types and geographical locations. Included were six private universities, five small liberal arts colleges and eight public universities. Five were located in the east; six in the midwest; three in the south; and five in the west. All students in classes that agreed to participate in the study were surveyed. There were 1140 pre- and post-surveys from students who participated in service and 404 from classmates who did not select service classes or options within classes.

Classes included service internships, professional classes such as those in education and social work which included service-learning, and special service-learning seminars, as well as traditional arts and sciences classes with a service-learning component. In the arts and sciences class sub-sample there were 616 students who participated in community service as part of their traditional academic course and 366 students who did not select that course section or option.

The arts and sciences sub-sample was analyzed because the role of service in the traditional liberal arts curriculum is the topic that has engaged academic policy-makers. There has not been a great deal of debate about including service and other community based options in professional programs like education and social work. Even if service-learning is not required within the liberal arts curriculum core, providing the option may encourage students to participate who would not otherwise seek out service-learning. It is a particularly easy way for students to become engaged in academically based service-learning. We were interested to see if service-learning students in those traditional courses were more similar to their counterparts than students in service and non-service options across the entire sample of diverse classes and experiences. If including service-learning in the core arts and sciences curriculum attracts students less inclined to seek out service or service-learning opportunities then the pre-test ‘selectivity’ differences should be less pronounced for these students than between service-learning and non-service-learning students in the larger sample.

**Outcome Measures**

For this analysis, we have focused on students’ assessments of their citizenship skills, their confidence that they can and should make a difference in their communities, their community-related values and their perceptions of social problems and social justice. These are among the most frequently expressed goals of service-learning programs, (Giles, Honnet & Migliore, 1991).

Students’ assessment of their political action skills, communication skills, and tolerance are based on items developed in an early version of a citizenship skill measure developed as part of the “Measuring Citizenship Project” of the Walt Whitman Center for the Culture and Politics of Democracy at Rutgers University (Whitman Center, 1993). Political action skills are measured with items that, for example, ask students to compare their ability to “lead a group” or “know whom to contact to get things done;” communication skills draw on items that refer to “listening” or “communicating with others;” tolerance items include “respecting views of others” and “empathetic to all points of view.” These three scales had Cronbach Alphas ranging from .71 to .80. The ability to identify social issues and critical thinking skill are measured by single items, as are the values outcomes. Students’ ratings of how they value such future roles as “careers helping people,” “community leadership,” and “influencing public policy” are drawn from measures developed by Markus, Howard and King (1993). The focus of these value items is on the students’ own definition of how they will live their lives.

The citizenship confidence items include a sense of personal efficacy in affecting community issues, a belief that the community itself can be effective in solving its problems, and feeling connected to the community. These scales developed by Scheurich (1994) yielded alphas with this sample ranging from .46 for community connectedness to .64 for personal efficacy. In Scheurich’s original development of the scale within one student population, the scales had somewhat higher consistency; the extreme diversity of this sample may have affected reliability.

Perceptions of social justice measures are designed to measure the complexity of students’ conceptualizations of social issues, how these problems should be addressed and their empathy and openness to multiple points of view. This is a measure of what students think and how they think about social justice issues. Locus of community problems measures whether students take a systemic view of social problems, or tend to narrowly assign blame to the individuals facing the problem. The alpha for this scale was .72. Students’ belief that social justice is a critical issue for the community and that changing policy is the most important approach were measured by single items; these both tap perception of the nature of the problem and commitment. Perspective-taking measures students’ ability to put the self in the place of others; this scale had an alpha of .59 for this sample. The final scale in this set of measures focused on the tendency of students to quickly reach closure on an