THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF VISUAL ARTS, THEATRE, AND DANCE

ARTISTICALLY SERVING: A STUDY OF LAKE COUNTY'S

ARTS-BASED SERVICE-LEARNING PROGRAM

by

Min Cho

A Dissertation submitted to the
Department of Art Education
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Degree Awarded:
Summer Semester, 2006

The members of the Committee approve the dissertation of Min Cho defended on July 6, 2006.

_____
Pat Villeneuve
Professor Directing Dissertation

_____
Sande Milton
Outside Committee Member

_____
Marcia Rosal
Committee Member

_____
John Bruno
Committee Member

Approved:

_____
Marcia Rosal, Chair, Department of Art Education

_____
Sally McRorie, Dean, School of Visual Arts and Dance

The Office of Graduate Studies has verified and approved the named committee members.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

ABSTRACT

This study explored the usage of service learning with visual art teachers in Lake County, Florida, and used the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) as the conceptual framework. Data were gathered using CBAM's three diagnostic tools: the Stages of Concern (SoC), Levels of Use (LoU), and Innovation Configuration (IC) to understand teachers' concerns of, usage levels with, and curricular configurations of service learning. The findings indicated that visual art teachers in Lake County are at various stages of concern and usage levels of service learning. Their project profiles also varied, depending on their participation in the district-wide project or school-specific projects. The District's unique service-learning delivery method, which relied on students in service-learning classes to act as service-learning coordinators, can be seen as one of the underlying reasons for the fluctuation in teacher concerns, usage levels, and project profiles.
.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Service learning is an emerging educational innovation that integrates community service into the academic curriculum. Over the past two decades, many educators have embraced this pedagogy as research has shown that it has positive academic, behavioral, and affective outcomes (Follman, 1998; Weiler, et al., 1998). With increased federal and state support to implement service learning, the number of schools including it as part of their curricula seems to be on a rise (National Center for Education Statistics, 1999). However, the number of teachers actually implementing service learning only rests at 6.6% (Toole, 2002).

Little information is available on the impact and role of classroom teachers' experiences with service learning (Siegel, 1995; Shumer, 1994). Less is known about art teachers who integrate this pedagogy. This dissertation addressed this issue by examining a group of visual art teachers in one Florida school district. It used quantitative and qualitative measures to focus on their concerns with and usage levels of service learning as well as to provide operational patterns characterizing their different uses of this educational innovation.

Background

The push for large-scale educational reform in the United States involves several major catalysts: the progressive period, the launching of Sputnik, and globalization. The progressive period, occurring pre-1950s, embraced a strong intellectual and practical base to change educational pedagogy. Progressive reformers such as John Dewey espoused and developed ideas for how to change schools and classrooms noting that teachers would embrace good ideas on their own (Fullen, 2001).

In 1957, the Russians launched Sputnik, the first successful artificial satellite. For some, this action was seen as Russian superiority in producing advanced education students. Many in the United States saw Sputnik as a failure in our schools to successfully educate our students, spurring the federal government to begin focusing on what and how teachers taught. In the late 1950s and throughout the 1960s, the U.S. federal government launched a series of large-scale national curriculum reform initiatives in physics, biology, and social sciences in addition to implementing organizational innovations such as open-plan schools, flexible scheduling, and team teaching. Reform efforts were underway (Fullen, 2001).

From the early 1970s to the present, the United States began evolving from an industrial age into an informational age and economy. Where children and young adults were once viewed as labor for mass production of goods and services, they now needed different skill sets. The explosion of technology in the late twentieth century has redefined the level of intellectual skills and functions students must now have in order to successfully compete in the ever-expanding information-processing global economy (Kiernan & Pyne, 1993).

Many researchers conducted studies that indicate our education system is not producing the highly trained and intellectual students needed for today's economy and that reform efforts are not working. The 1983 publication of <u>A Nation At Risk</u> by the National Commission on Education claimed that the unchallenged preeminence the United States once enjoyed in science, technology, and commerce and industry was now at risk of falling to other countries (National Commission of Excellence in Education, 1983). *America 2000*, a reform document that called for a set of national education goals, stated that the situation had not changed from 1983 (Rozycki, 1995). The most recent attempt at national reform legislation is the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 that requires states to test specified subjects and grades; establish minimum performance standards for students, schools, and school districts; and provide assistance to and impose sanctions on schools and school districts that do not perform to standards (Goertz, 2005).

Despite such initiatives, there is a possible reason that may explain the unsuccessful reform efforts: absence of change at the level of the classroom. The idea of integrating reform was more difficult than anticipated. Local curricular issues were complex, political relationships with commercial textbook designers pre-existed, and teachers received little or no incentives to alter their curricula. Teachers did not adopt educational innovations or assimilate parts to fit their current models. Legislation can set mandates, and superintendents and districts can provide visions; however, curricular changes at the classroom level begins with the teacher (Fullen, 2001). For significant change to occur, educational innovations must align with teachers' personal beliefs and pedagogical preference (Nash, 2002). One educational innovation that has received national attention within the past 15 years is service learning (Learn and Serve America, 2006).

Problem Statement

Since its early emergence in the 1970s, service learning is a growing area of interest to educators. With philosophical roots from John Dewey (Hatcher, 1997) and pedagogical

foundations harking to Paulo Freire (Cone & Harris, 1990) and experiential education (Association for Experiential Education, 2005), service learning incorporates community service into the academic curriculum. Similar to community service, it advocates for students to engage in service to their community. However, service learning integrates learning goals with the service and intentionally provides an avenue for thoughtful reflection. Though some researchers suggest that service learning has roots in prior national service movements from over half a decade ago (Stanton, et al., 1999), it has been only in the last decade that legislative reform efforts have placed emphasis on increasing students' involvement with their local communities (Skinner & Chapman, 1999).

The National and Community Service Act of 1990 and the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 provided support for service-learning activities in elementary and secondary schools (Corporation for National Service, 1999). For the 2005-2006 fiscal year, the federal government's budget for K-12 service learning was $40 million, with each state having the opportunity to apply for these funds.

The trend to implement service learning seems to be on a rise. In 1984, less than 10% of high schools offered some type of service-learning program, but by 1999, almost one-half of high schools had students participating. Overall, teachers include service learning in 25% of elementary schools, 38% in middle schools, and 46% of high schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 1999). With a closer look, though, at the number of teachers actually using service learning, the figures are less impressive; only 6.6% of U.S. teachers in K-12 schools are implementing service learning *(*Toole, 2002*).* With reports and studies on school reform endorsing service learning as a pedagogical method for school improvement and community engagement (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989; William T. Grant Foundation, 1991), with increased state and district support for implementation, and with an increasing number of schools requiring service as a graduation requirement, the question is why more schools are not implementing service learning. More specifically, if the success of a service-learning project depends on the skill, knowledge, and creativity of the classroom teacher (Nathan & Kielsmeier, 1991), what concerns do teachers have when implementing service learning? For those that do initiate such projects, what does service learning look like in their classrooms?

Purpose of the Study

This study determined the levels of concern of Lake County art teachers toward implementing service learning. It also showed their levels of use in implementing service learning and described elements of arts-based service-learning integration.

For this study, I utilized the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) methodology that conceptualizes and facilitates the education change process (Hall & Hord, 2001). I used three instruments: the Stages of Concern Questionnaire, the Innovation Configuration Checklist, and the Levels of Use of an Innovation. These instruments provided data on initial stages of concern and levels of use as well as the particular configuration of the innovation in use.

Research Questions

The three major research questions addressed in this study are:

1. At what stage, as determined by the Stages of Concern, are visual art teachers in Lake County?
2. What are the levels of use of art teachers who implement service learning in their curricula?
3. What descriptive configurations of the projects exist among the teachers who are currently implementing service learning?

Significance of the Study

Researchers have typically focused on the impact of service learning on youth, schools, and communities (Learningindeed, 2001). However, only a handful have addressed the classroom teacher's role or experiences with service-learning implementation (Seigel, 1995; Shumer, 1994; Wade, 1997, Ammon et al., 2002). Since service learning is compatible with many disciplines, much information from the teacher perspective is becoming available in the fields of science, environmental education, social studies, and reading (Florida Learn & Serve, 2006). However, a review of the literature shows very little research in art education, and especially of K-12 art teachers. As seen from the past 8 years of conference presentations at the National Art Education Association, 23 sessions focused on service learning with only 2 relating directly to K-12 art education. From 1998 to 2002, the majority of the presentations focused on pre-service teacher education, but within the past 3 years, the presentations concentrated on research and project descriptions. These figures provide good indications that the integration of service learning into arts education is slowly gaining attention by researchers and practitioners.

At the state level, Florida Learn & Serve is the statewide entity that disseminates service-learning funds to K-12 schools and school districts (Florida Learn & Serve, 2006). A review of the program grantee database from 2000-2005 reveals that 452 schools received funds directly to implement service learning. Of those 452, only 65 were arts-based or included the arts as part of their overall project. In addition, from 2002-2005, Florida Learn & Serve annually conducted arts-specific service-learning conferences hoping, to attract more art teachers to this pedagogy. Although attendance grew by 20% annually, the number of arts-based grant applications to Florida Learn & Serve declined during this period (Florida Learn & Serve, 2006).

Several studies have explored the topic of service learning and teacher engagement. Toole (2002) focused on the effects of teachers' instructional mental models and professional learning communities using surveys, interviews, and focus groups. Nash (2002) utilized case studies of four teachers who engaged in school-based service learning. Billig and Furco (2002), however, state that there is a paucity of research on K-12 service learning: most findings are descriptions or anecdotes, and measurement tools utilized are often unvalidated and untested for reliability. Finally, triangulation of data frequently is not performed.

Furthermore, two leading service-learning researchers, S. Billig (personal communication, September, 2005) and J. Toole (personal communication, September, 2005), have communicated that to their knowledge, no published study on service learning using the CBAM methodology exists. Therefore, this study has made contributions to the general field of service learning by 1) adding new knowledge from the art field, 2) utilizing a quantitative instrument that has been tested for reliability and validity, 3) adhering to triangulation of qualitative data, and 4) providing a template for other service-learning studies to replicate using a new methodology.

Delimitations and Limitations

From 2000-2005, an average of 11 Florida schools per year participated in arts-based service-learning projects (Florida Learn & Serve, 2006). Due to turnover in school personnel, limited state funding for service-learning projects, and non-renewal of some arts projects, selection of subjects for this study was limited to the school district that has consistently incorporated arts-based service learning, Lake County. However, permission from the district, principals, as well as all of the K-12 visual arts teachers was granted to participate in this study.

Therefore, this study's finding cannot be broadly generalizable to teachers in other districts or states.

Hall and Hord (1987) suggest that ideally, researchers should observe changes over a 3-5 year period. A limitation, then, is that this study only provided a quick glance at implementation efforts.

Definition of Terms

Concern – "The composite representation of the feelings, preoccupation, thought, and consideration given to a particular issue or task" (Hall, George, & Rutherford, 1998, p. 5).

Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) – "Diagnostic tools for assessing where the individual members of an organization are in relation to the adoption of an innovation" (Hall, George, & Rutherford, 1998, p. 4).

Innovation – A product or process that produces or is the focus of change in teaching and learning to facilitate student outcomes.

Innovation Configuration – One method of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model that shows the "operational patterns of the innovation that result from implementation by different individuals in different contexts" (Heck, Stiegelbauer, Hall, & Loucks, 1981, p. 1).

Levels of Use – One method of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model that explores behaviors and portrays how people are acting with respect to specified change (Hall & Hord, 2001).

Service Learning – Kendall's (1990) literature review unearthed 147 different terms and definitions relating to service learning. For this study, service learning refers to school-based learning projects where students apply curricula and classroom learning through hands-on service projects they help design. The service must meet a real need and is both a means and an application of learning. Activities are related directly to important learning goals and are designed to apply specific learning objectives linked to state education standards.

Stages of Concern – One method of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model that describes developmental patterns as to how our feelings and perceptions evolve as the change process unfolds (Hall & Hord, 2001).

Summary

The impetus for education reform in the United States stemmed from various causes: a paradigm shift in philosophical thought, technological advances, and Cold War competition. These catalysts spurred the United States government to examine and assess what curricula was taught in our classrooms and how it was delivered. National studies and publications have reaffirmed that the unchallenged preeminence once enjoyed by the United States was now in jeopardy of falling to other countries. Despite implementation of large-scale national educational reform efforts in response, the situation remains the same.

A possible explanation for the unsuccessful reform efforts lies with the absence of change at the classroom level. In order for change to occur, teachers must first adopt the educational innovation or assimilate parts to alter their curricula. Service learning is an example of an educational innovation that has been gaining interest with educators. Based on ideas from theorists such as John Dewey (Hatcher, 1997) and Paulo Freire (Cone & Harris, 1990), service learning incorporates community service into the academic curriculum with intentional structured time for reflection. Since service learning is multi-disciplinary and cross-curricular, much research has been conducted in various disciplines, however, few studies focus on visual arts.

Therefore, for the purpose of this study, I utilized the Concerns-Based Adoption Model as my conceptual framework to quantitatively show teachers' levels of concern toward, and usage levels while, implementing service learning. Through mixed-methods, I also described different operational patterns of arts-based service-learning integration.

This dissertation consists of an introduction, literature review, methodology, results, and conclusion. The introduction is comprised of a study overview, research questions, definition of terms, purpose, and significance. The literature review focuses on an overview of service learning, background of Hall and Hord's CBAM methodology (2001), studies concentrating on teachers' experiences with service learning, and studies using CBAM as a conceptual framework. The methodology chapter outlines the research design, data collection, data analysis, and reporting procedures.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Many published service-learning articles focus on impacts on students' personal and social responsibility, civic engagement, and academic learning (Weiler, et al., 1998; Morgan & Streb, 1999; Anderson, et al., 1991). However, there is little research on teacher engagement in service learning (Siegel, 1995; Shumer, 1994). As the success of a service-learning project is dependent on the skill, knowledge, and creativity of classroom teacher (Nathan & Kielsmeier, 1991), more research needs to be conducted on this topic. As a result, this section examines the pedagogy and conceptual framework that undergirds this study. A review and understanding of service learning, the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM), teachers' experiences with service learning, and studies using the CBAM framework is therefore necessary.

Service Learning History

Although the term "service learning" was first coined in 1967 (Sigmond, 1990; Southern Regional Educational Board, 1973), it has roots in prior national service movements such as land-grant colleges and universities, settlement house education, and Progressive Initiatives (Stanton, et al., 1999). Some service-learning researchers, however, would state that the notion of national service actively emerged during the New Deal Era under President Franklin D. Roosevelt through the creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps. President Roosevelt also enacted the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, popularly known as the GI Bill. This bill was developed to link service and education, offering World War II Veterans of the United States Armed Forces educational opportunities in return for the service to their country. In 1961, President John F. Kennedy established the Peace Corps, a federal agency working to promote a better relationship between the United States and the rest of the world. The presidential successor, Lyndon Johnson, expanded Kennedy's notion of the Peace Corps by creating Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), a domestic Peace Corps designed to place volunteers in community organizations to become catalysts for community change (APCO Associates, 1999).

In 1990, President George H. W. Bush created the Office of National Service and the Points of Light Foundation to foster volunteering. That same year, Congress passed and President Bush signed into law the National Community Service Act authorizing grants to schools to support service-learning (Learningindeed, 2001).

In a 1999 survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Education, statistics showed that 64% of all public schools and 83% of all public high schools organize some form of community service for their students. Nearly a third of all schools and half of public high schools provide service-learning programs, in which the service that is being provided is linked with the school curriculum (National Center for Education Statistics, 1999).

Service-Learning Definition and Principles

From the initial branding of service-learning terminology, the field has focused more on principles of good practice in combining service with learning than formulating an agreed-upon definition (Honnet & Poulsen, 1989, Kendall & Associates, 1990, Sigmon, 1990). The findings from the 1990 and subsequent 1993 National and Community Service Acts further reflect national engagement in the search for a consensus-based definition (Giles & Eyler, 1994). The latter (CNCS, 1993) provided the following definition:

A service-learning program provides educational experiences:

a. under which students learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service experiences that meet actual community needs and that are coordinated in collaboration with school and community;

b. that are integrated into the students' academic curriculum or provides structured time for a student to think, talk, or write about what the student did and saw during the actual service activity;

c. that provide a student with opportunities to use newly-acquired skills and knowledge in real-life situations in their own communities; and

d. that enhance what is taught in school by extending student learning beyond the classroom and into the community and helps to foster the development of a sense of caring for others (p. 5).

Kendall's (1990) literature review unearthed 147 different terms and definitions relating to service-learning, with most advocating an emphasis of the importance of a reflective component where students utilize higher-order critical thinking skills to create understanding and internalize the combination of formal learning with the service experience (Kraft, 1996). However, all the definitions espoused a central belief that is included in the preamble of the Wingspread Special Report (1989) that service combined with learning creates a unique symbiotic relationship. This report, composed by a national gathering of service-learning

practitioners and published by the Johnson Foundation, outlines 10 principles that provide essential components for good practice. The resulting model is one that:

1. Engages people in responsible and challenging actions for the common good.
2. Provides structured opportunities for people to reflect critically on their service experience.
3. Articulates clear service and learning goals for everyone involved.
4. Allows for those with needs to define those needs.
5. Clarifies the responsibilities of each person and organization involved.
6. Matches service providers and service needs through a process that recognizes changing circumstance.
7. Expects genuine, active, and sustained organizational commitment.
8. Includes training, supervision, monitoring, support, recognition, and evaluation to meet service and learning goals.
9. Insures that the time commitment for service and learning is flexible, appropriate, and in the best interests of all involved.
10. Is committed to program participation by and with diverse populations (Honnet & Poulsen, 1989).

Service-Learning Theories

Service learning is a method by which young people learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully-organized service experiences (ASLER, 1993). Primary theoretical underpinnings trace back to pragmatist John Dewey. Although there is no evidence that Dewey formally embraced the concept of service learning as part of his philosophy of education, his philosophy of experience is central to his early work on pedagogy (Giles & Eyler, 1994). In addition, Dewey's thoughts on interaction of knowledge and skills, with experience serving as the key to learning, are basic tenets of service learning (Ehrlich, 1996). One of the main questions for Dewey regarding experience focused on how is it that experiences are educative (Giles & Eyler, 1994). Dewey stated that whereas genuine education is conducted through experience, not all experiences are genuinely educative. Some experiences may be miseducative if they have an arresting effect on growth of further experiences (Dewey, 1938). Dewey outlined four conditions that maximize the potential for educative learning: generate learner interest,

provide meaningful experiences, introduce curious problems, and create a demand for information (Giles & Eyler, 1994).

An additional philosophical underpinning of service learning is experiential education (Campus Compact, 2005). Experiential learning is an educational format that actively engages learners in direct experience and focused reflection in order to increase knowledge, develop skills, and clarify values (Association for Experiential Education, 2005). Similar to other types of experiential learning like cooperative education, internships, and field placements, service learning enriches, broadens, and deepens the knowledge base that is gained from classroom lectures and readings (Dewey, 1938; Kolb, 1984; Weil & McGill, 1989). However, the key difference and distinguishing characteristic of service learning is its emphasis on enriching student learning and revitalizing the community (Campus Compact, 2005).

David Kolb (1984) proposed a theoretical model that has provided guidance in the development of experiential education for over a decade. Kolb drew from Dewey's logical six-step inquiry that involved: 1) encountering a problem, formulating a problem or question to be resolved, 2) gathering information to propose a solution, 3) making a hypothesis, 4) testing the hypothesis, and 5) making judgments (Dewey, 1938). Kolb also borrowed from Kurt Lewin's action research process model and Jean Piaget's dynamics of assimilation and accommodation (Pritchard, 2004). Kolb's resulting conceptualization as a four-stage experiential learning cycle involve concrete experiences, reflection, abstract conceptualizations, and active experimentation (Cone & Harris, 1990).

In recent literature, Joyce and Weil with Calhoun (2000) proposed The Collaborative Service-Learning model founded on the work of Thelen's Group Investigation Model (1972). Thelen's model, which links Dewey's and Lewin's concepts, embodies factors of social process learning – more specifically, cooperative learning and learning communities. Students work individually and collaboratively to identify, pledge, and develop solutions for real and academically-based problems. The Collaborative Service-Learning model combines Thelen's work with Kolb's learning cycle culminating in a new model that addresses cognitive and social dimensions. Its four-phase cycle encompasses commitment, goal setting, instructional planning, and evaluation (Pritchard, 2004).

Pedagogical Foundations – The Learners

Pedagogical foundations for service learning often emanate from experiential education and the work of Brazilian philosopher and educator Paulo Freire. Freire challenged educational thought when he opposed a "banking" approach to education where teachers are the only "depositors" of information and students are merely the depositing receptacle. In service learning, the learners are individuals comprising various learning styles, skills, attitudes, and perspectives (Cone & Harris, 1990). Cognitive growth, according to cognitive-interactionist Jerome Bruner, is an active process whereby learners are active participants in knowledge acquisition, transformation of knowledge, and judgment of knowledge pertinence (Bigge & Shermis, 2004). In service learning, students experience real-world situations to work with others through a process of acting and reflecting to achieve real objectives for the community and a deeper understanding and skills for themselves (Eyler & Giles, 1999).

The learning in service learning begins with personal connections made through direct contact with the service activities. In most cases, students develop interpersonal skills resulting in a learning outcome that may be integral to the learning they experience in the future (Eyler & Giles, 1999). In order for students to retain information learned, the learning must also be useful and meaningful. Creating sense of new situations and contexts does not typically occur with exposure to new information. Rather, it is the continuous questioning, challenging, and reflecting of pre-conceived notions that allow students to organize and process new information to create meaning (Bransford & Vye, 1989)

Pedagogical Foundations – The Teachers

Cooperative learning, based on teacher and student partnerships, provides a theoretical framework for instruction (Johnson, Johnson, & Stanne, 2001). Eyler and Giles (1999) state that cooperative problem solving through cooperative education instructional methods enhances higher-level thinking. These higher-order thinking skills are critical elements in service-learning instruction (Learningindeed, 2001). Cooperative learning happens in a group where specific knowledge and perception construction forms in reference to an explicit social problem (Rogoff, 1990). Essential to this social learning are two ideas: the zone of proximal development (ZPD) and mediated learning (Eyler & Giles, 1999).

Lev Semenovich Vygotsky's ZPD refers to the difference (or zone) between what students are able to comprehend independently versus their capacity to learn with peer or adult

support. Vygotsky advocated that students' cognitive processes are enhanced if others provide them with experiences and activities that challenge their problem-solving skills. Others then are charged with working with the students to aid them in gradual mastery of their skill (Bigge & Shermis, 2004). This concept is crucial for service learning as it assumes that all learners – including those with learning disabilities – are able to achieve increased competency if a more knowledgeable person mediates their learning.

In service learning, teachers provide less instruction and more facilitation to help students extend their learning capacity (Eyler & Giles, 1999). Mediated learning, which can take on a variety of different forms such as the use of probing reflection questions and incremental addition of information, helps students progress to a more sophisticated understanding (Cone & Harris, 1990).

Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM)

In the late 1960s, researchers at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (R&DCTE) at the University of Texas at Austin began focusing on the change process in schools and universities. The result of this research founded the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) whose purpose was to conceptualize and facilitate the education change process. Initial studies date back over 70 years with research conducted by Phillips (1932) on adjustment issues for novice teachers. Three decades later, Thompson (1963) studied 125 student teachers' types of anxieties. Travers, Rabinowitz, and Nemovicher (1952) found that after asking 120 elementary student teachers at the beginning and end of a student teaching course about any teaching anxieties, most voiced issues with discipline problems and teacher likability.

Gabriel's (1957) study focused on the problems and satisfactions of experienced and novice teachers. In a two-phase study of factors causing strain and emotional stress in teachers, his findings are similar to those of Fuller (1969) in that problems and satisfactions differ significantly between experienced and inexperienced teachers. The problems inexperienced teachers rated highly were criticism from superiors and maintaining discipline, whereas experienced teachers were discouraged with the slow progress of pupils. Praise and holidays were great sources of satisfaction for inexperienced teachers, however, the success of former pupils rated high for teachers with experience.

Frances Fuller (1969), a counseling psychologist, studied teachers' concerns from a clinical rather than a pedagogical point of view. After conducting in-depth student teacher

interviews and analyzing previous research, Fuller proposed a developmental conceptualization of teacher concerns that consisted of three phases: pre-teaching, early teaching, and late teaching.

In the Pre-Teaching Phase: Non-Concern, teachers had less of a concern with teaching than other issues. Items that did relate to teaching were amorphous and vague, focusing on affective issues such as anticipation and apprehension (Hall, George, & Rutherford, 1998).

Most issues in the Early Teaching Phase: Concern with Self dealt with the concept of image i.e., how do the other teachers regard me, what does the principal think of me. Self-efficacy and self-confidence consumed teachers at this level (Hall, George, & Rutherford, 1998).

In the final stage, Late Concerns: Concern with Pupils, teachers exhibited concern for non-self-related issues. Highest on their list of concerns were regard for student learning, student achievement, and student gain (Hall, George, & Rutherford, 1998).

After additional research, Fuller's concern model evolved to *self*, *task*, and *impact* concerns, with the *impact* concern sub-divided into several levels (Hall, George, & Rutherford, 1998). This foundational research served as the basis for CBAM.

CBAM Assumptions. In 1975, the IPRDC concluded six important assumptions about change supporting the CBAM model:

1. Change is a process, not an event.
2. Change is accomplished by individuals.
3. Change is a highly personal experience.
4. Change involves developmental growth.
5. Change is best understood in operational terms.
6. The focus of facilitation should be on individuals, the innovation, and the context (Hall, Loucks, Rutherford, & Newlove, 1975).

Further research and 26 years later, Hall and Hord (2001) renamed the assumptions to principles and added six conclusions describing, explaining, and predicting probable teacher behaviors during the change process:

1. Change is a process, not an event.
2. There are significant differences in what is entailed in development and implementation of an innovation.
3. An organization does not change until the individuals within it change.
4. Innovations come in different sizes.

14

5. Interventions are the actions and events that are key to the success of the change process.

6. Although both top-down and bottom-up change can work, a horizontal perspective is best.

7. Administrator leadership is essential to long-term change success.

8. Mandates can work.

9. The school is the primary unit for change.

10. Facilitating change is a team effort.

11. Appropriate interventions reduce the challenges of change.

12. The context of the school influences the process of change (Hall & Hord, 2001).

CBAM Dimensions. CBAM is composed of three dimensions assisting in the overall development and implementation of innovative change: Stages of Concern, Levels of Use, and Innovation Configuration. The first method, Stages of Concern, addresses the affective side of change. It captures people's perceptions and feelings towards the innovation. As the concerns progress, the feelings and perceptions developmentally change based on the rate and type growth. Hall and Hord (2001) classified these changes as Stages of Concern. Appendix B outlines the set of seven specific stages along with typical expression of each concern. Appendix C adds definitions to the seven stages. These stages are grouped into awareness, self, task, and impact:

Awareness (Stage 0) describes a person who either is not aware of the change being proposed or does not want to learn about it. These unrelated concerns are not centered on student- or teaching-related issues. They typically focus on external personal engagements.

Self concerns refer to the questions we ask when we hear about something new (Stage 1, Informational) and about how it might affect us (Stage 2, Personal). Stages 1 and 2 are attributed more to new teachers. Logistics such as location of teacher parking and teachers' lounge take precedents over teaching pedagogy and student learning.

Task concerns emerge as we engage with new skills, time demands, materials, etc. (Stage 3, Management). It focuses on logistics such as processes and tasks related to items such as efficiency, organizations, and scheduling.

Impact concerns describe our thoughts on how we can make a program work better for learners, typically for students (Stage 4, Consequence). Stage 5 (Collaboration) embodies concern with the coordination and cooperation of other stakeholders such as teachers, administrators, and/or community members. Stage 6 (Refocusing) deals with exploring the merit and effectiveness by reconceptualizing and possibly replacing the innovation with a modified alternative.

There is a developmental path from low concern (Awareness) to high understanding and reformatting (Refocusing). This path is grouped in "stages", since the flow of a teacher's concern may progress in a swift manner or be stifled at different levels. If the innovation is suitable, if the principal is amenable, and if the change process is facilitated with appropriate support, then the level of concern may rise two to three levels. Flow is not relegated to upward motion and any external factor may cause a halt in the flow, decreasing the level of concern (Hall & Hord, 2001).

Whereas the Stages of Concern deal with the affective dimension, the Levels of Use explore behaviors and portrays how people are acting with respect to specified change (Hall & Hord, 2001) by identifying the degree to which teachers are using the innovation. Levels of Use can assist teachers in moving to higher levels of use as well as following the entire implementation process. In Appendix D, Hall and Hord identified eight levels of use. Levels zero through two reflect the non-user status, but include headings such as orientation and preparation that indicate possible future use. Levels three through seven range from mechanical use of the innovation to a re-evaluation of program quality. As the level of use increases, so does the user's understanding and level of innovation implementation.

Hall and Hord (2001) state that the Levels of Use may be assessed only though long-term observation or a specifically designed focused interview. A configuration of the Levels of Use includes the branching interview where a facilitator asks a series of questions, and, based upon the answers, follows a line of thought to one of the levels. The interviewer must receive enough descriptive information to appropriately categorize the response. The second configuration, the focused interview, is a more rigorous and detailed data-acquiring method. The interviewer constructs a matrix to portray a more descriptive account of the individual's behavior. Crucial to this process is utilizing questions based on a set of seven categories that compose each levels of use: knowledge, acquiring information, sharing, accessing, planning, status reporting, and performing. Using the Levels of Use enables facilitators to understand the level of each

16

individual and then determine appropriate training or technical assistance to support promoting the change process.

Hall and Hord (2001) state that one of the reasons widespread change is not institutionalized within a school is that educational innovations may appear didactic on paper. However, when implemented, the innovation's configuration may look different to teachers, administrators, and policy-makers. This may cause problems, as those involved will create customized versions of the change. Evaluators, then, may not be able to assess consistently, producing immeasurable outcomes. This incongruence in implementation and innovation name spurred Hall and Hord to create a third method called Innovation Configuration.

The Innovation Configuration focuses on the descriptive outputs of the innovation. Innovation Configuration is a shared vision of what the innovation looks like when implemented properly. It represents operational patterns and is a word picture or description of the innovation or change. In other words, it answers the question, "What does it look like?" Heck, Stiegelbauer, Hall, and Loucks (1981) state that innovation configurations provide a broad range of uses. In an illustration context, teachers are able to visualize the different components of the innovation, allowing them to understand the broader picture. Using this as an evaluation, stakeholders can assess the extent of innovation implementation, providing a baseline for possible future procedural changes. For staff development activities, the innovation configuration acts as source document of what and how teachers are implementing the innovation. It then helps to plan in-service trainings to modify and change current practices.

Heck, Stiegelbauer, Hall, and Loucks (1981) format the descriptive outputs of an Innovation Configuration as a checklist to explore the relationships between configurations and teachers' interactions. More recently, Hall and Hord (2001) portrayed the outputs as a map to evaluate how closely teachers implement the innovation based on the original developer's intent. Both methods outline the major components of an innovation and then detail observable implementation variations.

Service-Learning Teachers

Within the past two decades, there have been many service-learning articles published on the impacts on students' personal and social responsibility, civic engagement, and academic learning (Anderson, V., Kinsley, C., Negroni, P., & Price, C., 1991; Cognetta & Sprinthall, 1978; Conrad & Hedin, 1982, 1991; Morgan, W., & Streb, M., 1999; Shaffer, B., 1993; Stephens, L.,

1995). However, few studies have focused on the experiences of service-learning teachers (Seigel, 1997; Shumer, 1994; Wade, 1997; Ammon et al., 2002). Seigel (1997) points to two central reasons to focus on teachers and their roles in service learning. Since teachers are the catalyst for change in educational reform, institutionalized change within the field of service learning relies on the extent to which teachers integrate it in their classrooms. Also, within a classroom, the teacher delivers the intended curriculum. Therefore, the success of a service-learning project is dependent on the skill, knowledge, and creativity of the classroom teacher (Nathan & Kielsmeier, 1991).

Service-Learning Teacher Demographics. The major studies that focused on teachers' beliefs and practices found that demographically, service-learning teachers are spread across the spectrum in age, gender, and income level (Wade, 1997; Seigel, 1997; Shumer, 1994; Ammon et al., 2002). However, in a study that included elementary, middle, and high school teachers, Melchior (1998) reported that middle-school teachers had higher-than-average use of service learning (36%) and were twice as likely to use it in their classrooms than their high school counterparts (18%). Although age, gender, and income level did not make a different in whether implementation occurred, Seitsinger (2000) found that in a study of middle school teachers, on average, their professional knowledge and the number of years teaching middle-level students predicted their use of service learning. More specifically, higher levels of knowledge of students' developmental issues and of curricular standards predicted more frequent implementation of service-learning strategies. By contract, greatest numbers of years teaching predicted less frequent use of service learning.

Motivations. Why do teachers incorporate service learning into their curricula? Studies show a variety of factors. Kinsley (1997) stated that one of the strongest reasons is the motivation for learning and the challenges service-learning projects provide for students. Wade (1997), Seigel (1997), Melchior (1998), and Ammon et al. (2002) reported that teachers wanted to instill civic, social, career development, and personal skills such as a sense of caring, social responsibility, and self-esteem. These outcomes were not even amongst all teachers. Elementary teachers frequently voiced their desire to enhance the ethic of citizenry, whereas high school teachers emphasized community issues or life skills. Elementary teachers gravitated toward creative expression, but middle school teachers emphasized problem solving, academic motivation, and self-efficacy.

In addition to student outcomes, Wade's (1997) study of 84 teachers found that the most common response toward motivation rested with teachers' ideological beliefs. Service-learning teachers advocated giving back to the community through service. Examples of contributions consisted of volunteering at community centers, working at hospices, or entertaining the elderly. One teacher stated that "service is absolutely necessary. It was a constant and would always be needed in the future" (p. 90). Teachers thought that this civic tie would not only help them connect with but also assist them to become active participants in their communities (Ammon et al., 2002), contributing in many ways (Siegel, 1997). The notion of civic engagement tied in with empathy and concern was not just for the external community but also for fellow students.

Teachers' pedagogical beliefs were also of great importance. Seitsinger (2000) found that on average, teachers thought service learning was essential to effective education for their students. Inherent within the philosophy and practice of service learning is the belief that students should not be confined within a classroom throughout the entire day (Siegel, 1997). Teachers wanted to engage students in experiential and hands-on learning. The desire for constant learning, while empowering students to take ownership of their learning and their projects, fit within teachers' educational philosophy (Ammon et al., 2002). Overall, teachers possessed core educational beliefs similar to service-learning pedagogy that served as the framework for their teaching (Nash, 2002).

When asked how they benefited personally from using service learning, teachers stated (Ammon et al., 2002) that they acquired better teaching management skills, increased subject-matter knowledge, enhanced relationships with students, and found more opportunities to collaborate with other teachers and members of the community.

In Kinsley's study (1997), some perceived service learning as a better way to understand and ultimately relate more positively toward students. A middle school teacher from Massachusetts explained:

> I guess my experience with community service is analogous to what the kids go through. Once I did it, I saw things differently. For the kids, once they're responsible, once they serve others, and problem solve, they become believers in all those good things…It fleshes out what learning is to be. They take what they're learning and put it in to practice right away. It's problem solving, critical thinking…I've elevated my expectations (p. 5).

Academic Goals. The definition of service learning includes integrating service into the academic curriculum (Florida Learn & Serve, 2005). Since some teachers emphasized their primary responsibility is to promote student learning, they stressed the importance of academic development from service-learning projects (Siegel, 1997). However, this academic development did not always mimic rote learning. A middle-school language-arts teacher stated that the kind of learning necessary for useful reading and writing came directly from interactions with the community. Constant observations about the happenings within the community and structured verbal and writing reflection helped to achieve her academic goals. Melchior's study (1998) supports the notion of academic development, as over 80% of the teachers felt that service learning was likely to increase student academic achievement.

Prior Community Service Experience. Siegel found that many teachers who integrate service learning into their curricular instruction have had previous community service experiences through their churches or other organization. Over three-fourths of the teachers had some prior service experience as a child or an adult (Wade, 1997). No study to date has directly correlated previous community service to service-learning integration. However, Hodgkinson and Weitzman in 1992 found early community service experience to be a significant indicator of adult community service involvement. Many teachers have pinpointed previous service experiences that contributed to their beliefs in the importance of service learning (Wade, 1997).

Rewards. Teachers reported several gratifying aspects of service learning, such as increased student motivation and learning (Wade, 1997; Seigel, 1997). However, similar to other findings about teaching rewards in general, the most gratifying aspect is observing changes in students (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986; Fullan, 1991). The words "excited," "enthused," and "changed" reflect their opinions. Teachers often elaborated stories of student success and behavior changes. A few teachers expressed pleasure at noticing students continuing to engage in service after the project ended. Other teachers relayed inspirational stories of problem students taking on positive leadership roles to become model students during service projects (Seigel, 1997).

As the success of a service-learning project increases, so does the attention from the media, community, and other teachers (Wade, 1997). It is common for newspapers and television stations to cover local projects. Politicians, school board members, and non-service-learning

teachers attend celebration activities to congratulate and praise students for their efforts as well as learn more about successful service-learning implementation.

Challenges. Although implementing service-learning projects bring student-focused and intrinsic rewards, teachers also expressed some difficulties. The most common challenge is the factor of time. Service-learning projects are different in scale and scope from traditional classroom assignments and cannot be taught directly from the curriculum (Shumer, 1994; Seigel, 1997; Wade, 1997). In addition to academic curricular goals, teachers must incorporate service-related curricula for elements such as preparation, reflection, and assessment (Wade, 1997). In other words, projects must be tailor-made. Teachers must alter pre-constructed service-learning curriculum to fit individual school and project needs (Florida Learn & Serve, 2005).

Whether students are providing service to other students on their campus or working with an external community organization, the issue of collaboration with community partners causes some concern. Finding and cultivating a service partner and coordinating logistics involves planning time, creativity, and mutual goal identification. Teachers also stated they needed to be flexible for unforeseen occurrences such as late bus arrivals, miscommunication with partners, and absent students (Shumer, 1994; Seigel, 1997). Many teachers received grant funding for expenditures not typically associated with classroom instruction. Those not part of a grant relied on administration support to cover these expenses. If the administration were not wholly supportive, teachers were not, for example, able to utilize their own or parent vehicles due to liability issues, thus causing more difficulties (Shumer, 1994).

Studies Using CBAM Framework

The CBAM conceptual framework has been used in several studies to gauge educators' perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors. Several studies used one or two of the framework's methods, whereas others implemented the entire framework. The following discusses a sample of these studies.

Stages of Concern Only. Cunningham, Hillison, and Horne (1985) studied vocational education teachers' stages of concern during implementation stages of competency-based instruction. The Virginia Department of Education spearheaded a statewide effort in 1982 to integrate competency-based instruction in approved vocational education programs. Program service areas offered workshops, conferences, and credit courses on the topic and vocational pre-service topics included instruction on competency-based education (CBE).

21

Cunningham et al.'s 1995 study focused on vocational teachers in six different school districts in Virginia with specific objectives relating to monitoring change in expressed concerns about implementation of CBE; comparing the expressed concerns about CBE implementation of vocational teachers in different service areas; determining differences in vocational teachers' stages of concern related to education, gender, and age demographic variables; and determining differences in vocational teachers' stages of concern related to type and amount of in-service education.

Cunningham et al. (1985) utilized CBAM's Stages of Concern (SoC) questionnaire and added a personal data form to obtain information about vocational program area, gender, age, level of education, and type and amount of in-service education on CBE, all variables related to objective three. The researchers collected the data in a three-stage survey conducted in six-month intervals, and although they asked and encouraged the teachers to complete the survey, the study suggests that not all complied. The researchers calculated frequencies and means followed by analysis of variance procedures to identify mean differences within the stages of concern for each of the independent variables.

The authors (Cunningham, Hillison, & Horne, 1985) concluded that the passage of time does not significantly affect teachers' concern. The teachers that showed the largest differences in levels of concern came from the business and marketing departments. Gender does not influence levels of concern, nor differences in age levels. Teachers who participated in school division workshops and who attended conferences in CBE showed decreases in lower stages of concerns and increases in higher stages of concerns. Finally, participation in one CBE course increased overall concerns, but attendance at two or more courses decreased concerns.

The authors (Cunningham, Hillison, & Horne, 1985) suggested that teachers cannot reach higher levels of concern until they address their lower stages of concern. Since each service department's concerns differed greatly, Virginia should develop pre-service and in-service activities to address these differences. In addition to specialized training and technical assistance, the authors highly recommended a monitoring system to provide an avenue for feedback, information dissemination, and future expansion and growth.

Fenton (2002) examined the extent to which Anchorage's secondary schools adopted the Alaska and Anchorage Standards and Benchmarks. Curriculum Coordinators reviewed the CBAM methodology as well as an evaluation instrument that showed the SoC in relation to new

directions in standards-based instruction and assessment. This modified instrument aligned the stages, a general expression of concern, and a typical spoken statement. The following is a simplified version of this instrument.

The coordinators began collecting data through natural conversations and then categorized the individual comments. They based the final rating of each school on the degree to which standards-based curriculum and instruction had taken hold in each of the schools (Fenton, 2002).

After calculating the mean for each school as well as for each curriculum area, the researchers found that approximately half of the high schools rated in the 3rd stage, with the other half lying in the 4th stage. For the middle schools, all rated in the 3rd stage. Delineations by curriculum areas are mixed as well. Art, music, world language, math, and literacy areas all fell in the 3rd stage, with health, social studies, and career tech in the 4th stage (Fenton, 2002).

The findings suggest that overall, the district programs are in the 3rd to 4th stages of adopting a standards-based system. Areas of collaboration, assessment, curriculum integration, and student-progress tracking system need further improvement. Additional information suggested that those areas that had substantial external support for teacher training and curriculum development had higher ratings. The researchers did note that differences in data collection, the standards used by the curriculum coordinators, and the extent to which a single staff discussion can provide valid information are all indicators of a somewhat imprecise rating process (Fenton, 2002).

Jacobus (1997) examined the change processes implemented by Colorado high school principals. The study focused on the similarities and difference between these processes and adherence or deviation from literature and actual practice. The study incorporated a written questionnaire based on four current change models that were used as conceptual frameworks: CBAM's SoC, the Diffusion Model, the reCreate model, and the Accelerated Schools model. Jacobus distributed 280 surveys with a return rate of 68%. Final percentage breakdowns were as follows: 56% rural, 28% suburban, 14% urban, and 4% resort or recreational. The data analyses used were primarily descriptive statistical techniques in addition to Spearman's Rho, paired t-tests, one-way analysis of variance, and reliability tests. Upon completion of data analysis, principals conducted nine interviews with principals.

The researchers (Jacobus, 1997) found that there was a discrepancy between elements stated as important in the change process versus the elements principals actually used in practice. This may be due to the unique and individual nature of each school and each change effort. Elements associated with one change process may include variables that do not align with the principal's administrative reasoning or may not be logistically feasible. A process element such as "build consensus" may not be feasible if there is a very large school. Another element, "parental involvement," may be difficult at the high school level as parents were inconsistent in staying involved with their child's educational pursuits.

With regard to using research literature as a foundation for making changes, most principals reported this was not typically done. The amount of time needed to find and analyze the research was complex. If principals did use research, they tended to select models that most closely aligned to their management style. Most of the principals stated that the sample population in current research did not mirror their school's demographics. Therefore, they viewed these ideas as non-applicable and impractical and chose to base any change decision on best practices instead of defined research (Jacobus, 1997).

Wesley and Franks (1996) sought to find improved understandings of processes relating to teachers' adoption of two classroom-based computer technologies at a selected magnet elementary school. The research focused on identifying and describing teachers' self-initiated or voluntary individual and collegial adoption-related activities and on understanding how these activities promoted progression through the CBAM SoC.

The Wesley and Franks (1996) study used both quantitative and qualitative methods. The SoC questionnaire provided the quantitative information. It identified those teachers who demonstrated advanced patterns of concerns regarding the technology innovation. The researchers interviewed these teachers for information about their adoption activities and experiences utilizing content analysis on the interview data to identify statement and statement group categories as they related to the SoC.

Wesley and Franks' (1996) findings indicated that both individual and collegial voluntary adoption activities were a part of the technology adoption process. In addition, as the teachers furthered their technological knowledge and continued to assess their situation, their activities fell into two categories: 1) investigation of computer resources and their uses, and 2) experimentation with classroom procedures related to integrating computer applications into

teaching practice. Their descriptions of adoption activities were aligned with the CBAM concerns ranging from Informational to the Consequence stage. Overall, their experimentation led to refined usages of computers in the classroom.

Stages of Concern and Innovation Configuration. Researchers from the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS) conducted a three-year project implementing educational computing in the sciences (Ellis & Kuerbis, 1988). The project focused on designing, developing, and disseminating educational computing curriculum to enhance science learning and teaching. The researchers trained 61 science teachers and administrators from 16 school districts and selected approximately 20 from each grade span: elementary, middle, and high.

In the first year, researchers created an Innovation Checklist of Microcomputers Use in Science Teaching (MUST) and administered it to all the participants. At the end of the first year, project staff tabulated the MUST results and redefined the checklist. The researchers also implemented the stages of concern questionnaire as a pre-test and a post-test. Finally, they gathered descriptive data through classroom observations and informal interviews (Ellis & Kuerbis, 1988).

Through the Innovation Checklist, the researchers found that nearly all teachers indicated they had microcomputers available for teaching science. However, only half of the teachers used the microcomputer for science class and over half used it to teach other non-science subjects. Additional usages for microcomputer use included recording grades, developing curricula, tutorials, and games. The Stages of Concern questionnaire pre-test revealed typical patterns for beginning and non-users. The post-test also provided no surprises, as mean scores decreased in the lower concerns (awareness and information) and increased in the higher concerns (consequence and collaboration). Through the staff trainings, teachers became more comfortable with the educational computing (Ellis & Kuerbis, 1988).

The researchers concluded through the CBAM instruments that the trainings and workshops were successful in increasing teacher usage of microcomputers. Since this was only the initial year of the evaluation, the researchers did not generalize the results to other districts, but stated that with continued support, they were confident microcomputers would be an asset to science teaching in the classroom (Ellis & Kuerbis, 1988).

Levels of Use. Klenke and Barrows (1980) began a three-year longitudinal study to explore the process of how a school implements and institutionalizes an innovation. The

researchers selected 13 Wisconsin sites already in the process of implementing the Instructional Programming Model (IPM), a component of the Individually Guided Education innovation. The researchers selected CBAM's Level of Use to measure change rather than merely document its consequences.

The implementation staff formulated interview questions and definitions of essential innovation criteria. Prior establishment of these criteria allowed for use/nonuse decisions to be made quickly and consistently during the interview process. The five criteria identified were objective-based instructions, criteria-references pre-assessment, student grouping based on individual needs, criteria-referenced post-assessment, and regrouping based on individual needs. The researchers taped each interview and focused on what the user was doing with the innovation at that time. The staff conducted the interviews twice during the year and made several observations of classroom instruction (Klenke & Barrows, 1980).

The interviewers rated the tapes and found little variation among the teachers across the sites with respect to their Levels of Use ratings. Almost all teachers (82%), independent of time spent implementing the innovation, rated at a IV-A level, also known as Routine Use. This raised questions, as classroom observers noticed varying levels of innovation use. The researchers decided that the Levels of Use instrument accurately documents how well users report they are managing the innovation, rather than their actual pattern of usage. The researchers also realized that teachers alter the innovation to make it manageable, as few would continue to implement an innovation that was not effective. They concluded that all three of the CBAM instruments must be implemented to properly document change (Klenke & Barrows, 1980).

Stages of Concern, Levels of Use, and Innovation Configuration. Mitchell (1998) applied all three CBAM diagnostic tools to evaluate Portland, Oregon's Project Read program. Of particular importance was the program fidelity of Project Read as well as the level of program implementation. The research involved 46 1st through 8th grade teachers at 14 schools who integrated Project Read into their reading and language arts program. Additionally, four Project Read coaches conducted weekly lesson demonstrations in each classroom during the year.

Mitchell sent the stages of concern questionnaire to all the teachers in December of 1986 and then again in December of 1987. The data collected from these surveys helped the researcher place teachers in either an affective (stage 0, non-user) or behavioral (stage 1-6, user) category. To assess teachers' implementation level of Project Read, Mitchell conducted levels of use

interviews with a sample of 18 teachers. The interviews lasted 20 minutes, were tape-recorded, and rated by 2 reviewers. Lastly, the researcher conducted classroom observations to collect descriptions to include in the innovation configuration checklist. The researcher shared these key descriptors with the developer of the educational innovation as well as the Project Read coaches to clarify the critical elements and to develop an agreed upon checklist (Mitchell, 1998).

The results from the initial stages of concern questionnaire showed that teacher concerns were high at the 0, 2, and 5 stages (awareness, personal, and collaboration). Mitchell states that awareness and personal concerns should be high since the innovation was just introduced to them and greatly affects their teaching style. Project Read requires substantial collaboration between teachers and coaches, hence, the possible explanation for high collaboration concerns. The second questionnaire showed similar results but with less intensity suggesting that this indicates increased familiarity with the innovation (Mitchell, 1998).

The Levels of Use interviews revealed that the majority of teachers were at either Level III–Mechanical Use or Level IV–Routine/Refinement. One explanation for such a high rating for first-year users is that Project Read is not supplementary, which may accelerate the rate of integration.   The teachers who rate at Level IV and above expressed making modifications to the innovation to meet student needs. Teachers spoke from a personal pedagogy rather than from rote instructional memorization (Mitchell, 1998).

Mitchell does not provide information about the results from the Innovation Configuration Checklist. Instead, she states that in the checklist will be used for future monitoring purposes for Project Read (Mitchell, 1998).

Huling, Hall, Hord, and Rutherford (1983) conducted a principal-teacher interaction study looking at principals' decisions and actions when implementing new school programs and determining implementation success. The researchers chose three principals from each of the following states: California, Colorado, and Florida. The principals within a state were also within the same district, and each district was in a different phase of implementing an educational innovation. For example, the California principals were in their first year implementing a writing composition program, Florida was in the second year of a unified math curriculum, and the Colorado district was in its third year of a revised science curriculum.

Huling et al. (1983) conducted phone discussions and site visits. In addition, the researchers collected data using the CBAM diagnostic techniques. Four times throughout the

study, teachers filled out the Stages of Concern questionnaire. Three times during the year, researchers interviewed the teachers using the Levels of Use tool. The researchers compiled the innovation configuration checklist by first collecting information during the Levels of Use interviews as preliminary data and then contacting the primary developers of the innovation materials to create components for a checklist.

After collecting the data, Huling et al., proceeded with a multi-dimensional approach for assessing implementation success. They rank-ordered each of the nine schools using all three CBAM techniques and then combined their rankings to create an overview.

Overall, the researchers determined that years of implementation, the district, or the type of innovation were not controlling factors of implementation success. Analyzing the levels of use tool, the researchers found that the more principals functioned as initiators of change, the higher the level of teacher usage of the innovation. In addition, teachers responded more favorably to innovations targeted towards them as a sub-group, rather than individually or as a whole. Through the innovation configuration, the researchers found that implementation success occurred when principals closely monitored the innovation feedback and provided additional interventions to successfully implement the innovation (Huling et al., 1983).

Summary

For the past two decades, there has been a growing interest in service learning. Statistics show that nearly a third of all public schools in the United States engage in this pedagogy (National Center for Education Statistics, 1999). Despite its popularity and growth, service learning continues to remain on shaky ground as some consider it to be another K-12 fad or innovation (Billig, 2002). Even with continuous endorsement by national foundations, state and district mandates, district coordinators, and program directors, the research still contends that "at every level of schooling, the ultimate success of service-learning projects depends, at least in part, on the skill, knowledge, and creativity of the classroom teacher" (Nathan & Kielsmeier, 1991).

Research has shown that service-learning teachers are disparate in age, gender, and income level (Wade, 1997; Seigel, 1997). However, most implement service learning due to their ideological and pedagogical beliefs, desire to instill civic, social, and career skills in their students, and motivation to increase student self-esteem. Service-learning teachers, however, have some difficulties implementing projects. High on the list are the factor of time and the lack

of standardized curricula. Teachers must alter their current curricula to include service-learning elements and fit individual school and project needs.

Since only a handful of studies have addressed the central role of the classroom teacher in service-learning programs (Shumer, 1994; Wade, 1997), the purpose of this research was to study visual art teachers in Lake County, Florida who have implemented service-learning projects. The framework I used was the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) that conceptualizes and facilitates the education change process. Initially created from a clinical rather than pedagogical viewpoint, CBAM consists of three diagnostic tools: Stages of Concern, Levels of Use, and Innovation Configuration. While the Stages of Concern addresses the affective side of change, the Levels of Use deals with behaviors and portrays how people are acting when they come into contact with change. The last tool, the Innovation Configuration, provides a word picture or description of different operational patterns of an innovation.

In recent studies, CBAM's diagnostic tools have been implemented in parts and in their entirety to gauge educators' perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors. Studied participants have included vocational teachers, curriculum coordinators, high school principals, and elementary school teachers. Researchers used one or more CBAM instruments based on the area of needed information. However, each study implemented both quantitative and qualitative instruments. All but one used the SoC plus interviews, observations, or the other two CBAM instruments. Klenke and Barrows (1980) was the lone study that used the LoU only. These researchers found that this instrument alone did not provide enough depth or detail to explain their results. Hence, they concluded that all three of the CBAM instruments must be implemented to properly document change. As a result of this finding, I used all three CBAM instruments in my study.

METHODOLOGY

For this study, I used the instruments of the CBAM model, which served as my conceptual framework. Topics presented in this chapter include research questions, research design, data collection, data analysis, reporting, and a summary. These topics are each discussed separately.

Research Design

Site Selection: Description and Rationale. Since the focus of this study is on teachers' concerns and implementation of service learning, I decided to select a site that was committed to and deeply involved in service learning. I used three criteria as evidence of commitment: (1) district administration financial support for service-learning implementation; and (2) increased annual growth of number of service-learning projects; and (3) minimum of 5 consecutive years of receiving a service-learning grant. The Lake County School District in Florida met all these criteria. The following chronological history of service learning in Lake County provides evidence that all the criteria mentioned above are met.

Service learning in Lake County began in 1993 as an outgrowth of the Adopting Communities for Excellence (ACE) program in South Lake High School. The district administration had slated South Lake High School to merge with Clermont High School the following year. Since the schools were rivals, the district felt that a program that would help provide a peaceful merger between the student populations was needed. ACE was created to facilitate a mindset of one rather than two schools. Students in the ACE program participated in community service projects and off-campus leadership trainings that consisted of activities promoting problem solving, decision making, and other types of critical thinking skills.

The teacher in charge of the ACE program began coordinating ACE as well as teaching life management classes. Within a year, she began to see positive affective and behavior changes within the participating students. In 1994, due to enormous amount of students (600) participating in ACE, she looked for other opportunities that would promote the same goals and provide her with assistance. In 1996, she applied for and was awarded a service-learning grant through Florida Learn & Serve.

With the support of her principal, the teacher wrote a service-learning curriculum that included her class of 30 students as the coordinators of the projects. In her 2nd year, she recruited the home economics and art teachers to participate and inherited an additional 45 students. By

the end of the 3rd year, four additional teachers and 400 students were participating in service learning. In year four, the school administration relieved her of her life management classes and positioned her to become the service-learning coordinator at South Lake High School. Seventeen teachers and over 600 high school students began working with feeder pattern schools to implement service-learning projects.

In 2001, through another Florida Learn & Serve grant, the teacher became the District Service-Learning Coordinator overseeing 23 teachers and 900 students. The same year, she and her students began traveling nationally and internationally to provide student and teacher trainings in service learning. As a result of their success, Lake County provided financial support by hiring four service-learning site coordinators to assist in oversight and project implementation. From 1996 to the present, South Lake High School has received annual service-learning grants. By 2008, it is expected that Lake County will incorporate service learning as part of its district-wide strategic plan. Clearly, Lake County with its financial and programmatic support for service learning presented a nearly ideal context for this study.

In 1996, one of South Lake High School's art teachers implemented a service-learning project creating murals for the school district. The following year, she began the Empty Bowls project with one ceramics class. In her 3rd year, she included two other art teachers from the pottery department. In the 4th year, she included three additional teachers by adding an elementary school. In 2006, there were a total of 9 schools and over 450 students in Lake County engaged in the service-learning empty bowls project.

Empty Bowls (Empty Bowls, 2002) began in 1990 with one Michigan high school art teacher who planned a project to raise funds for the food drive. The project's events culminated in a fundraising meal where guests were handed a student-made ceramic bowl and served soup and bread for dinner. The guests were invited to keep the bowls as a reminder of the students' efforts. At South Lake High School, students hand build the bowls with clay, molds, and pressed molds. Students research the Empty Bowls project, as well as issues focused on hunger and homelessness. These high school students then travel to middle and elementary schools in their feeder pattern to teach students about these community issues as well as the art of ceramic bowl making. All students who participate in the project are invited to a district-wide fundraising dinner where, as with the original Empty Bowls, guests are fed soup and bread for dinner.

However, guests must give a donation in order to receive a bowl. All donations are then given to the local food pantry.

Participant Selection: Description and Rationale. I selected the Lake County site based its deep commitment and involvement in service learning, accessibility, and district willingness to participate. From the Lake County Art Teacher's Association, I received a list of all the visual arts teachers in the district. Since the sample is small (n=30), I asked all the teachers to participate in the study. Out of the 30 participants, 19 agreed, 5 did not respond, and 6 declined. Therefore, the response rate rests at 63%.

Instrumentation. This study's design involved administering three CBAM instruments: (a) the Stages of Concern Questionnaire (SoCQ), (b) the Levels of Use Focused Interview (LoU), and (c) the Innovation Configuration Checklist (ICC). Of these three instruments, only the descriptive survey (SoCQ) was field-tested for validity with a convenience sample of six secondary teachers from Leon County Schools.

I invited six secondary visual arts teachers from Leon County School District to participate in a focus group to discuss the creation of an arts-based service-learning handbook. Participants included 5 females and 1 male with the majority of ages falling in between the 40-49 range. Their educational background ranged from Bachelor's degree to ABD/Doctoral degrees. Prior to beginning the focus group, I distributed the SoCQ to all six teachers. From their feedback, the language on the demographics page of the SoCQ was revised as necessary to ensure clarity.

Instrument 1: Stages of Concern Questionnaire. Hall, Wallace, and Dossett (1973) developed the SoCQ as a means to quickly score participants' levels of concern. The SoCQ is based on the stages of concern (SoC) that addresses the affective side of change, focusing on people's reactions, feelings, perceptions, and attitudes when implementing an educational innovation. The SoC, which identifies seven stages or levels of concern, is grouped into three sections: Impact, Task, and Self. Impact is sub-divided into the Refocusing, Collaboration, and Consequence stages. Task is generalized into a Management stage and Self is sub-divided into a Personal and Informational stage. A final stage that is not given a category is Awareness.

Hall et al. (1973) formats the SoCQ into three parts: the introductory page, two pages of Likert scale items, and a demographics page. The introductory page explains the purpose of the

questionnaire and provides an example of how to complete the form. It also requests the participant to respond in terms of present concerns dealing with the innovation.

The 35 items on the Likert scale are generalized to cover any innovation and administered with only the name of the innovation changed on the cover page. Respondents mark the items on a 0 to 7 scale according to how they felt about each statement at the present time. The numbers in the scale are grouped as follows: 0= irrelevant, 1-2= not true of me now, 3-4= somewhat true of me now, and 5-7= very true of me now. Hall, George, and Rutherford (1998) suggest that the SoCQ typically takes 10 to 15 minutes to complete.

The final section is the demographics page, and Hall et al. (1998) refer to it as optional. The SoCQ administrator may customize this page to accommodate desired space limitations or obtain only necessary information. This section provides useful data for descriptive statistics. Appendix E provides an example of the SoCQ.

Reliability of the Stages of Concern Questionnaire. Hall et al. (1998) concluded that the SoCQ accurately measures the Stages of Concern. In a two-year longitudinal study, the authors used Cronbach's Alphas on a stratified sample of 830 teachers. The coefficients of internal reliability for the stages ranged from .64 to .83 indicating adequate reliability. Results are shown in Figure 1.

Stage	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Alphas	.64	.78	.83	.75	.76	.82	.71

Figure 1. Coefficients of Internal Reliability for the Stages of Concern Questionnaire, N = 830

In addition, they sampled 171 individuals from the original group two weeks after their initial survey. From the 132 that responded, the test-retest based on the Pearson-r coefficient produced results ranging from .65 to .86 showing correlations between the two tests (see Figure 2).

Stage	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pearson-r	.65	.86	.82	.81	.76	.84	.71

Figure 2. Test-Retest Correlations on the Stages of Concern Questionnaire, N = 132

Validity of the Stages of Concern Questionnaire. The validity of the Stages of Concern Questionnaire was not as easily demonstrated as the reliability since there did not exist another measure that the Stages of Concern could be compared against. Therefore, Hall, George, and Rutherford (1998) state that to investigate the validity of the SoCQ scores, an attempt to follow a triangulation strategy outlined by Cronbach and Meehl (1955) was made. This included inter-correlation matricies, judgments of concerns based on interview data, and confirmation of expected group differences and changes over time.

A 195-item checklist was pilot tested. This checklist contained six subscales (Stages 1 through Stage 6) and each scale consisted of 14 through 68 items. This checklist was given to 359 people. Data analyses revealed an 83% item correlation between the subscales and their assigned stages. Using a correlation matrix, figure 1 summarizes these results.

		Stages					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
	1	1.0	.68	.47	.21	.21	.19
	2		1.0	.78	.43	.37	.43
Stages	3			1.0	.60	.51	.59
	4				1.0	.82	.80
	5					1.0	.77
	6						1.0

Figure 3. Inter-correlation of 195-Item Stages of Concern Questionnaire Scales

Instrument 2: Levels of Use Interview and Chart. The goal of the Levels of Use (LoU) instrument is to gather enough information from an individual's use of an innovation to assign a level of use. In its completion, the LoU portrays individual variations in the use of an innovation. The LoU instrument is divided into two segments: a focused interview with structured questions and the LoU chart.

The interview begins with a yes/no question. The remainder of the questions are based on the individual's response. If the answer was yes, then questions outlined in Appendix F applied. If the answer was no, then I proceeded to questions in Appendix G. These questions assess the user's level based on behavior categories described in the LoU chart. The questions do not need to follow any particular order or be asked verbatim. Rather, I referred to them throughout the progression of the interview.

Hall, Loucks, Rutherford, and Newlove (1975) propose eight levels of use that range from lack of knowing that the innovation exists to an active and highly sophisticated use of it. In a chart form, the LoU also describes various behavior categories of the user such as orienting, managing, and integrating. These categories represent functions the user engages in while carrying out the innovation. Below each category are descriptions of the innovation at each level. Individuals may not be on the same level in each category.

Instrument 3: Innovation Configuration Checklist. The Innovation Configuration concept emerged from research on the change process conducted at the Research and Education Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin. Innovation Configurations identify the major components of an innovation and then describe the observable variations of each component (Hall & Hord, 2001). The University of Texas at Austin researchers found that individuals used different parts of an innovation in different ways. When looked at as a whole, different configurations emerged depicting different innovation usage. The Innovation Configuration Checklist (ICC) is the tool that represents the different parts of the innovation and its variations.

Heck, Stiegelbauer, Hall, and Loucks (1981) list various applications for the Innovation Configuration such as in a dissemination context, illustration of materials, strategies, and management tools, description of operational patterns, evaluation, staff development, and research. For this research, the ICC concentrated on illustration and description of operational

patterns so that basic elements as well as project logistics was covered thereby providing a holistic view of arts-based service-learning implementation.

Heck, Stiegelbauer, Hall, and Loucks (1981) outline six steps involved in constructing the checklist: identify innovation components, identify additional components and variations, refine checklist, test the checklist with a few users, finalize checklist, and major data collection. Heck et al., also suggest involving the innovation developer with the first two steps by interviewing the developer for innovation components and variations within each component. I began by identifying the most commonly agreed upon service-learning elements espoused by Florida Learn & Serve and promoted through the research literature. These were Preparation, Action, Reflection, and Demonstration. Since this was a study of visual arts teachers who incorporate service learning, I divided these four innovation components into two sections: service objectives and artistic objectives. To address the service objectives, I interviewed Lake County's Service-Learning District Coordinator. For the artistic objectives, I referred to the National Visual Arts Standards and chose ones that best aligned with each of the four innovation components. To confirm that these artistic objectives were appropriate, I contacted two of Lake County's visual arts teachers for their input. I then refined the checklist to incorporate all gathered information.

Appendix H shows the final ICC, with the four major components of service learning that are sub-divided into service and artistic objectives. For example, under Preparation, I list six service objectives and six artistic objectives that describe broad activities that should take place during the preparation stage. I also added two columns for a "yes" or "no" response. A "yes" indicates that the participant includes or covers a particular objective during service-learning implementation. A "no" indicates the reverse.

Trustworthiness. Interviews are a part of qualitative inquiry; therefore, the researcher is considered the instrument. Intellectual rigor and methodological competence are elements of researcher trustworthiness that must be maintained and held to high standards. In addition, triangulation of data increases the credibility of findings (Patton, 2002). To discern a usage level for each of the participants, I first categorized them as users or non-users. If the participant was a user, I then triangulated my data sources by gleaning information from the Levels of Use focused interview, data from the Innovation Configuration checklist, and the Levels of Use rubric. This rubric, which serves as a framework for analyzing the Levels of Use interview, provides

characteristics of user development in acquiring new skills and varying use of the innovation. It includes seven categories (knowledge, acquiring information, sharing, assessing, planning, status reporting, and performing) and descriptors for each based on a user level.

For example, in Elizabeth's Levels of Use interview, she stated that her goal was to continue to combine her own efforts with other colleagues and community organizations to create quality service-learning projects. Elizabeth had also enfolded the participation of two middle schools and three elementary schools into her empty bowls project. Next year, she planned on expanding service learning countywide, by inviting not just art teachers, but all educators to partake in projects. From her Innovation Configuration interview, Elizabeth incorporated 80% of all the service and artistic objectives into her curriculum. Based on this information and referring to the Levels of Use rubric, I concluded that Elizabeth was at a level V for Knowledge, level IVB for Acquiring Information, level V for Sharing, level IVA for Assessing, level V for Planning, level V for Status Reporting, and level V for Performing. Elizabeth's overall usage level was that of Integration, (level V). This level is defined as the "state in which users are combining own efforts to use the innovation with related activities of colleagues to achieve a collective impact on clients within their common sphere of influence" (Loucks, Newlove, & Hall, 1998, p. 5).

If the participant was not a user, I did not involve them in the Innovation Configuration interview, as that only applied to users. Therefore, to triangulate my data sources, I used data from the Levels of Use focused interview, the Levels of Use rubric, and information from the follow-up conversation with the District Service-Learning Coordinator. For example, Barbara had participated in the district-wide empty bowls project during 2005-2006. However, recently, her school underwent a yearlong renovation, moving her classroom into a large storage room. As a result, Barbara felt spatially constrained and unable to participate in the project. She is interested in gathering project and future funding information, but has not done so on her own. Information from the District Service-Learning Coordinator confirmed that Barbara did participate during the 2005-2006 year but now, due to her temporary classroom, was more concerned about daily logistics rather than incorporating service learning. Based on this information and referring to the Levels of Use rubric, I concluded that Barbara was at a level I for Knowledge, level 0 for Acquiring Information, level 0 for Sharing, level 0 for Assessing, level 0 for Planning, and level 0 for Performing. Barbara's overall usage level was that of Non-

Use (level 0). This level is defined as "state in which the user has little or no knowledge of the innovation, no involvement with the innovation, and is doing nothing toward becoming involved" (Loucks, Newlove, & Hall, 1998, p. 5).

To triangulate data sources for the Innovation Configuration Checklist, I used the interview information from the Levels of Use and the Innovation Configuration Checklist, as well as information from the District Service-Learning Coordinator. For example, during Amy's Levels of Use interview, she stated that after her students completed one project, they inquired about their next service-learning activity. She remarked that their enthusiasm stemmed from their meaningful experience with their past project. These students recognized that they had a goal and purpose that related to their academic work. In her Innovation Configuration interview, Amy discussed how she and her students looked at their past projects and talked about if they should replicate it, and if so, how could they improve on the activity. Finally, the District Service-Learning Coordinator confirmed Amy's detailed attention to ensuring that her students understood the meaning behind their efforts. All this data reinforced the idea that Amy discussed her service activity, meaning, and/or value with her students. Therefore, based on this information, I placed a check mark under the "yes" column for Amy's Reflection Service Component: Discusses service activity, meaning, and/or value as a group either formally or informally.

Data Collection Methods

I collected data during the month of May, 2006 using the three instruments described above. I secured permission from the Superintendent of Lake County, the District Service-Learning Coordinator, the principals of the participating teachers, and the teachers themselves. I collected the data in two phases: during a district-wide training and via individual appointments/interviews.

The initial collection began with an email from the Superintendent to all the principals of visual arts teachers in the county voicing her support for this research project and asking for a written email consent reply (Appendix J). The District Service-Learning Coordinator then sent a follow-up email (Appendix K) inviting these teachers to a district-wide arts-based service-learning training that she and several experienced teachers would conduct. Since this training coincided with dates of my visit, I was also invited to begin data collection during this event.

On the morning of the training, all teachers present (n=13) were asked to participate in the study. All but one agreed. I distributed and collected the Stages of Concern Questionnaire packet, which included a cover sheet describing the research (Appendix L), demographics page, participant consent form, and the questionnaire. One-by-one, during the training, I interviewed the participants in a separate room. These face-to-face interviews lasted approximately 30-45 minutes and were digitally recorded. I transcribed this data at a later date.

The Levels of Use (LoU) interview, conducted through a focused interview format, elicited specific information about participants' levels of use through a series of questions. I referred to these questions throughout the interview but did not strictly adhere to the order in which they were asked.

For those participants whose response to the LoU indicated current service-learning usage, I asked additional questions based on the Innovation Configuration Checklist. Through a similar focused interview style, I addressed specific service-learning and art-related objectives. Responses provided particular arts-based service-learning configurations implemented by the teachers.

Not all the arts teachers attended this training, therefore, I sent an email requesting an appointment for an interview (Appendix M) and solicited the assistance of one of Lake County's visual arts teacher to send an email on my behalf (Appendix N). Seven teachers agreed and I visited them separately at their schools. I handed them a copy of the Stages of Concern Questionnaire packet and waited until they completed the forms and then began the LoU and ICC interview using identical procedures as outlined above. These seven teachers combined with the twelve participating from the training resulted in a total participant number of 19.

Data Analysis and Reporting

Instrument 1: Stages of Concern. I scored the SoCQ by hand. Each of the 35 statements expresses a certain concern about the innovation. Respondents placed a number next to each statement indicating the degree to which each concern is true of them at the present moment. High numbers (5-7) indicate high concern, low numbers (1-2) show low concern, and 0 indicate irrelevancy of the statement (Hall, George, & Rutherford, 1986). Each statement corresponds to one of the stages of concern and five statements represent each stage. I summed the responses of the five items on each stage to obtain a total number. Then, I divided the total score by the

number of items to obtain a mean score for each stage. A complete presentation of the scoring results is discussed in Chapter IV.

Instrument 2: Levels of Use Interview. Hall et al. (1975) propose that when the interviewee makes a statement that appears to place him/her at an LoU for a particular category, a tally mark is made on the rating sheet next to the appropriate number. I followed this format by making initial tally marks and re-evaluate marks again after the interview was complete. I used the same rating sheet to make a decision for each category. This decision was not based on which category has the most tally marks, as certain statements may have greater significance to the respondent than the others, but rather on the overall impression of the interview content. The tally marks acted as a guide and helped to provide evidence for the decision. Appendix I provides examples of ratings. Data for the LoU were analyzed through simple descriptive statistics and are presented in Chapter IV.

Instrument 3: Innovation Configuration. Interview responses were measured quantitatively and qualitatively for each participant and then for the entire group. Through the checklist, I marked the component objectives the participant had implemented. This was done by placing a mark next to the yes/no column for each service and art objective that the participant used. I then tallied the yes marks for each section to sum a total score for each participant. This provided a view of the objectives where the participant placed the most emphasis. The result is displayed in a table format in Chapter IV. For different grouping, I aggregated the scores for each section and then divided by the number of objectives in the section. This enabled me to determine how well service learning had been implemented in the county. This is also displayed through simple descriptive statistics in a table format in Chapter IV.

As quantitative methods permit gathering of information from large groups yielding generalizable information (Patton, 2002), qualitative methods allow deep digging beneath the surface of broad responses, producing an abundant amount of information from a smaller group of people. Qualitative research gives a holistic view of what is being studied. Its premise depends on interrelationships, where parts are greater than the whole. Qualitative research culminates in the form of a narrative and is imbued with thick and rich description. It is inductive, discovery-oriented, and incorporates a flexible yet systematic design. It relies on personal experience and gives voice to perspective and creative synthesis (Patton, 2002).

Since I am interested in capturing as many possible operational patterns of arts-based service-learning implementation as possible, I categorized and synthesized the interview information to perform content analysis that included data reduction and sense making of the material. I did this by looking for emergent themes and patterns of implementation that may not have been included in the checklist. I also coded the data, which is characteristic of the inductive analysis process (Seidman, 1998). The results of this information are presented in Chapter IV.

Summary

By using the CBAM methodology, this study was designed to show visual arts teachers' levels of concern toward, and usage levels while, implementing service learning. To accomplish this goal, 19 participants completed a Stages of Concern Questionnaire, which consisted of an introductory page, two pages of Likert scale items, and a demographic page. All 19 also participated in the LoU interview and for those participants who indicate current service-learning usage, I asked additional questions based on the ICC to determine the operational picture of their curricular implementation. All interviews were digitally audiotaped. All three instruments yielded quantitative data reported through simple descriptive statistics and graphs. To seek additional project configurations that may not have been included in the original checklist, I qualitatively performed content analysis to look for emergent themes and patterns of implementation. The results of these data are presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

This chapter presents data results, analyses, and findings. The purpose of this study was to determine the levels of concern of Lake County visual art teachers towards implementing service learning, the levels of usage, and describe elements of arts-based service-learning integration. The conceptual framework utilized was the Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM) developed by researchers at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin. Hall and Hord (2001) further refined the model that serves as the methodological basis of this study.

All of the visual arts teachers in the county (n=30) were asked to participate in the study. Of this number, 19 agreed to participate, 5 did not respond, and 6 declined. Therefore, the response rate rests at 63%.

Description of the Sample

All who responded yes filled out a short demographic survey. The researcher used frequency distributions to display all responses given from the survey. Question 1 asks for the participants' age. Table 1 presents these results. Three (16%) participants were under 30 years of age, with 2 (10%) educators between the ages of 30 and 39. Three (16%) participants were between 40-49 years old, and the largest group consisted of 11 (58%) participants ages 50-59.

Table 1. Frequency Distribution: Participant Age

Participant Age	Frequency	Percent
Under 30	3	16%
30-39	2	10%
40-49	3	16%
50-59	11	58%
Total	19	100%

Question 2 asked for participant gender. Table 2 shows that the overwhelming majority of participants were female. One participant was a male.

Table 2. Frequency Distribution: Participant Gender

Participant Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	1	5%
Female	18	95%
Total	19	100%

Question 3 requested information on participants' highest education level. The majority had college degrees (69%), while five had reached the masters level (26%). One held a doctorate degree (5%). Table 3 presents these results.

Table 3. Frequency Distribution: Highest Degree Earned

Highest Degree Earned	Frequency	Percent
Bachelor's	13	69%
Master's	5	26%
Doctorate	1	5%

The next question asked for the number of years the participants had been teaching. Eight teachers indicated 0-5 years (42%), with only 1 teaching 6-10 years (5%). One participant had been teaching between 10-15 years (5%) and 3 (16%) educators listed 15-20 years of experience. Six (32%) participants have had over 20+ years experience. Most at this level indicated they would retire relatively soon. This information is referenced in Table 4.

Table 4. Frequency Distribution: Number of Years Teaching

Number of Years Teaching	Frequency	Percent
0-5	8	42%
6-10	1	5%
10-15	1	5%
15-20	3	16%
Over 20	6	32%
Total	19	100%

The following question, as seen in Table 5, asked if participants had formally attended service-learning trainings. These trainings could consist of a workshop, conference, or other. Eleven (58%) participants indicated a yes while 8 (42%) indicated a no.

Table 5. Frequency Distribution: Attendance at Formal Trainings

Formal Training	Frequency	Percent
Yes	11	58%
No	8	42%

Research Questions

The following research questions related to the Stages of Concern, Levels of Use, and Innovation Configurations of Lake County art teachers involved with service learning:

1. At what stage, as determined by the Stages of Concern, are visual art teachers in Lake County?

2. What are the levels of use of art teachers who implement service learning in their curriculum?

3. What descriptive configurations exist among the teachers who have indicated a level of use?

Table 6 outlines a summary of the questions and the data collection method utilized for each:

Table 6. Research Questions and Data Collection Methods

Research Question	Data Collection Method
At what stage, as determined by the Stages of Concern, are visual art teachers in Lake County?	Stage of Concern Questionnaire
What are the levels of use of art teachers who implement service learning in their curriculum?	Face-to-face interview using the Level of Use Instrument
What descriptive configurations exist among the teachers who have indicated a level of use?	Face-to-face interview using the Innovation Configuration Checklist

The Stages of Concern consisted of a 35-item Likert scale. These data yielded information indicating present-day concerns of participants regarding service-learning implementation. Through a focused interview, each participant's level of service-learning usage was determined through the Levels of Use questionnaire. When a participant indicated usage of service learning, additional questions were asked based on the Innovation Configuration Checklist. This yielded data indicating 1) which service-learning elements were most

successfully implemented and 2) those elements that required further attention by the District Service-Learning Coordinating when working with teachers. All interviews were digitally audiotaped, transcribed, and coded according to the CBAM coding requirements. Data from the SoCQ, the LoU, and the IC Checklist were analyzed with simple descriptive statistics.

Stages of Concern Questionnaire

The Stages of Concern Questionnaire (SoCQ) is a quantitative diagnostic tool that provides data about the affective side of change. It captures people's feelings, perceptions, reactions, and attitudes about an educational innovation and categorizes this affective response through stages of concern.

The original concept of the SoCQ is based upon work from Hall et al. (1973), and defines stages of development of adoption of an innovation. A review of these stages may be helpful in understanding the SoCQ results and analysis.

Stage 0 - Awareness: Little concern about or involvement with the innovation is indicated.

Stage 1 - Informational: A general awareness of the innovation and interest in learning more detail about it is indicated. The person seems to be unworried about herself/himself in relation to the innovation. She/he is interested in substantive aspects of the innovation in a selfless manner such as general characteristics, effects, and requirements for use.

Stage 2 - Personal: The individual is uncertain about the demands of the innovation, her/his aadequacy to meet those demands, and her/his role with the innovation. This stage includes analysis of her/his role in relation to the reward structure of the organization, decision making, and consideration of potential conflicts with existing structures or personal commitment. Financial or status implications of the program for self and colleagues may also be reflected.

Stage 3 - Management: Attention is focused on the processes and tasks of using the innovation and the best use of information and resources. Issues related to efficiency, organizing, managing, scheduling, and time demands are utmost.

Stage 4 - Consequence: Attention focuses on the impact of the innovation on students in her/his immediate sphere of influence. The focus is on relevance of the innovation for students, evaluation of student outcomes, including performance and competencies, and changes needed to increase student outcomes.

Stage 5 - Collaboration: Teachers focus on coordination and cooperation with others regarding use of the innovation.

Stage 6 - Refocusing: Teachers focus on exploration of more universal benefits from the innovation, including the possibility of major changes or replacement with a more powerful alternative. The individual has definite ideas about alternatives to the proposed or existing form of the innovation.

Hall and Hord (2001) state that it is important to note that there is a developmental path from low concern (Awareness) to high understanding and reformatting (Refocusing). This path is grouped in stages since the flow of a teacher's concern may progress in a swift manner or is stifled at different levels. The SoCQ findings from this study pinpoint a certain moment in time of the participant's level of concern and may not represent future concern levels.

An analysis of the findings, also illustrated in Table 7 reveals the following:

1. Stage 1 (Information) had the highest number of participants scoring at this level (32%).
2. Stage 2 (Personal) and Stage 5 (Collaboration) tied for the second highest level of concern (21% each).
3. Stage 0 (Awareness) had the third highest number (16%) for the group.
4. Stage 3 (Management) only showed 11% of participants at this level.
5. No participant indicated Stage 4 (Consequence) or Stage 6 (Refocusing) as her/his greatest concern.

These findings indicate that almost a third of the participants are more interested in acquiring information about service-learning characteristics, effects, and results than in learning how to manage or collaborate with others in its use. This desire for more information is understandable, as 67% of those in this stage have indicated that they have not received formal training such as attending a service-learning conference or workshop prior to this study. Therefore, this need would be typical of first-time users. However, of these Stage 1 participants, 50% stated that they had been implementing service learning without realizing that they had done so, and the other 50% had been integrating service learning in their curriculum for 2-5 years.

Table 7. Frequency and Percentages of Highest Concerns Stage for Individuals

	Highest Stage of Concern						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of Individuals	3	6	4	2	0	4	0
Percentages	16%	32%	21%	11%	0%	21%	0%

Twenty-one percent of the participants indicated a Stage 2 concern level. Typically, users at this stage have already received information about or have been informed of service learning. In this study, 75% of the respondents who are at Stage 2 have indicated previous formal training. Concerns at this stage suggest uncertainty about what role the teacher plays once this pedagogy is implemented, how the inclusion of service learning would impact their personal and classroom time, and how their participation affects their decision-making authority. Hall and Hord (2001) state that teachers beginning a new innovation typically fall in this category. Two out of the four respondents have included service learning only within the past year; however, the remaining two are veteran users, with 4-5 years of implementation experience.

A high concern level in Stage 5 (Collaboration) focuses on including others in service-learning implementation. As evidenced from the interviews, all four users indicate some form of internal or external future collaboration and coordination. Seventy-five percent of these teachers, all with over five years of service-learning experience, have decided to include other faculty in their own school campus and/or intend to create new community partners. We would expect the fourth teacher, who is new to service learning, to exhibit high concern levels in Stages 1 or 2. However, a majority of her colleagues had recently attended an arts-based service-learning conference and had decided to implement a service-learning project school-wide. This upcoming project would account for her unusually high level of collaboration concern, as she is now faced with the practical challenges of logistical and teaching coordination.

Hall et al. (1998), state that peak scores from Stages 1-6 can be directly interpreted from the Stages of Concern definition, with the exception of Stage 0 (Awareness). For non-users,

Stage 0 suggests that the participant is cognizant of the innovation, but is currently not involved. These participants should also exhibit high levels on Stages 1 and 2. For users, Stage 0 reflects a lack of concern of the innovation and they should also be low on Stages 1 and 2. Two of the three are currently non-users and exhibit high levels on Stages 1 and 2, as predicted by Hall et al. (1998). The third, a user for 3 years, peaks at Stage 0 and further displays high Stages 1 through 3 suggesting that either service learning is difficult to implement or her involvement in its implementation has been minimal.

Hall and Hord (2001) group these seven stages into four categories: awareness (stage 0), self (stages 1 and 2), task (stage 3), and impact (stages 4 through 6). Of interest is an emergent subgroup of participants who displayed high concern levels in stages 0 through 2 (approximately 70%). Persons in stages 0 through 2 typically are aware of the innovation and may choose not to implement it, or hold great concerns regarding how the innovation affects her/him. These characteristics usually reflect concerns of those who have just been introduced to the innovation or who are currently deciding whether or not to implement it. However, 10 of the 13 in this subgroup are currently using service learning, with 5 of the 10 having 3 or more years of experience.

Levels of Use

The Levels of Use explores behaviors and portrays how people are acting with respect to specified change (Hall & Hord, 2001) by identifying the degree to which teachers are using the innovation. This strategy can assist teachers in moving to higher levels of use as well as following the entire implementation process. Hall and Hord (2001) identified eight levels of use. Levels zero through two reflect the non-user status but include headings such as orientation and preparation that indicate possible future use. Levels three through seven range from mechanical use of the innovation to a re-evaluation of program quality. As the level of use increases, so does the user's understanding and level of innovation implementation. Table 8 reviews these levels.

Like the Stages of Concern, the Levels of Use examined teacher responses at the end of the school year regarding service learning. Thus, results provide only a brief glimpse into participants' service-learning usage level. In lieu of classroom observation over a semester or year-long duration, the researcher relied on information obtained from the Levels of Use interviews supported with data from the Innovation Configuration checklist. Table 9 shows the frequency and percentages of teachers at each Level of Use.

Table 8. Levels of Use and Descriptions

Level	Description
0 – Nonuse	State in which the individual has little or no knowledge of the innovation, no involvement with it, and is doing nothing toward becoming involved.
I – Orientation	State in which the individual has acquired or is acquiring information about the innovation and/or has explored its value orientation and what it will require.
II – Preparation	State in which the user is preparing for first use of the innovation.
III – Mechanical Use	State in which the user focuses most effort on the short-term, day-to-day use of the innovation, with little time for reflection. Changes in use are made more to meet user needs than needs of students and others. The user is primarily engaged in an attempt to master tasks required to use the innovation. These attempts often result in disjointed and superficial use.
IVA – Routine	Use of the innovation is stabilized. Few if any changes are being made in ongoing use. Little preparation or thought is being given to improve innovation use or its consequences.
IVB – Refinement	State in which the user varies the use of the innovation to increase the impact on clients (students or others) within their immediate sphere of influence. Variations in use are based on knowledge of both short- and long-term consequences of clients.
V – Integration	State in which the user is combining own efforts to use the innovation with related activities of colleagues to achieve a collective impact on clients within their common sphere of influence.
VI – Renewal	State in which the user reevaluates the quality of use of the innovation, seeks major modifications of, or alternatives to, present innovation to achieve increased impact on clients, examines new developments in the field, and explores new goals for self and the organization.

Table 9. Levels of Use Findings (n=19)

LoU 0	LoU I	LoU II	LoU III	LoU IVA	LoU IVB	LoU V	LoU VI
2	1	7	3	0	4	2	0
11%	5%	37%	16%	0%	21%	11%	0%

LoU 0 – Nonuse. After examining the Levels of Use, two teachers, one elementary and one high school, indicated that they were nonusers. Both had been past users implementing service learning for only one year. Neither had suggested that they would begin use next year but both were amenable to the possibility once they received additional information. Pat had attended one service-learning training several years ago and had begun usage the following school year. Pat's literacy-based project included students from the art club who taught reading and art to one of the feeder pattern elementary schools. Attendance in this project began dwindling as the art club students acquired part-time jobs after school. In addition, Pat was given additional responsibilities from the school's administration. Feeling stretched, Pat did not feel continued implementation of service learning was possible.

Barbara participated in a district-wide empty bowls project during 2005-06. Her art classes received information about service learning and hunger and homeless issues through the district service-learning youth council. Recently, her school underwent a yearlong renovation, moving her classroom into a large storage room. As a result, Barbara felt spatially constrained and unable to participate in the project. She is interested in gathering project and future funding information, but has not done so on her own. Although both Pat and Barbara clearly have knowledge and information about service learning, their current lack of involvement and inactivity to become involved place them at a nonuse level.

LoU I – Orientation. Only one high school teacher falls within this stage. At the onset of the interview, Viola, a teacher of 2-Dimensional Art, had decided to include service learning in her curriculum next year. This could place her at a LoU II (Preparation) level. Throughout the interview, however, Viola raised certain questions more in line with information acquisition rather than first-use preparation. In addition, when asked about pursuing additional service-learning information, she stated that if she wanted to participate in a project, she would know whom to contact. This desire for more information and uncertainty for future implementation clearly situates her at the Orientation Stage.

LoU II – Preparation. Seven teachers demonstrated through their interview that they were planning on using service learning and had already formulated project ideas. These included four high school, two middle school, and one elementary school teacher. Two indicated that their past projects almost met service-learning criteria and, with some tweaking, would qualify. One teacher plans to relocate to another state but is currently preparing to include it in

her curriculum. The definition of this Level II-Preparation stage typically refers to first-time users. Three teachers had some familiarity with implementing the action component of service learning but were unaware of the preparation, reflection, or demonstration components. This type of project, then, could be classified as school-based community service, but not a service-learning project. Thus, adding the other service-learning components would not only provide a new experience for these three teachers, but also entail making some curricular changes. As a result, their experience with service learning the following year would be considered first usage and place them at LoU II.

LoU III – Mechanical Use. This group included two teachers from elementary schools and one high school teacher. All teach in the south end of the district, and all have varying degrees of experience with service learning. Meg had only begun her service-learning project a few months prior to the interview. She believes she understands service learning, as she had attended several workshops and been actively following other teachers' progress for several years. The overwhelming support from school administration and parents and the relative ease in which she implements her curriculum suggest overall success in her project. However, her short length of service-learning engagement has not allowed her to fully participate in reflection or demonstration, two essential elements of service learning.

Lisa has participated in service learning for three years, and while most activities have run smoothly, she has had difficulty communicating with other participating teachers and facilitating an end-of-the year celebration activity. Her response to the Innovation Configuration checklist indicated that she was struggling with several service-learning elements, especially reflection. For this reason, she felt that she did not have an adequate grasp of service learning, even though most of her implementation efforts ran without difficulty.

Like Lisa, Melody has experienced some difficulty coordinating service-learning activities with other schools in her feeder pattern. Of the three in this stage, Melody has the most experience (six+ years) implementing service learning, has attended three service-learning conferences, and has vocalized to others about this pedagogy. Her Levels of Use rating sheet places her between mechanical use and refinement. We would expect then a rating between these two levels. A close look at her Innovation Configuation checklist, though, reveals that she has been able to accomplish only 50% of the activities described and none of the elements have been fully integrated. This overall picture suggests that Melody's Level of Use is not yet Routine.

LoU IVA – Routine. No teacher is placed at this level.

LoU IVB – Refinement. This level focuses on user variation of the innovation. Four teachers, representing elementary, middle, and high schools, have or plan to extend their service-learning reach. Betty, Deb, Annie, and Nicole have a combined total of 17 years of service-learning experience and all currently partake in the empty bowls project. Betty, Deb, and Nicole have decided to increase their students' level of service learning participation through project research, younger student mentoring, and journal writing, thereby strengthening the preparation, action, and reflection elements. In addition, all three have indicated their desire to engage their students in a separate but additional service-learning project next year. Annie's high school students currently teach service learning to Betty, Deb, and Nicole's primary grade students. Annie will spearhead this effort of increased service learning, turning their activities into a truly cascading service-learning partnership.

LoU V – Integration. Amy, an elementary school teacher, and Elizabeth, a high school teacher, have reached a high-level of achievement by understanding and integrating all the elements of service learning and state that their goal is to continue to combine their own efforts with other colleagues and community organizations to create quality service-learning projects. For several years, Amy has worked with another colleague in her intergenerational project. She feels that the project is stable enough that she may branch into other service need areas, thereby widening the community reach for service-learning inclusion. Her other interest is to develop a school-wide service-learning project for the following year.

For the past nine years, Elizabeth has been able to enfold participation from two middle schools and three elementary schools into her empty bowls project. She is also planning to expand service learning county-wide, not just to art teachers, but to all educators. In this manner, she hopes to engage other teachers in service learning, not only in the arts, but also through the arts. Elizabeth has surpassed the Refinement Stage to attempt to fully integrate service learning into the district.

LoU VI - Refocusing. No teacher is placed at this level.

<div align="center">

Innovation Configuration Checklist

</div>

The checklist identifies four major components of service learning: preparation, action, reflection, and demonstration. Each of the four is sub-divided into a service and an artistic

component, with a minimum of two and maximum of six objectives listed under the sub-divided sections. These objectives describe broad activities that should take place during the each stage. To the right of each component, a "yes" and "no" column are added. A "yes" indicates that the participant includes or covers a particular objective during service-learning implementation. A "no" indicates the reverse.

For those participants who indicated during the Levels of Use interview that they were currently integrating service learning into their curricula, additional questions related to the Innovation Configuration were asked. I created this checklist by first identifying the most commonly agreed upon service-learning components espoused by Florida Learn & Serve (2006) and promoted through the research literature. To identify and confirm additional components and its variations, I interviewed Lake County's Service-Learning District Coordinator (for service-learning content), the originator of Lake County's Empty Bowls project (for arts-based service-learning content), and a local art education teacher (for art content). I refined the checklist and tested it in a focus group composed of local art teachers.

Responses were qualitatively measured, and the data are grouped and shown by overall findings and individual findings within three sub-groups. The overall findings provide a holistic picture of service learning in the county, while the latter furnishes useful information about several sub-groupings. Table 10 shows that all teachers implemented 6 of the 12 artistic objectives and 2 of the 15 service objectives. Therefore, as a group, the art teachers were more successful in implementing the artistic than service-learning components in the preparation, reflection, and demonstration stages.

The Innovation Configuration interviews produced findings that allowed the researcher to create additional categories or sub-groupings for these participants: Empty Bowl Server, Empty Bowls Served, and Individual Projects. In the Empty Bowls project, elementary, middle, and high school students learn about the hunger and homelessness issues and then create bowls with the assistance of teacher instruction. After students learn glazing techniques, the bowls are painted and fired. A district-wide celebration is held at which students coordinate a dinner to share a meal with the community using those bowls. This dinner is also a silent auction fundraiser, as the public is invited to purchase additional bowls made by the students. Usually, proceeds are given to a local food panty, homeless shelter, or other non-profit organization.

Table 10. ICC Results for Group (n=9)

Preparation Service Component	Y	N
Engages students in discussion of project need.	9	0
Performs writing exercises on the project need topic.	3	6
Researches project need issue.	3	6
Visits organization, classroom, or other environment prior to conducting service.	2	7
Creates presentation based on project need.	3	6
Students help to influence the selection of needs to be addressed in the project design.	2	7
Preparation Artistic Component	**Y**	**N**
Presents visual media to advance discussion.	7	2
Recognizes that various artistic organizational elements can communicate and fulfill a need effectively.	9	0
Connects the real world with the visual arts.	9	0
Chooses and evaluates subject matter, symbolism, and ideas.	5	4
Presents historical and current examples of art with the need as the subject.	2	7
Sketches an art project idea.	5	4
Action Service Component	**Y**	**N**
Students take leadership roles when conducting tasks.	5	4
Students work collaboratively with service recipients and partners.	4	5
Service activities utilize a range of learning styles.	9	0
Action Artistic Component	**Y**	**N**
Students create visual art forms based on curricula.	5	4
Students create and communicate ideas using knowledge of structures and functions of visual arts.	5	4
Reflection Service Component	**Y**	**N**
Discusses service activity, meaning, and/or value as a group either formally or informally.	8	1
Journals about the service activity.	1	8
Conducts future planning of service activity.	7	2
Students are involved in project's formative and summative evaluation.	3	6
Reflection Artistic Component	**Y**	**N**
Creates visual representation of impressions or meaning of service activity.	5	4
Evaluates own work looking at elements and principles, craftsmanship and technique.	3	6
Understands how knowledge, skills, and attitudes gained from visual arts can enhance and deepen understanding of life.	9	0
Evaluates own work informally.	9	0
Demonstration Service Component	**Y**	**N**
Students engage in presentations about their project.	3	6
Students teach others about the project.	7	2
Demonstration Artistic Component	**Y**	**N**
Students make connections between the visual arts, other disciplines, and the real world.	9	0
Students create products based on the learning acquired through the project.	9	0

Seven of the nine teachers who completed the Innovation Configuration Checklist participate in this district-wide project.

Table 11 shows the checklist responses of the teachers categorized in the Empty Bowl Server group. Out of the 29 objectives, all of the teachers in this group implemented the same 5 out of 15 service objectives and 9 of 14 artistic objectives. However, across each objective, teacher participation varied. For example, in the Preparation Stage, Elizabeth, the longest implementer of service learning, combines technology, history, critical thinking, teacher demonstration, and life skills management in her delivery:

> I have them create a Powerpoint presentation on the history of Empty Bowls because it's not my project that I invented, and I want them to know the reason for its invention. Then they research the topic of homelessness because some of them really don't understand the term. I also have them read the book *Stone Soup* (Brown, 1997). Finally, I ask them a question about how the book relates to Empty Bowls. They have to write an essay about that. Oh, before a certain group goes to the school, I give them instructions about the proper clothing that they are supposed to wear, how they're supposed to act, and what's going to happen so they are prepared for how they're going to deal with the little students at the other schools.

In contrast, Lisa greatly relies on other classes to assist in Preparation:

> I organize with the SL teacher to have her kids come over and explain what the project is. She sends her kids, and they give a Powerpoint presentation explaining the whole process of how to make the bowls, why they are doing it, the need for doing it…for helping the homeless. After they do that, then I demonstrate how to make the bowl.

The Action component for all the teachers in this stage is nearly identical. Students visit participating middle and elementary schools in their feeder pattern two to three times a semester. As Elizabeth states:

> During those visits, the students introduce themselves, explain the purpose of their visit, and give them a demonstration on how to make a bowl. Then they pass out the clay and pair up with the younger studentsAnd then my kids make sure their names are on the bowls for firing purposes. The second visit is usually a little bit more relaxing because that's when they're decorating the bowl, showing the younger students the proper way to apply underglaze and glaze.

Table 11. ICC Results for Empty Bowls Servers (n=3)

Preparation Service Component	Y	N
Engages students in discussion of project need.	3	0
Performs writing exercises on the project need topic.	0	3
Researches project need issue.	1	2
Visits organization, classroom, or other environment prior to conducting service.	1	2
Creates presentation based on project need.	2	1
Students help to influence the selection of needs to be addressed in the project design.	0	3
Preparation Artistic Component	**Y**	**N**
Presents visual media to advance discussion.	3	0
Recognizes that various artistic organizational elements can communicate and fulfill a need effectively.	3	0
Connects the real world with the visual arts.	3	0
Chooses and evaluates subject matter, symbolism, and ideas.	3	0
Presents historical and current examples of art with the need as the subject.	0	3
Sketches an art project idea.	2	1
Action Service Component	**Y**	**N**
Students take leadership roles when conducting tasks.	3	0
Students work collaboratively with service recipients and partners.	2	1
Service activities utilize a range of learning styles.	3	0
Action Artistic Component	**Y**	**N**
Students create visual art forms based on curricula.	3	0
Students create and communicate ideas using knowledge of structures and functions of visual arts.	3	0
Reflection Service Component	**Y**	**N**
Discusses service activity, meaning, and/or value as a group either formally or informally.	2	1
Journals about the service activity.	1	2
Conducts future planning of service activity.	2	1
Students are involved in project's formative and summative evaluation.	1	2
Reflection Artistic Component	**Y**	**N**
Creates visual representation of impressions or meaning of service activity.	3	0
Evaluates own work looking at elements and principles, craftsmanship and technique.	2	1
Understands how knowledge, skills, and attitudes gained from visual arts can enhance and deepen understanding of life.	3	0
Evaluates own work informally.	3	0
Demonstration Service Component	**Y**	**N**
Students engage in presentations about their project.	1	2
Students teach others about the project.	2	1
Demonstration Artistic Component	**Y**	**N**
Students make connections between the visual arts, other disciplines, and the real world.	3	0
Students create products based on the learning acquired through the project.	3	0

Reflection can be thought of as an internalization of someone's thoughts and actions. It allows students to process and absorb what they have experienced and is critical to meaningful learning. Annie and Elizabeth's approach differ.

> Annie: All of my students do, ah, what is called a critique sheet which they critique their art project. So if they're making a bowl or if they're making a set of bowls, they're evaluating that bowl on its artistic merit. This could be broken down to its craftsmanship or other. And then they have information about the service learning which is incorporated into their test so you could call that a reflection of sorts.
>
> Elizabeth: The reflection is basically a question thing. I ask how their experience was at the school, and they get to talk about their service.

Lisa confessed that she has heard of reflection and knows to incorporate it; however, she has not been successful in its implementation.

None of the teachers includes a formal Demonstration Component in the project. Informally, students engage in conversation with others about their efforts. Though they would like to capitalize on the effects of demonstration, for now, they have replaced it with an Empty Bowls Celebration dinner to acknowledge their accomplishments.

For the teachers of the Empty Bowls Served group, all of the teachers incorporated the same 2 of the service components and 6 of the artistic components. Again, across each objective, teacher participation varied. Table 12 shows the checklist responses of the teachers categorized in the Empty Bowl Served group. All teachers in this category did engage their students in discussion of the project need. For the Preparation Stage, Nicole states:

> The high school students would send us literature about Empty Bowls, which we would go over before we did the project. When they arrived, they would review it and talk about some of the Lake County statistics about homelessness and hunger issues.

Though Melody does not accomplish any other Preparation objective, she does provide some background information:

> I prepare them for working with the high school kids, but I also want them to understand what the project is about. So I ask them the what, where, why questions. What I don't want is the high school kids to just come in here and make bowls with them and have them to think that that is all there is to the project. I like for them to understand it.

Table 12. ICC Results for Empty Bowls Served (n=4)

Preparation Service Component	Y	N
Engages students in discussion of project need.	4	0
Performs writing exercises on the project need topic.	1	3
Researches project need issue.	0	4
Visits organization, classroom, or other environment prior to conducting service.	0	4
Creates presentation based on project need.	0	4
Students help to influence the selection of needs to be addressed in the project design.	0	4
Preparation Artistic Component	**Y**	**N**
Presents visual media to advance discussion.	0	4
Recognizes that various artistic organizational elements can communicate and fulfill a need effectively.	4	0
Connects real world with the visual arts.	4	0
Chooses and evaluates subject matter, symbolism, and ideas.	0	4
Presents historical and current examples of art with the need as the subject.	0	4
Sketches an art project idea.	0	4
Action Service Component	**Y**	**N**
Students take leadership roles when conducting tasks.	0	4
Students work collaboratively with service recipients and partners.	0	4
Service activities utilize a range of learning styles.	4	0
Action Artistic Component	**Y**	**N**
Students create visual art forms based on curricula.	0	4
Students create and communicate ideas using knowledge of structures and functions of visual arts.	0	4
Reflection Service Component	**Y**	**N**
Discusses service activity, meaning, and/or value as a group either formally or informally.	4	0
Journals about the service activity.	0	4
Conducts future planning of service activity.	3	1
Students are involved in project's formative and summative evaluation.	0	4
Reflection Artistic Component	**Y**	**N**
Creates visual representation of impressions or meaning of service activity.	0	4
Evaluates own work looking at elements and principles, craftsmanship and technique.	0	4
Understands how knowledge, skills, and attitudes gained from visual arts can enhance and deepen understanding of life.	4	0
Evaluates own work informally.	4	0
Demonstration Service Component	**Y**	**N**
Students engage in presentations about their project.	0	4
Students teach others about the project.	3	1
Demonstration Artistic Component	**Y**	**N**
Students make connections between the visual arts, other disciplines, and the real world.	4	0
Students create products based on the learning acquired through the project.	4	0

The Action Component reflects that of the Empty Bowl Server group. The high school students demonstrate bowl-making procedures and then engage the younger students in this process. All Empty Bowl Served teachers agree that this is the extent of the Action. Betty articulates:

> We made the bowls and painted them and followed through with getting ready for the dinner and selling the bowls. But as far as the bowls project goes, no that is it. They really don't have any other responsibilities to the program itself.

None of the teachers engaged their students in Reflection or Demonstration. This is not surprising as the high school students do not return for further service-learning engagement. Since this structure promotes service-learning teaching by the high school students, the teachers have relied on the high school students to implement service learning.

Both of the teachers in the Individual Project group included a high number of objectives (13 service, 13 artistic). Table 13 shows the checklist responses of the teachers categorized in this group. One of the two participated in Empty Bowls but also created an additional service-learning project. The other one create a non-Empty Bowl-related project. Although Empty Bowls has become a district-wide event, participation is not mandatory. Art teachers who participate in service learning may include their students or create separate and additional projects.

Meg's project focused on hurricane disaster relief, specifically the evacuees in shelters. For the Preparation Stage, nearby high school students created a Powerpoint presentation on hurricane devastations and followed with an open discussion. Meg's elementary school students then drew their impressions of a hurricane. Understanding the cognitive development of students at that age, Meg opted for a visual activity:

> I wanted my students to draw about what it would be like to be impacted by a hurricane. They could draw how it would feel or what it would look like. I wanted my kids to have this experience since not all of them have been through a hurricane. I wanted everybody to get in the same frame of mind.

Table 13. ICC Results for Teachers of Individual Projects (n=2)

Preparation Service Component	Y	N
Engages students in discussion of project need.	2	0
Performs writing exercises on the project need topic.	2	0
Researches project need issue.	2	0
Visits organization, classroom, or other environment prior to conducting service.	1	1
Creates presentation based on project need.	2	0
Students help to influence the selection of needs to be addressed in the project design.	2	0
Preparation Artistic Component	**Y**	**N**
Presents visual media to advance discussion.	2	0
Recognizes that various artistic organizational elements can communicate and fulfill a need effectively.	2	0
Connects real world with the visual arts.	2	0
Chooses and evaluates subject matter, symbolism, and ideas.	2	0
Presents historical and current examples of art with the need as the subject.	2	0
Sketches an art project idea.	2	0
Action Service Component	**Y**	**N**
Students take leadership roles when conducting tasks.	2	0
Students work collaboratively with service recipients and partners.	2	0
Service activities utilize a range of learning styles.	2	0
Action Artistic Component	**Y**	**N**
Students create visual art forms based on curricula.	2	00
Students create and communicate ideas using knowledge of structures and functions of visual arts.	2	0
Reflection Service Component	**Y**	**N**
Discusses service activity, meaning, and/or value as a group either formally or informally.	2	0
Journals about the service activity.	0	2
Conducts future planning of service activity.	2	0
Students are involved in project's formative and summative evaluation.	2	0
Reflection Artistic Component	**Y**	**N**
Creates visual representation of impressions or meaning of service activity.	2	0
Evaluates own work looking at elements and principles, craftsmanship and technique.	1	1
Understands how knowledge, skills, and attitudes gained from visual arts can enhance and deepen understanding of life.	2	0
Evaluates own work informally.	2	0
Demonstration Service Component	**Y**	**N**
Students engage in presentations about their project.	2	0
Students teach others about the project.	2	0
Demonstration Artistic Component	**Y**	**N**
Students make connections between the visual arts, other disciplines, and the real world.	2	0
Students create products based on the learning acquired through the project.	2	0

To engage in full student participation, Meg surveyed the students for their input on activities children could do while living in a hurricane shelter:

> We brainstormed for a couple of days different activities that were fun to do. Then we looked at what age groups these activities cover because it was very important that when a family comes in and receives a tote bag, there needs to be activities that weren't just for kindergarten age children. Since most families have varying ages of children, we tried to put at least two activities together for primary and secondary. My students even thought about little toddlers. My kids grew a little concerned and said maybe we should put something in there for the adults. We tried to make our activities age-appropriate.

Funding for Meg's project arrived late in the year, making it impossible to engage in Reflection or Demonstration this year; however, she has already made plans with her students to accomplish these components:

> I love to get feedback from my kids so I know how we did. I'll be talking to them and probably do a survey. We might do KWL. I work with K-5, so I assess them using a different instrument for each grade level. We'll probably do a discussion or checklist or just do verbal feedback. We'll look at what we did, how can we do it better, what worked, and what didn't. For Demonstration, I'd like the high school students and my students to create a Powerpoint. My students and I will use this to present the project again in the future to the community like in a festival. I'd like the public to learn about what we've done.

Amy, another elementary school teacher, began working with ceramics and bowl creation, however, her project had an intergenerational bent. Like the teachers in the Empty Bowls project, Amy taught her students how to make and glaze ceramic bowls. They also created personalized note cards to include in the bowls. To enhance the Action Component, the students visited the nursing homes and spent time engaging in dialogue with the elderly. As part of their reflection, students and the elderly informally critiqued the students' artwork. By discussing their project, the meaning they derived from their participation, and a formal presentation of the bowls to the elderly, the students engaged in active demonstration.

Summary

This section presents the findings for the three research questions in this study:

1. At what stage, as determined by the Stages of Concern, are visual art teachers in Lake County?

An analysis of the findings shows that one-third of the participants are more interested in acquiring information (Stage 1) about service-learning characteristics, effects, and results than in how to manage or collaborate with others in its use. Stage 2 (Personal) and 5 (Collaboration) tied for the second highest level of concern, with 21% of participants in each stage. This suggests that several participants are uncertain about their role as a teacher when implementing service learning, while others feel they have a good grasp of this pedagogy and are now concerned with proper and effective collaboration methods. Sixteen percent of the participants (n=3) fall in the Stage 0 (Awareness) category. Two of the three are currently non-users and exhibit high levels on Stages 1 and 2. This indicates that they have heard of service learning but are currently not users. The third, a user for 3 years, peaks at Stage 0 and further displays high Stages 1 through 3, suggesting either that service learning is difficult to implement or that her involvement in its implementation has been minimal. Finally, no participant peaked at Stage 4 (Consequence) or Stage 6 (Refocusing).

2. What are the levels of use of art teachers who implement service learning in their curricula?

After examining the Levels of Use, two teachers, one elementary and one high school, indicated that they were nonusers, with only one high school teacher falling in the Orientation level. Seven teachers demonstrated through their interview that they were planning on using service learning and had already formulated project ideas (Preparation level). Through the interviews, two teachers from elementary schools and one high school teacher indicated that they were at the Mechanical Use level. All three of these teachers are located in schools in the south end of the district, and all have varying degrees of experience with service learning. The Refinement levels focuses on user variation of the innovation. Four teachers, representing elementary, middle, and high schools, have extended or plan to extend their service-learning reach, indicating refinement of their current efforts. Amy, an elementary school teacher, and Elizabeth, a high school teacher, have reached a high-level of achievement by understanding and integrating all the elements of service learning and state that their goal is to continue to combine

their own efforts with other colleagues and community organizations to create quality service-learning projects. These final two teachers are at the Integration level.

3. What descriptive configurations exist among the teachers who have indicated a level of use?

The interviews revealed three sub-groups or categories of arts-based service-learning projects: the Empty Bowl Server, the Empty Bowl Served, and the Individual Project. Overall, all teachers implemented 6 of the 12 artistic objectives and 2 of the 15 service objectives. For the Empty Bowl Server group, out of the 29 objectives, all of the teachers in this group implemented the same 5 out of 15 service objectives and 9 of 14 artistic objectives. With the initial assistance of students from service-learning leadership classes, these three teachers engaged in a cascade of service by having their students teach the knowledge and skills learned to middle and elementary school students.

For the teachers of the Empty Bowls Served group, all of the teachers incorporated the same 2 of the service components and 6 of the artistic components. This low number of inclusion is not surprising, as the students of these teachers were the recipients of the service. Their students participated in service learning by listening to presentations and then creating ceramic bowls. The structure allowed these teachers to take a moderately inactive role in the service-learning delivery. As a result, the service-learning elements were not embraced or integrated in any intentional effort.

Both of the teachers in the Individual Project group included a high number of objectives (13 service, 13 artistic). Therefore, this group was the most successful in incorporating the objectives. Although one teacher utilized students from the service-learning leadership class, she deliberately created her own preparation activities to enhance the learning. Since these individual projects did not follow any structured delivery method, the teachers were able to freely coordinate and plan their project, which resulted in successful integration of nearly all the objectives in the checklist.

Chapter V provides a summary of the study, presents a discussion of the findings, and offers recommendations.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the levels of concern of Lake County visual art teachers toward implementing service learning. It also sought to show the teachers' levels of use in implementing service learning. Finally, the study provided descriptive configurations of arts-based service-learning integration. The methodology employed was the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) that conceptualizes and facilitates the education change process (Hall & Hord, 2001). The literature that framed this study centered around service-learning history, theory, and pedagogy, as well as teachers' experiences with service learning. It also focused on CBAM's developmental origins and included an analysis of several CBAM studies.

This study addressed the following research questions:

1. At what stage, as determined by the Stages of Concern, are visual art teachers in Lake County?

2. What are the levels of use of art teachers who implement service learning in their curricula?

3. What descriptive configurations exist among the teachers who have indicated a level of use?

The researcher used a mixed-method approach, employing both quantitative and qualitative data. Nineteen teachers agreed to participate in the study. Of that number, 18 were female, and 1 was a male. Three teachers were between the ages of 20-29, two fell in the 30-39 category, three were between 40-49, and the majority (11) were between 50-59 years of age. Only nine of the nineteen teachers qualified for the follow-up interview.

The study used three instruments: the Stages of Concern Questionnaire, the Innovation Configuration Checklist, and the Levels of Use of an Innovation. With these instruments, data were collected on initial stages of concern and levels of use as well as the particular configuration of the innovation in use.

Discussion of Findings

Findings from the study indicate that visual art teachers in Lake County are at various stages of concern and usage levels of service learning. Their projects profiles also vary

depending on whether they participated in the district-wide project or ventured on their own to create their own project. A follow-up discussion with the District Service-Learning Coordinator revealed a plausible explanation of these findings that may be attributable to the method of delivery of arts-based service learning in Lake County.

County Factors. The impetus for service learning began in 1993 through the Adopting Communities for Excellence (ACE) community service program at South Lake High School. The following year, the lead coordinator/teacher, now the District Service-Learning Coordinator, turned to service learning to better meet program goals and also receive additional assistance via grants. By 2001, service learning expanded to a network of 27 student designed service-learning projects, involving 2,800 students and 25 in-classroom partnerships with teachers. In 2005, approximately 11,000 students were participating in over 70 service-learning projects.

Due to the enormous amount of student participation in Lake County, the majority of projects consist of student volunteers who, as part of a service-learning youth council (SLYC), participate at various levels of design, leadership, and coordination of service-learning initiatives. Students initially participate in trainings that promote teamwork, leadership, and creativity before leading workshops for other students on the development of individual projects. As part of a service-learning leadership class, students are assigned to help teachers in their project development and execution by developing agendas, determining leadership roles, producing materials, and providing logistical support. This delivery construct is intended to distribute much of the instructional load from teachers onto the students. The findings from the study relate to this unique structure.

Teacher Categories. Analysis of the interviews revealed four sub-groups or categories of service-learning teachers: Empty Bowl Server, Empty Bowls Served, Individual Projects, and Non-Users. In service learning, servers are students who apply curricula and classroom learning through hands-on service projects (Florida Learn & Serve, 2006). The students are actively engaged in the elements of service learning and perform the service directly to the recipients. In this study, the served are students who are recipients of the service. Typically, the server and served jointly partake in the service, but only the server is fully immersed in learning and sense making of service learning.

The premise of the Empty Bowls project in Lake County is for students to create and fire ceramic glazed bowls and then share a meal with the community in those bowls. Usually,

proceeds from sales of the bowls are given to a local food panty, homeless shelter, or other non-profit organization. In Lake County, students in the service-learning youth council who are assigned to the Empty Bowls project present through Powerpoint presentations and handouts the homeless/hunger issue to high school students in participating art classes.

The Empty Bowl Server, then, are the high school teachers who are currently implementing this project. The Empty Bowl Served consist of the middle and elementary school teachers whose students are the recipients of the service. Individual Projects refer to the teachers who opted not to participate in the Empty Bowls project, but are still including service learning, and Non-Users are those not currently using service learning and who may or may not be planning use next year.

Klenke and Barrows (1980) concluded that all three of the CBAM instruments must be implemented to properly document teachers' concerns and usage level; therefore the following analysis will follow this suggestion.

Empty Bowl Server. Three high school teachers may be placed in this category: Elizabeth, Annie, and Lisa. Elizabeth's Stages of Concern (SoC) is at Stage 5 (collaboration) and her levels of use (LoU) is at Integration. Her responses on the Innovation Configuration Checklist (ICC) indicate that she successfully integrates into her project 80% of the service and artistic components. It is not surprising that Elizabeth scored so high, as she formally began the Empty Bowls project in Lake County nine years ago and, through her interview, exhibits the greatest amount of knowledge of service learning. She is past the point of routinely using service learning and is now concerned with how to best collaborate with other teachers and community partners to enhance service learning in the district. Table 14 displays results for all three instruments.

A service-learning teacher of five years, Annie's SoC is at Stage 2 (Personal) and her LoU is at Refinement. Her ICC indicate that she covers 76% of the service-learning objectives. Annie's interview data suggest that at times, this project is overwhelming due to lack of communication and to logistical errors. More time is spent on one personal demands and managing issues. This would account for her Stage 2 SoC.

Lisa has been involved in service learning for three years. Her SoC is at Stage 1 (Informational) and her LoU rests at Mechanical Use. Her ICC shows only a 55% success rate. Annie and Elizabeth, colleagues at the same school, have been involved in service learning two

and three times longer than Lisa, respectively. The data show that most of Lisa's time is spent on the day-to-day tasks of implementation. While she may have three years of experience, she is still searching for information. This is corroborated through her interview. When asked how she would rate herself in terms of service-learning knowledge on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being an expert, Lisa replied "about a 3."

Table 14. Participant Results for the Stages of Concern (SoC), Levels of Use (LoU), and Innovation Configuration Checklist (ICC)

Group	User Name	SoC	LoU	ICC
Empty Bowl Server	Elizabeth	5	V	80%
	Annie	2	IVB	76%
	Lisa	1	III	55%
Empty Bowl Served	Nicole	0	IVB	38%
	Melody	5	III	38%
	Betty	1	IVB	45%
	Deb	2	IVB	31%
Individual Project	Amy	5	V	93%
	Meg	2	III	90%
Not Current User - Will Use Next Year	Carolyn	1	II	N/A
	Lee	1	II	N/A
	Melanie	1	II	N/A
	Pam	3	II	N/A
	Melissa	5	II	N/A
	Donna	1	II	N/A
	Gina	3	II	N/A
	Brenda	0	II	N/A
Not Current User- No Plans to Include Next Year	Pat	2	0	N/A
	Barbara	0	0	N/A

For Elizabeth and Annie, the method of service-learning delivery works to their advantage. The SLYC provides some preparation activities and coordinates the action component. This additional teaching by the SLYC allows these two teachers extra time to enhance their instruction by intentionally including additional preparation, reflection, and evaluation in their projects. Combined, their 56 years of teaching experience have taught them that a Powerpoint presentation and handouts do not sufficiently prepare the students to

understand the need or relevance behind their service-learning projects. It seems that Lisa, who has three years of teaching experience, relies heavily on the SLYC to provide instruction, thereby relieving but also preventing her from acquiring information and lessons gained through teaching.

Empty Bowls Served. Nicole, Deb, and Betty's SoC fall in the Self category, which indicates high personal concerns and need for further information. However, their three to five years of service-learning experience coupled with their LoU Refinement level suggest they have a good grasp of service learning. Interviews reveal that these teachers did not need to engage in service learning teaching since they depended on the high school students' efforts. This certainly would explain their lack of service-learning knowledge, need for information, and thus low SoC stages.

This does not explain their high usage levels, though. Through the interviews, we learn that all three are currently in the planning stages of enhancing their projects by increasing their preparation activities and implementing reflection and demonstration elements. Students will now research the project need, make the bowls, and then teach this service and artistic concept to other students. Thus, adding these components would not only provide a new experience for these three teachers, but also entail making some curricular changes. These teachers are refining their models.

Though Melody is part of this grouping, her SoC is at the Collaboration level, while her LoU resides at Mechanical Use. This indicates that her concerns concentrate on coordination and cooperation with others, while her efforts focus on day-to-day usage. Melody, with 13 years of teaching experience, has attended and presented at numerous service-learning conferences and trainings, which may explain her high level of understanding. Unlike the others, she has surpassed the Self stage and moved up to the Task stage. Melody did not state in her interview whether she would be adding additional elements to her curriculum. Therefore, her LoU resides at Level III.

Like Lisa, Nicole, Deb, and Betty all rely heavily on the SLYC to deliver the preparation and action components. They have all agreed that their students are the recipients of service, for once the high school students depart, their students' participation in service learning ends. Thus, the service-learning delivery does not work to their advantage; rather, it acts as a hindrance for project development and curtails teacher understanding of service-learning pedagogy.

Individual Projects. As teachers leading their own projects, Amy and Meg do not participate in Empty Bowls. Amy, a 16-year veteran of the education system, has been implementing service learning for five years. Her peak stage of concern is at 5, Collaboration, her usage level is at Integration, and her ICC suggests she incorporates 93% of the objectives. Amy's intergenerational project involves students creating bowls and personalized notes for the elderly. Since she intends to extend her reach next year by creating a separate project, her present efforts are to enhance collaboration efforts with the chorus teacher and enable her to continue the project in her stead. Amy's highest stages of concern and her usage level directly reflect her current situation.

Meg, a newcomer to service learning, has been active for less than one year. However, she has been mentored and followed other teachers' progress for two years. Her SoC places her at Stage 2 (Personal), her LoU at Mechanical Usage, and her ICC shows 90% of the objectives are included. Meg states that her tote bags for hurricane shelter victims project has been such a success that she plans on expanding the concept to address other needs. It is not surprising that Meg's highest SoC is related to personal concerns, and her usage level rests with tackling day-to-day project tasks, since her involvement with service learning is in the toddler stage.

Unlike some of the other teachers who have been implementing service learning for 2-5 years, Meg and Amy have managed to incorporate 90%-93% of the service-learning objectives. These percentages surpass those within the Empty Bowl Server group. Two of the essential elements of effective service-learning practices involve applying skills learned and active involvement of learning (NYLC, 1999). These elements originally intended for student learning, may also apply to teacher development. Teachers involved in project creation, development, and execution are active learners while also facilitators of the service-learning delivery. They are their own curriculum managers and through training, technical assistance, and experience, they are able to incorporate essential service-learning components resulting in successful service-leaning projects.

Not Current User-Both Groups. The researcher purposely invited users and non-users of service learning to participate in this study to create a more holistic picture of service learning in Lake County. Of the eight participants in this Not Current User group, five indicate a SoC of 1 (Informational). This seems appropriate, as these teachers have made a commitment to

implement service learning the following year. Therefore, they have passed the Awareness stage and are now looking for more information.

Three, however, are a bit surprising. Both Pam and Gina exhibit a Stage 3 (Management) concern. In reviewing their interviews, we find that both teachers have had previous experiences with service learning but are not current users. These experiences enable them to acquire needed information and thus, they are now concerned about processes and tasks of service learning. We would expect Melissa, who is new to service learning, to exhibit high concern levels in Stages 1 or 2. However, a majority of her colleagues had recently attended an arts-based service-learning conference and have decided to implement a service-learning project school-wide. This upcoming project would account for her unusually high level of collaboration concern as she is now faced with practical challenges of logistical and teaching coordination.

All in this group have a LoU of II (Preparation). The LoU exactly captures their current state as all have made commitments for next year's implementation and are currently planning their projects.

There are only two participants who have specifically stated that they will not include service learning in their curricula the following year. Pat's SoC indicates a Stage 2 (Personal) concern and a LoU of 0. Pat had previously implemented service learning two years prior, but chose to focus on other projects due to increased workload, and unavailability and unpredictability of the high school students. Last year, Barbara's students had been Empty Bowl recipients. However, her school, undergoing a renovation project, moved her classroom to a large closet providing less-than-ideal conditions. As a result, Barbara opted not to participate in Empty Bowls this year. Barbara's SoC and LoU rate her as showing little concern and as a result, no usage, for this pedagogy.

Recommendations for Future Practice in Lake County

The Empty Bowl Server group was successful in implementing more of the objectives than the Empty Bowl Served group. However, improvements can be made with both groups of teachers. Therefore, I suggest that Lake County Schools consider the following guidelines. Table 15 also reflects these suggestions.

Table 15. Recommendations for Future Practice for the Empty Bowls Project

	Empty Bowl Server (High School Students)	Empty Bowl Served (Elementary and Middle School Students)
Preparation	SLYC Use multi-media to present the issue. Use multiple learning styles by engaging in interactive exercises. Research national and local statistics about homelessness and hunger issues. Invite a representative of the local community agency to speak. Art Teacher Have the students conduct historical research and write a paper on their findings. Demonstrate the bowl making process to familiarize the students with this technique.	Introduce the topic of hunger and homeless. Discuss any food drives they may have participated in and relate that project's goals to this project. Have them research via the Internet statistics on this issue. Ask them to create drawings on how they perceive this issue.
Action	Continue with current planning. High school art students should read to the younger students instead of the SLYC.	Continue with current planning.
Reflection	Structure a journaling activity after each visit. Create additional ceramic works representing impressions or meaning of their service. Hold formal or informal discussions.	Structure a journaling activity after each visit. Hold informal discussions about their experience.
Demonstration	Create a multi-media presentation. Write an artist statement explaining the value of their service. Invite the community and business partners to share their experience with the project.	Creating drawings of their experience and display their work. Write an artist statement about their project.

Preparation Component: Empty Bowls Server. Lake County's main method of service-learning delivery centers on the innovative use of students as teachers. Their Service-Learning Youth Councils (SLYC), also known as the "service-learning students," are organized within three high schools and provide most of the preparation for the other students in the service-learning classes within their school. For the participating high school visual arts classes, the SLYC students research the topic of Empty Bowls, create Powerpoint presentations based on their research, and present their work to the art students. At times, handouts are also distributed. This is the extent of their teaching. The art students then take what they have learned to the elementary and middle schools and assist them in creating ceramic bowls.

The concept of Preparation is not an easy goal to implement and so is often omitted. In preparation, students are given an outline and an overview of their project. They learn the context of the service they will provide, including why the service is important, who the recipients of the service encompass, and how the service will be designed and delivered. In high-quality service learning, where students are active project creators and coordinators, preparation is inherent in project design. Once the overall goal is realized, students take ownership of the project by helping to determine how they can best prepare in its execution (Roy & Cho, 2006). As teachers are the main vehicles of the knowledge to be implemented, they should co-teach with the SLYC students. Objectives for the SLYC may include the following: present the issue of hunger and homelessness via Powerpoint presentation and handouts, engage in interactive exercises/games highlighting points of the presentation, offer national and local statistics on this topic with emphasis on their nearby surroundings, and coordinate with the local homeless shelter or food pantry for a representative to visit and share with the art class the mission, goals, and importance of that agency.

Teachers then may include the following: have the students conduct research and write on the history of bowls, their structural and artistic evolution, and how they have been used in various past and present cultures; demonstrate the bowl-making process to familiarize the students with this technique.

Preparation Component: Empty Bowls Served. The elementary and middle school teachers should not rely solely on the high school students' preparation activities. They may prepare for the visit by engaging in the following: introduce the topic of hunger and homelessness; discuss any food drives they may have participated in and relate that project's

goals to this project; have them research statistics on this issue via the Internet; ask them to create drawings on how they perceive this issue.

Action Component: Both Groups. The Action component of this project is well-constructed and coordinated; however, improvements could be made. The high school art teachers have collaborated with several middle and elementary schools to conduct the project. The same SLYC students who conduct the presentations also visit local middle and elementary schools and read the book *Stone Soup* (Brown, 1997) with these younger children as part of their Preparation. The high school art students then assist the younger students in creating ceramic bowls. I suggest the high school art students take part in the reading in lieu of the SLYC students. This would provide another opportunity for the high school art students to engage in service and form a closer bond to the younger students, thus increasing their participation level and exposure to civic engagement through service learning.

Reflection Component: Empty Bowl Server. In Reflection, students utilize higher-order critical thinking skills to create understanding of the combination of formal learning with the service experience (Kraft, 1996). Reflection, then, is an internalization of students' thoughts and actions brought forth through structured journal writing, meaningful class discussions, and creative artistic venues. Without cognitive deliberation on the purpose of the service, the service then becomes just an action performed for the benefit of the community (Roy & Cho, 2006).

In order to considerably strengthen the Reflection component, I suggest the following for the high school art teachers: engage the students in an ongoing structured journaling activity, providing a pointed question about the activity, meaning, or value of each visit with the younger students; use artistic techniques learned from creating the ceramic bowls, have students create another art project representing impressions or meaning of their service; hold formal or informal discussions evaluating their service and how to improve future service visits.

Reflection Component: Empty Bowl Served. Similar to the suggestions for the Empty Bowl Server, teachers should engage the students in an ongoing structured journaling activity, providing a pointed question about the activity, meaning, or value of each visit. Also, through informal discussions, students should share their experience of working with older students.

Demonstration Component: Both Groups. For this study, Demonstration is the final element of service-learning application. It involves students participating or educating others about the project issues they are addressing. Demonstration takes various forms and is dependent

on the individual project and the developmental skills of the students. With the Empty Bowls project and during the end-of-the year dinner/silent auction, the high school art teachers may wish to have students create and present a slideshow presentation about their project, complete with visual images; write and display an artist statement next to their ceramic creations, explaining their participation and the value of their service; ask all community and business partners to share how the project impacted their organizations/businesses.

The elementary and middle school students (served) should also participate in Demonstration activities by creating drawings of their experience with the project, writing their own artist statement about their ceramic bowl, and speaking to the dinner/silent auction guests explaining their role in the project.

Non-Empty Bowls Projects. Utilizing the Service-Learning Youth Council as part of the delivery method of service learning is beneficial to the District Coordinator. With the students actively searching for teachers to participate in service learning, they, in essence, have become an extension of the District Office. This structure is unique as it empowers students to take ownership of the process and projects. It also relies on substantial district-level support, as the activities of the Youth Council are part of a class dedicated to only service learning. Every year, the numbers of projects increase, but are these service-learning projects good projects?

The findings in this study suggest that although the art teachers' intent is admirable, their level of participation dictates their understanding and usage of service learning. The group that integrated the most objectives listed in the Innovation Configuration Checklist is the Individual Projects groups. These teachers were fully engaged during each phase of their service-learning project. Both of the teachers invited students to brainstorm project activities during the initial project development. Teachers were hands-on during the action stages, often working with their students. Their reflection was informal and unstructured but still embraced the notion of reflective thinking about their project and among all their students. Therefore, for future teacher training and expansion of arts-based service learning, Lake County Schools may wish to promote individual projects as well as their district-wide initiative.

Implications for the Field of Art Education and Service Learning

Findings from the interviews suggest that art teachers who are using and not using service learning are increasingly pressed for time as district and local administrations are mandating closer curricular connections to the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). The FCAT

is Florida's strategy to achieve student growth by implementing higher standards (Florida Department of Education, 2006). Although the FCAT currently does not assess art education, art teachers must still include components of reading and writing based on the Sunshine State Standards. With this responsibility, an art teacher must be able to find curricular resources quickly and pertinent to visual arts.

Currently, the amount of resources for K-12 art teachers are sparse. Recently, a plethora of articles have been written about arts-based service learning from a higher education perspective (Jeffers, 2000; Taylor, 2002; Olson-Horswill, 2004; Taylor & Ballengee-Morris, 2004) and in 2005, the National Art Education Association published a book on service learning and the visual arts in higher education (Jeffers, 2005). Campus Compact, national nonprofit organization dedicated to promoting community service, civic engagement, and service-learning in higher education, houses arts-based service-learning curricula on its website. Resources for K-12 are not as plentiful. A few articles have surfaced regarding K-12 service learning and art projects (Namnoum, 2002) and in 1998, the Constitutional Rights Foundation focused their Service-Learning Network publication on linking the arts with service learning. Not until 2006 did an arts-based service-learning handbook, detailing curricula and other resources, emerge for K-12 visual art teachers (Roy & Cho). Without a more comprehensive literature list to choose from, it is safe to say that K-12 teachers interested in service learning might find it difficult to implement this pedagogy. Implications from this state of literature suggest a need for future action at the state and district level to educate teachers and provide them with necessary tools for project implementation. How can this be accomplished? Following are a few recommendations.

Across the state of Florida, teachers are mandated to renew their teaching certification every five years. Certification renewal is based on a 120-point system. Staff development trainings, workshops, and/or college credits, all may be counted toward the 120 in-service points. Arts-focused service-learning trainings could be aligned with district in-service training dates. J. Broome (personal communication, March, 2005) and P. Taylor (personal communication, March, 2005) suggest that this would provide an additional avenue to reach teachers who may be interested in service learning.

Scholarly journal publications serve as useful documents for K-12 teachers to search for supplemental information. However, most do not provide the hands-on instruction these teachers look for. J. Broome (personal communication, March, 2005) suggests that more published

articles are needed but in publications such as School Art Magazine and the Florida Art Educators Association's (FAEA) newsletter called Fresh Paint, both which are geared towards the average K-12 art teacher. For the service-learning field, online service-learning newsletters and websites from the state office of service learning should dedicate a portion of their space to subject-specific areas. Though print material serves a purpose, online publications are typically more recent and easier to access.

C. McLean (personal communication, March, 2005) suggests that awareness is crucial if teachers are to implement new projects. She suggests that the National Art Education Association (NAEA) conference and the FAEA conference are two conference venues to achieve such awareness. A presentation on service learning would enhance the awareness process but more than one would begin to stir curiosity. A review of the past 8 years of conference presentations at the NAEA reveals 23 sessions focused on service learning with only 2 relating directly to K-12 art education. From 1998 to 2002, the majority of the presentations focused on pre-service teacher education, but within the past 3 years, the presentations concentrated on research and project descriptions. These figures provide good indications that the integration of service learning into arts education is slowly gaining attention by researchers and practitioners, however, more presentations directly related to K-12 art teachers are still needed to ensure continued awareness.

Within the service-learning field lies a multitude of conference venues for K-12 art presentations. The National Youth Leadership Council (NYLC) is a non-profit organization dedicated to linking youth, educators, and communities to redefine the roles of young people in society through service learning (NYLC, 2006). Annually, NYLC provides trainings and technical assistance through their national service-learning conference. Very few presentations have focused on arts-based service learning. This is not due to a weeding out process. Although NYLC typically receives proposals three-times the amount of presentation spaces, few K-12 educators have submitted proposals. More arts presentations would provide a vehicle for publicizing the importance and emergence of visual arts in service learning.

Most state education agencies or volunteer commissions annually receive a non-competitive formula grant from the Corporation of National and Community Service to disseminate service-learning funds statewide. With these funds, most of these state agencies hold an annual service-learning conference for their grantees. Also, the State Education Agency K-12

Service-Learning Network (SEANet) is a national network of staff from state education agencies and other organizations that provide leadership for statewide K-12 school-based service-learning initiatives. For logistical ease, SEANet has grouped states by regions. Most regions hold annual service-learning conferences to provide networking opportunities, showcase exemplary projects, and facilitate continuous dialogue on the state of political affairs in the area of service-learning funding. Both of these conferences provide an excellent outlet for arts-based service-learning presentations, thus promoting the field of arts education and service learning.

The Value of Arts-Based Service Learning

Research has shown that service learning has positive academic, behavioral, and affective outcomes (Follman, 1998; Weiler et al., 1998). Service-learning projects that are well coordinated allow students to make a personal connection with their academic curriculum as well as with the community. The service provides meaning for the students; meaning that is conveyed through their learning.

The arts are also an important facet of our educational curriculum. It has been argued that the arts are thought of as a public good, non-excludable, and non-rival in consumption. Its meritorious activities help to preserve cultural significance and authenticity. Arts education, then, is something that is generally desirable and supported by the public for the well being of society (Roy & Cho, 2006).

Richard Anderson (1990) states that human beings have attempted to create meaning through social structure, religion, and art. This, in essence, is what separates us from other living creatures. Our attempts to establish this meaning have led us to create symbolic relationships that help us understand different constructs. The arts play an important role in aiding the creation of this meaning, as they allow us to communicate with and understand each other through creative processes and ensuing conversations about them.

Both service learning and arts education contribute to youth and community development in unique ways. Service learning fosters principles, moral values, and individual standards by providing opportunities for students to make community contributions. Arts education cultivates creativity, helping students contribute to a healthy and vibrant community in which they are active producers and consumers of the arts. Both share an approach to education that promotes authentic, active, community-connected learning. Both share core values. Students learn through relationships with peers, teachers, and a community of adults who use knowledge in realms

77

beyond schools. Students learn when they are engaged, and engagement is most likely when students see a personal and social value to what they are learning. Finally, students learn through active, in-depth investigation and exploration and students engage in critical problem solving and critical thinking (Jobs for the Future, 1999).

Analysis of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model

Heck, Stiegelbauer, Hall, and Loucks (1999) state that the Concerns-Based Adoption Model, especially the Innovation Configuration diagnostic tool, are useful for a variety of purposes: dissemination of context, illustration of innovation components, description of operational patterns, evaluation of programs, and development of staff trainings and activities. Though this study focused on illustration, description, and evaluation, its findings may be applied toward dissemination and staff trainings.

In recent studies, CBAM's diagnostic tools have been implemented in parts and in their entirety to gauge educators' perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors. Studied participants have included vocational teachers, curriculum coordinators, high school principals, and elementary school teachers. Researchers used one or more CBAM instruments based on the area of needed information. However, each study implemented both quantitative and qualitative instruments. The quantitative instrument was the Stages of Concern Questionnaire but the qualitative piece may or may not have been the Levels of Use Focused Interview. Klenke and Barrows (1980) was the lone study that used the LoU only.

Klenke and Barrows (1980) found that this instrument alone did not provide enough depth or detail to explain their results. Hence, they concluded that all three of the CBAM instruments must be implemented to properly document change. I agree with this conclusion. Utilizing the Stages of Concern only provides quantitative answers to what participants' feelings, perceptions, and attitudes are regarding the innovation. Several studies included the Stages of Concern and a researcher-created qualitative instrument. Fenton (2002) noted a somewhat imprecise rating process as differences arose in the qualitative data collection and the standards used by the curriculum coordinators. To implement only the Levels of Use may result in misleading data as Klenke and Barrows (1980) discovered. They found that the Levels of Use instrument accurately documents how well users report they are managing the innovation, rather than their actual usage pattern. As seen and confirmed from my study, a district-wide project

produces varying degrees of implementation based on the art teachers' engagement and understanding of service learning.

The use of all three CBAM instruments provides a holistic picture of an innovation. The Stages of Concern addresses the affective dimension, the Levels of Use outlines the behavior aspect, and the Innovation Configuration describes curricular configurations. It seems that usage of these three instruments would provide triangulation of data sources. My study, however, shows that except for the Non-Users, the Stages of Concern is not an indicator of art teachers' usage level. Therefore, an interview with a district-level administrator or classroom observations would provide adequate and necessary information.

Wesley and Franks (1996), Jacobus (1997), and Fenton (2002), found CBAM to be somewhat useful to obtain a snapshot of an innovation's adoption among its intended participants. The CBAM methodology, though, is intended to measure participant change regarding an innovation. As such, for future research on art teachers, I would implement all three instruments at the beginning and conclusion of the same academic year. The two data sets would provide meaningful information regarding the effectiveness of service learning in the art classroom. However, data collection and analysis of CBAM is labor intensive. To implement and retrieve two sets of data may result in additional work or prolonged study results.

Recommendations for Further Research

Service learning continues to be a growing area of interest with K-12 educators and state- and district-level policymakers. However, if service learning is to continue to produce positive academic, affective, and behavioral outcomes, more research is needed to focus on the implementation methods of the classroom teacher. It is also vital that future research continue to examine delivery methods from the district administration. Thus, I make the following recommendations:

1. Further study the longitudinal effects of service learning with the visual arts teachers in Lake County by replicating this study over periods of 1, 3, and 5 years.

2. Replicate this study in another district that is integrating service learning into its visual arts curriculum to determine if these results are confirmed in other settings. Compare those findings with the ones from this study to discern elements of similarity that may provide insight into successful implementation.

3. Replicate this study with the visual arts teachers in Lake County, but remove the artistic objectives from the Innovation Configuration Checklist. Most teachers successfully incorporated these objectives, as it is a requirement to align curriculum to the Sunshine State Standards. Instead, include other service-learning domains in the checklist such as career, social, and civic engagement.

4. Study the District Service-Learning Coordinator in Lake County and other district service-learning administrators to assess their levels of commitment and preferred future methods of service-learning delivery.

For future educators, service learning also continues to be an area of pursued interest. The results of a study conducted by the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse (1990) showed that by 1990, 110 doctoral and masters candidates focused their research on service learning; by 2001, that number had climbed to over 200, with 81 disciplines and content areas represented. In 2006, the number increased to 245; however, only four dealt specifically with the arts, and none of those four focused on teachers. There is a prime opportunity for future educators to expand the current research on art teachers' affective and behavioral sides of change when implementing service learning.

Conclusion

Service learning is a method by which students apply classroom knowledge through hands-on service projects. The service meets a real community need, and its activities are designed to apply specific learning objectives. Service learning is gaining momentum through national and local educational support and the percentage of K-12 schools implementing this pedagogy has risen from 10% in 1984 to nearly 50% in 1999. However, only a small percentage of teachers are using this educational innovation.

This study provided baseline research for evaluating visual art teachers' concern and usage levels when implementing service learning. Findings concluded that for teachers who were not current users but intended to incorporate service learning the following year or who had no plans to use service learning in the future, their Stages of Concern closely coincided with their levels of service-learning usage. The Stages of Concern for teachers in the other three categories (Empty Bowl Server, Empty Bowl Served, and Individual Project) were not predictors nor were they always closely aligned with their Levels of Use. The interviews revealed that concern and usage levels varied depending on the extent of teacher participation within a project and level of

service-learning knowledge and experience. Teachers who were engaged in their project from its conception to the final demonstration were more likely to understand this pedagogy and thus successfully include more service and artistic elements of service learning.

Although the results of this study cannot be generalized to other populations, it does indicate that successful project implementation or fidelity to service-learning elements varies even within a district-wide initiative. Participation in training opportunities and acquisition of necessary curricular resources certainly provide assistance to teachers new to this pedagogy, but to successfully engage in a service-learning project, this study suggests that teacher buy-in and active implementation efforts most likely will result in positive effects.

APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITY FORMS

(HUMAN SUBJECT APPROVAL)

(CONSENT FORM, PAGE 1)

(CONSENT FORM, PAGE 2)

APPENDIX B

STAGES OF CONCERN:

TYPICAL EXPRESSIONS OF CONCERN ABOUT THE INNOVATION

Stages of Concern: Typical Expressions of Concern about the Innovation

	Stages of Concern	Expressions of Concern
	6 Refocusing	I have some ideas about something that would work even better.
IMPACT	5 Collaboration	I am concerned about relating what I am doing with what my co-workers are doing.
	4 Consequence	How is my use affecting clients?
TASK	3 Management	I seem to be spending all of my time getting materials ready.
	2 Personal	How will using it affect me?
SELF	1 Informational	I would like to know more about it.
	0 Awareness	I am not concerned about it.

APPENDIX C

STAGES OF CONCERN ABOUT THE INNOVATION: DEFINITIONS

Stages of Concern About the Innovation: Definitions

Type of Concern	Stages of Concern	Definitions
Impact	Stage 6	*Refocusing*: The focus is on the exploration of more universal benefits from the innovation, including the possibility of major changes or replacement with a more powerful alternative. Individual has definite ideas about alternatives to the proposed or existing form of the innovation.
	Stage 5	*Collaboration*: The focus is on coordination and cooperation with others regarding use of the innovation.
	Stage 4	*Consequence*: Attention focuses on impact of the innovation on clients in his or her immediate sphere of influence. The focus is on relevance of the innovation for clients, evaluation of outcome including performance and competencies, and changes needed to increase client outcomes.
Task	Stage 3	*Management*: Attention is focused on the processes and tasks of using the innovation and the best use of information and resources. Issues related to efficiency, organizing, managing, scheduling, and time demands are utmost.

Stages of Concern About the Innovation: Definitions (continued)

Type of Concern	Stages of Concern	Definitions
Self	Stage 2	*Personal*: Individual is uncertain about the demands of the innovation, his/her inadequacy to meet those demands, and his/her role in relation to the reward structure of the organization, decision-making, and consideration of potential conflicts with existing structures or personal commitment. Financial or status implications of the program for self and colleagues may also be reflected.
	Stage 1	*Informational*: A general awareness of the innovation and interest in learning more detail about it is indicated. The person seems to be unworried about himself/herself in relation to the innovation. She/he is interested in substantive aspects of the innovation in a selfless manner such as general characteristics, effects, and requirements for use.
N/A	Stage 0	*Awareness*: Little concern about or involvement with the innovation is indicated.

APPENDIX D

LEVELS OF USE OF THE INNOVATION

Levels of Use of the Innovation

	VI	*Renewal*: State in which the user re-evaluates the quality of use of the innovation, seeks major modifications of or alternatives to present innovation to achieve increased impact on clients, examines new developments in the field, and explores new goals for self and the system.
U S E R S	V	*Integration*: State in which the user is combining own efforts to use the innovation with related activities of colleagues to achieve a collective impact on clients within their common sphere of influence.
	IVB	*Refinement*: State in which the user varies the use of the innovation to increase the impact on clients within immediate sphere of influence. Variations are based on knowledge of both short- and long-term consequences for clients.
	IVA	*Routine*: Use of the innovation is stabilized. Few if any changes are being made in ongoing use. Little preparation or thought is being given to improving innovation use or its consequences.
	III	*Mechanical Use*: State in which the user focuses most effort on the short-term, day-to-day use of the innovation with little time for reflection. Changes in use are made more to meet user needs than client needs. The user is primarily engaged in a stepwise attempt to master the tasks required to use the innovation, often resulting in disjointed and superficial use.

N
O
N
U
S
E
R
S

II   *Preparation*: State in which the user is preparing for the first use of the innovation.

I   *Orientation*: State in which the user has recently acquired or is acquiring information about the innovation and/or has recently explored or is exploring its value orientation and its demands upon user and user system.

0   *Nonuse*: State in which the user has little or no knowledge of the innovation, no involvement with the innovation, and is doing nothing toward becoming involved.

APPENDIX E

STAGES OF CONCERN QUESTIONNAIRE

Concerns Questionnaire

Name _____

    In order to identify these data, please give us the last four digits of your Social Security number:

              _____   _____   _____   _____

    The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine what people who are using or thinking about using various programs are concerned about at various times during the innovation adoption process. The items were developed from typical responses of school and college teachers who ranged from no knowledge at all about various program to many years experience in using them. Therefore, <u>a good part of the items on this questionnaire may appear to be of little relevance or irrelevant to you at this time</u>. For the completely irrelevant items, please circle "0" on the scale. Other items will represent those concerns you <u>do</u> have, in varying degrees of intensity, and should be marked higher on the scale.

    For example:

This statement is very true of me at this time.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	(7)
This statement is somewhat true of me now.	0	1	2	3	4	(5)	6	7
This statement is not at all true of me at this time.	0	(1)	2	3	4	5	6	7
This statement seems irrelevant to me.	(0)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

    Please respond to the items in terms of <u>your present concerns,</u> or how you feel about your involvement or potential involvement with <u>service learning</u>. We do not hold to any one definition of this program, so please think of it in terms of <u>your own perceptions</u> of what it involves. Remember to respond to each item in terms of <u>your present concerns</u> about your involvement or potential involvement with service learning.

    Thank you for taking the time to complete this task.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Irrelevant	Not true of me now		Somewhat true of me now		Very true of me now		

1. I am concerned about students' attitudes toward service learning.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I now know of some other approaches that might work better.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I don't even know what service learning is.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I am concerned about not having enough time to organize myself each day.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I would like to help other faculty in their use of service learning.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I have a very limited knowledge about service learning.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. I would like to know the effect of reorganization on my professional status.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. I am concerned about conflict between my interests and my responsibilities.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. I am concerned about revising my use of service learning.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. I would like to develop working relationships with both our faculty and outside faculty using service learning.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. I am concerned about how service learning affects students.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. I am not concerned about service learning.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. I would like to know who will make the decisions in this new system.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. I would like to discuss the possibility of using service learning.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. I would like to know what resources are available if we decide to adopt service learning.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. I am concerned about my inability to manage all service learning requirements.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. I would like to know how my teaching or administration is supposed to change.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Irrelevant		Not true of me now			Somewhat true of me now		Very true of me now	

18. I would like to familiarize other departments or persons with the progress of this new approach. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. I am concerned about evaluating my impact on students. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. I would like to revise service-learning's instructional approach. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. I am completely occupied with other things. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. I would like to modify our use of service learning based on the experiences of our students. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. Although I don't know about service learning, I am concerned about things in the area. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. I would like to excite my students about their part in service learning. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. I am concerned about time spent working with nonacademic problems related to service learning. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. I would like to know what the use of service learning will require in the immediate future. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. I would like to coordinate my effort with others to maximize service-learning's effects. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

28. I would like to have more information on time and energy commitments required by service learning. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29. I would like to know what other faculty are doing in this area. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

30. At this time, I am not interested in learning about service learning. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

31. I would like to determine how to supplement, enhance, or replace service learning. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

32. I would like to use feedback from students to change the program. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

33. I would like to know how my role will change when I am using service learning. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

34. Coordination of tasks and people is taking too much of my time. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

35. I would like to know how service learning is better than what we have now.   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

APPENDIX F

LEVELS OF USE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS BASED ON A YES RESPONSE

Levels of Use Interview Questions Based on a Yes Response

Question	Purpose
Are you using service learning?	To distinguish between users and nonusers; to break LoU 0-II from LoU III-VI

<div style="text-align:center">

IF YES

</div>

Question	Purpose
What do you see as the strengths and weaknesses of service learning in your situation? Have you made any attempt to do anything about the weaknesses?	To probe Assessing and Knowledge categories.
Are you currently looking for any information about service learning?	To probe Acquiring Information category.
What kind? For what purpose? Do you ever talk with others about service learning? What do you tell them?	To probe Sharing category.
What do you see as being the effects of service learning? In what way have you determined this? Are you doing any evaluating, either formally or informally, of your use of service learning? Have you received any feedback from students? What have you done with the information you get?	To probe Assessing category.

Levels of Use Interview Questions Based on a Yes Response (Continued)

Question	Purpose
Have you made any changes recently in how you use service learning? What? Why? How recently? Are you considering making any changes?	To distinguish between LoU III (User-oriented changes), LoU IVB (student-oriented changes) and LoU IV A (no or routine changes); to probe Status Reporting and Performing categories.
As you look ahead to later this year, what plans do you have in relation to your use of service learning?	To probe Planning and Status Reporting categories.
Are you working with others (outside of anyone you may have worked with from the beginning) in your use of service learning? Have you made any changes in your use of service learning based on this coordination?	To separate LoU V from III, IV A and IV B. If a positive response is given, LoU V probes (below) are used.
Are you considering or planning to make major modifications or to replace service learning at this time?	To separate LoU IV from III, IV A, IV B and V.

Levels of Use Interview Questions Based on a Yes Response (Continued)

Question	Purpose

LoU V Probes

How do you work together? How

frequently?

What do you see as the strengths

and weaknesses of this collaboration?

Are you looking for any particular kind

of information in relation to this

collaboration? When you talk to others

about your collaboration, what do you

share with them?

Have you done any formal or informal

evaluation of how your collaboration is

working?

What plans do you have for this collaborative

effort in the future?

APPENDIX G

LEVELS OF USE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS BASED ON A NO RESPONSE

Levels of Use Interview Questions Based on a No Response

Question	Purpose

<div style="text-align:center; border:1px solid black; display:inline-block;">IF NO</div>

Question	Purpose
Have you made a decision to use service learning in the future? If so, when?	To separate LoU 0 from I; to probe Status Reporting, Planning, and Performing categories. To separate LoU I from II.
Can you describe service learning for me as you see it?	To probe Knowledge category.
Are you currently looking for any information about service learning?	To probe Acquiring Information category.
What kinds? For what purposes?	To probe Assessing category.
What do you see as the strengths and weaknesses of service learning for your situation?	
At this point in time, what kinds of questions are you asking about service learning? Give examples if possible	To probe Assessing, Sharing, and Status Reporting categories.
Do you ever talk with others and share information about service learning? What do you share?	To probe Sharing category.

Levels of Use Interview Questions Based on a No Response (Continued)

Question	Purpose
What are you planning with respect to service learning? Can you tell me about any preparation or plans you have been making for the use of service learning?	To probe Planning category.
Can you summarize for me where you see yourself right now in relation to the use of service learning?	To get a concise picture of the user's perception of his/her use or nonuse.
(Optional Question)	

Past Users

Why did you stop using service learning?

Can you describe for me how you

organized your use of service learning,

What problems you found, what its

effects appeared to be on students?

When you assess service learning at this

point in time, what do you see as the

strengths and weaknesses for you?

APPENDIX H

INNOVATION CONFIGURATION CHECKLIST

Innovation Configuration Checklist

	Service Objectives	Y	N
Preparation	Engages students in discussion of project need.		
	Performs writing exercises on the project need topic.		
	Researches project need issue		
	Visits organization, classroom, or other environment prior to conducting service.		
	Creates presentation based on project need.		
	Students help to influence the selection of needs to be addressed in the project design.		
	Uses other forms of preparation:		
	Artistic Objectives	Y	N
	Presents visual media to advance discussion.		
	Recognizes that various artistic organizational elements can communicate and fulfill a need effectively.		
	Connects real world with the visual arts.		
	Chooses and evaluates subject matter, symbolism, and ideas.		
	Presents historical and current examples of art with the need as the subject.		
	Sketches an art project idea.		
	Uses other forms of preparation:		

	Service Objectives	Y	N
Action	Students take leadership roles when conducting tasks.		
	Students work collaboratively with service recipients and partners.		
	Service activities utilize a range of learning styles.		
	Uses other forms of action:		
	Artistic Objectives	Y	N
	Students create visual art form based on curriculum.		
	Students create and communicate ideas using knowledge of structures and functions of visual arts.		
	Uses other forms of action:		

	Service Objectives	Y	N
Reflection	Discusses service activity, meaning, and/or value as a group either formally or informally.		
	Journals about the service activity.		
	Conducts future planning of service activity.		
	Students are involved in project's formative and summative evaluation.		
	Uses other forms of reflection:		
	Artistic Objectives	Y	N
	Creates visual representation of impressions or meaning of service activity.		
	Evaluates own work looking at elements and principles, craftsmanship and technique.		
	Understands how knowledge, skills, and attitudes gained from visual arts can enhance and deepen understanding of life.		
	Evaluates own work informally.		
	Uses other forms of reflection:		

	Service Objectives	Y	N
Demonstration	Students engage in presentations about their project.		
	Students teach others about the project.		
	Uses other forms of demonstration:		
	Artistic Objectives	Y	N
	Students make connections between the visual arts, other disciplines, and the real world.		
	Students create products based on the learning acquired through the project.		
	Uses other forms of demonstration:		

APPENDIX I

LEVELS OF USE RATING EXAMPLE

Levels of Use Rating Example

Statement	Level of Use/Category	Explanation
I feel like I spend more time trying to be a good team member and work together than I do trying to teach kids. It seems we are always trying to get ready to teach.	Level III/Status Reporting	Reports that logistics, time, management, resource organization, etc. are the focus of most personal efforts to use service learning.
As far as service learning is concerned, I have no plans to do anything about it.	Level 0/Planning	Schedules no time and specifies no steps for the study or use of service learning.
I'm using service learning, but I'm reading and attending national professional meetings to find out more about alternative programs for children, how effective they are and whether team teaching is the best vehicle for teaching kids.	Level VI/Acquiring	Seeks information and materials about other innovations as alternatives to service learning or for making major adaptations in service learning.

APPENDIX J

SUPERINTENDENT'S EMAIL TO LAKE COUNTY PRINCIPALS

A message from Superintendent Cowin:

Dear Principals:

Min Cho is a doctoral candidate in the College of Visual Arts, Theatre, and Dance at Florida State University, and is conducting a research project as part of her dissertation. She would like to interview visual arts teachers in Lake County to discover if and how they are using service learning in their classrooms.

The research consists of a 10-15 minute paper and pencil survey and a follow-up 20-30 minute interview, which will be arranged around your teacher's schedule or during an in-service service-learning training. Your consent does not imply mandatory participation by your teacher. Each participant is still required to sign an interview consent form and may opt to not participate in the study.

She is requesting permission from you to interview your art teacher(s). If you approve and teachers are interested in participating, please respond to Min Cho at mcho@admin.fsu.edu by this Friday, April 28, 2006 by writing either:

I give my consent for my art teacher to participate in your research study.
OR
I do not give my consent for my art teacher to participate in this study.

Judith Carter
Senior Executive Assistant to
Superintendent of Schools
352-253-6510

APPENDIX K

DISTRICT COORDINATOR'S EMAIL TO

LAKE COUNTY VISUAL ARTS TEACHERS

Dear Lake County Art Teachers:

Due to the number of excellent art teachers participating in service-learning activities, I will be holding a special arts workshop opportunity. The workshop is designed to:

- expand current service-learning art projects to become district-wide in focus and
- provide a time for new and experienced service-learning teachers to network, coordinate logistics, and discuss their ideas.

In addition, Min Cho, a doctoral student from Florida State University, is conducting research on arts-based service learning. She will be here to hand out a survey and conduct interviews for her dissertation. Your participation in her research is not mandatory but we hope you will spend some time with her, as her results will help our district expand arts-based service learning.

What's in it for you as an art teacher?

- Allows you first access to additional funds for supplies, subs, and transportation costs not covered by the traditional school budget (example: clay, glaze, paint, etc).
- Free copy of *My Art, My World.* This is Florida Learn and Serve's newly developed handbook for integrating service learning into the K-12 art classroom. This book is the first-ever to be created just for K-12 art teachers who are or would like to be involved in service learning. It has fully developed art lesson plans as well as other great resources
- Free catered lunch
- No worry about paying for subs! Lake County's Florida Learn and Serve grant will cover the cost of a sub for you. Send signed leave form to Evelyn Robinson- County Office- on or before May 11th.

The workshop will take place next **Thursday, May 11th at the Safety Complex from 8:30 to 3:00 pm**. Selected art teachers will share their extraordinary service-learning projects with you. If you would like to create or continue with your service-learning project, this would be a perfect opportunity for you to develop ideas or expand on your current ones. By the end of the workshop, you will have a work plan, timeline, and a lesson plan resource for a project. You will also be given time to complete your purchase order requests (you should receive your supplies by August, 2006)!

I hope you will not pass up this great opportunity.

Thanks.
Evelyn Robinson, Lake County Schools, District Service-Learning Coordinator

APPENDIX L

COVER LETTER OF INSTRUMENT PACKET

Dear Art Teacher:

I am a doctoral candidate in the College of Visual Arts, Theatre, and Dance at Florida State University in Tallahassee, Florida. Dr. Pat Villeneuve is the major advisor of my dissertation study. My dissertation research is titled, " Artistically Serving: A Study of Lake County's Arts-Based Service-Learning Program and I am studying visual arts teachers in Lake County to determine if and how they use service learning. The current research literature states that in order for an educational innovation like service learning to become implemented in the classroom, teachers must first understand and then accept this method of teaching.

However, there are very few studies that have focused on service-learning visual arts teachers and even less arts-based service-learning curricular resources available for teachers to use in their classrooms. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine teachers' levels of concerns with and usage levels of service learning as well as to discover curricular descriptions of service-learning implementation. The results may help to create needed resources for art teachers.

Since you are one of the visual arts teachers in Lake County, I would be most appreciative if you would agree to participate in my study. Please note that Lake County Schools has given me permission to conduct this study, however, participation is completely at your discretion. This packet contains several items:

- Participant Consent Form
- Demographics Page
- Stages of Concern Questionnaire, and
- Interview Request Sheet.

The questionnaire should take approximately 10-15 minutes and a follow-up interview, which will be arranged around your schedule and audiotaped, should be approximately 20-30 minutes in length. If you would like to participate in this study, please fill out the enclosed forms and return to either Elizabeth McLean or Evelyn Robinson. Please keep all completed forms inside this envelope.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, feel free to contact my major advisor, Dr. Pat Villeneuve, at (850) 644-1915, or the Human Subjects Committee at Florida State University. The committee may be contacted at: (850) 644-7900, 2035 E. Paul Dirac Drive, Box 15, 100 Sliger Building, Innovation Park, Tallahassee, FL 32310.

A token of my appreciation will be given to you upon completion of the audiotaped interview.

Thank you in advance for your time.

Min S. Cho
Ph.D. candidate in Art Education/Arts Administration
College of Visual Arts, Theatre, and Dance
Florida State University

APPENDIX M

INTERVIEW REQUEST EMAIL

Dear Lake County Art Teachers,

My name is Min Cho and I am a doctoral student at Florida State University. I am conducting research on the uses or non-uses of service learning in Lake County. Since your county has such a high percentage of <u>exemplary</u> arts-based service-learning projects, it is a perfect site to find out why teachers are or are not using service learning.

I have already contacted Superintendent Cowin's office and they have given me the go-ahead. Their email to your principals is below. I will be in town on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week. Will you assist me with my research?

There is a 10-15 minute survey followed by a possible 15-30 minute interview. The time frame depends on if you are using service learning or not. I would be available to stop by your classroom sometime between May 12-16, 2006. If you are able to assist, would you please email me at mcho@admin.fsu.edu with a date and time that fits your schedule?

Sincerely,

Min Cho
Doctoral Candidate
Florida State University

APPENDIX N

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW REQUEST EMAIL
FROM A LAKE COUNTY ART TEACHER

Dear Teachers,

Min Cho has contacted me and requested my assistance in contacting you. She is working on her Doctorate degree and would like to interview art teachers. She is interested in your opinion; you do not have to be doing any service projects. She would like to spend about 30 minutes interviewing each of you and will give you a copy of the new Florida Learn & Serve Service Learning & the Arts Handbook. She can meet with you any time between May 12-16, 2006. I realize it is a very busy time of the year, but she is interested in your input.

If you can spare the time please email her at: mcho@admin.fsu.edu

Thanks & hope you have a great end of the year.

Amy

REFERENCES

Alliance for Service-Learning in Education Reform (1993). *Standards of quality for school-based and community-based learning*. Washington, DC: The Alliance for Service-Learning in Education Reform.

Anderson, R. (1990). *Calliope's sisters: A comparative study of philosophies of art*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Anderson, V., Kinsley, C., Negroni, P., & Price, C. (1991). Community service-learning and school improvement in Springfield, Massachusetts. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*, 761-764.

Ammon, M.S., Furco, A., Chi, B., & Middaugh, E. (2002, March). *Service-learning in California: A profile of the CalServe service-learning partnerships 1997-2000* (Final Report to the California Department of Education). Berkeley, CA: The Service-Learning Research & Development Center.

APCO Associates. (1999). *A brief history of service-learning*. Battle Creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation. Retrieved January 21, 2005 from http://servicelearningpartnership.org/

Association for Experiential Education. (2005). *What is experiential education?* Retrieved March 7, 2005 from http://aee.org/

Bigge, M., & Shermis, S. (2004). *Learning theories for teachers*. Boston: Pearson Education Inc.

Billig, S.H., & Furco, A. (2002). Research agenda for K-12 service-learning. In Furco, A. & Billig, S. (Eds.), *Service-learning: The essence of the pedagogy* (pp. 245-246). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Brandsford, J.D., & Vye, N.J. (1989). A perspective on cognitive research and its implications for instruction. In L. Resnick and L.E. Klopfer (Eds.), *Toward the thinking curriculum: Current cognitive research*. Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Brown, M. (1997). *Stone Soup*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1982). The impact of experiential education on adolescent development. *Child and Youth Services, 4*(3-4) 57-76.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1991). School-based community service: What we know from research and theory. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72,* 743-749.

Campus Compact. (2005). *History of service-learning*. Retrieved March 7, 2005 from http://www.campuscompact.org/

Cognetta, P.V., & Sprinthall, N.A. (1978). Students as teachers: Role taking as a means of promoting psychological and ethical development during adolescence. In N.A. Sprinthall & R.L. Mosher (Eds.), *Value development ... As the aim of education* (pp. 53-68). Schenectady, NY: Character Research Press.

Cone, D., & Harris, S. (1990). Service learning practice: Developing a theoretical framework. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *Fall*, 31-43.

Corporation for National Service. (1993). *The National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993*. Washington, DC: Corporation for National Service.

Cronbach, L. & Associates (1980). *Toward reform of program evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cronbach, L., & Meehl, P. (1955). Construct validity and the psychological testing. *Psychological Bulletin, 52*(4), 281-302.

Cunningham, D. L., Hillison, J., & Horne, R. (1985). Adoption of an innovation: Monitoring the concerns of vocational teachers. *Journal of Vocational Education Research, 10*(1), 15-28.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Education and experience*. New York: Macmillan.

Ehrlich, T. (1996). Foreword in B. Jacob & Associates (Eds.). *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ellis, J. D., & Kuerbis, P. J. (1988, April). *A model for implementing microcomputers in science teaching.* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Lake of the Ozarks, MO.

Empty Bowls. (2002). *Empty bowls: Home.* Retrieved June 11, 2006 from http://www.emptybowls.net/

Eyler, J., & Giles D.E., Jr. (1999). *Where is the learning in service learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Floden, R. E. (1986). The cultures of teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 505-26). New York: MacMillan.

Fenton, R. (2002). *Status of standards implementation in Anchorage Secondary Schools: A concerns based acceptance model (CBAM) review, 2001-2002*. Anchorage, AK: Anchorage School District. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED466645)

Florida Department of Education. (2006). *Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test*. Retrieved July 8, 2006 from http://firn.edu/doe/sas/fcat.htm

Florida Learn & Serve. (2005). *Current Projects*. Retrieved January 4, 2005 from
http://fsu.edu/~flserve/projects/projects.html/

Florida Learn & Serve. (2005). *What is school-based service learning?* Retrieved January 3,
2005 from http://fsu.edu/~flserve/sl/intro.html/

Florida Learn & Serve. (2005). *Who we are*. Retrieved March 8, 2005 from
http://fsu.edu/~flserve/whoweare.html/

Follman, J. (1998). *Florida Learn and Serve: 1996-97 Outcomes and Correlations with 1994-95
and 1995-96.* Tallahassee, FL: Florida State University, Center for Civic Education and
Service.

Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. Teachers College Press: New York.

Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change* (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press:
New York.

Fuller, F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American
Educational Research Journal*, 6(2), 207-226.

Gabriel, J. (1957). *An analysis of the emotional problems of the teacher in the classroom.*
Melbourne: F.W. Cheshire.

Giles, D.E., & Eyler J. (1994). The theoretical roots of service-learning. *Michigan Journal
of Community Service Learning*, *1*(1), 77-85.

Goertz, M. (2005). Implementing the No Child Left Behind Act: Challenges for the states.
Peabody Journal of Education, 80(2), 73-89.

Hall, G., George, A., & Rutherford, W. L. (1998). *Measuring stages of concern about the
innovation: A manual for the use of the SoC questionnaire*. Austin: Texas University
Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hall, G., & Hord, S. (1987). *Change in schools: Facilitating the process*. Albany: State
University of New York Press.

Hall, G., & Hord, S. (2001). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Needham
Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Hall, G., Loucks, S., Rutherford, W., & Newlove, B. (1975). Levels of use of the innovation: A
framework for analyzing innovation adoption. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *26*(1), 52-6.

Hall, G., Wallace, R., & Dossett, W. (1973). *A developmental conceptualization of the adoption
process within educational institutions*. Austin: Research and Development Center for
Teacher Education, University of Texas.

Heck, S., Stiegelbauer, S., Hall, G., & Loucks, S. (1981). *Measuring innovation configurations: Procedures and applications*. Austin: Texas University Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hodgkinson, V. A., & Weitzman, M. S. (1992). *Giving and volunteering in the United States*. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Honnet, E.P., & Poulsen, S.J. (1989). *Principles of good practice for combining service and learning: A Wingspread Report.* Racine, WI: Johnson Foundation.

Huling, L., Hall, G., Hord, S., & Rutherford, W. (1983, April). *A multi-dimension approach for assessing implementation success.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Quebec, Canada.

Jacobus, K. (1997, March). *A study of the change process utilized by Colorado high school principals: The concordance of practice and theory*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Jeffers, C. S. (2000). Between school and community: Situating Service Learning in University Art Galleries. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 7*(1), 109-116.

Johnson, D., Johnson, R., & Stanne, M. (2001). *Methods of cooperative learning: What can we prove works.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Cooperative Learning Center.

Joyce, N., & Weil, M., with Calhoun, C. (2000). *Models of teaching* (6th ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Kendall, J.C., & Associates. (1990). *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service, Volumes I & II*. Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Kiernan, H., & Pyne, J. (1993). National standards and educational reform: Prospects and Sources. *Journal of the New Jersey Council for the Social Studies*, March, 1-7.

Kinsley, C. (1997). Service Learning: A process to connect learning and living. *NASSP Bulletin, 81*(591), 1-7.

Klenke, W. H., & Barrows, L. K. (1980). *The measurement of educational change. The application of the Level of Use (LoU) approach.* Madison, WI: Research and Development Center for Individualized Schooling.

Kolb, D.A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kraft, Richard J. (1996). Service learning: An introduction to its theory, practice, and

effects. *Education and Urban Society, 28* (2), 131-59.

Learn and Serve America. (2006). *History, legislation, and budget*. Retrieved March 9, 2006 from http://learnandserve.gov/about/lsa/history.asp/

Learningindeed. (2001). *The impacts of service learning on youth, school, and communities: Research on K-12 school-based service-learning*, 1990-1999. Retrieved March 9, 2006 from http://learningindeed.org/.

Loucks, S., Newlove, B., & Hall, G. (1998). *Measuring levels of use of the innovation: A manual for trainers, interviewers, and raters*. Austin, TX: The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin.

Maryland Department of Education. (2003). *Preparation, action, reflection*. Retrieved June 7, 2006 from http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/programs/servicelearning/PARDIA.htm

Melchior A. (1998) *National evaluation of Learn and Serve America school and community-based programs*. Waltham, MA: Center for Human Resources, Brandeis University.

Mitchell, S. (1988, April). *Applications of the concerns-based adoption model in program evaluation.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Morgan, W., & Streb, M. (1999). *How quality service-learning develops civic values*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Namnoum, D. (2002). Empty bowls feed the hungry: Service-learning across the curriculum with the visual arts at the core. *Arts & Activities, 131*(1), 26-8.

Nash, K.E. (2002). Examining teachers' beliefs about school-based service-learning programs. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63* (01). (UMI No. 3041380).

Nathan, J., & Kielsmeier, J. (1991). The sleeping giant of school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, June, 750-753.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1999, September). *Service-learning and community service in K-12 public schools (NCES 1999-043).* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

National Youth Leadership Council. (2006). *About NYLC*. Retrieved July 8, 2006 from http://www.nylc.org/aboutus.cfm

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.

Olson-Horswill, L. (2004). *Art and service learning: The magnificent monsters: A community college art and service learning project*. Retrieved July 8, 2006 from http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/other/engagement/Journal/Issue3/Horswill.jsp

Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Phillips, M. (1932). Some problems of adjustment in the early years of a teacher's life. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 2*, 237-256.

Pritchard, F. (2004). *Serve and learn: Implementing and evaluating service-learning in middle and high schools*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Roy, R., & Cho, M. (2006). *My world…my art: A handbook on integrating service learning into the art classroom.* Tallahassee: Florida Learn & Serve.

Rozycki, E. (1995). America 2000: An education strategy. *Educational Horizons*, Summer, 163-165.

Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Seigel, S. *Community service learning as empowering pedagogy: Implications for middle school teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Massachusetts at Amherst, 1995.

Seigel, S. (1997). Teacher of Service-Learning. In R. Wade (Ed.), *Community service-learning: A guide to including service in the public school curriculum* (pp. 197-213). Albany: State University of New York

Seitsinger, A., & Felner, R. (2000, April). *By whom and how is service-learning implemented in middle level schools: A study of opportunity-to-learn conditions and practices*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Annual Education Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Shaffer, B. (1993). *Service-learning: An academic methodology*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Department of Education. Cited in R. Bhaerman, K. Cordell, & B. Gomez (1998). *The role of service-learning in educational reform.* Raleigh, NC: National Society for Experiential Education, and Needham, MA: Simon and Shuster, Inc.

Shumer, R. (1994, April). *A report from the field: Teachers talk about service-learning.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Sigmon, R. (1990). *Service-learning: Three principles. In J.C. Kendall and Associates (Eds.),
Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service, Vol
I,* (pp 37-56). Raleigh, North Carolina: National Society for Internships and Experiential
Education.

Skinner, R., & Chapman, C. (1999). *Service-learning and community service in K-12 public
schools.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of
Education.

Southern Regional Education Board. (1969). *Service-Learning in the south: Higher education
and public service.* Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.

Stanton, T., Giles, D., & Cruz, N. (1999). *Service-learning: A movement's pioneer reflects on its
origins, practice, and future.* Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

Stephens, L. (1995). *The complete guide to learning through community service, grades K-9.*
Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Taylor, P. (2002). Singing For Someone Else's Supper. *Art Education, 55*(5), 46-52.

Taylor, P. & Ballengee-Morris, C. (2004). Service-learning: A language of we. *Art
Education, 57*(5), 6-12.

Thelen, H. A. (1972). *Education and the human quest.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Thompson, M. L. (1963). Identifying anxieties experienced by student teachers. *Journal of
Teacher Education, 14*, 435-439.

Toole, J. C. (2002). Mental models, professional learning community, and the deep structure of
school improvement: Case studies of service-learning. *Dissertation Abstracts
International, 63* (03). (UMI No. 3047669).

Toole, P. (1999). *Essential elements of service-learning.* Roseville, MN: National Youth
Leadership Council.

Travers, R. M. W., Rabinowitz, W., & Nemovicher, E. (1952). The anxieties of a group of
student teachers. *Educational Administration and Supervision, 38*, 368-375.

Wade, R. C. (1997). Teachers of service-learning. In A.S. Waterman (Ed.), *Service- learning:
Applications from Research* (pp.77-94). Mahwak, NJ: Erlbaum.

Weil, S. W., & McGill, I. (1989). A framework for making sense of experiential learning.
In S. W. Weil & I. McGill (Eds.), *Making Sense of Experiential Learning* (pp. 3-24).
Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University
Press.

Weiler, D., LaGoy, A., Crane, E., & Rovner, A. (1998). *An evaluation of K-12 service-learning in California: Phase II final report*. Emeryville, CA: RPP International with the Search Institute.

Wesley, M. T., & Franks, M. E. (1996, November). *Advanced adoption of computer technology in the classroom and teachers' participation in voluntary innovation adoption activities*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Tuscaloosa, AL.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Min S. Cho, Ph.D.

Education
Doctorate
The Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL
Doctor of Philosophy: Art Education
                               Certificate in Program Evaluation
Dissertation Topic: *Evaluating Concerns, Implementation, and Program Practices for Arts-Based Service-Learning Teachers in Lake County, Florida*

Graduate
The Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL
Masters in Art Education, Specialization in Arts Administration

Undergraduate
Tufts University, Medford, MA
Bachelor of Arts in Art History

Professional Experience
1999-Present   Florida Learn & Serve, Tallahassee, FL
Associate Director
Assists in creating statewide K-12 service-learning policy goals. Provides training and technical assistance to grantees. Reviews and selects grant applications. Oversees project administrative budget of $250,000. Conducts statewide grant, service learning, and public relations trainings and workshops. Conducts service-learning and grants-related workshops for Florida State University's Art Education Department classes. Initiated and coordinated the 1st through 4th Annual Service-Learning & the Arts Conferences. Co-coordinated the15th Annual National Service-Learning Conference; chaired Arts & Culture Committee. Coordinates annual statewide conference planning. Creates evaluation instruments for subgrantees' final reporting. Creates and implements additional evaluation goals and instruments for specific Learn & Serve studies. Investigates, compiles, and disseminates pertinent service-learning research-based studies. Supervises staff of 4.

1989-99   AmeriCorps ArtsUSF, Tampa, FL
Program Coordinator
Prepared and managed $320,000 budget. Increased the budget by over $24,800 through Florida Learn & Serve and Hillsborough County Arts Council grants. Liasion between the AmeriCorps program and program partners. Oversaw public relations. Created recruitment strategy. Wrote monthly and quarterly reports. Created new collaborations and partnerships with area city Parks and Recreation Departments and fine arts magnet schools. Integrated service-learning into the AmeriCorps curricula.

1997-98   Serve Houston Youth Corps, Houston, TX
Outreach/Public Relations Coordinator
Created and implemented recruitment strategies to annually hire over 120 members.
Spokesperson for media and outreach events. Managed the President Clinton's Student Service
Scholarship for Houston area schools awarding over $30,000. Coordinated over 200 volunteers
for community-wide events. Wrote press releases. Designed publications. Created Public Service
Announcements. Supervised recruitment staff of 10.

1995-97   Serve Houston Youth Corps, Houston, TX
Team Leader
Responsible for strategic planning and managing of three elementary after-school programs.
Initiated and managed community-wide arts projects. Incorporated service-learning projects
throughout the year. Established collaborative programs with community organizations.
Supervised staff of 12.

1992-1994   Pucker Gallery, Boston, MA
Gallery Assistant
Responsible for curating Alexander Anufriev and Inuit Sculpture shows. Managed and created
daily correspondence with gallery clients. Directed patrons through gallery collections.

Professional Training and Technical Assistance/Teaching Activities
2006
- February – Tallahassee, Grant Writing Workshop to Florida State University's Art
  Administration Class
- March — Miami, Coordinated 4th Annual Service Learning and the Arts Conference
- April — West Palm Beach, Service-Learning Workshop to Palm Beach County Teachers
- April — Ft. Lauderdale, Service-Learning Workshop to Broward County Teachers
- April — Miami, Service-Learning Workshop to Miami-Dade County Teachers
- April — Tavares, Arts-Based Service-Learning Workshop to Lake County Teachers

2005
- February — Sarasota, Coordinated 3rd Annual Service Learning and the Arts Conference
- February — Tallahassee, Grant Writing Workshop to Florida State University's Art
  Administration Class
- April — West Palm Beach, Service-Learning Workshop to Palm Beach County Teachers
- April — Ft. Lauderdale, Service-Learning Workshop to Broward County Teachers
- April — Miami, Service-Learning Workshop to Miami-Dade County Teachers
- September — Tallahassee, Service-Learning Workshop to Florida State University's
  Community Arts Class

2004
- January — Tallahassee, Grant writing Workshop to Florida State University's Art
  Administration Class
- January — Tallahassee, Service-Learning Presentation to Florida State University's College
  of Engineering

- January — Orlando, Coordinated Service-Learning Workshops to Advanced Trainers
- March — Orlando, Service-Learning Presentation to Florida Grant Writers Association
- March — Sebastian, Eight Hour Service-Learning Training to The River School Faculty
- March — Orlando, Service-Learning Workshop to Orange County Teachers
- March — West Palm Beach, Service-Learning Workshop to Palm Beach County Teachers
- April — Jacksonville, Service-Learning Workshop to Duval County Teachers
- April — Tampa, Service-Learning Workshop to Hillsborough County Teachers
- April — Winter Park, Service-Learning and Pubic Relations Workshop at Philanthropy Conference
- April — Orlando, Service-Learning and Pubic Relations Workshop at Volunteer Magic Conference
- May — Ft. Lauderdale, Service-Learning Workshop to Broward County Teachers
- November — Miami, Service-Learning/Public Relations/Grant Writing Workshop to Miami-Dade Teachers-of-the-Year

2003
- March — Jacksonville, Service-Learning Workshop to Duval County Teachers
- March — Orlando, Co-Coordinated 15th Annual National Service-Learning Conference (Arts and Culture Committee Chair)
- June — Wakulla, Service-Learning Workshop to Wakulla County Teachers
- September — Tallahassee Service-Learning Workshop to Florida State University's Community Arts Class
- October — Coordinated Service-Learning and Sunshine State Standards Conference
- November — Orlando, Coordinated 10th Annual State-Wide Service-Learning Conference

2002
- April — Tampa, Service-Learning Workshop to Hillsborough County Teachers
- April — Miami, Service-Learning Workshop to Miami-Dade Teachers
- April — Ft. Lauderdale, Service-Learning Workshop to Broward County Teachers
- April — West Palm Beach, Service-Learning Workshop to Palm Beach County Teachers
- April — Orlando, Service-Learning Workshop to Orange County Teachers
- April — Largo, Service-Learning Workshop to Pinellas County Teachers
- May — Panama City, Service-Learning Workshop to Bay County Teachers
- May — Jacksonville, Service-Learning Workshop to Duval County Teachers
- June — Tallahassee, Grant Writing Workshop to Florida State University's Art Administration Class
- July — Miami, Service-Learning/Public Relations/Grant Writing Workshop to Miami-Dade Teachers-of-the-Year
- October — Largo, Service-Learning Workshop to Pinellas County Teachers
- October — Orlando, Service-Learning Workshop to Orange County Teachers
- October — Jacksonville, Service-Learning Workshop to Duval County Teachers
- October — Miami, Service-Learning Workshop to Miami-Dade Teachers
- November — Jacksonville, Coordinated 2nd Annual Service Learning and the Arts Conference

- November — Panama City, Service-Learning Workshop to Bay County Teachers

2001
- April — Orlando, Coordinated 1st Annual Service Learning and the Arts Conference
- April — Pensacola, Service-Learning Workshop to Escambia County Teachers
- April — Ft. Lauderdale, Service-Learning Workshop to Broward County Teachers
- April — Tampa, Service-Learning Workshop to Hillsborough County Teachers
- November — Orlando, Coordinated 9th Annual State-Wide Service-Learning Conference

Awards
2006   Florida State University
Received the inaugural "Extending Our Reach" award for promoting Florida State University's name outside of the state of Florida through the Service Learning & the Arts Conferences.

Publications
Initiated and co-authored "My Art…My World", the nation's premiere K-12 arts-based service-learning handbook.

Volunteer Service
2006-2007   International Service-Learning Research Conference
Board Member
Voted by national membership to represent the graduate student voice for this research conference.

2003-2004   Tallahassee Cultural Plan
Assistant Local Coordinator
Worked with Cultural Plan Advisory Committee to help launch Tallahassee's cultural plan. Conducted interviews, researched statistics, assisted in final cultural plan document.

2001   Very Special Arts, Florida
Intern
Created evaluation supplement entitled *Linking and Leveraging Arts Disability and Community*

2000-2001   Florida State University, Service Scholar Program
Advisor
Advised and mentored four Service Scholars in academic and career goals.

1995-1997   Cultural Arts Council of Houston/Harris County
Grants Review Panelist
Reviewed grant applications to allocate over $5,000,000 to arts groups and artists during 1995-97 funding years.

Grants Awarded
1999   Florida Learn & Serve $ 6,800
1999   Hillsborough County Arts Council $18,000

Organizational Memberships

2005-Present National Service-Learning Partnership
2004-Present American Evaluation Association
2003-2004   National Arts Education Association
1999-2000   Junior League of Tallahassee
1998-1999   Junior League of Tampa
1997-1998   Junior League of Houston