with a focus on applied phonetics
- Classify consonants by articulatory place, manner, and voicing
- Describe vowels by tongue height and advancement
- Pronounce the speech sounds symbolized in the International Phonetic Alphabet
- Phonetically transcribe words and phrases in American English with emerging proficiency
- Read phonetic transcriptions of basic words in Khmer with limited proficiency
- Provide examples of interlanguage and language transfer in second language acquisition
- Apply your newly-attained knowledge of phonetics to your service learning assignments

With regard to understanding human values here and in a developing country, as well as the meaning and purpose of ethical service learning, you will be able to:

- Identify situations of war, poverty, inadequate healthcare, accidents, violence, political systems, and aging, and the effects of such situations on the populace
- Identify any such situations, as above, as they exist now and in the recent past in Cambodia
- Reflect on your own stereotypes and prejudices about, and experiences with, individuals in developing countries
- Reflect on your own stereotypes and prejudices about, and experiences with,
individuals with disabilities

☐ reflect on your own stereotypes and prejudices about, and experiences with, individuals living in poverty

☐ discuss the components of and standards and practices in service learning

☐ outline an approach for providing ethical service to individuals from materially impoverished backgrounds

☐ articulate the nature of our planned community service work in Cambodia, as expressed by the Cambodians themselves

☐ develop academic, cultural, and personal goals for yourself related to your service work

☐ specify learning outcomes and assessments of your service learning work

☐ prepare yourself and materials for your community service assignments in Cambodia

☐ engage in English language teaching to children, teens, and adults in your service placements

☐ reflect on your experiences before, during, and after your service learning assignments

Competencies

By the end of winter term, you will have demonstrated your knowledge and understanding of course material through your performance on:

☐ your performance in Khmer

☐ homework on the assigned readings

☐ in-class discussions and activities

☐ guided journaling before and during service work

☐ the materials you prepare for your service work

☐ your final reflection essays

Evaluation

Approximately one third of our class time will be dedicated to learning phonetics and Khmer, while the remaining time will be dedicated to covering the other diverse topics. The following assignments comprise the graded course requirements.
Khmer Conversation (10%)

Students will be placed in groups of five. Each group will be responsible for writing and performing a 10-minute skit in Khmer, using the words, phrases, and expressions taught in class; supplemental words are encouraged! All students are required to have a speaking role. Grading will be based on correctness of the language used, correct articulation of the words, originality of the skit, and level of participation.

Homework on the Required Readings (2% each; 10% total)

To participate thoughtfully in class discussions, it will be important that you come to class prepared to discuss the day’s required readings. To provide external motivation for you to complete the assigned readings prior to coming to class, homework pertaining to the assigned readings will be due at the beginning of select class periods.

Participation during In-class Activities and Discussions (10%)

There will be graded activities and discussions in every class. The quantity and quality of participation will be noted for each class period. I realize, and ask you to realize, that not everyone will be able to participate in every class, so on days when you feel particularly connected to the material being covered, please be certain to share your views.

Journaling (25%)

You will keep a journal in which you will respond to specific prompts that I provide. You will be asked to journal on topics related to human values and ethical service learning throughout the first five weeks of the class; you also will journal every day that you participate in community service work in Cambodia. You can journal in a narrative style using text and/or pictures, and sometimes the journal assignment will involve class discussions and presentations.

Teaching Materials and Activities (25%)

You will develop teaching materials and activities to use in your community service work in Cambodia. You will be graded on the academic soundness of the activities, as well as the creativity, age appropriateness, overall appeal, and completeness of your materials and activities.

Reflection Essays (5% first set, 5% second set, 10% final set; 20% total)

You will produce essays to answer several questions that I pose three times during the term. I will evaluate each essay on how successfully you relate the academic coursework to your experiential work, as well as on the complexity of your reflection, and how your thinking changed over time. I will provide you with a rubric that explains how I will grade your essays.

Work Outside of Class Time

You will be expected to spend a considerable amount of time working on assignments for this course outside of class time. Assignments comprising the majority of that work include readings, writing assignments, individual and group Khmer practice, and individual and group
construction of teaching materials. Please budget a minimum of 8 hours per week for Weeks 1-5.

**Reflection Assignments: Background Information and Grading**

"We do not learn from our experiences, we learn from processing our experiences." John Dewey

Reflection has been described as "the hyphen in service-learning" (Eyler & Giles, 1999). Throughout this course, you will be asked to engage in many reflection exercises in my attempt to help you connect what we’re learning in class to the work we’ll do in the community. As part of this course, you will have ample opportunities to think, process, talk, and write about course material and your service-learning experiences (SLE) in Cambodia.

While all reflection requires the thinking skills of comprehending and summarizing material and experiences, deep reflection requires the use of higher-order thinking, including skills of analyzing, problem solving, inferencing, and viewing situations from multiple perspectives. It is my goal to help you achieve the latter.

I have designed a wide variety of reflection activities that I will assign throughout the term. A few of these activities will be completed during the first five weeks of the course; many will be assigned while we engage in our SLE. At three times in the term, you will complete a substantial reflection paper.

I will use your daily reflections in three ways:

. 1) to gage the level at which you are learning

. 2) to provide you with feedback designed to push your thinking to a higher level

. 3) to help me determine if I am achieving my desired course outcomes

The purpose of each reflection assignment, practically speaking, is to help you make sense of the course material and SLE. Some aspects of the material and service work you will find easier to make sense of than others. Your knowledge is certain to increase as we proceed throughout the term; however, I believe that you will reach an even deeper understanding if you consistently engage in reflective thought throughout the entirety of the term.

In an attempt to gage the level at which you are learning, I will look for evidence that you are engaging with the material and in the SLE in three areas: academic, civic, and personal. Academic engagement is when you demonstrate that you are connecting course content to the SLE. Civic engagement is when you demonstrate that you are connecting your participation to collective change-oriented processes. Personal engagement is when you demonstrate that you are connecting your own strengths, weaknesses, assumptions, skills, etc. to the SLE.

There are three stages of learning that I will look for: 1) Describe, 2) Analyze, and 3) Create. You might think about the three stages as: 1) What?, 2) So What?, and 3) Now What? If you accurately describe and summarize course content, then I will consider your reflection to be at the descriptive stage. If you demonstrate the ability to analyze, predict, hypothesize, etc., then I will consider your reflection to be at the analytical stage. If you demonstrate solutions to
problems, generate new ideas, challenge assumptions, etc., then I will consider your reflection to be at the creative stage. My goal is that you reach the highest stage in all three areas by the end of the term.

Some questions that you can use to guide your thinking as you complete the reflection assignments follow.

Personal

1) What did I learn?
2) How did I learn it?
3) Why is it significant to me? Why does it matter to me?
4) How will I use this information? Or, what goals will I set to improve myself, quality of my learning, or quality of future service?

Civic

1) What might the people I serve learn?
2) How will they learn it?
3) Why might it be important to them?
4) How might I impact other people?

Academic

1) When before have I studied this?
2) What do I already know about this?
3) What could I read or re-read to learn more about this?
4) In practice, is this the same as in theory?

The rubric that I will use to grade your reflections is appended to the syllabus.

Relation of Course Competencies to College-wide Outcomes

Augustana has nine learning outcomes that you will develop over your four years on campus. In this course, we will address six of them as you work to achieve all of the Competencies (as listed above). You will expand your Disciplinary Knowledge (phonetics and Khmer), Critical Thinking and Information Literacy (assigned readings, discussions, guided journaling, essays), Intercultural Competency (SLE teaching and travel in-country), Communication Competency (SLE teaching), Creative Thinking (SLE preparation and materials assignments), and Ethical Citizenship (SLE assignments).
Course Schedule

Week 1: Tuesday

Course Overview

- syllabus, expectations, Week 3 books, grading, Khmer and SLE groups, opportunity to participate in a research study, etc.

Today's Phonetics Topics

- evolution of language
- phonetic science
- major branches of phonetics
- the International Phonetic Alphabet

Today's Phonetics Required Reading


Today's SLE Topics

- volunteering vs. service learning
- your past volunteer experiences
- positive outcomes of your volunteering
- provide basic information regarding our SLE work
- initial reflection assignment

*I have assigned each student one of the following books to have read by Week 3, as well as to have answered a student-specific set of book-related questions.*


*Due tomorrow, Wednesday, by 5:00 p.m.; hand deliver to Brodahl or email the six documents to me*

- 6 reflective essays on the SLE itself
- Instructions & Essay Questions
Create a single Word document for all 6 essays
Start each essay on a new page
Format is Calibri font, size 12, double spaced
At the top of each essay, write the number of the essay, followed by your Code
Essay 1 B: What about this SLE do you find personally interesting? Why?
Essay 2 B: How do your thoughts about this SLE mesh with ideas you were raised with or topics you have studied?
Essay 3 B: What qualifies as "service" in this particular SLE and setting?
Essay 4 B: By participating in this SLE, what are your intentions?
Essay 5 B: What are your worries and/or fears in participating in this SLE?
Essay 6 B: What strengths and confidences do you bring to this SLE?

Week 1: Thursday

Today's Phonetics Topics

- students placed into teams of 5 for phonetics and Khmer language assignments
- classification of English consonants by articulatory place, manner, and voicing
- classification of Khmer consonants by articulatory place, manner, and voicing

Today's Phonetics Optional Reading


Today's SLE Topics

- taking a close look at service learning
- watch and discuss The Hummingbird Story
- watch and discuss Who Wants to be a Volunteer?
- unpacking today’s readings, including the concepts of white savior industrial complex, voluntourism, benevolent imperialism, mission vacations, paternalism, etc.
- possible unintended harms perpetrated in the name of service learning

Today's SLE Required Readings


Illich, I. (1968, April). To hell with good intentions. Presentation to the Conference on InterAmerican Student Projects (CIASP), Cuernavaca, Mexico.

Continue reading your assigned book and answering your questions.

Assignment Due Tuesday, Week 2

- write a list in your journal of potential harms in the name of service learning
- take at least two implicit bias tests and write your reactions in your journal
- implicit bias tests can be found online at https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit.takeatest.html

Week 2: Tuesday

*Today's Phonetics Topics*

- classification of English vowels by tongue height and advancement
- classification of Khmer vowels by tongue height and advancement
- learning basic phrases in Khmer

*Today's Phonetics Optional Reading*


*Today's SLE Topics*

- discuss student lists of potential harms
- helping vs. serving vs. collaborating
- helping vs. joining
- components, standards, and practices in service learning
- ethics as reflective praxis: combining theory and action
- reactions to implicit bias testing
- watch and discuss Learning Service—Daniela Papi
- watch and discuss Empathy—Brené Brown
- re-write statements from essays using new concepts and language

*Today's SLE Required Readings*


Continue reading your assigned book and answering your questions.
Turn In Today

- list of potential harms in the name of service learning

Assignment Due on Tuesday, Week 3

- Boo book and written responses for half of class

Week 3: Tuesday

Today's Phonetics Topics

- forming groups for Khmer assignment
- learning words and phrases in Khmer

Today's SLE Topics

- your own stereotypes and prejudices about individuals in developing countries: journal a word wall
- half of class will lead discussion of Behind the Beautiful Forevers
- situations of inequality and poverty as portrayed in the book
- relative vs. absolute poverty
- "materially poor"
- situations of poverty and inequality in Cambodia

Turn In Today

- students assigned to read Boo’s book will turn in written responses to their specific questions

Assignment Due on Thursday, Week 3

- Kidder and Mortenson & Relin books and written responses for other half of class
- Journal
  - What did you learn about poverty?
  - Why does it matter?
  - How will you use what you learned?

Week 3: Thursday

Today's Phonetics Topics

- developing your performance in Khmer in group

Today's SLE Topics

- other half of class leading discussion of Strength in What Remains
- history of war and genocide as portrayed in the book
• history of war and genocide in Cambodia

Turn In Today

• students assigned to read Kidder’s book will turn in their written responses
• students assigned to read Mortenson and Relin’s book will turn in their written responses

Assignments Due on Tuesday, Week 4

• watch the movie, Living on $1 a Day, and answer my questions in your journal
  o approximately 50 minutes long
  o can be found on You Tube

Week 4: Tuesday

Today's Phonetics Topics

• practicing your performance in Khmer in group

Today's Phonetics Required Reading


   Chapter 9: Second Language Acquisition, pp. 214-234

Today's SLE Topics

• discuss your response to Living on $1 a Day
• watch They Come in the Name of Helping
• watch Sustainability
• discuss both
• brainstorming your service learning materials and activities

Today's SLE Required Readings


Turn In Today

your responses to Living on $1 a Day

Assignment Due on Thursday, Week 4
• specific ideas for teaching materials for your topic

Week 4: Thursday

Today's Phonetics Topics

• practicing your performance in Khmer in group

Today's SLE Topics

• developing your personal, civic, and academic outcomes for our SLE
• preparing your service learning materials and activities

Today's SLE Required Reading


Chapter 16: Voices of People with Disabilities (PWD) in Vietnam, pp. 257-276

Assignment Due Today

• specific ideas for your teaching topic

Week 5: Tuesday

Today's Phonetics Topic

• refining and practicing your performance in Khmer in group

Today's SLE Topics

• finalizing your personal, civic, and academic goals for our SLE
• preparing your service learning materials and activities

Today's SLE Required Reading

Ethic of Care document

Assignment Due Today

• significant progress on your teaching materials

Week 5: Thursday

Group Presentations Due Today

• performances in Khmer
• explaining your teaching materials

*Turn In Today*

• teaching materials

**WGS 320: Life Writing - Taddy Kalas, Ph.D. - Course Texts**


**SOC 380: Special Topics: Life and Culture of Cambodia - Marsha Smith, Ph.D. - Course Texts**


**ISS 313: Cambodia Culture Seminar – Team Taught – Course Text**

Appendix C

Reflection Essay Prompts

1. What about this service learning experience (SLE) do you find personally interesting? Why?

2. How do your thoughts about this SLE mesh with ideas you were raised with or topics you have studied?

3. What qualifies as “service” in this particular SLE and setting?

4. By participating in this SLE, what are your intentions?

5. What are your worries and/or fears in participating in this SLE?

6. What strengths and confidences do you bring to this SLE?
## Appendix D
### Service Learning Engagement Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Cognitive Perspectives</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Application/Analysis</th>
<th>Evaluate/Create</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Verb markers include:</strong> count, choose, define, describe, draw, find, identify, label, list, name, quote, recall, remember, recite, tell, write, reproduce, select, state</td>
<td><strong>Verb markers include:</strong> act, apply, assess, change, demonstrate, develop, draw, imitate, implement, include, inform, instruct, implement, show, relate, use, analyze, characterize, classify, contrast, correlate, deduce, differentiate, distinguish, examine, illustrate, infer, relate, separate</td>
<td><strong>Verb markers include:</strong> appraise, argue, assess, choose, conclude, critique, decide, defend, evaluate, interpret, predict, rank, select, rate, adapt, collaborate, compose, construct, create, design, initiate, integrate, invent, formulate, generate, modify, organize, perform, produce, revise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service Learning Experience to Personal Area

(References to: personal traits, life events or experiences past, present or future, opinions, beliefs)

- **Answers questions:** What does it mean?, Which one?, What is the best...?, Who/what is...?, Name..., Identify..., Define...

### Service Learning Experience to Civic Area

(References to: group approaches to situations, social characteristics, social fluctuations and action, roles within groups, world views)

- **Answers questions:** What does it mean?, Which one?, What is the best...?, Who/what is...?, Name..., Identify..., Define...

### Service Learning Experience to Academic Area

(References to course concepts, understanding of course material, synthesis of course material and SLE experience, new ideas about course material)

- **Answers questions:** What does it mean?, Which one?, What is the best...?, Who/what is...?, Name..., Identify..., Define...