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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

A variety of factors influences student learning and motivation. In particular, an instructor’s pedagogical approach can greatly influence the student learning process. Instructors utilize various instructional models within the classroom based on her/his pedagogical approach. The type of pedagogical approach/model chosen by the instructor to employ within a classroom can either enable or inhibit student learning if not utilized properly. Joyce and Calhoun (1996) argued that models of instruction are truly models of learning, thus making instructional models worthy of analysis in regards to learning. Furthermore, the instructional format used to deliver course content is crucial to student learning. Instructional format is the design of the classroom such as face-to-face instruction, online instruction, or a blended format (face-to-face with online components). In this project, I address the influence of pedagogical approach and instructional format used in an introductory communication course on students’ learning and motivation.

The instructional models an instructor chooses to employ demonstrate her or his pedagogical approach. Many instructional models exist, but two general categories encompass the majority of models: information processing models (IPM) and social processing models (SPM). The models represent instructor’s pedagogical approaches. IPMs enable students to process large amounts of data through employing innate processing abilities (Joyce & Weil, 1986). Content matter or cognitive learning is of utmost importance when engaging in the use of IPMs such as concept attainment, advanced organizers, and the Suchman inquiry (Ausubel, 1980; Darling, 1990; Joyce &
Calhoun, 1996). Instructors are able to analyze the cognitive learning of a student through the student’s ability to evaluate cause and effect, utilize deductive reasoning, and analyze problems (Darling, 1990; Joyce & Calhoun, 1996; Joyce & Weil, 1986; Thompson & Fine, 1999). SPMs focus on students’ abilities to function in a social world where the most productive form of learning occurs when students create and engage in their own experiences of learning (Darling, 1990; Dewey, 1938/1997). Instructors are facilitators of learning. However, individuals are ultimately responsible for their own learning. By working together, students understand they live in a social world (Dewey, 1938/1997). Teachers serve as facilitators to guide students through the learning process whereby each person is responsible for their own learning.

In the past 20 years, a shift from IPMs (Ausubel, 1980; Barnes & Clawson, 1975) to SPMs has occurred within the communication discipline (Applegate & Morreale, 1999; Corbett & Kendall, 1999; Crabtree, 1999; Katula & Threnhauser, 1999; Kreps & Lederman, 1985; Seibold & Meyers, 1985; Warnemunde, 1986) and the broad academic community (Giles & Eyler, 1994; Johnson, Johnson, and Smith, 1991; Katula & Threnhauser, 1999; Matthews, Cooper, Davidson, and Hawks, 1995; Millis & Cottell Jr., 1998). Information processing models tended to not increase students’ learning when utilized alone; however, a social processing structure that incorporated aspects of information processing seemed advantageous within the classroom (Darling, 1990; Dell’Olio & Donk, 2007; Joyce & Calhoun, 1996).

Previous research exploring cooperative learning and service-learning demonstrates how pedagogical approaches incorporating SPMs used with some IPM techniques are extremely beneficial to student outcomes (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Jacoby,
The service-learning classroom employs a group-based and cooperative approach favorable to student learning. Most research supports service-learning within the classroom as a positive influence increasing learning as well as civic engagement (Boss, 1994; Cirone, 1989; Dewey, 1938/1997; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Jacoby, 1996; Porter Honnet & Poulsen, 1989; Sigmon, 1994; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2004). While a few studies compare service-learning with the non-service-learning approaches, most of this research utilizes a qualitative method that analyzes student’s responses or instructor’s reflections rather than an empirical analysis (Applegate & Morreale, 1999; Crabtree, 1999; Gray et al., 1996; Weintraub, 1999). The pedagogical approach of social processing within the areas of collaborative learning and service-learning was relevant to evaluate for many reasons. A lack of direct comparison research and a lack of empirical research within the communication discipline warrant a closer examination of service-learning in the classroom (Applegate & Morreale, 1999; Crabtree, 1999; Gray et al., 1996; Weintraub, 1999).

In addition to pedagogical approach, I analyzed how instructional format used to process course content affects student learning and motivation. In this study, the introductory communication course has been offered in a variety of instructional formats including blended (the combination of face-to-face and online) as well as traditional face-to-face. Learning is the goal of classrooms no matter the format.

Lujan and DiCarlo (2006) argued that more instruction rather than learning occurs within the traditional face-to-face classroom. In contrast, researchers argue that knowing how to facilitate an online environment is more important to student learning than subject knowledge (Moore & Kearsley, 1996; Palloff & Pratt, 1999; Salmon, 2000),
which is ironic due to the findings that knowledge of subject matter is crucial to effective teaching (Brophy, 2001; Shulman, 1987). Furthermore, a lack of motivation found in online education leaves room for decreases in student learning (Whitten & LaRose, 2000). I argue that a balance of instruction and activity base such as a blended format could potentially balance the distribution of content with increased learning. Few studies directly compared traditional face-to-face instruction with blended instruction (Dziuban & Moskal, 2001; Rivera, McAlister, & Rice, 2002; Waddoups, Hatch, & Butterworth, 2003), and the research on blended instruction does not encompass comparisons of multiple instructional formats or pedagogical approaches (Bruner, 2006; Joseph, 2005; Vess, 2005). According to Joyce and Calhoun (1996), the method of instruction utilized within a classroom makes a difference as to what type and level of learning occurs. Thus, I examined how instructional format and pedagogical approach affects students’ learning and motivation.

Specifically, I examined cognitive and affective learning. Cognitive learning focuses on students’ ability to recall, understand, apply, analyze, and evaluate concepts (Mottet & Stewart, 2002), while affective learning focuses on students’ attitudes, values, and beliefs in relation to the content and knowledge gained (McCroskey, 2002).

Motivation is a contributor to the student learning process, which supports the evaluation of learning in conjunction with motivation (Hall, 1966). Student motivation affects learning in forms such as student energy, volition, direction, involvement, and completion (Millette & Gorham, 2002). Overall, there are two types of student motivation: trait and state (Brophy, 1987). Trait motivation is a broad and general type geared toward studying or learning. Based on the situation, state motivation focuses
toward one specific class, task, or content area (Frymier, 1994). As instructors develop instructional goals and strategies for a class, an instructor should consider students’ motivation because motivation can influence students’ cognitive and affective learning (Christophel, 1990).

Previous studies on service-learning as a pedagogical approach primarily analyze student responses or instructor’s reflections through a qualitative method rather than empirically (Applegate & Morreale, 1999; Crabtree, 1999; Gray et al., 1996; Weintraub, 1999). No empirical exploration of service-learning in the basic communication course was found.

The basic communication course is a necessary avenue of research for several reasons. Communication skills are applicable to many aspects of students’ lives. Through students’ participation in a basic course, students are able to develop an interest in the subject matter and chose the field for her/his major. The introductory communication course is able to reach a large, diverse student population as well. If students become motivated and learn in introductory courses, the level of student retention could potentially reduce. Students’ success in her/his educational investment has the ability of reducing dropout rates. For each of the aforementioned reasons, the introductory communication course is worthy of study.

For the purpose of this study, I evaluated how pedagogical approach and instructional format affect cognitive and affective learning as well as trait and state motivation. I employed a quantitative survey to address the lack of empirical research. Participants were involved in one of two pedagogical approaches of service-learning or non-service-learning. The instructional format incorporated in this study included
blended (face-to-face and online) and traditional face-to-face instruction. Participants engaged in one of four conditions based on the section of Introduction to Communication in which they enrolled. Thus, four variations of the introductory communication class were evaluated: traditional face-to-face format with non-service-learning condition, blended format with non-service-learning condition, traditional face-to-face format with service-learning condition, and blended format with service-learning condition.

As noted in Chapter 4, the results of the multivariate analysis of variances (MANOVAs) reported significant declines overall in state and trait motivation over the course of the semester. Participants affect toward course content significantly decreased by the end of the semester. Specifically, participants from the service-learning condition with face-to-face instruction reported a significant decline in affect toward course content than the service-learning condition with blended instruction. Students’ affect toward behavior decreased significantly as well over the course of the semester. In particular, participants in the service-learning condition reported a significant decline in affect toward behavior than participants in the non-service-learning condition. Affect toward the instructor significantly declined as well. However, the service-learning condition influenced the overall affect toward the instructor, because participants affect toward the instructor increased in the non-service-learning condition, but decreased in the service-learning condition. Overall, all groups had a significant increase in cognitive learning. However, face-to-face instruction participants’ demonstrated a significant increase in cognitive learning when compared to blended instruction participants.
In Chapter 5, I discuss three main factors, which contributed to the decline in motivation and student affective learning over the semester: the timing of data collection, the role of the teaching assistant, and the fact that the class is mandatory. I utilized hooks (1994) notion of engaged pedagogy as a potential explanation for the decrease in affective learning and motivation. In addition to discussing the aforementioned elements, I evaluate the pedagogical approach of service-learning incorporating group work as a potential reason for the decline in student motivation and affective learning. I look at instructional format as a potential explanation for the decrease in students’ affect toward content and behavior. Lastly, I discuss a potential explanation for the cognitive learning results. Within each specific discussion point, I discuss limitations of the study as well as recommendations for future research such as a mixed method approach.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this paper, I explore how instructors’ pedagogical approaches and instructional format influence student learning and motivation. To understand pedagogical approach, an overview of the two primary categories of teaching models, information processing (IPM) and social processing (SPM), follow. Additionally, I proceed to present several examples of each type of model. Concept attainment, advanced organizers, and the Suchman inquiry are forms of information processing models, while cooperative learning and service-learning are the forms of social processing addressed. Dewey serves as a theoretical framework for experiential learning, which ties directly as a portion of SPMs. Experiential learning links to service-learning specifically as a SPM. I review research on online and blended/hybrid (face-to-face and online) instruction in order to demonstrate the difference online instruction has on student learning. Finally, the student outcomes of learning and motivation are addressed.

Instructional Models

Models of instruction are ways of systematically structuring methods of teaching certain concepts or processes (Joyce & Weil, 1986). Instructional strategies and models are a crucial facet of teaching making them worthy of attention (Joyce & Calhoun, 1996). An abundance of teaching models exists; however, two broad categories encompass most models: information processing models and social processing models.

Information Processing Models

An information processing model (IPM) allows each student the opportunity to process large amounts of information by utilizing innate processing abilities (Joyce &
Weil, 1986). Two assumptions about teaching and learning are consistent in IPMs: first, “that learning content matter is the primary purpose of instruction and, second, that effective instruction develops students’ natural information-processing abilities” (Darling, 1990, p. 268). IPMs help improve concept retention, individuals learn how to acquire and organize data, distinguish a problem and determine a solution, and increase students’ ability to relate concepts (Ausubel, 1980; Barnes & Clawson, 1975; Joyce & Calhoun, 1996). From this approach, instructors present stimuli that helps guide the students’ cognitive learning. Instructors utilize an IPM in order to focus on learners’ efficiency of cognitive learning through the learners’ ability to analyze problems, evaluate cause and effect, utilize inductive reasoning, and organize data (Darling, 1990; Joyce & Calhoun, 1996; Joyce & Weil, 1986; Thompson & Fine, 1999). Bereiter and Kurland (1981) reviewed past studies that analyzed instruction, which incorporated information processing versus instruction that did not incorporate the model, and found significantly higher levels of achievement in those that did incorporate levels of information processing. However, for a maximum effect on learning, a combination of models is best (Joyce & Calhoun, 1996).


**Concept attainment.** Bruner (1966) developed the IPM of concept attainment. The intent behind the concept attainment model is to have students actively learn by focusing on sorting through information, determining how specific individual concepts relate to one another, and then having students explain the process they encountered while making decisions (Bruner, 1966; Darling, 1990; Dell’Olio & Donk, 2007). Inductive reasoning is the focus of the concept attainment aspect of instructional processing. The model is one of the first in helping teachers to focus not only on “what” but also on the “how” of learning (Dell’Olio & Donk, 2007; Joyce & Calhoun, 1996). Teachers function as facilitators of learning through helping students question their remarks on the encountered experience and decisions they made (Bruner, 1966; Deethardt, 1974; Joyce & Calhoun, 1996). Benefits of concept attainment include cognitive reinforcement, processing learning strategies, and reinforced information processing abilities (Darling, 1990).

**Advance organizers.** Ausubel (1963) created the advance organizers model, which focuses on the idea that deductive organization is the format of cognitive structure as well as learning. According to Ausubel (1963), instructors should discuss a broad idea (the advance organizer), and then incorporate new ideas into the knowledge students already possess, and finally reinforce the learning through internal processing. Two groups of advance organizers exist: expositor and comparative (Dell’Olio & Donk, 2007). Kirkman and Shaw (1997) concluded, “Expository organizers function to provide the learner a conceptual framework for unfamiliar material, and comparative organizers
are used when the knowledge to be acquired is relatively familiar to the learner” (pp. 3-4). The goal of the advance organizer is enhancing an individual’s capacity to take in information and then organize it according to a greater cognitive structure (Dell’Olio & Donk, 2007; Joyce & Calhoun, 1996). An example of the steps presented by Ausubel (1963) would be when an instructor introduces a new concept, shows a film clip (learning stimulus) that relates old information to the new information, and then has students write a paper incorporating similarities and differences between new and old information (Darling, 1990). Students begin to take an active role in their learning process. Instructors would function as facilitators and discussion leaders through lectures (Joyce & Calhoun, 1996). Past research shows that communication classrooms frequently utilize various forms of advanced organizers especially the form of instructional objectives (Bradley, 1984; Joyce & Calhoun, 1996; Kibler, Bassett, & Byers, 1977; Staton-Spicer & Bassett, 1980; Stewart & D’Angelo, 1980).

**Suchman inquiry.** The Suchman inquiry (inquiry training) model of information processing combines inductive and deductive reasoning by utilizing questioning through scientific inquiry (Joyce & Calhoun, 1996; Suchman, 1964). Goals of the Suchman inquiry are to develop independent learners and to teach students how to produce explanations; the reasoning for this approach is the assumption that knowledge is constantly expanding and evolving (Dell’Olio & Donk; 2007; Joyce & Weil, 1986; Suchman, 1964). Students learn to gather information, construct concepts, and then create and test hypotheses (Joyce & Calhoun, 1996). Teachers’ roles in the Suchman inquiry are to provide information when asked appropriate questions by the students as well as to encourage the articulation of hypotheses formulated by the students based on
their questioning (Darling, 1990). Students learn to think causally (Joyce & Calhoun, 1996).

Traditional instruction often utilizes IPMs. Dewey (1938/1997) divides instructional format between traditional teaching and experiential teaching. Dewey portrays traditional formats using the IPMs as limiting the students’ experiences by invoking a rigid, structured, and disciplined classroom where teachers impose on students learning (1938/1997). The experience that does occur is static where students neither understand nor relate the experience with future experiences. Often, teachers within the traditional mindset focus on mere content rather than a combination of content, process, and socialization thereby limiting the contribution made to the wellbeing of both the individual and society. Dewey (1938/1997) focuses on the importance of societal purpose as well as individual purpose; thus, traditional education by focusing on mere content is unable to achieve Dewey’s goal of education. After reviewing the IPM in regards to cognitive learning and traditional teaching style, research reveals that applications of an IPM does not achieve students’ full learning potential when utilized solely (Darling, 1990; Dell’Olio & Donk, 2007; Joyce & Calhoun, 1996).

Social Processing Model

Social processing models (SPM) “assume that the primary responsibility of schools is to teach individuals how to operate in a social world…they assume that learning is most productive when individuals construct their own learning experiences” (Darling, 1990, p. 273). By working together students understand they live in a social world and are able to take responsibility for their own learning (Dewey, 1938/1997).
Teachers serve as facilitators to guide students through the learning process whereby each person is responsible for their own learning. Lew, Mesch, Johnson, and Johnson (1986) argue that social models are effective in teaching pro-social behavior and problem-solving skills. Communication journals, textbooks, and classrooms frequently utilize and evaluate the SPM (Applegate & Morreale, 1999; Beebe & Biggers, 1986; Corbett & Kendall, 1999; Crabtree, 1999; Gibson, Kostecki, & Lucas, 2001; Katula & Threnhauser, 1999; Kreps & Lederman, 1985; Makau, 1985; Rowan, 1984; Seibold & Meyers, 1985; Warnemunde, 1986).

Dewey’s research (1938/1997) focuses on the importance of experience, which is a mechanism that supports the foundation of SPMs. Dewey argues that students need to be able to apply concepts to their own experiences in order to facilitate their learning. A combination of reflection in addition to action is critical for students to connect what she/he does to the informing principles (Dewey, 1954). Experience emerges from the two main principles of continuity and interaction. Dewey (1938/1997, 1954) stresses that valued experiences are in the eye of the beholder thereby making every experience different for the individual. Value comes from an experience based on the impact that experience has on the individual’s present or past as well as the individual’s ability to contribute to society (Marlin-Bennett, 2002). Dewey (1938/1997) clearly reveals that education is a social process through the development of experience through interactions. Because Dewey believes education and learning is a social process, in his research he sought to change the way instructors transmit information to students in order for them to become engaged in acquiring the knowledge (Katula & Threnhauser, 1999). The goals of Dewey’s educational perspective are to link
knowing and doing by facilitating engagement of practical knowledge and create active citizens (Giles & Eyler, 1994). Matthews, Cooper, Davidson, and Hawkes (1995) agree with Dewey in that learning is active, teachers are facilitators, teachers and students share learning and teaching, and intellectual development occurs when one takes responsibility for their own learning. Kolb (1984) further clarifies “learning is the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience” (p. 38).


Group investigation is a method of instruction utilizing a SPM that formulates on Dewey’s philosophy (1916/1941) that individuals gain knowledge by acquiring information and solving problems within groups. Goals of learning within group investigation include social responsibility and group problem solving skills (Darling, 1990; Joyce & Weil, 1986). When an individual examines and reflects on her/his social experiences, the individual begins to value civic engagement and responsibility within a democratic society (Darling, 1990). For the purpose of the study, I will focus on two social processing strategies in depth: cooperative learning and service-learning.

**Cooperative learning.** As Dewey (1938/1997) and Marlin-Bennett (2002) concluded, action is a necessity for learning to occur; cooperative learning is a route of facilitating action. Since the beginning of this century, evaluation of cooperation has occurred within the classroom (Maller, 1929). According to Johnson, Johnson, and Holubec (1993), cooperative learning is maximizing each person’s learning through small group interaction. Five common attributes in the extensive research on cooperative learning include “a common talk or learning activity suitable for group work;
small-group learning; cooperative behavior; interdependence; individual accountability and responsibility,” (Davidson, 1994, p. 25). A key component for success in cooperative learning is that each student realizes that they are responsible for contributing to another’s learning as well as their own (Millis & Cottell Jr., 1998). Cooperative learning promotes the accomplishment of shared goals as well as socialization and learning (Cohen, 1994; Gillies, 1999). Johnson et al. (1991) report that the effectiveness of cooperative learning has been researched more than almost any other aspect of education over the last ninety years through over six hundred studies. Although a large portion of research does not focus on the collegiate level, studies do show that the positive benefits of the research are applicable to all age levels, all content areas, and diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds (Bossert, 1988; Millis & Cottell, Jr., 1998; Natasi & Clements, 1991). According to Slavin (1999), cooperative learning is one of the best educational innovations in recent years.

Cooperative learning meets three basic human needs for the learner: competence, relatedness, and autonomy (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Cooperative learning meets competence by including students in supportive situations where members of her/his group can give constructive feedback in a lower risk situation as well as increase their participation (Jacobs, Power, & Inn, 2002). In classrooms where less interaction occurs, lecturing is frequent, or vocal students tend to dominate discussion, the quiet student or less participatory student loses competence (Millis & Cottell, Jr., 1998). Team building and group interaction encourage relatedness between students as well as the facilitator/teacher (Cooper, 1990). According to Slavin (1995), students need to develop trust and solidarity in order to function well within their group. A feeling of security and
developing a sense of belonging enhances the learning experience (Jacobs et al., 2002; Johnson et al., 1991). Cooperative learning allows students to achieve autonomy in the sense that students are able to take power/control over their learning. Groups of students are empowered to enhance their learning and be self-directive (Cohen, 1994; Cooper, 1990). Competence, relatedness, and autonomy are not only elements students need to be successful within a classroom, but also, are beneficial in the workplace. Learning skills such as group problem solving, group decision making, and interpersonal communication help individuals function in the corporate realm (Millis & Cottell, Jr., 1998). According to some researchers, teachers that do not utilize a form of cooperative learning that helps enable the previously listed skills are doing a disservice to their students (Covey, 1989; Millis & Cottell, Jr., 1998).

The benefits of cooperative learning are numerous from academic achievement to socialization of students in addition to increasing listening and collaborative skills (Astin, 1993; Cooper & Mueck, 1990; Freirson, 1986; Jacobs et al., 2002; Johnson & Johnson, 1993). Facilitation of material by instructors through a cooperative approach not only leads to increases in cognitive learning, but also impacts students affect toward learning and behavior in a positive way (Millis & Cottell, Jr., 1998; Johnson et al., 1993). “A college’s purpose is not to transfer knowledge but to create environments and experiences that bring students to discover and construct knowledge for themselves, to make students members of communities of learners that make discoveries and solve problems,” (Barr & Tagg, 1995, p. 15). The paradigm of teaching could benefit in shifting from a focus of pure instruction to a paradigm that focuses on students’ learning and success such as cooperative learning.
**Service-learning.** Service-learning is another application of SPMs. Instructors can utilize a service learning approach within their classroom in a group format or individually. The concept of service-learning has been around since the time of Aristotle as a form of collaborative/cooperative learning (Bulot & Johnson, 2006; Burr, 1999). Service-learning is “more than volunteerism, service-learning combines community work with classroom instruction, emphasizing reflection as well as action. It empowers students by making them responsible in a real world context, while giving them the support, encouragement, information, and skills to be effective,” (Rosenberg, 2000, p. 8). Thus, service-learning is grounded in experience as a basis for learning tying back to Dewey’s theory of experience. Dewey’s theory is the benchmark of the experiential movement encompassing cooperative learning and service-learning (Jacoby, 1996; Smythe, 1990). Additionally, service-learning strives to address community needs and promote learning and development (Jacoby, 1996). Service-learning is different from other types of learning in that students’ reflection of their experience in the community connects to their academic learning (Olney & Grande, 1995). According to Sigmon (1994), the hyphen illustrates that service and learning are goals of equal importance; thus, I will incorporate the hyphen to represent this aspect of the term.

Service-learning is extracurricular and curricular and can be a one-time, short-term, or long-term experience as long as reflection and reciprocity occur (Jacoby, 1996; Olney & Grande, 1995). Learning and development does not occur necessarily through the service-learning act itself, but rather results from the reflective component based on the act (Kendall, 1988; Porter Honnet & Poulsen, 1989). The reflective aspect of a service-learning project is of utmost importance for success of the overall experience.
Reciprocity is necessary between all parties involved in the service-learning including those served and those individuals providing the service (Kendall, 1990). Empowerment occurs on both for both groups. The individuals serving take a responsibility in their community and those served take responsibility for their own needs as well as possible ways of addressing the needs. A combination of action and thought, theory and application, as well as reflection and practice increases learning (Dewey, 1938/1997; Jacoby, 1996).

Past research demonstrates higher education needs strengthening especially in the areas of integrating experiences with education, preparing students for the workplace, creating a nation of learners, putting student learning first, and teaching students to value civic engagement (Association of American Colleges, 1988; Boyer, 1988; Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Droge & Murphy, 1999; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Jacoby, 1996; Wingspread Group on Higher Education, 1993). In order to strengthen these areas, students must be able to see a connection between their learning and living (Boyer, 1988; Jacoby 1996). Service-learning provides the connection between learning and living. Active engagement is crucial to students understanding their role in society, to application of concepts, and facilitating their learning process. According to Astin (1993), service-learning is the best mode of achieving higher education’s mission: “to produce educated citizens who understand and appreciate not only how democracy is supposed to work but also their own responsibilities to become active and informed participants in it” (p. 24). One must engage in the process of good citizenship and responsibility rather than receive lectures on what these terms represent. Through service-learning, individuals can involve themselves in the process of realizing what
good citizenship and responsibility concerning their community truly signifies (Cirone, 1989).

In addition to education of citizens, researchers have established that service-learning has a direct impact on students’ cognitive, behavioral, and social development (Boss, 1994; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2004). Service-learning correlates directly to experiential learning because it allows individuals to learn in a context that is more dynamic and applicable than a traditional classroom and is similar to environments which she/he would perform in the future (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003). Gray et al. (1996) conducted a comprehensive study across forty-two institutions that determined students’ service-learning contributions were valuable to community organizations, service-learning projects improved community relations, and student learning and development was positively affected (as cited in Corbett & Kendall, 1999, p. 69). The authors determined that students engaged in service-learning experienced increases in civic responsibility, academic achievement, and life skills. Generally, students in service-learning classes were competent in their learning, more successful, and retain more knowledge than students that have not experienced service-learning (Kinsley, 1994).

Although the majority of research shows positive attributes of service-learning, negative attributes exist as well if the instructor does not handle the service-learning assignment in the correct manner. Service-learning can lead to reinforcement of negative stereotypes if the reflective step of processing does not occur (Eyler & Giles, 1999). Service-learning research agrees that negative attributes are avoidable by
utilizing methods of reflection that tie the service experience to cognitive inquiry in order to make a permanent transformation on numerous levels (Strain, 2005).

Service-learning is relevant to the communication discipline due to the field’s preparation for public life as well as service-learning’s focus on student learning and development (Applegate & Morreale, 1999; Jacoby, 1996). An endless connection exists between the communication classroom and service-learning. Communication instructors have the ability to incorporate service-learning projects into the classroom with ease (Gibson et al., 2001). By teaching students to function as communication professionals as well as helping them to maintain a strong sense of social responsibility, scholars believe that service-learning programs are having a large impact on students within the communication discipline (Applegate & Morreale, 1999; Crabtree, 1999; Droge & Murphy, 1999; Soukup, 1999). By having such a large impact in the field, the community as well as the communication program will thrive as learning occurs simultaneously for those involved in the process. Service-learning has the potential to benefit communication classrooms as well as the community. The focus of this study is on the introductory communication classroom. Limited research exists analyzing service-learning within the introductory communication course (Droge & Murphy, 1999; Weintraub, 1999). Overall, the research tends to show many positive correlations between service-learning and the classroom (Applegate & Morreale, 1999; Crabtree, 1999; Droge & Murphy, 1999; Gibson et al., 2001; Soukup, 1999) such as promotion of learning and development (Applegate & Morreale, 1999; Jacoby, 1996; Olney & Grande, 1995), social responsibility and empowerment (Rosenberg, 2000), engagement...
and socialization (Cohen, 1994; Gillies, 1999; Johnson et al., 1993; Millis & Cottell Jr., 1998).

As noted above instructional pedagogical choices are factors that influence levels of student learning; however, the format of instruction can also influence student learning. The instructional format of a classroom has the potential to affect the level of student learning and motivation just as the instructor's pedagogical decisions can.

Instructional Format

An instructor often decides the instructional format of a course based on her or his pedagogical preferences. A great deal of research exists between the connectivity of pedagogical preference and instructional format. Certain pedagogical preferences tend to apply more appropriately to certain forms of instruction. In this project, I explore instructional formats that incorporate online learning as well as traditional face-to-face instruction.

Online Instruction

Online instruction is increasing dramatically each year on college campuses. The first course taught completely online occurred in 1981 (Harasim, 2000). While distance education has transpired for many years, only recently has the shift included the option of a completely online-based course (Arbaugh, 2000). Research shows an importance of engagement with others throughout the learning process to make sense of information as well as the value and benefit students receive from interaction (Brown & Campione, 1994). Extensive research conducted on online learning stresses the necessity of online collaboration, engagement, and community (Harasim, 2000; Hoadley & Pea, 2002; Owston, 1997; Palloff & Pratt, 1999; Salmon, 2000). Researchers agree
that community develops when students participate actively by sharing not only academic ideas but also personal thoughts (McGinnis, 1996; Palloff & Pratt, 1999; Salmon, 2000). Often, online classes do not delve deep enough in academic ideas or personal thoughts in order to develop community. Engagement can occur through online chat sessions or postings, but often students participate on a surface level that does not maximize their potential for learning (Wallace, 2003).

The change toward online education was not only one of potentially increasing students' education (McComb, 1994; Webster & Hackley, 1997), but also cutting instructional costs and reaching more students (Gubernick & Ebeling, 1997; Shein, 1997). Potentially, learner motivation is the downfall of online learning due to a lack of immediacy, enthusiasm, and intensity (Whitten & LaRose, 2000). Immediacy has only recently been researched in the context of distance education/online education. According to Whitten and LaRose (2000), research not only looks at immediacy between the learners, but also the immediacy between instructor and student as well as students and computers. Students of distance learning classes have lower expectations in regards to immediacy and nonverbal behavior than a face-to-face classroom (Frietas, Myers & Avtgis, 1998; Witt & Wheeless, 1999). Through discussions utilizing emoticons, humor, or audio clips, instructors can monitor and increase immediacy within the online environment thus increasing learning (Arbaugh, 2001).

By focusing on the ease of scheduling and savings in money rather than the learning that occurs, past online research is lacking in determining where instructional design should focus (Wallace, 2003). Many researchers argue that knowing how to facilitate an online environment is more important than subject knowledge (Moore &
Kearsley, 1996; Palloff & Pratt, 1999; Salmon, 2000), which is ironic due to the findings that knowledge of subject matter is crucial to effective teaching (Brophy, 2001; Shulman, 1987). In addition to this interesting shift in perspective concerning the online format, a lack of motivation found in online education leaves room for decreases in learning overall (Whitten and LaRose, 2000). A blend of face-to-face and online instruction might address some of the downsides to a course taught completely online Dodero, Fernandez, & Sanz, 2003; McCray, 2000; Riffell & Sibley, 2005).

**Blended/Hybrid Instruction**

Hybrid or blended classes are a combination of online instruction as well as face-to-face instruction enabling students to come together in a traditional face-to-face classroom, while retaining connectivity between face-to-face sessions using online technologies (Garrison & Kanuka, 2004; Olapiriyakul, & Scher, 2006). For the purpose of this study, blended instruction is a combination of face-to-face instruction and online instruction incorporating technology in the process of learning. The goal of blended instruction is to combine the positive aspects of both face-to-face and online learning (Dodero et al., 2003; Garrison & Kanuka, 2004; McCray, 2000; Parsons & Ross, 2002; Rosbottom, 2001; Rovai & Jordan, 2004).

Typically, these classes have some type of discussion forum, lecture content, online quizzes, or interactive animations of concepts for the online component of the class. Noble (1997) suggested that a blended education is of a lesser quality than traditional classrooms; however, recent scholars argue that this type of environment can indeed encourage a healthy learning atmosphere (Joseph, 2005; Levin, Levin, & Waddoups, 1999; Waddoups et al., 2003; Young, 2002).
A blended classroom is beneficial due to its ability to mesh the positive aspects of both environments. Face-to-face interaction is not lost within the blended environment as it is with a strictly online class (Vess, 2005). Within the online component of a blended class, discussions tend to be more in depth and are not limited by the class period (Joseph, 2005). Unlike online courses, the traditional face-to-face portion of the class fulfills the social facets of learning (Joseph, 2005). Rovai and Jordan (2004) conducted a comparative study of blended, traditional, and online courses, which reported students' perceiving a stronger sense of community within the blended format course. Young (2002) suggests that blended learning environments have lower drop out rates than a purely online course and tend to maintain students’ attention more than a traditional classroom.

In a blended format course, as stated previously, instructors typically post course content as a form of self-guided lessons. By students being able to access a great deal of the course material prior to class, more in-depth discussions are able to occur during the face-to-face portion (Lorenzetti, 2004). Combining various forms of online content as well as a diverse assortment of interactive activities in the face-to-face portion incorporating various learning styles, overall learning would potentially increase (McCray, 2000; Riffell & Sibley, 2005). Because instructors are able to help students with a variety of learning styles (Young, 2002), hybrid courses in many cases rate higher in overall success than fully online or face-to-face classrooms (Dziuban & Moskal, 2001). According to Rivera et al. (2002) in a comparative survey of the three modes of instruction, students’ satisfaction was highest with the blended model (Young, 2002); however, each of the instructional formats was the same in regards to students’
test scores. Overall, previous research reports several positive aspects of blended instruction. Limited research exists in regards to the communication field. Anderson and McGlynn (2006) report benefits of blended instruction in the basic communication course; however, decreases in motivation occurred. This is the only research conducted on blended classrooms in the basic communication course that I have found.

Universities have different motives for implementing the blended learning environment. Studies reveal that a blended course might be the best mode for convenience and eliminating a classroom shortage (Olapiriyakul & Scher, 2006; Parsons & Ross, 2002; Young, 2002). Students appreciate the reduction in commute as well as the flexibility of blended classes in comparison to traditional formats (Garnham & Kaleta, 2002; Olapiriyakul & Scher, 2006). Thus, my goal was to understand the affect of pedagogical approach and instructional format on student learning and motivation.

Student Outcomes

For the purpose of this study, I explored two types of student outcomes: learning and motivation. Specifically, I analyzed how instructional format and pedagogical approach influence students’ learning and motivation.

Learning

From the beginning of a student’s education in elementary school, the purpose of attending class is to learn. According to Johnston (1996), a student’s ‘will to learn’ is the beginning of the learning process and aligns with motivation. The student’s will to learn originates from the individual’s sense of purpose or meaning. In essence, the individual’s energy to act on what is meaningful and ties to how prepared the student is to devote effort in learning. Overtime, it is the individual’s effort to engage her/his
motivation by processing, performing, and developing as a learner (Harlen & Crick, 2003).

Overall, three primary types of learning exist including cognitive, behavioral, and affective (Bloom, 1956; Krathwohl, Bloom, & Masia, 1964). Cognitive learning includes “learning objectives that focus on students being able to recall, understand, apply, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate course content” (Mottet & Stewart, 2002, p. 160). Behavioral learning focuses on students enacting a specific skill or behavior. The third type of learning is affective learning, which focuses on students’ attitudes, values, and beliefs in relation to the content and knowledge gained from the experience (McCroskey, 2002).

Previous research evaluates learning according to many variables such as teacher immediacy (Christophel, 1990; Comadena, Hunt, & Simonds, 2007; Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1986; Richmond, 2002), level of teacher caring (Comadena et al., 2007), environment (Arbaugh, 2000; Stichter, Lewis, Richter, Johnson, & Bradley, 2006; Tolhurst, 2007; Wu, 2003), content relevance (Frymier, Shulman, & Houser, 1996), and teacher clarity (Chesebro, 2002; Comadena et al., 2007; Kearney, Plax, & Wendt-Wasco, 1985; McCroskey, Sallinen, Fayer, Richmond, & Barraclough, 1996). Each of the aforementioned variables is capable of producing positive effects on learning when utilized in an appropriate manner. According to Hall (1966), theorists view motivation as a contribution to the learning process; therefore, evaluation of learning should occur in conjunction with motivation.
Motivation

Motivation is the moving force that helps to influence behavior in order to achieve a desired outcome (Millette & Gorham, 2002). Motivation includes stimulating and directive properties (Christophel, 1990). Student motivation affects learning in forms such as student energy, volition, direction, involvement, and completion (Millette & Gorham, 2002). Overall, there are two groups of types of student motivation: trait and state (Brophy, 1987). Trait motivation is a broad and general type toward studying or learning. Based on the situation, state motivation focuses toward one specific class, task, or content area (Frymier, 1994).

As instructors develop instructional goals and strategies keeping in mind students’ motivation can influence students’ affective learning (Christophel, 1990). Teachers are capable of encouraging student motivation toward learning. Keller (1983, 1987) created the ARCS model of motivation, which proposed four conditions that were necessary in order to influence students’ motivation: interest, relevance, expectancy, and satisfaction (as cited in Frymier, 1994, p. 136). In addition to the development and assessment of this model, motivation has been studied by looking at the process of teachers motivating students (Frymier, 1994), teacher enthusiasm (Brophy, 1987), and immediacy (Christophel, 1990). As Christophel (1990) demonstrates, instructors’ behaviors influence student motivation which in turn influences student learning outcomes.

Rationale

The goal of this study was to clarify how an instructors’ pedagogical approach (service-learning vs. non-service-learning) and instructional format (blended vs. face-to-
face) influenced student learning and motivation. Specifically, I evaluated four instructional combinations: service-learning with face-to-face instruction; service-learning with blended instruction; non-service-learning with face-to-face instruction; and non-service-learning with blended instruction.

Instructors of the non-service-learning format in this study utilized an IPM approach to instruction through face-to-face large lecture or online lecture. Although elements of social processing potentially occurred throughout activities in the recitation classroom of both face-to-face and blended instruction, an IPM was the guiding structure. The classroom within this study that utilized service-learning centered around SPMs. Instructors might employ a portion of an IPM; however, the primary focus of the classroom functioned through the lens of service-learning and cooperative learning as guided by social processing.

For the maximum affect on learning, Joyce and Calhoun (1996) recommend that effective teachers should utilize a blend of strategies and models. Previous research exploring service-learning within a classroom demonstrates that SPMs blended with some IPM techniques is extremely beneficial (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Jacoby, 1996; Olney & Grande, 1995; Rosenberg, 2000). The service-learning classroom employs a group-based and cooperative learning approach favorable to learning. Most research supports service-learning within the classroom as a positive influence that increases learning as well as civic engagement (Boss; 1994; Cirone, 1989; Dewey, 1938/1997; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Jacoby, 1996; Porter Honnet & Poulsen, 1989; Sigmon, 1994; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2004).
However, few studies directly compare service-learning with the non-service-learning approach. Research on service-learning primarily analyze student responses or instructor’s reflections through a qualitative method rather than empirical examining students’ learning and motivation (Applegate & Morreale, 1999; Crabtree, 1999; Gray et al., 1996; Weintraub, 1999). Furthermore, no empirical exploration of service-learning in the basic communication course was found.

Based on the literature reviewed, service-learning is beneficial not only to student learning within the communication classroom but to enhancing students’ civic engagement (Astin, 1993; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Kinsley, 1994; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2004). Due to the gap in research comparing non-service-learning with service learning within the introductory communication course and a lack of empirical research on service-learning in the communication discipline, I propose the following research question:

RQ 1: Does students' cognitive learning, affective learning, and motivation in the basic communication course vary based upon the pedagogical approach (service-learning vs. non-service-learning)?

In addition to analyzing pedagogical approach, the instructional format (face-to-face, online, or a blend of the two) of a course has the potential to influence learning and motivation. Lujan and DiCarlo (2005) discovered that within the traditional classroom, a focus on instruction rather than learning occurs. A conclusion drawn from this research suggests that a balance of instruction and activity base such as a blended format could potentially balance the distribution of content and still focus on learning. Blended instruction includes online as well as traditional face-to-face instruction (Vess,
2005). Blended instruction addresses student-learning differences by applying a variety of strategies and material, which allows for debriefing and discussion through active learning (Joseph, 2005; Levin et al., 1999; Waddoups et al., 2003). Few studies directly compare traditional face-to-face instruction with a blended instructional format (Waddoups, Hatch, & Butterworth, 2003); however, most research of blended instruction does not encompass comparisons of multiple instructional formats (Bruner, 2006, Joseph, 2005; Vess, 2005). Minimal research was uncovered concerning the communication classroom from a blended standpoint in regards to learning and motivation (Anderson & McGlynn, 2006; Young, 2002). Although a lack of research exists pertaining to blended classes, the growth of usage of blended classes is surpassing the number of fully online courses (Allen & Seaman, 2003). With this drastic increase of usage, blended instruction needs evaluation. According to Joyce and Calhoun (1996), the method of instruction utilized within a classroom makes a difference in what type and level of learning occurs; therefore, a clearer understanding of the blended classroom is important. In order to engage in this comparison, the following research question was explored:

RQ 2: Does students’ cognitive learning, affective learning, and motivation in the basic communication course differ based upon the method of instruction (blended versus traditional classroom)?
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Participants

The participants utilized for the study consisted of 402 undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory communication course at a large southwestern university located in a major metropolitan city. Seventeen surveys were removed from the data set before analysis because the participants did not complete a portion of the survey. Participants received a small amount of course credit for their participation. Seventy-nine (20.5%) participants were in the traditional face-to-face instructional environment without a service-learning component, 71 (18.4%) of the students participated in a blended instructional environment without a service-learning component, 114 (29.6%) participants were involved in the traditional face-to-face instructional environment with a service-learning element, and 121 (31.5%) participants were in the blended instructional environment with a service-learning element. The department offered a limited number of blended instruction with non-service-learning, thus, only four classes were utilized in each of the instructional formats without the service-learning component. The face-to-face sections were chosen randomly to participate. Six sections of each instructional format of the introductory communication course involving service-learning were chosen randomly to participate.

Of the 385 participants involved in the analysis, 165 (42.9%) were male and 220 (57.1%) were female. Average age of the participants was 20.80. Two hundred forty-six participants (63.9%) identified themselves as Caucasian, 61 (15.8%) as African American, 41 (10.6%) as Hispanic, 16 (4.2%) as Asian, and 21 (5.5%) as Other.
Seventy-seven participants (20%) identified themselves as freshman, 142 (36.9%) as sophomores, 83 (21.6%) as juniors, 77 (20%) as senior, and 6 (1.5%) as Other. Overall, 216 participants (56.1%) participated in a service-learning classroom and 169 participants (43.9%) participated in a non-service-learning classroom. One hundred and ninety-five participants (50.9%) engaged in the face-to-face instructional format and 190 participants (49.1%) engaged in the blended instructional format.

Field Experiment Conditions

Due to the size of the university and the basic communication course, an instructional teaching team is utilized to teach the Introduction to Communication class. A professor in the communication department oversees all sections of the introductory course. Additionally, approximately twenty graduate teaching assistants (GTA) are instructors for the course. GTAs are responsible for holding two 50-minute recitations weekly. Within the recitation period, students engage in interactive activities, present speeches, and participate in discussions. GTAs grade all assignments and speeches for the class and are the primary contact for all matters pertaining to the course. The professor conducts large lecture for the traditional format classes as well as created all course content for the blended content lessons. Students in the blended format classes have little to no interaction with the professor, and students within the face-to-face classes see her for 50 minutes each week in a large lecture hall.

Participants were engaged in one of four conditions based on the section of Introduction to Communication in which they enrolled. The four conditions included traditional face-to-face format with non-service-learning, blended format with non-
service-learning, traditional face-to-face format with service-learning, and blended
format with service-learning.

*Traditional Format/Non-Service-Learning*

The semester of data collection, approximately nine-hundred students registered
for the traditional format of the non-service-learning class. Each student enrolled in one
large lecture and one recitation class. The lecture met once a week, while the recitation
typically met twice a week for 50 minutes; however, certain sections convened once a
week for 1 hour and 50 minutes. Overall, the course content includes foundations of
communication as well as common contexts such as rhetoric, public speaking,
performance, intercultural communication, media, interpersonal and group
communication. In the large lecture, the instructor conducted a lecture on one general
component for fifty minutes via PowerPoint. In the recitation class, a teaching assistant
debriefed the lecture through activities, discussion, and mini-lectures.

The major assignments for the traditional classroom without service-learning
included a variety of speeches, exams, and participation. Students took two exams
throughout the course on approximately half of the course material. A comprehensive
optional final gave students the opportunity to take the final to replace a lower exam
grade. In addition to the exams, students presented an individual introductory speech as
well as a larger individual persuasive speech that utilized Monroe's motivated
sequence. Students wrote one major interpersonal analysis paper that discussed a
relationship in their life and the dialectical tensions of the relationship. Teaching
assistants graded students' participation throughout the semester holistically through
recitation participation as well as lecture activities. The students turned in all major
assignments to the teaching assistant and took each exam within the recitation portion of the class.

**Blended Format/Non-Service-Learning**

The blended introductory communication class functioned without the large lecture component. Rather than students attending large lecture once each week, students read online course content lessons and posted to a discussion forum each week. The material covered in the online lessons incorporated the same topics presented in the large lecture of the traditional class. Students attended recitation where teaching assistants debriefed and extended the online readings through activities, discussion, and mini-lectures. The major course assignments were the same as the face-to-face classroom without service-learning. In addition to the major assignments, the teaching assistant assigned a grade based on each student’s participation and the depth of the discussion forum responses the student presented throughout the semester.

**Traditional Format with Service-Learning**

The structure of the traditional class with service-learning followed the same structure as the traditional format without service learning. Students enrolled in a recitation section as well as a lecture and attended the same frequency as the other traditional class; however, the assignments were different. The teaching assistant administered two exams that each covered approximately half of the course content. Students received the opportunity to take a comprehensive final to replace their lowest exam grade. The other assignments were different from the traditional format without service-learning because the assignments of the service-learning format filtered through
a group processing lens. At the beginning of the semester, the teaching assistants divided students into groups. The students were divided based on one of three factors: similar availability, similar interests in social problems, or at random.

After the groups were assigned, students chose a social issue/problem that they worked with the duration of the semester. After each group decided on a social problem, the group picked an organization that attempted to address the social problem. The group completed ten hours of service-learning with the non-profit organization. Main assignments focused on the group’s social problem/service-learning and group processing. The public speaking components of the class consisted of an introductory speech as well as a group problem/solution persuasive speech concerning the group’s chosen social problem. Another major assignment was the group analysis paper, which required students to analyze how their group moved through the phases of group development. Students wrote papers individually. Activities in recitation often consisted of group work. Students received grades on the completion of the service-learning hours. In addition to the assignments, a participation grade was distributed based on the holistic participation of each individual’s contribution in discussions and group work.

*Blended Format with Service-Learning*

The blended format with service-learning consisted of the online content lessons as well as two recitations each week. Some recitations met once a week for an extended time-period rather than twice a week. Online content lessons covered the same material as the lecture of the traditional format with service-learning. Students also completed lesson quizzes each week over the online content. All major activities
were the same as the traditional format with service-learning. Teaching assistants utilized discussions and group activities to process material in the recitations.

Procedures

Within the first two weeks of class, all students completed a pre-test that assessed their cognitive and affective learning as well as motivation. During the last two weeks of the course, students received a post-test survey to assess the levels of the students’ cognitive learning, motivation, and affective learning. The teaching assistant for each section dispensed the survey to their individual classrooms. Before the teaching assistant distributed the survey, the teaching assistants assured the respondents of confidentiality verbally in addition to the written statement on the consent form. The following section describes the various portions of the pre-test and post-test.

Measures

Cognitive Learning

In order to measure cognitive learning, the researcher utilized an existing measure created as an ongoing assessment process for the communication department to determine learning objectives in the course (see Appendix A). The measure consisted of eleven questions that covered information taught over the course of the semester. Each question was multiple choice with four answer choices. The number of questions the student answered correctly equaled the student’s raw score. An identical copy of the measure was distributed at the beginning as well as the end of the semester.
Motivation

Christophel’s (1990) Trait and State Motivation Scales measure student motivation (see Appendix A). Utilizing a semantic differential scale, twelve bi-polar adjectives measured the motivational attitudes of students towards general classes at the University (trait motivation) and the students’ feelings about the specific introductory communication course (state motivation) (i.e. motivated/unmotivated, interested/uninterested). Each scale was identical in the terminology used. The survey provided directions at the beginning of the section warning students that at times the positive score will be “1” and other times “7.” Previous research established good reliability from .91 to .96 (Christophel, 1990). In this study, reliability on the two dimensions of the motivation reached acceptable levels (trait motivation: pre-test $\alpha=.84$, post-test $\alpha=.88$; state motivation pre-test $\alpha=.91$, post-test $\alpha=.94$).

Affective Learning

Gorham’s (1988) Affective Learning Scale measures the attitude and behavioral intention in terms of content, recommended behaviors, and course instructor (see Appendix A). Utilizing a semantic differential scale, four, seven-step bi-polar scales measure the attitude of each participant towards the course content, recommended behaviors, and course instructor. The four scales include good/bad, worthless/valuable, fair/unfair, and positive/negative. Four similar, seven-step, bi-polar scales measure the behavioral intention of the likelihood of attempting to engage in the recommended behaviors of the course, likelihood of enrolling in another course of related content, and likelihood of taking another course with the teacher of the current course. The four
scales for these questions include likely/unlikely, impossible/possible, probable/improbable, and would/would not. The affective learning scale contains reverse coding. Gorham determined a split-half reliability of .98 for the affective learning scale. In this study, reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) on the three dimensions of the measures reached acceptable levels (content: pre-test $\alpha=.89$, post-test $\alpha=.92$; behavior: pre-test $\alpha=.92$, post-test $\alpha=.93$; instructor; pre-test $\alpha=.79$, post-test $\alpha=.96$).

Data Analysis

I conducted a 2 (service learning vs. non-service learning) x 2 (blended vs. face-to-face) factorial design series of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) procedures to explore the research questions and determine whether pedagogical approach and instructional format influenced students’ cognitive learning, affective learning, and motivation. Interaction and main effects were examined.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

Through a series of 2x2 factorial design multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVAs), I assessed whether pedagogical approach (service-learning vs. non-service-learning) and instructional format (face-to-face vs. blended) influenced students' affective learning, motivation, and cognitive learning (See Table 1 and Table 2 for means and standard deviation of each variable).

Students trait motivation declined over the semester, $F(1, 381) = 8.68, p = .003, \eta^2 = .022$. Students trait motivation did not differ significantly based on the instructional format, $F(1, 381) = 1.20, p > .05, \eta^2 = .003$, or pedagogical approach, $F(1, 381) = .425, p > .05, \eta^2 = .001$. The interaction effect was also not significant, $F(1, 381) = .010, p > .05$.

State motivation followed a similar pattern as trait motivation decreasing as the semester progressed, $F(1, 380) = 40.42, p = .001, \eta^2 = .096$. The students state motivation did not differ significantly based on pedagogical approach, $F(1, 380) = .93, p > .05, \eta^2 = .002$; nor in regards to the instructional format, $F(1, 380) = .70, p > .05, \eta^2 = .002$. The interaction effect was not significant, $F(1, 380) = 1.53, p > .05, \eta^2 = .004$.

Students affect toward course content declined over the semester, $F(1,382) = 79.97, p = .001, \eta^2 = .173$. The interaction effect was significant, $F(1,382) = 6.05, p = .014, \eta^2 = .016$. Specifically, participants in service-learning condition and face-to-face instruction reported a significant decline in affect toward course content than the service-learning condition and blended instruction. The main effect of instructional format on affect toward course content did not differ significantly, $F(1,382) = 1.42, p > .05, \eta^2 = .004$. 
Students affect toward the behaviors exhibited in the classroom followed a similar pattern as students affect toward course content decreasing as the semester progressed, $F(1, 381) =107.56, p=.001, \eta^2=.220$. The main effect of pedagogical approach on affect toward the behaviors exhibited in the classroom decreased significantly, $F(1, 381) =16.41, p=.001, \eta^2 =.041$. In particular, participants in the service-learning condition reported a significant decline in affect toward behavior than participants in the non-service-learning condition. The main effect of instructional format on affect toward behavior did not differ significantly, $F(1, 381) =.003, p>.05, \eta^2 =.000$. The interaction effect was not significant, $F(1,381) =2.03, p>.05, \eta^2 =.005$.

Participants affect toward the instructor declined over the semester $F(1, 382) =7.88, p=.005, \eta^2 =.020$. However, the pedagogical approach influenced the overall affect toward the instructor. Participants affect toward the instructor increased in non-service-learning condition, but decreased in service-learning condition, $F(1, 382) = 13.95, p=.001, \eta^2 =.035$. Students affect toward the instructor did not differ significantly based on the instructional format, $F(1, 382) =.875, p>.05, \eta^2 =.002$. Also, the interaction effect was not significant, $F(1, 382) =2.85, p>.05, \eta^2 =.007$.

Overall, cognitive learning significantly increased over time, $F(1, 383) =130.75, p=.001, \eta^2 =.255$. However, face-to-face instruction participants’ cognitive learning was significantly higher than blended instruction participants, $F(1, 383) =4.41, p=.036, \eta^2 =.011$. Students cognitive learning did not differ significantly based on pedagogical approach, $F(1,382) =2.18, p>.05, \eta^2 =.006$. 
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CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

In order to answer research question one concerning whether pedagogical approach (service-learning versus non-service-learning) impacts cognitive learning, affective learning, and motivation, I utilized a series of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVAs). The findings of my quantitative analysis demonstrated that participants affect toward the instructor of the course increased in the non-service-learning condition, but decreased in the service-learning condition. Trait motivation, state motivation, affect toward content, and affect toward behaviors each decreased over the course of the semester; however, this finding was not specifically influenced by the pedagogical approach. These decreases in learning and motivation are not consistent with previous qualitative research that argues higher levels of experiential learning increases student motivation and affect toward the course (Boss, 1994; Droge & Murphy, 1999; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Jacoby, 1996; Olney & Grande, 1995; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2004). Overall, cognitive learning did increase in the service-learning condition as well as the non-service-learning condition.

To answer my second research question concerning whether instructional format (face-to-face versus blended/hybrid) influences cognitive learning, affective learning, and motivation, the same quantitative research surveys were used. Students in the service-learning condition with face-to-face instruction showed a significant decrease in affect in regards to course content than participants from the service-learning condition with blended instruction. Participants’ cognitive learning increased significantly over the duration of the semester; however, face-to-face instruction students’ scores increased
significantly in comparison to blended participants. Although face-to-face students showed significant decreases in regards to affect, it is interesting that the cognitive learning increased. My findings in regards to instructional format are inconsistent with the research (Joseph, 2005; Levin et al., 1999; McCray, 2000; Riffell & Sibley, 2005; Young, 2002) that points toward a blend of instruction as the best mode for overall increased learning.

In order to explore potential explanations for the aforementioned results, I will discuss the following: overall student affective learning and motivation, pedagogical approach incorporating group work assignments, instructional format, and cognitive learning.

Overall Student Affective Learning and Motivation

The decline in students’ affective learning and motivation occurred from the second week of school to the last week of class. I believe three key elements of the communication course and study contributed to the overall decrease in student affective learning and motivation: timing of data collection, the role of the teaching assistant, and the class is mandatory.

*Timing of Data Collection*

Teaching assistants distributed pre-test surveys during the second week of class and post-test surveys during the last week of class just before finals week. Because students were asked to respond to questions about their attitudes toward the course or the instructor as well as their motivation so close to finals, student fatigue might be partially to blame for the significant decreases. Toward the end of the semester, my experience has been that students seem to engage less in the classroom overall.
Sometimes this is due to high stress in preparation for finals or anticipation of the upcoming break from classes (McClain, 1983). A possible solution might be to conduct data collection two-thirds or three-fourths through the semester rather than wait until the final week of classes. By performing data collection earlier, instructors would avoid the busyness of the end of the semester for the student.

Role of the Graduate Teaching Assistant

One of the primary reasons I believe participants’ affect toward the instructor decreased was due to teaching assistants being the primary instructor of the course. Overall approximately twenty teaching assistants are responsible for the introductory communication course examined in this study. As noted in the method, graduate teaching assistants met with students two hours a week whether participating in blended or traditional face-to-face instruction. Teaching assistants are responsible for the grading of all assignments.

Since the communication course is a basic course at a large academic institution, adjunct and teaching assistants are students’ primary contact. A need to maintain enrollment numbers as well as the desire to let faculty focus on their research has led to increased usage of graduate teaching assistants (GTA) at large universities (Eble, 1987; Luo, Bellow, & Grady, 2000). Dependence on GTAs has increased significantly over the last fifteen years (Nicklow, Marikunte, & Chevalier, 2007). According to Nyquist and Wuliff (1991), twenty-five to thirty-eight percent of undergraduate education is taught by GTAs. Luo et al. (2000) reported a rise in GTAs usage to approximately fifty-three percent. Departments depend on GTAs as part-time faculty, who are seemingly motivated, have basic knowledge of the course subject, are inexpensive to employ, and
are typically flexible employees (Park, 2004). When selecting GTAs, departments assess various capabilities such as previous teaching experience, ability to handle stress, and ability to manage class work and a teaching load.

After selecting the GTAs, training typically occurs at both the departmental and university levels. Throughout training, it is important GTAs feel supported by their course leaders and peers (Meyers, 1998). In the Communication Studies department utilized for this research, GTAs undergo extensive training to prepare each individual for the classroom. GTAs spend approximately a week in training learning about many different topics from learning styles to facilitating discussion to grading tips and techniques as well as detailed sessions on the assignments. Some of the sessions utilize experienced teaching assistants to answer questions and mentor the new teaching assistants, which is beneficial according to Bollis-Pecci and Walker (1999-2000). Various active learning tools such as working through activities that each teaching assistant will utilize in recitations as well as practicing the first day of class are effective (Johnson, 2001). According to Etkina (2000), a combination of constructivist and active learning is beneficial to training. In training, the department utilized in the study attempts to combine the previous active learning activities with constructivist learning in the form of discussions concerning past teaching experiences and group work.

In addition to training, the communication department requires first year GTAs to take a graduate seminar in Pedagogy and Communication. The seminar extends and reinforces the training of GTAs incorporating a combination of practical teaching tips as well as exploring educational philosophy and critical pedagogy. Finally, the course
director holds regular staff meetings to help GTAs stay on track with recitation lesson plans and answer questions regarding problems, course policies, and procedures.

While the department within this study provides a great deal of training for the GTAs, the basic communication course incorporates experiential learning rather than mere lecture especially when engaging in the service-learning focus. The majority of service-learning/experiential learning research shows positive correlations between the method and increased learning as discussed in the review of the literature; however, if the instructor is unable to explain assignments or create a “buy in” with the students, benefits may be minimal (Eyler & Giles, 1999). A challenge during training is to equip teaching assistants with the abilities to engage students effectively in experiential learning, especially in an introductory course. When engaging in the service-learning project concerning two of the four categories of students, the focus on the classroom assignments involved social problems and the engagement of service-learning to potentially reduce the problem. Students dealt with issues of class and race when evaluating social problems within their community such as poverty, homelessness, or environment issues (recycling, global warming).

According to hooks (1994), engaging in types of learning where students step beyond their social norms and dialogue on their personal experiences can increase apprehension, uncertainty, and discomfort. The service-learning assignments in this course are likely to ask students to engage in topics noted by hooks. By dealing with problems such as poverty or homelessness in regards to race or class, students are forced to confront issues that she/he might not face on a regular basis. The encounters call for a “courageous contact” (hooks, 1994, p. 109) without fear or blame, which might
be difficult for the student since the encounter is not necessarily by choice. According to hooks, an engaged pedagogy involves the sharing of personal experience opening throughout classroom discussion. By bringing the experiential knowledge to the classroom, each individual's learning experience enhances (hooks, 1994).

The success of engaged pedagogy within the communication classes depended on GTAs being able to facilitate in depth discussions and encourage student participation. Even experienced GTAs had to learn new assignments and facilitate different types of discussions for the first time in a service-learning condition. Because of the shift in the overall course as well as the addition of a more engaged pedagogy, affective learning and motivation of the students might have decreased due to the GTA’s struggle with a service-learning classroom. Initially, several GTAs did not “buy in” to the idea of a social problem and service-learning because they did not truly understand the concepts and assignments; therefore, these GTA’s students struggled to accept the focus of the course. Overall, the role of the graduate teaching assistants might have impacted the overall decrease in students’ affective learning and motivation toward the communication course.

Limitations include minimal feedback concerning the instructional abilities of the teaching assistants instructing the sections of the course examined as well as the variations of instruction due to a variety of GTAs. Future research might address each of these issues by collecting relevant data through student evaluations or perhaps through direct observation which could evaluate the teaching assistants' style of instruction.
The Class is Mandatory

At the time that the study was conducted, the introductory communication course fulfilled the University’s core curriculum and College of Arts and Sciences oral communication requirement. While students might choose to take another course such as Interpersonal Communication to fulfill this requirement, the Introduction to Communication course is one of the largest courses available to students. Additionally, this specific course is required of all students in the College of Education and the College of Business. Many students were apprehensive or frustrated about being required to take another class that was not part of their major classes (A’Brook & Weyers, 1996; Johnson & Olekalns, 2002; Prosser & Trigwell, 1999). Because of the negative affect toward the course initially, it is not surprising students’ negative affect would include the instructor and the behaviors within the course. Beginning the semester with the negative attitudes would then be difficult for the graduate teaching assistant to neutralize or reverse student affect and motivation.

In order to help avoid this potential problem, instructors engagements is crucial. If instructors receive adequate training to help them to engage students regardless of the students initial affect toward the course, students could potentially be more willing to participate, thus increasing her/his affective learning. In addition, instructors should help students to realize the relevancy of the communication topics. If students were able to see the applicability to her/his everyday life and future, students might perceive the course as more meaningful and beneficial.

A limitation of this study is that the class is mandatory for the majority of the students attending the class. Because of this large hurdle, instructors must prepare for
students potential negativity and overcome it. This challenge of students’ attitude toward required courses is an important component that is not explored in existing research on pedagogical approaches or instructional formats. Only limited research (Johnson & Olekalns, 2002) has addressed these issues in traditional classrooms. Future research should begin to address this crucial point by engaging in comparisons of pedagogical approach, instructional format, and required versus elective courses.

Overall, the timing of the data collection, the usage of graduate teaching assistants, and the lack of choice in taking the introductory communication course might potentially be responsible for the decrease in students’ affect and motivation toward the course.

Pedagogical Approach Incorporating Group Work Assignments

An additional factor, which could have contributed to the decrease in student affect and motivation by the participants of the service-learning condition, was the assignments centralized focus on group work. Primarily, instructors placed students into groups at the beginning of the semester with the majority of team members being strangers. The participants went through the process of developing a team contract, completing ten service-learning hours within the community as a team, doing activities as a group throughout the entire semester in class, as well as working toward a persuasive group speech focusing on each group’s social problem.

The majority of past literature shows the benefits of cooperative learning and group work no matter the course content, age, or cultural background of participants (Bossert, 1988; Millis & Cottell, Jr., 1998; Natasi & Clements, 1991) in regards to socialization and learning (Cohen, 1994; Gillies, 1999; Slavin, 1999), competence
(Jacobs et al., 2002; Millis & Cottell, Jr., 1998), relatedness of students and the instructor to students (Cooper, 1990; Jacobs et al., 2002; Johnson et al., 1991), autonomy (Cohen, 1994; Cooper, 1990), as well as group problem solving and interpersonal skills (Millis & Cottell, Jr., 1998).

While the benefits of group work and cooperative learning are numerous, many challenges often arise. According to researchers (Fisher, Shaw, & Ryder, 1994; Hassanien, 2006; McGraw & Tidwell, 2001), students often deal with minimal communication, unequal work load, varied grade expectations, differing work ethics of participants, lack of leadership, difficulties with the instructor assessing individual input, and inability to find time to work within each group member’s schedule. Hassanien (2006) reported students’ primary problems with group work were attendance difficulties at group meetings and individuals receiving credit for work that was not theirs.

Each of the aforementioned difficulties of group work seemed present in the current study. The large university utilized for this study comprises of a diverse student body with a large number of students being commuters driving up to an hour to reach campus. Many students work at least part-time in addition to attending classes, which limits time for group work. In addition to the challenge of time constraints, each participant of a group could potentially live in a different city in the metroplex making finding a centrally located organization difficult for the some teams. Due to the requirement of each group completing their service-learning hours as a team, many groups found the service-learning hours challenging to meet.

Limited feedback from participants in regards to their group experience as well as a more in-depth evaluation of individuals’ contributions to the group assignments limit
conclusions, which can be drawn related to the impact of group work assignments. Future research, therefore, should incorporate a more reflective qualitative element for students as well as instructors in addition to the quantitative survey to receive a more direct feedback.

Instructional Format

A potential explanation for face-to-face with service-learning participants’ significant decrease in content and behavior affect in comparison to the blended with service-learning participants could be the overall instructional format of the basic communication course in this study.

The current face-to-face structure incorporates a large lecture and recitation format. Students must enroll in a recitation class that meets for two hours during the week in a small twenty-five to thirty person class with a teaching assistant as well as a large lecture that meets once a week for an hour with approximately three hundred students with a lecturer. Due to the space constraints, the university will only allow the department to have the large lecture rooms on Thursday and Friday afternoon when most students are not on campus. Because of the time of day and week the lecture meets, attendance is often sparse in comparison to the number of students enrolled in each lecture. The professor who oversees the entire basic course presents the majority of the course content during this lecture time with a brief activity lasting less than ten minutes. Each week, the professor utilizes a PowerPoint with the key points. Minimal dialogue occurs between students and the lecturer.

For the purpose of this study, research on large classes translates into classes with more than one hundred students (Heppner, 2007; Weimer, 1987). Often, as
students attend large lectures, she/he often feels anonymous as a nameless, faceless crowd (Hilton, 1999). Discussion is typically impractical encouraging students to remain passive as well as anonymous (Erickson, Peters, & Strommer, 2006; Hilton, 1999). The more passive environment follows an information processing model (IPM) with little opportunity for student engagement. According to Bligh (2000), lecture does not promote understanding, thinking, or attitude change as effectively as a more participatory and engaged classroom. McKeachie (2002) reinforces Bligh’s findings that in order to develop thinking skills or changes in motivation and attitude, a smaller class is more effective. According to Barkley, Cross, and Major (2005), a way to attempt to engage students might be through asking questions requiring responses. Noise and distractions are other challenges of larger classrooms (Weimer, 1987). Although the large lecture utilized for this study incorporates PowerPoint to help visual learners as well as an instructor who attempts to engage students through questions, each of the aforementioned challenges remains.

Students involved in the blended classroom do not attend a large lecture. The majority of the course content is online through weekly lessons that the students read and then took a quiz for a grade. The content each week typically incorporated flash animations of concepts, pictures, blocks of text, and interactive question and answers. Teaching assistants had the option of utilizing the discussion forums and announcement posting functions to incorporate more interaction. Students were able to move through the material when their schedule permitted. All course content lessons remained active the entire semester so students could refer back to the content; however, students were required to take the quiz of the assigned lesson before coming to class each week.
Students dealt completely with the teaching assistant for the recitation section she/he enrolled. By seeing the same instruction each time the students came to class, the perception of one instructor was consistent even though a professor oversees all section of the introductory communication course.

When students attended their face-to-face portion of the class, engagement of in-depth conversations was frequent, which ties to previous research on blended learning formats (Joseph, 2005; Lorenzetti, 2004; Vess, 2005). By participating in a classroom involving twenty-five to thirty students rather than three hundred, students seemed more comfortable with one another creating a stronger community feel within the class (Rovai & Jordan, 2004). Throughout the face-to-face class period, interactive activities incorporating cooperative learning engaged students. Although previous research supports each of the elements incorporated into the blended service-learning classroom utilized for this study (Joseph, 2005; McCray, 2000; Riffell & Sibley, 2005; Rovai & Jordan, 2004; Vess, 2005), a significant increase in students’ affective learning and motivation did not occur.

A limitation of this portion of the study includes a lack of direct feedback from participants on elements concerning each instructional format from a qualitative perspective such as students’ satisfaction of the online content as well as the effect the students felt the online content had on her/his learning experience. In addition, it would be beneficial to assess students’ satisfaction of specific course elements such as comparing face-to-face lecture material versus the online course content. Specifically, it would be interesting to identify where disengagement occurs. Another element to evaluate would be how often students engage in the online content or the frequency of
students’ attendance in large lecture. Future research should utilize a qualitative approach of reflection through open-ended questions or focus groups in addition to the surveys utilized within this study in order to gather students’ direct feedback on the aforementioned instructional elements.

Cognitive Learning

Despite decreases in student affective learning and motivation, cognitive learning increased overall. The face-to-face students’ cognitive average on the pre-test was lower than the blended students’ cognitive average; however, students in both instructional formats reported approximately the same cognitive average on the post-test, thus the face-to-face students reported a significant increase in cognitive learning. One potential explanation for the pre-test averages would be the variation in student body between blended students and face-to-face students. Individuals enrolling in the blended format course are often non-traditional college students. Because the individuals are non-traditional, participants’ life experiences prior to taking the class could be a factor contributing to a higher initial score. Because students in all sections reached approximately the same level on the cognitive test overall, one assumption can be that consistency exists in overall course content regardless of the instructional format. This study supports the findings of Rivera et al. (2002), which showed a consistency in overall cognitive learning amongst blended and face-to-face formats.

In regards to limitations pertaining to the cognitive aspect for this study, it would have been wise to determine factors that might contribute to various differences in students’ initial knowledge base. Future research should include some type of assessment to understand the prior experiences of non-traditional students in order to
explain a higher initial level of knowledge. An open-ended qualitative assessment might be beneficial in acquiring an explanation.

Conclusion

The findings of the current study do not support the previous qualitative research on instructional format and pedagogical approach. Many limitations to the study are potential factors in the differing results. Dependence on teaching assistants as well as a large introductory course as the context are variables that could significantly impact the findings. In teaching the basic communication course, future research should incorporate qualitative assessments such as open-ended questions or focus groups in order to help further examine the impact of instructional format and pedagogical approach on student learning and motivation. Additionally, an importance of evaluating teaching assistants’ training in order to equip them for the challenges of teaching a basic course with experiential elements is necessary.

The introductory and required nature of the Introduction to Communication course are logical explanations of why the pattern of student learning and motivation differed from previous research on the benefits of service-learning and blended instruction. A more detailed review of the literature supports that much of the service-learning literature is focused on upper division undergraduate courses, not introductory level courses (Boss, 1994; Corbett & Kendall, 1999; Gibson et al., 2001; Gray et al., 1996; Markus, Howard, & King, 1993). Furthermore, the limited blended learning literature demonstrates a variety of course formats are examined as blended learning. Some blended learning courses have extremely limited interaction meeting a few times a semester, while others meet more often (Anderson & McGlynn, 2006; Buzzetto-More
& Sweat-Guy, 2006; Joseph, 2005; Riffell & Sibley, 2005). A more nuanced understanding of the format of blended learning design might provide insight into the influence of instructional format on student learning and motivation.

Due to the limitations of this study in conjunction with the positive results of the research examined, future research should be conducted evaluating instructional format as well as pedagogical approach and the impacts each element has on students’ learning and motivation through both qualitative and quantitative methods.
Table 1
Pre-Test Means and Standard Deviation Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Service-Learning</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Service-Learning</th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>Blended</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>Blended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>4.86 (.80)</td>
<td>4.82 (.81)</td>
<td>4.84 (.81)</td>
<td>4.85 (.81)</td>
<td>4.86 (.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Motivation</td>
<td>4.59 (.95)</td>
<td>4.35 (1.19)</td>
<td>4.47 (1.08)</td>
<td>4.48 (.93)</td>
<td>4.34 (1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Learning-Content</td>
<td>4.93 (1.19)</td>
<td>4.47 (1.28)</td>
<td>4.69 (1.26)</td>
<td>4.88 (1.17)</td>
<td>4.46 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Learning-Behavior</td>
<td>5.89 (1.04)</td>
<td>5.76 (1.07)</td>
<td>5.82 (1.05)</td>
<td>5.88 (1.01)</td>
<td>5.81 (.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Learning-Instructor</td>
<td>5.19 (.88)</td>
<td>5.17 (.85)</td>
<td>5.18 (.86)</td>
<td>5.24 (.85)</td>
<td>5.21 (.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Learning</td>
<td>5.04 (1.46)</td>
<td>5.31 (1.48)</td>
<td>5.18 (1.48)</td>
<td>7.10 (1.96)</td>
<td>7.69 (1.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Service-Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Service-Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>Blended</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>Blended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Motivation</td>
<td>4.78 (1.02)</td>
<td>4.63 (1.02)</td>
<td>4.70 (1.02)</td>
<td>4.71 (1.02)</td>
<td>4.58 (1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Motivation</td>
<td>4.00 (1.44)</td>
<td>3.82 (1.44)</td>
<td>3.91 (1.44)</td>
<td>4.22 (1.44)</td>
<td>3.77 (1.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Learning-Content</td>
<td>3.59 (1.51)</td>
<td>3.75 (1.51)</td>
<td>3.67 (1.51)</td>
<td>4.49 (1.51)</td>
<td>3.85 (1.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Learning-Behavior</td>
<td>4.66 (1.26)</td>
<td>4.77 (1.26)</td>
<td>4.72 (1.26)</td>
<td>5.50 (1.26)</td>
<td>5.22 (1.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Learning-Instructor</td>
<td>4.47 (1.92)</td>
<td>4.60 (1.92)</td>
<td>4.54 (1.92)</td>
<td>5.59 (1.92)</td>
<td>5.05 (1.92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please provide us with the following information about yourself. This will not be used to identify you. We use this to report the characteristics of people who helped with our research.

Your sex: Male Female

Your age (in years): ______

Your ethnicity / cultural background: ________________________________

Your major_____________________________________________________

Classification: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Other

Trait Motivation Scale:
These items are concerned with how you feel in general about taking classes at the University. Please circle the number toward either word, which best represents, your feelings. Note that in some cases the most positive score is “1” while on other cases it is “7”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivated</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
<th>Unmotivated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Uninterested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Uninvolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stimulated</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Stimulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t want to study</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Want to study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Uninspired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unchallenged</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Challenged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninvigorated</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Invigorated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unenthused</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Enthused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Not excited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroused</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Not aroused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not fascinated</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Fascinated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**State Motivation Scale:**
These items are concerned with how you feel about this specific class. Please circle the number toward either word, which best represents, your feelings. Note that in some cases the most positive score is “1” while on other cases it is “7”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmotivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uninterested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uninvolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stimulated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stimulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t want to study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Want to study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uninspired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unchallenged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Challenged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninvigorated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invigorated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unenthused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enthused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not excited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not aroused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not fascinated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fascinated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affective Learning Scale:**
Using the following scales, evaluate this class. Please circle the number for each item, which best represents your feelings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My attitude about the content of this course:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unfair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My attitude about the behaviors recommend in this course:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unfair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My attitude about the *instructor* of this course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My likelihood of actually attempting to *engage in the behaviors recommended* in this course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impossible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My likelihood of actually *enrolling in another course of related content*, if I had the choice and my schedule permits: (If you are graduating, assume you would still be here.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impossible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The likelihood of my *taking another course with the teacher of this course*, if I have a choice, is: (If you are graduating, assume you would still be here.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impossible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMM 1010

Name: ____________________________  Section: ____________________________

The goal of this brief upgraded quiz is to gauge our students’ current knowledge level regarding concepts of communication at the beginning of the semester so we can make adjustments to content in the course. Your help will allow us to continue to improve COMM 1010.
1. Aristotle defined which of the following artistic proofs as the speakers’ good-will, character, or the speaker’s credibility?
   a. pathos
   b. ethos
   c. logos
   d. rhetor

2. A leader within an organization who provides specific guidance and continual monitoring to ensure task completion is enacting which of the following leadership styles?
   a. Democratic Leadership Style
   b. Laissez-Faire Leadership Style
   c. Theory Y
   d. Autocratic Leadership Style

3. Vicki is a woman, a daughter, a sister, a teacher, a democrat, and a dancer. This list indicates all of the _____ Vicki enacts in her life.
   a. Dual perspective
   b. text
   c. roles
   d. monitoring

4. The following statement is a good example of which step in an introduction of a persuasive speech: Daily exercise is important to maintain a healthy relationship.
   a. thesis statement
   b. attention-getter
   c. preview
   d. transition

5. Mickey and Malorie have been dating for 2 weeks and Mickey tells Malorie that he wants to be with her for the rest of their lives and “never wants to kiss another girl”. Which of the following love styles would best fit Mickey’s communication?
   a. storge
   b. eros
   c. pragma
   d. agape

6. According to the transactional model of communication, all of the following concepts are part of the definition of communication EXCEPT?
   a. process
   b. meaning
   c. messages
   d. linear
7. During which phase of group development may group members experience conflict over leadership and the emergence of roles?
   a. storming
   b. performing
   c. norming
   d. forming

8. Cognitive schemata such as personal constructs, scripts, and stereotypes are all concepts utilized during which stage of the perception process?
   a. selection
   b. interpretation
   c. organization
   d. stimuli

9. Which of the following concepts is defined as an individualized or personalized meaning that may be emotionally laden?
   a. denotative meaning
   b. language is ambiguous
   c. language is abstract
   d. connotative meaning

10. Relationships are an ongoing process in which tensions exist between two conflicting forces defines which of the following theories?
    a. Social Penetration Theory
    b. Sapir-Whorf
    c. Relational development
    d. Dialectical Theory

11. _____ context cultures are characterized by a direct style of communication with an emphasis placed upon the source of the message.
    a. high
    b. low
    c. implicit
    d. explicit

12. Gerbner’s Cultivation Theory falls under which of the following area of communication studies?
    a. interpersonal communication
    b. small group communication
    c. intercultural communication
    d. mass communication
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