The idea of citizen service has been given increasing attention as a remedy for problems of civic disengagement. This study reviews 37 empirical studies about the relationship between service and citizenship. A formal model of change is used to guide the review. Six types of citizenship outcomes are discussed: citizenship-related cognitive understanding, citizenship attitudes, citizenship skills, institutional change, philanthropic and civic behaviors, and political behavior. Based on the review, several conclusions are drawn about what is known about the service-citizenship relationship.
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The foundations of democratic society are built on the concept of citizenship. The basic question that all democratic societies must ask, then, is, What does it mean to be a citizen? This question looms large in the U.S. context. Aside from simply understanding the rudiments of government, a citizen is expected to participate in public life. Many institutions and organizations have taken up the task of orienting people, especially youth, toward participation in public life in the United States. An editorial in the Washington Post poignantly articulated the stakes associated with such initiatives: "Civic education feeds a more civically engaged culture. But a culture of civic disengagement may get the civic education it deserves" (Dionne, 1999, p. A29).

The question we address in the present study is, Is there a connection between service and citizenship? The question is central to the field of
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service.¹ Both generalized beliefs about service and specific service programs are predicated on the assumption that service has a favorable influence on citizenship. We review 37 empirical studies, drawn from an extensive service-related bibliographic database, to identify what is known about the relationship between service and citizenship, the quality of extant research, and needs for future research.²

We proceed in five steps. We begin with a discussion of citizenship, which is the dependent variable in the literature review. A brief explanation of the methods used to create our database follows. Next, we turn to specifying a theory of change, that is, how service affects citizenship. These steps set the stage for the process of discussing the literature through several critical lenses. We conclude with reflections on what we know and what remains undiscovered in the service-citizenship relationship.

DEFINING CITIZENSHIP

The outcome or dependent variable in this literature review of service-related research is citizenship. We conceive citizenship as a global construct that represents an array of discrete values, attitudes, and behaviors. This interpretation of the meaning of citizenship is consistent with the mainstream of recent scholarship. In Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics, Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995) observed that voting is “the most basic citizen act.” They proceeded, however, to associate a variety of behaviors with citizenship:

We consider a wide range of activities beyond the vote, activities that vary along several relevant dimensions: work in election campaigns, contributions to campaigns and other political causes, informal activity in local communities, contacts with public officials, affiliation with political organizations, attendance at demonstrations or protests, and service on local governing bodies such as school or zoning boards. (p. 9)

In The New Citizenship, political scientist Craig Rimmerman presented an equally expansive definition of citizenship. Rimmerman (1997) contended that the “new” citizenship “goes well beyond the traditional model of political participation” (p. 5). Rimmerman associated citizenship with traditional forms of political participation, such as initiating a political discussion and attending a political meeting or rally, and with
broader forms of participation, such as grassroots mobilization, community participation, and the Internet. In the literature on democratic theory, citizenship carries both descriptive and normative meanings. Michael Walzer (1970), for example, suggested that “citizens come in kinds and degrees and that all of those men and women legally bound to the state are not in fact morally bound in the same way” (p. 226). Thus, according to Walzer, different kinds of citizens define their moral obligations to the state differently. Barber (1998) echoed Walzer's perspective in his distinction between “thin democracy” and “strong democracy.” The common distinction between liberalism and civic republicanism or communitarianism (Sandel, 1996) is yet another way of modeling different descriptive and normative visions of citizenship.

The scholars whose work is examined in our literature review do not share a unified definition of citizenship. In fact, formal definitions of citizenship are largely absent in the studies of service and its effects. A vast majority of authors forgo formal definitions of citizenship and proceed directly to discussions of the concepts operationalized in their own research. However, there are exceptions to this general rule. As already mentioned, Verba et al. (1995) integrated a formal definition of citizenship into their research. Flanagan, Bowes, Jonsson, Csapo, and Sheblanova (1998) based their analysis of citizenship on Walzer’s (1989) Aristotelian notion that a citizen is a member of a political community. Hajdo (1998) discussed “thick” versus “thin” citizenship. He cited Sandel (1982) as a representative of the former and Taylor (1989) and Barber (1991) in his discussion of the latter. In both of these formalized definitions of citizenship, participation and identity are integral factors. Thick citizenship stresses national identity and extensive participation in civic life, whereas thin citizenship revolves around the protection of personal freedoms and participation in democratic institutions in a more limited scope. Given our reading of the literature and the definitions employed therein, we will define and operationalize individual citizenship-related outcomes along three dimensions.

An individual's motivations and skill. The individual attributes that may affect citizenship behaviors are varied. They might entail individual attitudes, which would include either expressed preference for civic or political involvement or feelings of community attachment and connectedness (Battistoni & Hudson, 1997). Skills and cognitive capacities that facilitate the practice of citizenship may also be understood as indi-
individual attributes. Eyler, Giles, Root, and Price (1997) asserted, for instance, that one outgrowth of service is “improvements in problem solving or more complex understanding of social issues” (p. 2). This change in individual capacity is clearly commensurate with the type of skills that civic republicans have long associated with active citizenship. Other-regarding ethics and values supportive of democratic citizenship (Battistoni & Hudson, 1997) are further manifestations of this individual-attribute dimension of citizenship.

Philanthropic and civic behaviors. This dimension of citizenship involves nonpolitical behaviors that produce public benefits. In their analysis of political participation, Verba et al. (1995) asserted that nonpolitical voluntarism is integral to political participation, which we, in turn, identify with citizenship. They observed that “non-political voluntarism provides a foil illuminating the salient characteristics of political participation and because involvement in the non-political spheres of American voluntary activity can enrich the stockpile of resources relevant to political action” (p. 8). Among the behaviors we associate with this dimension are volunteering in civic associations and charitable giving.

Political behaviors. The third dimension is commensurate with the types of political action we have historically associated with citizenship. Political theorists have frequently differentiated these behaviors along continua of political involvement (Milbrath, 1965), influence, and extensiveness of the message conveyed to policy makers (Verba et al., 1995). Among the behaviors reflective of this dimension are voting, campaign contributions, service on public boards or commissions, and running for public office.

METHOD

The database we employ in this study was developed in several stages between July 1998 and June 1999. Its development involved five tasks: (a) creating search terms, (b) developing the database of service-related research, (c) cleaning the database, (d) assigning keywords to each record, and (e) identifying high-quality records. The precise order in which we performed the tasks is more complex than depicted below, but we have simplified the presentation in the interest of brevity.
CREATING SEARCH TERMS

Our first task was to develop a list of terms that could be used to search the service-related research. The search terms included programs developed in response to national service legislation, such as AmeriCorps, Learn and Serve America, and Volunteers in Service to America, and terms that identified points or entry into service, such as faith-based programs, community-based organizations, and university and college-based programs.\(^3\)

Experience demonstrated the advantages of being expansive and editing the results of the search as necessary. If a restrictive set of search terms is used, it is easy to miss references or even a fruitful line of research because the terminology used by the author in a title, abstract, or list of keywords fails to contain one of the limited search terms. Having determined a broad list of search terms, the next step was to search selected databases to see how well the search terms performed. The search focused on several databases available at Indiana University over the World Wide Web. These included Dissertation Abstracts International, ERIC (education), Education Abstracts, PAIS (public affairs), IPSA (International Political Science Abstracts), SocioFile (sociology), PsycINFO (psychology), and Philanthropic Studies Index.

Our preliminary search proved that the search terms worked well. There was little overlap across the terms, and a wide variety of academic disciplines was represented in the results. However, the search yielded thousands of results, which meant that we had to narrow the number of terms employed. This was accomplished by eliminating those search terms that pulled up an excessive number of records. Other terms were eliminated by scanning the search results and excising those terms that appeared to be ineffective in identifying the research of interest to this project. Although some useful references were surely lost, we are reasonably confident that they were either captured by other search terms or were identified as a result of the subsequent steps taken in constructing the database.

The process of search term development produced a revised list of search terms. A more limited set of databases was then searched using this list of keywords. Education Abstracts was not searched because ERIC appeared to be more inclusive. The Philanthropic Studies Index was not searched at this time because it was difficult to incorporate the search results into a database. This process produced a large, but more manageable, set of records.
The next step was to incorporate the information into a ProCite database. ProCite is a bibliographic database software package that allows one to organize and manage databases containing thousands of references in different formats (e.g., books, journal articles, government documents, conference proceedings). The advantage to using ProCite was the software's ability to import electronic records from other online or CD-ROM databases. The nine bibliographic databases selected for use in the comprehensive scan were Academic Search Elite, Book Where, Dissertation Abstracts International, ERIC, Government Documents, PAIS, IPSA, SocioFile, and PsycINFO. This process of creating databases resulted in the following amount of records from each online source:

- Academic Search Elite: 872
- Book Where: 960
- Dissertation Abstracts International: 500
- ERIC: 2,480
- Government Publications: 100
- IPSA: 70
- PAIS: 625
- PsycINFO: 634
- SocioFile: 878

The nine databases were then merged to create a master database. The vast majority of the records in the database contain detailed abstracts and other information about the reference. Upon creating our own master database, we again conducted scans to obtain a subset of research that focused on empirical investigations of the relationship between service and citizenship. These steps narrowed the number of records to 219. All lower quality research was not eliminated, but it did help to identify those records and original sources that needed to be reviewed in greater depth. For the in-depth review, copies of each of the citations on the final list were obtained and examined in detail. This is the process that led us to the current examination of empirical studies that shed some light on the relationship between service and citizenship.

SPECIFYING A THEORY OF CHANGE

Defining what we mean by citizenship leads logically to another question: By what set of causal processes is service linked to, or influence, citizenship? As we noted earlier, both general beliefs about service and
specific service programs are predicated on the assumption that service is a positive influence on citizenship. In his normative analysis of national service, Azaro (1993) observed, “An ideal, either implicit or explicit, of active citizenship can be found as a constitutive element in every theory or proposal for national service” (p. 234). If we can identify these processes theoretically, then we have a model against which to assess what we know and do not know as a result of service-related research. This model is sometimes referred to as a logic model, process evaluation, or theory of change (Wholey, Hatry, & Newcomer, 1994).

The specific theory of change or logic model we propose consists of five sets of variables that merit consideration in an assessment of the relationships between service and citizenship. These blocks are antecedents, attributes of service, attributes of the server, individual changes, and institutions. The components of the theory of change are summarized graphically in Figure 1.

ANTECEDENTS

Before inquiring about how service acts on individuals to produce citizenship outcomes, which we might presume to be the starting point for a theory of change, it is appropriate to inquire about antecedent conditions that may affect citizenship outcomes. This helps place the role of service into context.

The literature about political participation and citizenship points to several antecedent factors that may profoundly influence outcomes. Verba et al. (1995) identified four intergenerational processes that influence political activity beginning from infancy. These processes are parental education and the socioeconomic path to political activity; parental education and political socialization in the home; parental education and community roots; and parental church attendance, respondent’s church attendance, and community roots. Some of these intergenerational processes, such as the transmission of status via parental education, serve to reinforce the social stratification of political participation, perpetuating patterns over time. These intergenerational processes are not deterministic, however. Janoski and Wilson (1995), using three waves of data from the Youth-Parent Socialization Panel Study, found that family economic status explained self-oriented participation (occupation and profession). Their results also showed that family socialization through example and value modeling, a variable that is perhaps less stable across generations.
Figure 1: Theory of Change for Service-Citizenship Relationships
than economic status, explained community-oriented types of participation (service, church, community, fraternal, and neighborhood).

The antecedents raise two critical issues for a service-citizenship theory of change. One is the extent to which service is an efficient and effective method for either modifying or reinforcing the strong dynamics that operate between generations. The second issue is how service can be influential as a change mechanism in those instances in which the power of intergenerational processes is less compelling.

ATTRIBUTES OF SERVICE

Attributes of the service experience itself are likely to influence whether service affects citizenship. The importance of the attributes of service is manifest in at least two ways in the literature. One is a generalized concern about effective implementation of service programs or initiatives (Corporation for National Service, 1994; Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997). Scholars and practitioners interested in implementation of service programs are typically concerned about the quality of programs and the fidelity of implementation to program logic and goals.

The other way attributes of service are important involves the adequacy of the service experience for developing capacities that promote citizenship (Battistoni & Hudson, 1997; Koulish, 1998; Peters, 1993; Raskoff & Sundeen, 1998; Smith, 1994). Viewpoints about the appropriate instrumentalities for citizenship development are varied. There appears to be a significant gap between scholars who assert that service, by its very nature, promotes citizenship and those who argue that only particular types of service activities nurture citizen development.

Harry Boyte and Nancy Kari's (1996) perspective about "public work" is a counterpoint to the optimistic views about the dividends of service for citizenship. Boyte and Kari contended that community service is usually not designed in ways that "lead students to think broadly about the larger policy dimensions of the problems they confront" (p. 8). The lack of connection to broad policies is not the authors' only criticism of conventional service programs. Boyte and Kari believed the personal language of many service programs seldom signals the reality of effective citizen action:

To learn how to act effectively as citizens, students need to learn that the main point in public life is rarely intimacy or self-expression, protest, or advocacy. Rather it is getting things done through creative, hard, messy public work. (p. 8)
Koulish (1998) sounded a similar concern about the relationship between service program design and citizenship development. He questioned the adequacy of service in community-based organizations (CBOs) as arenas for learning broad lessons of citizenship: “It is wrong-headed to presume that students should gain such broad civic lessons in public responsibility, accountability, and tolerance solely through working in a CBO” (p. 562). Peters (1993) and Raskoff and Sundeen (1998) expressed similar reservations about the appropriateness of service programs for citizenship development.

ATTRIBUTES OF THE SERVER

It is reasonable to assume that individual differences will be an important determinant of how service influences citizenship. Age, for example, is likely to be a factor, because service cannot be expected to influence adolescents in the same ways it may affect young adults. Income and social class are also individual differences likely to affect a variety of factors that are important in the causal chain by which service is related to citizenship.

INDIVIDUAL CHANGES

How does service act on individuals to bring about change, particularly with respect to citizenship outcomes? The ways are probably numerous, but we will focus on three primary mechanisms: intellectual stimulation, socialization, and practice.¹

**Mechanism 1: Intellectual stimulation.** One way service acts on the individual is to present him or her with new situations that stimulate cognitive processes. This form of intellectual stimulation is presumed to produce understanding and civic skills and attitudes (Battistoni & Hudson, 1997).

**Mechanism 2: Socialization.** The process of socialization begins with the family, but it does not end there. Service provides the context for servers to learn citizenship values and behaviors from others. Modeling of participation and tolerance by adults can be influential for transmitting values of democratic citizenship to youth. The process of socialization is not
merely from adults to youth. Citizenship values and behaviors can be transmitted within generations and from youth to adults as well.

*Mechanism 3: Practice.* Another means for learning about citizenship involves what Morse (1993) variously referred to as learning by doing or practice. The practice of citizenship (e.g., involvement in community activities) can produce several types of individual changes. To the extent that practice involves individual capacities that improve with repetition, it can enhance citizenship skills such as negotiation and public speaking. This route to citizen development is consistent with traditional ideas of civic republicanism (Sandel, 1996). Practice also increases the prospect that a server’s agency (Yates & Youniss, 1996)—the ability to see oneself in a new social role—will be enhanced. Battistoni and Hudson (1997) contended that students who have participatory experience in school policies and activities are more likely to exhibit democratic attributes.

**INSTITUTIONAL FILTERS**

Institutions within which citizens operate, such as local communities, the national political system, the voluntary sector, and schools, can be viewed both as antecedents of service and as filters for the effects of service on citizenship. For simplicity, the discussion in the present study treats them as the latter. What is important about institutions is that they provide understandings about prescribed behavior (Ostrom, 1986) and implicit or explicit principles or norms around which actors’ expectations converge (Krasner, 1988). In this capacity as rule-defining and rule-enforcing mechanisms (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1991), institutions can magnify or attenuate the effects of service on citizenship. Although institutions are viewed as highly stable structures, they may also be the direct objects of change through service.

Broad climate variables have been shown to affect the capacity for citizenship to take root. Chavis and Wandersman (1990) demonstrated that sense of community reinforces the community problem-solving abilities individuals acquire. The same logic by which community cohesiveness may be said to be an important antecedent extends to social capital as a contextual influence on the capacity for collaboration in communities (Thomson & Perry, 1998).
SYNTHESIS OF EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

Table 1 summarizes information about each of the 37 studies reviewed. The Source column provides a citation for the entry, and the Outcome Focus column gives keywords that identify the entry’s focus. Sample refers to the group the author(s) studied. n is the number of participants involved in each study. We have made an effort in this column to differentiate between treatment group and control or comparison groups. The Methods column includes two types of information. First, we identified the research design employed in the study. Second, the data collection method, such as surveys or interviews, is listed. In the Type of Service column, we described, where possible, the specific service activity studied. Outcome Variable(s) refers to the dependent variable the author(s) investigated. In some cases we also included the study’s research question. The Major Findings column lists the most noteworthy findings.

Using the three-dimensional definition of citizenship and the theory of change, we identified six categories of outcomes across the 37 empirical studies. They are citizenship-related cognitive understanding, citizenship attitudes, citizenship skills, institutional change, philanthropic and civic behaviors, and political behavior. These are the outcome keywords used in the second column of Table 1. The following discussion is organized around these categories.

CITIZENSHIP-RELATED COGNITIVE UNDERSTANDING

Several studies reported in Table 1 investigated some aspect of cognitive complexity and understanding related to citizenship. Research by Batchelder and Root (1994); Eyler, Giles, Root, and Price (1997); and Yates and Youniss (1996) found a positive relationship between service and some facet of cognitive understanding. Batchelder and Root investigated the complexity of student thinking about social problems in a comparison of two groups of 48 students enrolled in service learning and non-service learning courses. The service-learning group scored significantly higher on uncertainty/resolve and multidimensionality, two measures of complexity of thinking about social problems.

Eyler, Giles, Root, and Price (1997) interviewed college students, both service-learning participants and nonparticipants, in a study of the effects...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Outcome Focus</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Outcome Variable(s)</th>
<th>Major Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aguirre</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes; citizenship skills</td>
<td>AmeriCorps members: 1,800; control group: 750</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest/posttest surveys; control group; interviews; case studies</td>
<td>Included work in education, health and human needs, environmental and neighborhood restoration</td>
<td>Civic involvement; life skills (ability to formulate solutions to social problems)</td>
<td>AmeriCorps experience leads members to future public and community service; AmeriCorps experience led to substantial gains in life skills for more than three quarters of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astin and Sax</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes; Citizenship skills</td>
<td>Undergraduates from 42 institutions with Learn and Serve America, Higher Education (LSAHE) programs</td>
<td>3,450; program participants: 2,309; control group: 1,141</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest surveys; control group</td>
<td>Included work in education, human needs, environment, public safety, and work with the poor and elderly</td>
<td>Life skills (awareness of the world, ability to work cooperatively); attitudes toward civic responsibility; 1997 article: acts of charitable giving; 1996 article: civic responsibility</td>
<td>Participants developed life skills at higher rate than nonparticipants; participants committed to promoting racial understanding, social values, and community-action programs; participants had higher grades and retention rates and greater aspiration for advanced degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1998)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Sample Characteristics</td>
<td>Methodological Details</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astin, Sax, and Avalos (1999)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes; philanthropic and civic behaviors</td>
<td>Students surveyed at times T1, T2, and T3</td>
<td>Surveys; General volunteering; propensity to volunteer at T3</td>
<td>No conclusive evidence that volunteering affects political leaning; undergraduate students develop lasting volunteering behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batchelder and Root (1994)</td>
<td>Citizenship-related; cognitive understanding</td>
<td>Undergraduates from midwestern liberal arts college</td>
<td>Journals; interviews; surveys; Students participated in Head Start and literacy tutoring, among others</td>
<td>Thinking about social problems; Service-learning students demonstrated more complex understanding of social problems than those in the comparison group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berger (1991)</td>
<td>Philanthropic and civic behaviors</td>
<td>Participants aged 18 or older</td>
<td>In-home interviews; surveys; Varying forms of community service</td>
<td>Volunteering and giving; Giving to a particular type of organization can lead to volunteering for that type of organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blyth, Saito, and Berkas (1997)</td>
<td>Philanthropic and civic behaviors</td>
<td>Students in Grades 6 through 12</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest surveys; surveys not randomly assigned; Service-learning activities in environmental, general volunteer work, and political</td>
<td>Social responsibility according to three variables: civic involvement, environmental issues, and service to others; No overall change reported over time regarding intent to help others in the future within service-learning programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Outcome Focus</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Type of Service</td>
<td>Outcome Variable(s)</td>
<td>Major Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brehm and Rahn (1997)</td>
<td>Institutional change</td>
<td>Respondents to the General Social Survey (GSS) of 1972-1994</td>
<td>1,000 to 2,400</td>
<td>Analysis of GSS data; modeling</td>
<td>Civic participation through church and school as well as political and social organizations</td>
<td>Civic engagement, interpersonal trust, and confidence in government</td>
<td>Civic engagement and interpersonal trust are positively related, although civic engagement has stronger effect on interpersonal trust than vice-versa; social capital is on the decline, due in part to high rates of television watching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chavis and Wandersman (1990)</td>
<td>Institutional change</td>
<td>Adult residents of a Nashville neighborhood</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey; longitudinal study; interviews</td>
<td>Local action; participating in block events</td>
<td>Sense of community</td>
<td>Participation in block activities contributed significantly to a sense of community, and the relationship is almost as strong in the opposite direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyler, Giles, and Braxton (1997)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes; citizenship Skills; institutional change</td>
<td>Undergraduates at 30 colleges and universities</td>
<td>Students engaged in service learning courses: 1,136; control group: 408</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest surveys; control group; interviews</td>
<td>Context not specified</td>
<td>Students' skills (political action, issue identification, tolerance communication); citizen confidence (personal effectiveness in the community)</td>
<td>Service learning was a predictor of political participation skills, citizenship values, and confidence in being effective in community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Citizenship-related; cognitive understanding</td>
<td>Undergraduates from six colleges</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest surveys; interviews; classroom experiences comparison group</td>
<td>Varied, but tied to solutions to social problems</td>
<td>Ability to formulate solutions to social problems with greater ease than non-service learning students</td>
<td>Service learning students formulate solutions to social problems with greater ease than non-service learning students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyler, Giles, Root, and Price (1997)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes</td>
<td>Undergraduates enrolled in a philosophy course</td>
<td>Service and reflective section: 28; nonservice section: 29</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest surveys; journals; reflection; interviews; comparison group</td>
<td>Volunteering at a local community agency</td>
<td>Social responsibility (compassion for the disenfranchised of society, commitment to community work)</td>
<td>No greater gains in attitudes of social responsibility for service students than nonservice students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenzel and Leary (1997)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes</td>
<td>Undergraduates enrolled in a philosophy course</td>
<td>Service and reflective section: 28; nonservice section: 29</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest surveys; journals; reflection; interviews; comparison group</td>
<td>Volunteering at a local community agency</td>
<td>Social responsibility (compassion for the disenfranchised of society, commitment to community work)</td>
<td>No greater gains in attitudes of social responsibility for service students than nonservice students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson (1993)</td>
<td>Philanthropic and civic behaviors</td>
<td>High-income households; respondents from general population</td>
<td>Two surveys</td>
<td>Volunteer work, both formal and informal; philanthropic donations</td>
<td>If volunteer work was performed; type of volunteer work; level of volunteer work; level of philanthropic donations</td>
<td>Religious attendance, education, income level, age, and whether recruited all positively affect likelihood of volunteering</td>
<td>Religious attendance, education, income level, age, and whether recruited all positively affect likelihood of volunteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanagan, Bowes, Jonsson, Caupo, and Sheblanova (1998)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes</td>
<td>12- to 18-year-olds; 5,379 mean age = 15.5</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>Varied, usually involved youth organizations, schools, church, or community groups</td>
<td>Civic commitment (propensity to volunteer in community, norm of humanitarianism)</td>
<td>Civic commitment (propensity to volunteer in community, norm of humanitarianism)</td>
<td>Civic commitment (propensity to volunteer in community, norm of humanitarianism)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Outcome Focus</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Outcome Variable(s)</th>
<th>Major Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flanagan et al. (1999)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes; institutional change; philanthropic and civic behaviors</td>
<td>12- to 19-year-olds from Australia, United States, Hungary, Czech Republic, Russia, and Sweden</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>Included work in environmental, church, school-related, or fundraising work through youth organizations</td>
<td>Societal norms determining participation in voluntary activity; attitudes toward voluntary work</td>
<td>Youth service is important in developing social norms and drawing servers to political life; volunteering more common in societies without large social welfare programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford (1994)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes; philanthropic and civic behaviors</td>
<td>Youth volunteers, aged 11 to 18, engaged in summer youth volunteer corps</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest surveys; interviews; site observations</td>
<td>Volunteering in the community (restoring dwellings, cleanup efforts)</td>
<td>Levels of tolerance and empathy; future commitment to community service</td>
<td>Increases not significant from pre-experience to post-experience surveys; participants between ages of 13 and 15, long-term commitment to philanthropic behavior difficult to assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford (1995)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes</td>
<td>Students in five Active Citizenship Today (ACT) projects</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest surveys; comparison group; interviews</td>
<td>Context not specified</td>
<td>Attitudes toward political involvement</td>
<td>Students in the sample who self-identified themselves as ACT participants scored higher on civic participation attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Citizenship-related measures</td>
<td>Sample Description</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles and Eyler (1994)</td>
<td>Human and organizational development at Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>Enrolled in service learning course: 72; completed three surveys: 56</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest surveys; interviews; oral reports; written reports</td>
<td>Social responsibility: (endorsement involvement in the community); attitudes on political activity; social responsibility in a cognitive sense</td>
<td>Participants endorse involvement in community, aspiring to leadership roles, and political participation; participants empathetic to others’ misfortune</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray et al. (1998)</td>
<td>Undergraduates from 42 institutions with LSAHE programs</td>
<td>Students enrolled in service learning courses: 1,378; students not enrolled: 794</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>A wide variety of tasks in the areas of education, health and human needs, environment, and public safety</td>
<td>Civic responsibility: (willingness to help others, promote racial understanding, and influence social values)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray et al. (1999)</td>
<td>Undergraduates from 28 institutions with LSAHE programs</td>
<td>725 service learning students; 597 students in the comparison group</td>
<td>Recent graduates of a service-learning course and a corresponding comparison group were surveyed; self-reporting; self-selection</td>
<td>A wide variety of tasks in the areas of education, health and human needs, environment, and public safety</td>
<td>Civic responsibility (current and expected involvement in addressing social problems, on campus, in service)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
### TABLE 1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Outcome Focus</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Outcome Variable(s)</th>
<th>Major Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hajdo (1998)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes</td>
<td>Maryland members of AmeriCorps</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Pretest and posttest surveys; the pretest was administered after 3 months of service</td>
<td>Included work in education, public safety, and environmental work</td>
<td>Civic virtue; service and citizenship</td>
<td>Favorable attitudes toward service; participants believe that being a good citizen can be met by familial obligations, not necessarily through community or national service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hettman and Jenkins (1990)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes</td>
<td>Ages 18 to 65</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surveys; surveys left for several days at volunteers’ places of work; control group members not necessarily involved in volunteering</td>
<td>Volunteer worked in legal services, health services, and social welfare services</td>
<td>Interest in the interests of others, as measured by Crandall’s Social Interest Scale</td>
<td>Volunteers scored higher on the Social Interest Scale than nonvolunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jastrzab, Masker, Blomquist, and Orr (1996)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes; political behavior</td>
<td>Participants in youth service corps</td>
<td>2,382</td>
<td>Two stages of interviews; control group</td>
<td>Service learning, such as human service work, environmental work, public safety, education</td>
<td>Current and planned community service; voting behavior</td>
<td>Only 4 out of 41 outcomes tested yielded significant results, none of them related to community service/involvement; overall, the impacts of service-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Citizenship Attitudes</td>
<td>Group Description</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Research Focus</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaplan (1997)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes; philanthropic and civic behaviors</td>
<td>People younger than 21 and older than 60</td>
<td>Journals; interviews; testimony from participants</td>
<td>Varied, but geared toward bringing youth and elderly together</td>
<td>Citizen responsibility; community activism; Programs helped build feelings of citizen responsibility and community activism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koliba (1998)</td>
<td>Citizenship-related; cognitive understanding</td>
<td>College students from one university</td>
<td>Case studies; narratives; interviews</td>
<td>Taking part in tutoring and mentoring programs</td>
<td>Learning process within the service-learning environment; Service experiences increased student understanding of issues, but also of theory and society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks (1994)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes; institutional change</td>
<td>Students from 60 independent high schools</td>
<td>Surveys; school records; interviews; classroom observations; field notes; documents</td>
<td>Students worked with homeless individuals</td>
<td>Citizen efficacy and social conscience; Community service participation has a positive and significant effect on citizen efficacy, as long as the number of hours of service is minimal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Outcome Focus</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Type of Service</td>
<td>Outcome Variable(s)</td>
<td>Major Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markus, Howard, and King (1993)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes</td>
<td>Undergraduates at University of Michigan</td>
<td>53 males, 36 females</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest surveys; control group; surveys</td>
<td>Included working at a homeless shelter, women’s crisis center, the Ecology Center</td>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
<td>Students enrolled in service component scored higher in responding to issues concerning social responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melchior (1998)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes</td>
<td>Middle and high school students</td>
<td>Participants in LSAHE: 608; comparison group: 444</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest surveys; comparison group; interviews; observations</td>
<td>Included working with senior citizens, countering teen violence, teen parenting, peer counseling</td>
<td>Personal and social responsibility; service leadership; civic attitudes</td>
<td>Service had a positive impact on personal and social responsibility, service leadership, civic attitudes; 1-year follow-up: positive impact remained in service leadership measure; other impacts were no longer significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan and Streb (2000)</td>
<td>Citizenship-related; cognitive understanding; citizenship attitudes</td>
<td>High school students from 10 schools in five different states</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest surveys; site visits; discussions with participants and teachers</td>
<td>Varied widely, students helped elderly with computing skills, single mothers to plan their budgets</td>
<td>Self-concept: efficacy, personal competence; political engagement: political interest, political action; attitudes toward outgroups: operationalized as elderly, disabled</td>
<td>When students had voice in project creation all three variables increased significantly between pretesting and posttesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Timepoints</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgell (1994)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes</td>
<td>Ninth graders engaged in school based, mandatory service</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest surveys, Varied, but categorized as “helping others” or “improving the community or environment”</td>
<td>Social responsibility, No statistical difference was found from pretest to posttest scores in social responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenthal, Feiring, and Lewis (1998)</td>
<td>Political behavior</td>
<td>White adolescents aged 18 at T1 and aged 21 at T2</td>
<td>105; males: 48; females: 57</td>
<td>Interviews at T1; surveys at T2, Political volunteerism (student government, political action groups); nonpolitical volunteerism (charitable work, social services)</td>
<td>Propensity to engage in political volunteerism, Propensity to volunteer, Social structures more important than events early in life for predicting political volunteerism; adolescents with a family member engaged in voluntary activity and/or belonging to a prosocial organization are more likely to volunteer than their counterparts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandler and Vandegrift (1994)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes</td>
<td>Participants from grades 7 through 12, between 11 and 21 years old</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest surveys, Volunteering within the Connectedness to the community (human services, neighborhood beautification projects, educational activities)</td>
<td>At-risk youth are more disenfranchised from community than non-at-risk youth; gains reported in areas of organizational skills, goal setting, job skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Outcome Focus</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Outcome Variable(s)</th>
<th>Major Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith (1994)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes</td>
<td>Undergraduates from a Catholic liberal arts college</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Direct service, such as tutoring, mentoring, working with senior citizens or the homeless</td>
<td>Civic participation/citizenship</td>
<td>Students denied connection between their service and citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson and Perry (1998)</td>
<td>Institutional change</td>
<td>Informants in five communities</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Telephone survey at T1 and T2; interviews; documents; field visits</td>
<td>Work for community-based organizations through a national service program</td>
<td>Impact of AmeriCorps work on institutional sponsors and communities</td>
<td>AmeriCorps had negligible impacts on the community as a whole but positive impacts on individual organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995)</td>
<td>Philanthropic and civic behaviors; political behavior</td>
<td>Americans of 18 years and older</td>
<td>Phone interviews: 15,053; in-person interviews: 2,517</td>
<td>Telephone interviews followed up by in-person interviews</td>
<td>Political voluntarism</td>
<td>Participation in political activity; participation in nonpolitical voluntary activity</td>
<td>A four-step process, intergenerational in nature and beginning exposure to activities in high school, will predict factors such as income, free time, and finally one's ability to take part in civic life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams (1993)</td>
<td>Citizenship attitudes</td>
<td>High school seniors</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest surveys; control group</td>
<td>Context not specified</td>
<td>Student attitudes toward social and personal responsibility</td>
<td>At 10 hours of service, no difference in attitudes between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yates and Youniss (1996)</td>
<td>Citizenship-related; cognitive understanding</td>
<td>High school juniors from a northeastern parochial school</td>
<td>Analysis of a series of reflective essays</td>
<td>Students worked four times in a soup kitchen</td>
<td>Transcendent thinking resulting from service</td>
<td>Service can stimulate higher order thinking; service activities can compel youth to think about politics and morality in society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yates and Youniss (1998)</td>
<td>Citizenship-related; cognitive understanding; philanthropic and civic behaviors</td>
<td>Students and alumni from a Catholic high school</td>
<td>Students: 160; alumni: 121</td>
<td>Pretest/posttest surveys; reflection; discussion groups; observations</td>
<td>Students volunteered in the community soup kitchen</td>
<td>Understanding service in political terms</td>
<td>Service encouraged reflection on personal agency and government responsibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Incorporates Sax and Astin (1997); see also Gray et al. (1996).
b. Includes Leary (1994).
c. See also Jastrzab, Blomquist, Masker, and Orr (1997).
of service learning on their abilities to formulate solutions to social problems. They concluded that students exposed to service learning were better able to formulate solutions to social problems than those who were not exposed. Yates and Youniss (1996) found a similarly positive association between service learning and what they termed transcendent thinking, that is, the ability to perceive the social world in more complex and abstract ways. They studied a sample of 132 high school juniors participating in mandatory, school-based service programs, which sets their sample apart from the others in Table 1, which used college students.

Although the findings in Eyler, Giles, Root, and Price (1997) and Yates and Youniss (1996) supported a service-cognitive understanding relationship, limitations of their methods merit noting. Eyler, Giles, Root, and Price relied solely on interview data and used no systematic comparison group. Yates and Youniss employed no comparison group.

A fourth study about cognitive understanding, by Giles and Eyler (1994), found no differences between service learning and non-service learning students in pretests and posttests of social responsibility. It can be differentiated from the other studies on two counts. First, social responsibility was defined in terms of reduction in stereotypes and development of empathy, which distinguishes it from the cognitive understanding variables in the other studies. Second, and perhaps more important, the service learning experience was limited to 8 weeks of volunteering 3 hours per week. Thus, the lack of intensity of the service experience (Yates & Youniss, 1996) could account for the null finding.

One of the variables that Morgan and Streb (2000) tested for was attitudes toward out-groups. They found that when students were given a voice in creating service-learning projects, positive attitudes toward the out-groups they were serving increased.

**CITIZENSHIP ATTITUDES**

More research has been conducted about citizenship-related attitudinal outcomes of service than any other outcome. Although the attitudinal outcomes investigated are not uniform, most of the outcome variables measure either civic or social responsibility. A few of the studies (e.g., Giles & Eyler, 1994; Hajdo, 1998) investigated political alienation.

The results from these studies are about evenly divided between positive and null findings. One study (Fenzel & Leary, 1997) reported both positive and negative effects. Because three of the studies reporting positive results in the table used the same database (Astin & Sax, 1998; Gray
et al., 1996; Sax & Astin, 1997), a simple count of the positive versus no-effect studies overstates the positive results. Morgan and Streb (2000), in their study of 210 high school students, demonstrated that attitudinal measures of political engagement increase significantly when students are permitted to take part in the design of the service-learning program.

Several large-sample, multiorganizational studies found positive relationships between service and citizenship attitudes. In a study of 3,450 college freshmen as part of the 1st-year evaluation of Learn and Serve America, Higher Education (LSAHE), Gray et al. (1996) reported positive effects of service on civic responsibility. Using the same database, Sax and Astin (1997) and Astin and Sax (1998) found similar positive results. Astin and Sax reported that all 12 civic-responsibility outcomes they used were positively correlated with service. Eyler, Giles, and Braxton (1997) surveyed more than 1,500 students at 30 colleges and universities. They found significant effects for increases in citizen confidence, a scale that consists of items similar to those used in the LSAHE evaluations.

Large sample, multiorganizational studies by Jastrzab, Masker, Blomquist, and Orr (1996) and Ford (1994, 1995) found no significant relationships between service and citizenship attitudes. Two of these studies (Ford, 1994; Jastrzab et al., 1996) focused on youth corps. Only 4 of 41 outcomes measured in Jastrzab et al. yielded significant results, but none of them involved citizenship outcomes. Ford's (1994) preservice and postservice survey of 514 participants in summer youth volunteer corps found no significant changes in tolerance or empathy toward others. In a study of 1,322 middle and high school students, Ford (1995) investigated attitudes toward political involvement. She found no attitudinal changes as a result of the service-learning experience.

The types of service (service learning, youth corps, direct service), sample sizes, and sample composition (high school, college, nonschool) investigated in the large, multiorganizational studies discussed above vary widely. The variations among a small number of studies make it difficult to identify consistent patterns that might account for the opposing results. One possible pattern may be effects from a combination of the type of service and composition of the servers. The studies that achieved positive results investigated college-level students involved in service learning. The no-effect studies involved noncollege samples (mainly high school-aged students) engaged primarily in youth corps. A combination of more controlled conditions associated with service learning and a more mature sample of servers could account for the variations in results. Although this
explanation is only conjecture, it is a type of moderating effect on the outcomes of service that merits future study.

Another factor that may account for the variations in outcomes across the studies in Table 1 is differences in the outcome measure. The measures of social or civic responsibility varied. Some of the studies measured attitudes more directly related to community involvement (e.g., “help the community,” “help society as a whole,” “fulfill civic responsibility”), and others measured attitudes more directly related to political involvement (e.g., interest in politics, political alienation). It is conceivable that respondents are sensitive to small variations in survey items that cannot readily be ascertained based on the reports by the investigators. Furthermore, social desirability bias is a distinct possibility that may further confound the analysis of the types of attitudes investigated in these studies.

CITIZENSHIP SKILLS

The amount of research concerning citizenship skills is surprisingly small. In fact, only three studies that examine citizenship skills are summarized in Table 1. The small number of studies may be an artifact of how we have defined citizenship skills or our search process. It is conceivable, for example, that research about service and skill acquisition is available but largely divorced from the types of search terms we used to assemble this specialized citizenship database.

The samples used for the studies in the table were large and multiorganizational. Eyler, Giles, and Braxton (1997) found that service learning had a positive influence on student interaction with faculty. They also concluded that service improved political participation skills. Sax and Astin (1997) found positive relationships between participation in service learning and several skills, including interpersonal skills, ability to work cooperatively, conflict resolution, and critical thinking.

Although there is a paucity of research to report, the service-skill relationships are consistent with expectations derived from our theory of change. It is also worth noting that the positive results emanate from service-learning programs or institutions affiliated with LSAHE.

INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

As we noted earlier, service is directed at changing individuals, but it is also directed at changing institutions. For example, service learning is
viewed by many as both a pedagogy and an approach to school reform. Service learning is perceived not only as a way to enhance understanding of academic subjects but also as a better and more democratic way to connect students to faculty and schools to their surrounding communities. Thus, it is appropriate to consider research about institutional change along with research about individual change when assessing citizenship-related outcomes.

Institutional change may pose the greatest challenge to scholars studying the outcomes of service. As we noted earlier, institutions are relatively permanent structures that are typically difficult and slow to change. Thus, attempting to measure institutional change and attribute causality to service is a daunting task.

Six studies addressed some aspect of institutional change. Only one of the studies, that of Thomson and Perry (1998), was explicitly evaluative. These authors sought to assess the impact of AmeriCorps on institutional sponsors and communities. Although they identified positive impacts on organizations, the effects of AmeriCorps on the community as a whole were negligible.

The other studies in the table were less self-consciously directed toward the relationship between a service program and institutional change. Eyler, Giles, and Braxton (1997) found that service learning altered social processes in 30 colleges and universities they studied. Faculty-student interaction was enhanced as a by-product of service learning. Furthermore, students who felt their studies and their service were connected felt more connected to the community.

Flanagan et al.’s (1999) study investigated issues of the interaction between social institutions in a comparative study of seven countries. One of the questions their research addressed is that of the relationship between a strong welfare state and voluntarism. They cited the relatively low level of voluntarism to illustrate the negative effect that a strong welfare state can have on voluntarism. This judgment is based on modest information about volunteering in each country and does not explore possible alternative explanations. Another issue the authors addressed is the importance of youth service in helping to develop social norms and drawing people to political life. The connection between service and developing an orientation toward political life is not demonstrated by their empirical results, though. The authors stated that this could be attributable to the youths’ rather narrow conceptions of what political activity means in the various countries.
PHILANTHROPIC AND CIVIC BEHAVIORS

These citizenship behaviors can be broken into two categories: relationships between (a) volunteering and giving and (b) service involvements over time. Nine studies that investigated these outcomes are summarized in the table.

The most rigorous research about the relationship between volunteering and giving emanates from the annual survey of college freshmen by University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). In a study of LSAHE institutions, Sax and Astin (1997) found a significant relationship between undergraduate service and charitable donations. Consistent with the Sax and Astin findings, Ferguson (1993) found a slightly positive relationship between volunteering and donations. Berger (1991) also concluded that there is a relationship between volunteering and giving. His study reversed the causal ordering, however, suggesting that giving leads to volunteering rather than the reverse. In addition, both Ferguson and Berger suggested that volunteering and giving may be motivated by different or independent factors. Berger contended, for instance, that moral commitment is a common underlying reason that motivates individuals to engage in charitable activities and volunteer.

The pattern of findings for service involvements over time is more difficult to interpret. The most compelling evidence about the relationship again emanates from longitudinal research conducted by the Astin group at UCLA. Astin, Sax, and Avalos (1999) surveyed 12,376 students at four points in time over a 10-year period. They looked at the propensity to volunteer, that is, the likelihood that an individual will volunteer. The study looked at the propensity to volunteer over time by comparing volunteering as an undergraduate with volunteering 5 years after college. Astin et al. found a positive relationship between an individual's willingness to volunteer during college and 5 years later. They concluded that volunteering, for whatever reason, is a behavior that is sustained over time.

Either the outcome variables are less clearly drawn or the methodology is less defensible, making the other studies about volunteering over time less persuasive. Blyth, Saito, and Berkas (1997) reported mixed results about the contributions of service-learning programs to youth civic-involvement rates. The outcome, civic involvement, is not clearly defined and operationalized. The evidence they presented does not entirely support this conclusion. Kaplan's (1997) finding that intergenerational community service programs contributed to building community activism is difficult to sustain based on the seven-site, single-program case study that
he investigated. Thus, several of the studies that investigated civic behaviors are not sufficiently rigorous to draw valid inferences from.

POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

Despite the centrality of traditional forms of political participation to our understanding of citizenship, they have received almost no attention in research on service. The only high-quality research studies that investigated political behavior were those of Jastrzab et al. (1996); Rosenthal, Feiring, and Lewis (1998); and Verba et al. (1995), all of which are summarized in the table. They studied whether service learning had any effect on voting behavior and found no significant relationship. No research has been directed at political behavior other than voting, such as campaign contributions, service on public boards or commissions, and running for public office.

WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT HOW SERVICE AFFECTS CITIZENSHIP?

Based on the research summarized in the table and reviewed above, what can we say we know about how service affects citizenship? The limited number of studies makes generalization risky. We present these summary statements, therefore, with the caveat that they are as close as we can presently come to definitive statements.

Service appears to influence favorably citizenship-related cognitive understanding. Three of four studies that investigated the server’s cognitive understanding of society as an outcome produced positive results. This generalization comes with a caveat. Service learning was the type of service in all three of the positive studies we reviewed (and summarized in the table). Thus, although the limited research produced consistent results, the generalization may not be robust over different types of service programs.

Service and volunteering appear to positively influence later giving and volunteering. The correlation between volunteering and later giving, and volunteering over time, is consistently positive. At the same time, we are not highly confident of this generalization for two reasons. First, there has been little systematic research about these issues since 1990. Second,
we do not readily understand the reasons for the positive correlations—in other words, the question of why.

*The type of service that produces the most consistent positive results is service learning.* Systematic research about outcomes across types of service is lacking. Based on patterns we observed in conducting the review, it is our impression that service learning may be the most reliable type of service. The ability to better control conditions associated with service learning and to formalize a process of reflection may account for its higher reliability. It is important to bear in mind that this generalization involves a relative rather than an absolute observation. Many of the studies reviewed, some that involved service learning, found no effects from service. In a particularly interesting finding, Morgan and Streb (2000) demonstrated that allowing students to take an active role in designing service projects can positively boost outcomes.

**WHAT QUESTIONS ARE UNANSWERED?**

*Research about citizenship skills and behaviors, particularly political behavior, has largely been neglected in studies of service.* Given the centrality of active citizenship in most theories of and proposals for service, the paucity of research about citizenship outcomes, particularly behaviors, is noteworthy. Part of the explanation for the paucity of behavioral research resides with the dominance of attitudinal research. As we observed in the in-depth review of service-citizenship research, more research has been conducted about attitudes than about the other five categories of outcomes we reviewed. The psychology of service is, in many respects, the most easily accessed outcome of service. Attitudinal outcomes such as self-esteem and civic responsibility interest many scholars and practitioners. They can also be readily measured. Acknowledgment of these strong incentives to study the psychology of service—largely to the exclusion of other types of outcomes—might be the starting point for the scholarly and philanthropic community to launch alternative research programs.

An extension of the need for more behavioral research is the need to investigate why the attitudes → behavior link in the theory of change is attenuated. Is the attenuation a result of service-learning pedagogy that does not translate into enough hands-on experience (Ford, 1995)? Or is it a
function of institutions that do not reinforce service experiences? Or is the attenuation explained by something else?

_The research sheds little light on the relationship between the attributes of service and citizenship outcomes._ We noted earlier that there appears to be a significant gap between scholars and practitioners who assert that service, by its very nature, promotes citizenship and those who argue that only particular types of service activities nurture citizen development. Relatively little research has been directed at resolving these divergent perspectives. Markus, Howard, and King (1993) asserted that the apolitical or antipolitical nature of many service programs demands more careful attention to the controversy about how service inculcates citizenship values and behaviors. Markus et al.'s concern is sufficiently widespread and central to service as a social enterprise (see also Boyte, 1991; Serow, 1991) that it merits attention in future research.

_Characteristics of the server and attributes of service are important moderators of outcomes that merit more research._ We conjectured earlier that variations in results across attitudinal studies may have been a product of both the characteristics of servers and attributes of service. As the field of service matures, it will be important to develop answers to questions about the interactions among service, server, and outcomes. More systematic research needs to be conducted about the characteristics of the server and the attributes of service.

**NOTES**

1. We use the term _service_ throughout to refer to a range of phenomena from traditional volunteering to more recent forms of intensive, stipend-paying services such as AmeriCorps.

2. The bibliography consisted of almost 1,000 research articles, books, and reports published since 1990. For information about the development of the bibliographic database and its contents, see Perry, Imperial, Matsey, Katula, & Beckfield (1999).

3. This latter set of search terms was recommended by the Grantmaker Forum Research Task Force.

4. This block of the logic model is conceptually parallel to three developmental concepts used by Yates and Youniss (1996). Their concepts are agency, social relatedness, and moral-political awareness.

5. The convention we are using for the logic model is to treat proximate variables such as an individual's parents and family (e.g., family socialization, socioeconomic status) as antecedents and more distant factors such as community power structure as institutional filters.
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