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Abstract

Evolving Learning: Educators’ Inner Experiences of Engaging in Service-Learning with Undergraduates is an exploratory, qualitative study of faculty members’ learning, growth, and development in service-learning contexts. Through two, interwoven forms of constructivist grounded theory – situational mapping and dimensional analysis – this dissertation brought voice to a once ‘private’ perspective, making explicit what all is happening as participants make meaning of their experiences engaging in service-learning with college students. A three-phased series of recursive, comparative interviews and concurrent analysis resulted in the development of a grounded theory best captured by a core, organizing perspective – evolving learning. This perspective is comprised of five intersecting dimensions: (1) bearing witness, (2) navigating, (3) reconciling expectations, (4) resolving and reorienting, and (5) locating self in humanity. Both novel and exploratory, this dissertation adds extensively to extant literature, contributing significantly to our understanding of how educators adapt, transform, or make meaning of their own engagement. Also, the study unveils a number of opportunities for qualitative and mixed methods inquiry on faculty teaching, learning, engagement, and development.
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Chapter One: Introduction

This dissertation presents an exploratory, qualitative study of educators’ inner experiences of engaging in service-learning with undergraduate students. In the context of five chapters, the study is situated, unveiled, discussed, and critiqued. This chapter presents the rationale and background for the study, followed by an exhaustive review (Chapter Two) of contributing literature. Chapter Three focuses on both methodological fit and method, making explicit the tools utilized to best address the research question. What ensues is Chapter Four, which presents the findings and results of the dissertation study. Chapter Five discusses, interprets, and reintegrates these findings, also presenting a reflexive critique and elucidating areas for future inquiry.

Service-learning, the locus of this study as applied to the faculty experience, is a transforming venture. Adapted from Burns’ (1978) seminal work, the gerund transforming connotes a state of leadership wherein “one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (p. 20). In the context of this dissertation, transforming learning\(^1\) encompasses experiential pedagogies and practices – namely service-learning – in traditional, undergraduate education that: prompt cognitive, psychosocial, and moral development in students; may embrace organic, adaptive relationships between teacher and student, classroom and context; and are aimed toward not only the expansion of mind, but the illumination of one’s role as agent of change or transformation.

\(^1\) Of critical importance is the distinction between what I term “transforming learning” and what is widely known as “transformative education.” The latter refers to a pool of scholarship on nontraditional adult populations; my interests are linked closely to the experience of traditional, residential undergraduates (e.g. 18-22 years of age) in the liberal arts academy.
While the literature abounds with scholarship on undergraduate learning and development, little exists in this research about how educators experience the very contexts that may develop, change, or transform their students. The premium placed on holistic, pragmatic learning is reflected in college and university mission statements, the agendas of higher education consortia and foundations, and the proliferation of research on service-learning, community-based learning, and civic engagement. While sufficient arguments are made in the literature for how, why, and where faculty members might infuse, augment, or adapt their curricula to broaden inquiry and cement students’ learning, little to nothing has been known about how educators experience such contexts themselves. Arguably, the educator is among the most critical actors in students’ learning and development. So, how might we come to understand his or her experience?

Building upon our knowledge of undergraduate learning and development, this dissertation critically explored the landscape of educators’ experiences with service-learning, resulting in a grounded theory explicating ‘evolving learning.’ Evolving learning is the core, organizing perspective that emerged as the ‘heart’ of the study and within which five intersecting, interdependent dimensions are situated: (1) bearing witness, (2) navigating, (3) reconciling expectations, (4) resolving and reorienting, and (5) locating self in humanity.

The Situated Self

My journey as student, observer, and educator invariably shaped the phenomena and experiences I sought to illuminate through this study. Having spent much of my life learning, researching, and educating in colleges and universities, I rest firmly on the belief that higher education is uniquely poised to address domestic and global inequities,
challenges, and problems. In fact, I believe this is our calling. Around us, colleges and universities espouse lofty, globally-minded missions irrefutably infused with “buzz words” like stewardship, leadership, engagement, and citizenship. Both popular and refereed literatures reveal, however, that what colleges and universities do is often misaligned with their purported aims. As educators, we have both agency and responsibility to close extant gaps between perception and reality, practice and rhetoric.

In many ways, I discovered my voice in academe 14 years ago. A precocious undergraduate, I was described by faculty and peers as inquisitive, thoughtful, creative, and idealistic. In time, these gifts opened doors to considerable learning experiences, many transforming; those within and after which I was deeply moved were, all at once, enlightening, disturbing, and evocative. Later, those transformative service-learning experiences abroad and domestic would lead me to consider how and why we educate students for responsible, ethical citizenry in an increasingly global community.

Not until the summer between my junior and senior year did I develop the cognitive, psychosocial, and emotional framework needed to debunk, question, and unlearn a priori assumptions about the world. Perhaps by serendipity or fate, I discovered what would later become the most transforming experience of my life: a service-learning course in Honduras followed by a self-directed field study in Panama and the San Blas Islands. While I could easily fill pages with documentary-style ruminations and reflections, several core outtakes from that summer – each invariably shaping this dissertation – are most important to air and critical to the grounding of this study.
From my host parents, both educators and devout believers in Honduras’ political promise, I discovered grace and patience in change. The children of Liston, Honduras, taught me why education is so important. We are always their hands of hope and, quite literally, why the idiom “look up to” exists. From the elderly and sick, I tapped into a spiritual, almost mystic, dimension of my educational experience. Assigned the role of pharmacist in Liston’s rural clinic, I was outfitted with Tylenol, ibuprofen, and a nasty concoction of intestinal worm-killing medication. My patients yearned not for these Western cure-alls, but for my presence, touch, and prayers. For hours, they would wait to be heard, never to be dispensed to or of.

Daily, we would process our experiences with a group of three faculty members – one epidemiologist, one student affairs staff, and one dietician. After several hours of deep, vulnerable divulging, something revealed itself to me. These teachers are in this with us. We are all teachers. We are all learners. An outsider could enter our conversation with no chance of guessing who paid tuition, who had a terminal degree, or who was leading the trip. Seemingly, our faculty left any remnants of power and control in the Miami International Airport. Gently and intentionally, they granted us – the undergraduate corps – the responsibility for teaching and learning. Given that onus, our learning – individual and collective – spiraled, evoking deeper levels of thinking, doing, and being. While our faculty provided intellectual context, they also expressed their own vulnerability and fear. Prior to this experience, I had never considered the role of emotion in the classroom.

An oft-cited quotation of Maya Angelou’s – gracing notepads, calendars, and Hallmark cards – reads, a woman in harmony with her spirit is like a river flowing. Two
weeks after I left Honduras, I swung from a hand-strewn hammock on a remote San Blas island, resident with one other American and three Kuna Indians. In the space of near-solitude, my reflections on Honduras eclipsed fleeting thoughts of which lofty, post-baccalaureate business jobs I might apply for during senior year. Just as intrigued by what I had become with what my faculty had modeled, I could not erase from my conscience a fluid, flowing desire to learn more… more about culture, more about transformation, more about the leadership I witnessed, more about the human condition, and more about what it really meant to be an educator. These were the tributaries that would mark my subsequent journey as learner, teacher, activist, and practitioner.

A decade later, transforming learning practices form the heart of my work. For 8 years, I served a small, private, liberal arts college as staff and adjunct faculty, teaching a range of interdisciplinary courses while cultivating advocacy efforts with, for, and of our students, faculty, and community partners. A master’s degree in counseling and student development gifted me with the knowledge, skills, and abilities to meet students where they are – socially and academically. While a growing array of scholarship on community-based learning guided my work with students and community partners, I resorted to intuition and experience when engaging with fellow faculty interested in transforming practices. Also, I maintained a practice of reflecting deeply on my own experience as educator co-engaged with undergraduate learners. Over time, I began to see that my students – in the context of our collaborative experience – held up a mirror for me. Through and in their learning, my own was reflected. I struggled, at times, with my vulnerability, especially when facilitating course experiences that took me out of my own comfort zone. To my own chagrin, however, I could discover neither language,
literature, nor research to describe adequately the self-exposure, transparency, and transformation that I witnessed in my Honduras faculty, my current colleagues, and myself.

The Research Landscape

This study was built upon diverse terrain, within which various strata coexist: the personal, inner experience; the history of higher education; the undergraduate learning experience; our emergent understanding of transforming learning; and so on. Like an archeologist, the inquirer mindfully hones this repertoire, sharpening her tools – both new and antiquated - in preparation for discovery. Importantly, the scholar cannot unearth such terrain without locating a place to commence discovery. In this section, I present the topography comprising this study, arriving ultimately at the coordinates upon which the excavation will begin.

Perhaps universally, both geographers and laypersons employ the terms latitude and longitude to describe time, place, space, acquisition, ownership, and – in some cultures – existence. To render visually this landscape, I ask the reader to picture in his or her mind’s eye a map divisible by perpendicular, intersecting lines, creating four quadrants. Dividing north from south, latitude draws its line between east and west; metaphorically, it represents the inner experience of faculty co-engaged in transforming learning with undergraduates. Longitude – running north to south and south to north – represents the expression, analysis, and meaning-making of such experiences through the qualitative, constructivist tools and methods later described.

The latitude of research and scholarship includes the history, culture, and context of higher education; the emerging, evolving, and changing role of faculty in academe; the
means, ends, and modalities through which students and educators learn and teach; and
the arrival of community-based learning, service-learning, and civic engagement as
academic tools. The scholarship reviewed and analyzed is multi- and inter-disciplinary;
literary and empirical; refereed and popular; qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-
methods; experimental and non-experimental. Like human diversity, these layers and
strata are richly hued and culturally arrayed. Still, anomalous gaps exist – particularly
with respect to our understanding and knowledge of the faculty experience.

Both implicitly and explicitly, most contemporary colleges and universities strive
to educate graduates who possess knowledge, skills, and abilities that are theoretical and
practical, intellectual and emotional. Central to these missions is an emphasis on student
learning, as those institutions, administrators and faculties responsible for student
learning must also articulate the intended outcomes of the educational enterprise (King,
1996). While few scholars agree there is one overarching, intended purpose of higher
learning (Bok, 2006), Kegan’s (1994) work speaks to the philosophical aim of education.
He urges us to consider “the fundamental growth of the mind, transformational learning
[and] qualitative changes in how the student knows, not just what the student knows” (p.
273). Consequently, the process of learning in higher education is essential to developing
wise, responsible citizens who are equipped to deal with local and global issues – from
sustainable ecology to human rights. And as Kegan (1994) implied, the processes and
outcomes of learning must be both qualitative and quantitative, allowing for the
expansion of knowledge in both breadth and depth.

Aside from two abiding objectives – intellectual development and character-
building – today’s colleges and universities bear few resemblances to their colonial, pre
Civil War predecessors, which educated heterogeneous cadres of upper-echelon males (Boyer, 1990; Bok, 2006). Following the passage of the Morrill Act of 1862, more informally cited as the Land Grant College Act, academe was imbued with a spirit of service for democratic aims; most agreed “that education was, above all, to be considered useful” (Boyer, 1990, p. 6). The role of educator, moreover, was to aid and abet this quest.

Later, the role of faculty would shift to one still resident in today’s academy. The research tradition of German universities legitimized scientific discoveries and, by the late nineteenth century, “the advancement of knowledge through research had taken firm root in American higher education, and colonial college values, which emphasized teaching undergraduates, began to lose ground to the new university that was emerging” (Boyer, 1990, p. 9). In time, war and economic depression opened the research flood gates; agencies, grants, and scholarly agendas flowed from this. By mid-century, colleges and universities teemed with newly hooded PhDs; becoming a faculty member grew synonymous with conducting and publishing research (Boyer, 1990). Tenure and promotion, furthermore, hinged on educators’ scholarly successes.

Scholarship Reconsidered examined the paradoxical culture of higher education through the lens of faculty roles and priorities. While the academy grew more diverse and all-encompassing in its outreach, the faculty role became constrictive, with focus shifting “from the student to the professoriate, from general to specialized education, and from loyalty to the campus to loyalty to the profession” (Boyer, 1990, p. 13). Scholarship Reconsidered left a landmark legacy, creating the template upon which significant movement in faculty culture would be etched. Educators nationwide – many
associated with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the American Association for Higher Education’s Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards – contributed significant scholarship to this effort. Collectively, their writings, research, and scholarship have broadened our understanding of what research is, how we define and understand the professoriate, where teaching is situated in the faculty experience, and why it is critical that our teachers co-engage in discovery, application, teaching, and community practice. While the benefits of these efforts are salient, my review of the literature and scholarship reveals several gaps.

Just as it took decades for academe to transition from the colonial to Germanic model, higher education continues to be slow-changing. Lamenting the snail-like pace of curricular reform, I once confided – albeit naively – in a long-time faculty member about my observations of progress (or seeming lack thereof). Jokingly, he reassured me that there exists only one other institution more reticent to change than the academy: the Catholic Church. Later, I would find myself stumbling upon similarly-stated non-secular anecdotes in various readings and lectures. I was not altogether surprised, therefore, to uncover a dearth of literature on faculty perspectives and experiences of the evolving professoriate. Those unearthed were auto-ethnographic stories of teaching and learning, lacking a deep, empirical understanding of the educator’s own inner experience.

Meanwhile, I was pulled back to my tacit and reflexive learning experiences, seeded in Central America. What I observed in my faculty mentors in that service-learning context was indescribable, yet I felt “it” in my own teaching and learning with undergraduates years later. And I most certainly witnessed “it” in the faculty with whom I worked. Years later, I found faculty grappling to understand or describe “it” in
conversations, dialogues, even classrooms. So, I turned to the literatures on community-based learning, the scholarship of engagement, and more for an understanding of what may be happening with these educators co-engaged in deep, experiential learning contexts with undergraduate students.

What the scholarship on transforming learning revealed was a tangled web of research, networks, and associations both loosely and inextricably connected to academe’s historic and contemporary interest in engaged, civic learning. I came across vast amounts of knowledge on service-learning, for instance: how it transpires, what it means, how it develops, what students gain, how it impacts their learning and development, how it complements the educational experience, why it matters, why faculty should teach service-learning courses, and so on. Still the faculty experience was ever eluded, an invisible player in the field of learning. The service-learning research appeared overtly concerned with the community – philosophy, environment, and context – as instrument for student learning. But what about the faculty member, I mused. Invariably, s/he is also an actor in this process. My questions proliferated, growing a life of their own. How do educators experience these learning contexts? What is their inner, personal experience of learning and teaching undergraduates?

On a more systemic, macro-level, the literature with closest ties to the faculty experience exists in more recent derivations of Boyer’s (1990) work on priorities of the professoriate. Referring to what he named the scholarship of application and later recast as the scholarship of engagement, Boyer noted:

Clearly, a sharp distinction must be drawn between citizenship activities and projects that relate to scholarship itself. To be sure, there are meritorious social
and civic functions to be performed, and faculty should be appropriately recognized for such work. But all too frequently, service means not doing scholarship but doing good. To be considered scholarship, service activities must be tied directly to one’s special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity. (p. 22)

Boyer’s (1990) work offered credibility to engaged learning as a scholarly pursuit in the academy; in the tenure and promotion process, research, teaching, and service deserve equal attention. The Scholarship Reconsidered movement bears great relevance to this dissertation study, presenting insights into the evolving professoriate and illuminating macro-level opportunities, challenges, and tensions surrounding the faculty role. Further, this work prompted a developing commitment on the part of colleges and universities to value, evaluate, and reward various forms of scholarship. This, in turn, incited the evolution of transforming, learning-centered practices like service-learning, field research, and community-based learning/research. Still, much is unknown about faculty development in these all-important contexts. This dissertation inhabits some of that gap.

*Inhabiting the Gap*

The contemporary college student exists within an open system; all elements influence the other. Many curricula, however, are short-sighted, built upon a modern, industrial ethos. Our students consistently under-perform in most areas of academic study (Bok, 2006); in light of a “near-total public silence about what contemporary college graduates need to know and be able to do” (LEAP, 2007, p. 7), few graduates are prepared for the volatility and unpredictability of 21st century realities. Simply stated,
university graduates “will need to be intellectually resilient, cross-culturally and scientifically literate, technologically adept, ethically anchored, and fully prepared for a future of continuous and cross-disciplinary learning” (p. 15). The call for change is a resounding one. If we conceptualize the role of faculty as catalyst, purveyor, or instrument to students’ learning, what assumptions exist about where the educator is with respect to his or her own experience? Further, can we fully understand the learning, development, and potential transformation of the student if we have not yet grasped that of the educator?

Those curricula and co-curricula that are innovative and cross-disciplinary - that most influence students’ learning (e.g. service-learning) and best prepare them for active citizenship - continue to exist at the margins or peripheries of higher education (LEAP, 2007). Often, such praxes are inherently constructivist, postmodern, and collaborative; they require new ways of teaching and learning. A fascinating paradox exists; one identified by Kegan (2004), who suggested that students’ habits of mind establish “the person as a citizen” – one who is capable of joining a community. Kegan suggests that eventually, we as educators put ourselves out of business, preparing our students to do for themselves, and perhaps to each other, what we do for them.

To begin the very process of transforming students’ learning for the 21st century, perhaps we must look within first, which entails considerable reflection on our roles as educators, practitioners, and student advocates. Such knowledge requires reflexive practice; Horton and Freire (1990) suggested that we first “get the knowledge about how [our students] know” in order to “invent with the people the ways for them to go beyond their state of thinking” (p. 98). Further, the educator must extend this awareness to
oneself, considering how his/her own awareness, beliefs, and development shape the environment. When we understand knowledge as holistic, dialectical, and rooted in practice, we begin to see the roles of “the self” and “the other” in shaping curricula and praxes. Education transgresses its own boundaries, evolving into a way of being that evolves, ever adapting to the needs of those engaged. It is transformative and transforming.

Such education combines theory and practice in ways that develop the whole person in the context of a networked, global community. While the educator may exude willingness to transgress modern boundaries, the environment is all too often steeped in bureaucracy. How, then, do we adapt and expand our curricula to meet the learning needs of our students and respond to postmodern world conditions when the context or structure may be maladaptive or resistant to change? How do we create processes and reward systems that enable collaborative opportunities for faculty, staff, and administrators? Like leadership, change is a diffuse and multifaceted concept, one that is rich and textured. Within the rhetoric of change, a cogent paradox exists: Hurry up and wait. Irrefutably, change takes time, requiring persistent, evolving leadership toward the vision; as Kotter (1996) notes, “…changing anything of significance in highly interdependent systems often means changing nearly everything, [so change] can become a huge exercise that plays itself out over years, not months” (p. 143).

This level of transformation requires diligent, patient, visionary leadership that slowly and judiciously anchors new approaches in the culture of the organization. It also requires an awareness of culture as normative and behaviorally entrenched, operating within and outside of our realms of consciousness. Still, we must educate a cadre of
responsible and ethical leaders, and we must do this soon. I suggest we begin this process from the inside out, looking at the role of educator-self as an instrument of growth, change, and development in contemporary academe. Herein, considerable latitude exists for further exploration, transferability, and change within, between, and among the systems and processes that comprise higher education: curriculum, promotion and tenure, faculty scholarship, community partnerships, and so on.

**Research Question**

The primary research question for this study was as follows: *What is the experience of faculty members engaged in service-learning with undergraduate students at a small, private liberal arts institution?* I aspired to study educators’ personal, inner experience of engaging in such transforming and transformative contexts with undergraduate students. While some faculty are tacitly, explicitly, and reflexively aware of their own learning, others’ experiences reside on the fringe of consciousness. That is, one might not have considered his/her own learning, development, or potentially transformative experience unless provoked, challenged, or invited to do so. My selective sample consisted of educators engaged in one or more service-learning practice in the context of their teaching curricula. In the mind of the educator reflecting on these experiences, *what all is happening?* How, why, and with whom?

**Tools of Inquiry**

My question lent itself best to the application of situational mapping and dimensional analysis, two forms of grounded theory research. Inherently constructivist and postmodern, each is pragmatically tied to my phenomenon of interest. While situational analysis was best applied to the ‘excavation’ and ‘illumination’ of factors
imminent and ‘hidden’ in the social world/arena, dimensional analysis presented unique opportunities to understanding the inimitable, personal experience of an educator.

Developed by sociologists Glaser and Strauss, grounded theory “is a research method which was developed for the purpose of studying social phenomena from the perspective of symbolic-interactionism… [and is] designed primarily to generate theory from empirical data rather than to validate existing theory” (Bowers, 1988, p. 43). A reaction against grand theories in sociology, symbolic-interactionism is a social-psychological theory focused “on the acting individual rather than on the social system” with analysis “from the individual up through social groups, organizations, and institutions rather than from the system down” (p. 36). Given my interest in studying the unique, personal experience of educators immersed in transforming learning, this theory-methods package provided a philosophical and pragmatic fit.

More succinctly, Leonard Schatzman’s (1991) approach to grounded theory presented a set of procedures and epistemological assumptions aligned closely with the grounded explication of my phenomenon of interest. In brief, Schatzman makes explicit the importance of dimensionality, “…a property and variety of human thinking that turns language towards interrogative and analytic processes…[and] affords an understanding – learned and grounded in past problematic experience – that any phenomenon is more complex than any single name or meaning for it” (p. 309). Dimensionality, then, provided an understanding into all parts, contexts, attributes, and implications of the phenomenon of interest, which emerged as evolving learning. Through situational mapping and dimensionalizing, I was able to look to what all was happening as expressed by my participants.
Summary of Chapters

Through grounded theory dimensional analysis, this study explored the inner, personal experiences of faculty engaged in transforming learning contexts with undergraduate students. The literature review (Chapter Two) presents an exhaustive excavation of the research and scholarship terrain, covering historical and contemporary contexts that contribute to this study. Intentionally interdisciplinary, the literature review is also laden with scholarly contributions on leadership and change, subsequently informing data analysis and recommendations. Metaphorically, Chapter Three presents the tools with which I came to understand the phenomenon of interest. Critically, this chapter also previewed the important contribution that constructivist, qualitative inquiry makes to the evolution of 21st century higher education. Chapter Four presents the findings of the situational and dimensional analyses, arising primarily from intensive interviews and augmented by memoing, site visits, and artifact review. Finally, Chapter Five explores evolving learning in the context of discussion points, integration with extant literature and scholarship, opportunities for future inquiry, and recommendations for practice.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

This literature review presents context and rationale for a dimensional analysis-constructivist grounded theory study of *Transforming Learning: The Inner Experience of Faculty Engaged in Service-Learning and Leadership*. Foremost, the chapter expands awareness and presents insights into those historic and present factors inimitably or implicitly tied to faculty members’ inner experience of engagement with service-learning: the landscape of higher education; the scholarships of *teaching and learning* and *engagement*; scholarly inquiry into service-learning as pedagogy, methodology, and practice; and the literature on faculty development. While the review offers a critical perspective, it intends neither to prove, disprove, nor lead into a hypothesis on the faculty experience. In fact, the latter would be anathema to the epistemology and technique of traditional grounded theory, which privileges an opening up of data from the ground, distanced from a priori knowledge. More recently, however, scholars value “prior knowledge of the substantive field as valuable rather than hindering” (Clarke, 2005, p. 13).

Such valuing of knowledge will be manifest in a layered critique of Boyer’s (1990) framework, introduced and advanced through The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. This schema, particularly its insights on teaching/learning and engagement, sensitize and enrich our individual, collective, and systemic understanding of the faculty experience. The literature on service-learning furthers these aims, illustrating ties between each of Boyer’s four spheres: teaching, application, discovery, and integration. Finally, this review will explore the literature on faculty
development and learning, uncovering inherent connections to the above mentioned concepts.

*The Landscape of Higher Education: An Evolving Faculty Role*

Institutions of higher education exist in an epoch of uncertainty. More often than not, change appears to be our only constant, prompted by the democratization of knowledge, the dissolution of global borders, the digital revolution, and other factors. These and other forces – creativity, connectivity, outsourcing, among others – have flattened our world (Friedman, 2006). Around us, individuals, groups, and communities either evolve or fail to adapt to their co-constructed environments. Thomas Friedman (2006), author of *The World is Flat*, provides us with this poignant reminder:

> Whenever civilization has gone through a major technological revolution, the world has changed in profound and unsettling ways. But there is something about the flattening of the world that is going to be qualitatively different from the great changes of previous eras: the speed and breadth with which it is taking hold…And that is why the great challenge for our time will be to absorb these changes in ways that do not overwhelm people or leave them behind. (pp. 48-49)

The contemporary era of education is surrounded, influenced, and defined by the continued growth in students and numbers of degree-granting institutions; an infusion of technology, vocationalism and consumerism; and the tension between managerial and collegial cultures (Altbach, 1999; Ward, 2003; Rice, 1996b). Indeed, the need for colleges and universities to narrow extant gaps between rhetoric and practice and address social, cultural, political, and environmental challenges cannot be understated (Boyer, 1990). Herein, the role of educator is central – and nuanced; “Preparation for broadened
civic life can stand in conflict with the desire for an education to expediently prepare students for the workforce… [What] faces higher education is concern about what academe does and for whom, at what cost” (Ward, 2003, p. 44).

Indeed, faculty members have the unique opportunity – and responsibility – to enlighten, illuminate, and develop the potential of tomorrow’s change agents across all sectors of society. With this in mind, this chapter critically and analytically situates the faculty experience in (1) the historical and evolving role of professor and higher education; (2) the broadening conception of scholarship; (3) the mutually intertwined and reinforcing phenomena of teaching, learning, and engagement; (4) service-learning and the faculty experience; and (5) faculty development over time. While the literature reveals a dearth of scholarship relating directly to my locus of inquiry, foundational studies contribute significantly to the background, scope, and purpose of this dissertation study.

Foremost, one cannot endeavor to study the inner experience of faculty engaged in transforming contexts such as service-learning without understanding the evolving, ever-changing professoriate. To comprehend fully the evolution of the faculty role, a basic understanding of higher education’s history is critical. From these histories, we come to make meaning of the complexities – internal and external – with which educators have contended over time. Histories of higher education are relative and multifaceted, reflecting authors’ personal, anecdotal, and scholarly conceptions of the times within which change transpired. Bok (2006), in his review of critical historical perspectives of higher education, noted that most writings propose a downturn in the quality of education over time. What might have prompted such decline remains elusive and multifaceted.
What appears consistent, however, is the lack of agreement around a unifying purpose of higher education and the faculty role. Post-Civil War, for instance, humanists touted the importance of liberal learning while others argued for broad, public service (Bok, 2006). Even after World War II, when institutions “tried anew to build a model program of general education that would prepare young people to take their place as knowledgeable, thoughtful members of a free and democratic society” (p. 23), dissensus prevailed. Others noted colleges and universities were “inextricably bound to the intellectual and cultural heritage of the nation itself” (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997, p. 6).

Tracing United States education to the founding of the nation, the colonial colleges educated elite cadres of males under a strict, religious canon. With British roots, a student-focused education was aimed at “building character and preparing new generations for civic and religious leadership” (Boyer, 1990, p. 3). These institutions emphasized the cultivation of intellect and character through methods sometimes described as sterile and abstruse (Bok, 2006). Faculty members, known as tutors, were hired not for their teaching abilities, but for a commitment to upholding a religious ethos (Benditt, 1990); most were recent graduates awaiting clergy positions (Ward, 2003). Notably, “a single tutor was assigned the shepherding of a single class through all four years of their baccalaureate program, both inside and outside the classroom” (Finkelstein, 1984, p. 8). During mid to late eighteenth century, the “professoriat” – a core of faculty – replaced tutors; this seeded the creation of specialization, leading to the development of disciplines (Ward, 2003).

The denominational college, founded on principles of service throughout the late eighteenth and early-mid nineteenth centuries, proliferated as settlers encroached
westward (Ward, 2003). Many of these institutions were established in conjunction with developing towns and communities; as such, they “created the ideal of higher education as a public good and exposed higher education to many people for whom higher education had been elusive” (Ward, 2003, p. 21). During this time period, professors began to outnumber tutors; Finkelstein (1984) referred to this as the professor movement, an artifact of the secularization and industrialization of U.S. society. As education advanced through the 1850s, faculty “began to exercise their expertise as educators and proponents of culture and not just proponents of religion” (Ward, 2003, p. 24). While engagement in the community had always been part of the faculty and/or tutor role, new responsibilities “led to a switch in service roles from those tied to religion to those tied to specialization” (p. 24). Still, faculty remained engaged in the community – civically, religiously, and politically. During the 1860s and 1870s, the faculty role developed more formally, expanding into a career sequence that “regulated the movement through the junior ranks to a full professorship” (Finkelstein, 1984, p. 21).

By the late nineteenth century, noteworthy reform efforts commenced, due in large part to federal land grants, donors across industry sectors, and a seemingly novel approach to education employed by German universities (Bok, 2006). The Morrill Act of 1862, also known as the Land Grant College Act, established federal funds for the development of state universities. Soon, courses in logic and the great texts were replaced by emphases on practical classes that would support the burgeoning mechanical and agricultural revolutions. Notably, the student demographic began to change; higher education was no longer considered the veritable province of the elite, economically privileged. Concurrently, the founding ethos of our nation’s colleges and universities
shifted fundamentally, following the pioneering aims of the denominational college: “once devoted primarily to the intellectual and moral development of students, [they] added service as a mission, and both private and public universities took up the challenge” (Boyer, 1990, p. 5). In many instances, both students and faculty sought to serve their communities.

By the latter decade of the nineteenth century, the German model had slowly infused private and public agendas. Some regarded its emphasis on research as “a violation of the integrity of the university, since the prevailing Germanic model demanded that the professor view the everyday world from a distance” (Boyer, 1990, p. 9). To most historians of higher education, the founding of Johns Hopkins University in 1876 was a monumental, decisive undertaking in higher education. The rise of Daniel Coit Gilman’s (i.e., founder of Johns Hopkins) research university gave birth to academic professionalism (Rice, 1996b). Tenets of the “new” university included “professorial notions of research, academic departments, specialization, and academic freedom” (Ward, 2003, p. 32). For many educators, teaching and service became peripheral to experimentation – but this “remained the exception rather than the rule” (Boyer, 1990, p. 9).

Indeed, many institutions embraced change; others retained grounding in the Colonial model. By the early 1900s, curricula were bifurcated: public universities offered practical, vocational courses with a sprinkling of liberal arts while the more revered private institutions resisted applied coursework (Bok, 2006). Still, higher education expanded in depth and breadth with emphasis on pragmatic and research-focused orientations. Academicians continued to enter land-grant universities, confident
in their abilities to build the nation (Boyer, 1990), while undergraduates embraced the
diverse array of credit-bearing and extra-curricular options afforded to them. Notably,
the early evolution of tenure can be traced to the 30s and 40s, emerging as a means of
protecting faculty positions on social issues deemed controversial or potentially
unpopular (Ward, 2003). Interestingly, “many of the faculty involved in controversial
activities were acting in ways that are similar to what we could define as service today”
(p. 33). In 1940, the AAUP created principles on tenure, later adopted by most colleges
and universities (Ward, 2003).

The landscape of higher education was further transformed by the Great
Depression and subsequent war. Vannevar Bush of MIT urged the development of
common purpose between government and higher education; in his 1945 report to the
President, Bush proclaimed their irrefutably connective aims for the betterment of
humankind:

Science, by itself, provides no panacea for individual, social, and economic ills. It
can be effective in the national welfare only as a member of a team, whether the
conditions be peace or war. But without scientific progress no amount of
achievement in other directions can insure our healthy, prosperity, and security as
a nation in the modern world. (pp. 10-11)

While scholarship and service conjoined, higher education underwent “the
revolution of rising expectations” (Boyer, 1990, p. 11), later typified by O’Meara and
Rice (2005) as transformative yet disjointed. President Harry Truman created a
Commission on Higher Education, whose landmark report prompted a paradigm shift in
who had access to higher education. Backed by the G.I. Bill of Rights, eight million
servicepersons gained access to college and university education. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union’s launching of *Sputnik I* impacted the “why” underlying college and university life, triggering “a narrowly circumscribed form of scientific and technical research” (Rice, 2005, p. 18). *Brown v. Board of Education*, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, World War II, and Title IX legislation catalyzed and supported integration efforts (Ward, 2003). Consequently, institutions expanded significantly with respect to diversity and access; by the 1990s, the number of BA degrees awarded annually rose by eightfold (Bok, 2006). In tandem, faculty demographics diversified and the number of individuals entering academic careers increased exponentially (Ward, 2003).

Ironically, while all this growth was occurring, the faculty role became increasingly constrictive, as promotion and tenure in many institutions depended largely on one’s research (Boyer, 1990). While pre World War II faculty were promoted for their teaching, the tables began to turn in the ‘50’s as “scholarship became research, and teaching and research became activities that competed for faculty members’ time” (Rice, 1996b, p. 564). Public trust abounded; with the assistance of federal funding, faculty “were valued for their specialized knowledge and the contributions they could make” (Ward, 2003, p. 39). For the ensuing 30 years, the American professoriate would nearly quadruple (Finkelstein, 1984). Rice (1996a, 2005) referred to the rapid growth and developing prestige of the professoriate through the 60s and 70s as the *assumptive world of the academic professional*. Situated in historical contexts - primarily Western world influences on higher education - scholarly work could be categorized into major components: research as central to academic life; peer review and autonomy as key factors in assessing professional quality; the quest for knowledge and truth – organized
by discipline – for knowledge’s sake and one’s advancement; and development of one’s professional reputation through specialization and external affiliations such as national associations (Rice, 2005).

The research-heavy climate of institutions, dwindling federal support, and subsequent tuition hikes in the 1970s and 1980s catalyzed public scrutiny of higher education (Ward, 2003). During this time frame, higher education could be described as a “radically decentralized system that placed a high priority on autonomy – both individual and institutional” (Rice, 2005, p. 18). Throughout the ‘80’s, concern mounted about the misalignment of faculty priorities with institutions’ espoused missions. Popular media referenced the “absentee professor” – altogether disconnected from society (O’Meara & Rice, 2005). *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (1983), published by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, elevated concern about the quality of K-12 and higher education. Across the board, “questions were soon being raised by higher education’s major constituents – legislators, trustees, parents, and others – about the quality of undergraduate teaching” (Rice, 2005, p. 19). Further, it appeared few faculty members meaningfully addressed societal issues in their work; research agendas were narrow, discipline-focused, and highly specialized. Still, the public expected colleges and universities to apply disciplinary skills and expertise to social and political problems (Boyer, 1990; Braxton, Luckey, & Helland, 2002).

In the foreword to *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered*, former AAHE president Russell Edgerton describes the circumstances foreshadowing change in the professoriate, with reference to faculty role reform at Syracuse, Stanford, and University of California – three research universities – during the late ‘80’s and early ‘90’s (O’Meara & Rice,
While research universities are not representative of higher education at large, “the research university is often a leader in terms of trends that shape all of higher education” (Ward, 2003, p. 40). Edgerton credits Eugene Rice – former scholar in residence at The Carnegie Foundation – with moving dialogue around faculty priorities beyond the tired trilogy of teaching, research, and service. Rice prompted faculty to consider their roles as members of a broader intellectual community (i.e., scholar) above that of professor (i.e., members of a university). Rice and other pioneers brought issues surrounding the faculty role from the margins of debate to the center of discourse; such issues and concerns would later serve as fodder for Scholarship Reconsidered (Boyer, 1990), a report and widespread initiative of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching intended to reframe collective understanding of faculty priorities in the context of society’s evolving needs (Rice, 2005).

Scholarship Reconsidered fueled dialogue across the United States, augmenting existing and developing efforts to address the quality of undergraduate teaching and learning. Glassick et al. (1997) contend the report inspired questioning of the legitimacy of extant faculty roles in the context of a “fresher, more capacious vision of scholarship” (p. 9). The report’s simple, heuristic framework spoke to multiple constituents: faculty, staff, administrators, and graduate students, among others. While many reports, associations, and assemblies had been initiated on the margins of institutional reform efforts, Scholarship Reconsidered “began with the faculty role and had the audacity to raise questions about the meaning of scholarship…it called into question the academic reward system – the criteria used in making decisions about tenure and promotion” (Rice,
2005, p. 21). Boyer emphasized how scholarship should be performed and actualized, not how it was or is done (Braxton et al., 2002).

Since 1990, much of the literature and reform efforts pertaining to the evolving faculty role have been linked to or grounded in *Scholarship Reconsidered*. The work of faculty, noted Boyer (1990), is rooted in research, creative work, and developments in one’s discipline, but it “also means stepping back from one’s investigation, looking for connections, building bridges between theory and practice, and communicating one’s knowledge effectively to students” (p. 16). *Scholarship Reconsidered* conceptualizes four separate, overlapping spheres of the faculty role: discovery, integration, application, and teaching (Boyer, 1990). Within and across each, scholarship is preeminent; the report breaks down the misconception that scholarship transpires in the sole context of discovering new knowledge and truths through vigorous, objective experimentation. The latter is integral, but it cannot stand on its own. The scholarship of discovery, synonymous with traditional conceptions of research, is one of four spheres of scholarship. The advancement of knowledge is vital, generating “an almost palpable excitement in the life of an educational institution” (p. 17), but should not dominate teaching, learning, and engagement.

The second sphere of scholarship discussed by Boyer (1990) and his colleagues is that of integration – “…serious, disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research” (p. 19). Linked closely to discovery, the scholarship of integration values interconnectedness and promotes interdisciplinary collaboration. The scholarship of integration nudges the role of faculty beyond myopia into inter-, intra-, and multi-disciplinary engagement. The third element of scholarship –
application - moves beyond discovery and integration toward engagement (Boyer, 1990). Ideally, the faculty member applies knowledge to local and global issues, advancing the aims of individuals, groups, and communities across varying spheres of influence. This goal was seldom achieved, evidenced by the “gap between values in the academy and the needs of the larger world” (p. 22). Across the board, there existed – and continues to be – lack of an integrated understanding of what application, engagement, and service entail. Amorphous at best, service in the ‘80’s and early ‘90’s involved an array of campus and community activities: committee work, advising, departmental involvement, and so on. And all too frequently, service meant “not doing scholarship but doing good” (Boyer, 1990, p. 22).

Scholarship Reconsidered introduced a fourth component, the scholarship of teaching (Boyer, 1990), later renamed the scholarship of teaching and learning (Huber, Hutchings & Shulman, 2005; Rice, 2005). The role of faculty extends beyond research and application; teaching encompasses “all the analogies, metaphors, and images that build bridges between the teacher’s understanding and the student’s learning” (Boyer, 1990, p. 23). Further, good teaching inspires success in discovery, application, and integration. Together, the four components comprise an inclusive, interdependent view of what it means to be teacher, learner, scholar, and entrepreneur – each vital to the modern professoriate.

From Scholarship Reconsidered, numerous reform efforts coalesced; for instance, the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) and a cadre of senior administrators co-founded the Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards. The forum convened annually; over ten years, hundreds of institutions sent teams of faculty and
administrators to “work on issues central to the mission of the institution” (Rice, 2005, p. 23). Concurrently, various sectors and associations embraced the phenomenon of Scholarship Reconsidered. During AAHE’s 2000 conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards, constituents celebrated advances made in the scholarship of teaching and learning (Rice, 2005); equally critical was a renewed emphasis on applied, community-based learning – now known as the scholarship of engagement. Given the inherent connections between the focus of this study and the scholarships of engagement and teaching/learning, more explicit attention will be given in this review to these elements of the contemporary professoriate.

Scholarship Reconsidered is an imperfect document, subject to critique and criticism. First, Boyer (1990) gives little credit to those scholars whose paths blazed the trail for his commentaries on scholarship, the professoriate, and higher education. Braxton et al. (2002) trace the distinction between applied and basic research to scholars predating Boyer. For instance, the work of Braxton and Toombs (1982); Pellino, Blackburn, and Boberg (1984); and Miller (1972, 1987) warrants attention. Concurrently and consecutively, these scholars expanded and delineated conceptions of scholarship, ultimately recommending flexible tenure and promotion criteria. Also, these scholars seeded a more holistic view of scholarship, denoting “an outcome or product observable by others, whereas scholarly activities denote a process that applies professional knowledge and skill” (Braxton et al., 2002, p. 18).

Though Schön (1995) agrees with Boyer’s expanded conception of scholarship, he makes salient the epistemological bases upon which Boyer’s contentions are founded. Schön notes “we cannot avoid questions of epistemology, since the new forms of
scholarship [Boyer] describes challenge the epistemology built into the modern research university” (p. 27). The normative epistemology, linked closely to the scholarship of discovery, rewards technical rationality. Here, the ‘indeterminate zones’ – uncertainty, complexity, chaos, conflict – are not welcome. Schön (1995) conceptualizes discovery as part of the high, hard ground overlooking a swamp. On the swampy low ground, the scholarships of application, integration, and teaching thrive on the indeterminate; therein lay the messy, indescribable problems of humanity, which require continual processes of reflection, reflexivity, and action. Higher up, faculty are comforted by technical rigor; lower, one confronts more questions than answers. So, what Schön (1995) suggests is an epistemology of practice – action research – that recognizes indeterminacy, is inherently rigorous, and creates space for faculty members’ reflection in and on action.

Noting the importance of the socioeconomic contexts of universities and colleges, Davis and Chandler (1998) offer another critique of Scholarship Reconsidered. While criticisms abound, the authors make clear their use of Boyer’s work as impetus for a broader, macro-level discussion around institutional change. Boyer (1990) fails to address adequately the issue of who or for whom colleges and universities serve; also, he avoids discussion about the inherently complex, layered systems within which promotion and tenure exist. Often, faculty wield little overall power in the decision-making processes; until organizational structures change to embrace all forms of scholarship, Davis and Chandler (1998) do not foresee change in the professoriate. Applying a general systems approach, the authors offer an alternative model premised upon the inherent interaction of goals, social structures, and system attributes (Davis & Chandler, 1998).
While Schöner (1995) approaches his analysis from an epistemological angle and Davis and Chandler (1998) offer a systems-level critique of Boyer’s work, Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) identify a salient disconnect between Boyer’s rhetoric and the institutional practice of assessing scholarship. While expanding the meaning of scholarship was critical, faculty noted that the primary concern revolved around how scholarship was assessed and valued. In *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*, Glassick et al. (1997) decree “that it is indeed possible to find standards that can be applied to each kind of scholarly work, that can organize the documentation of scholarly accomplishments, and that can also guide a trustworthy process of faculty evaluation” (p. 5). Research conducted in 1994 by The Carnegie Foundation backs this proclamation; over 80 percent of surveyed four-year colleges had reexamined or were in the process of reexamining faculty roles and rewards. The majority (86%) sought to redefine teaching, research and service; and over three-quarters (78%) “hoped to find ways to improve the balance of time and effort faculty spend on tasks” (Glassick et al., 1997, p. 12). Alas, only one third reported developing new ways of evaluating research, creative endeavors, and service. And pressure mounted about how to evaluate faculty: “When evaluation is obsessed with numbers, it shortchanges teaching and service as well as research” (p. 20).

The relevance of the *Scholarship Reconsidered* movement to this dissertation study cannot be understated. Foremost, it presents nuanced insights into the evolving professoriate, illuminating macro-level opportunities, challenges, and tensions surrounding the faculty role. The work of Boyer, The Carnegie Foundation, and others promulgated a developing commitment on the part of colleges and universities to value,
evaluate, and reward various forms of scholarship. Also, the movement gave birth to
greater understanding for and appreciation of teaching and engagement, both vital,
intersecting components of academe. From this work, we can trace the development of
significant reformation and change efforts, notwithstanding the steady growth of
learning-centered praxes like service-learning, field research, and community-based
learning/research later explored in this literature review. Still, faculty contend with
inordinate pressure; even at liberal arts institutions, they “face increasingly demanding
standards for promotion and tenure as expectations for hours in the classroom and for
engagement in research activity increase” (Ward, 2003, p. 48).

The Scholarship Reconsidered movement appears externally affixed, situated in a
systemic desire to expand (1) how, when, and where scholarship is manifest in academe;
(2) means of evaluating faculty engagement in discovery, teaching, service, and
application; and (3) the implications for expansive and integrated scholarship on the
culture of undergraduate learning. We know that professors are required, today, “to do
more with less” (Ward, 2003, p. 49); faculty members are asked to respond to multiple,
often paradoxical demands – preparing students vocationally and civically, making their
own work relevant to community needs and those of the College. Nearly void from the
literature, however, is the deeper, qualitative emphasis on the faculty experience,
developmentally and contextually. Seemingly, authors circumvent or altogether avoid
discussions of what faculty learn, develop, or gain from a more comprehensive view of
scholarship. While the implications for student learning and the advancement of the
academy’s commitment to society are both implicit and overt, how faculty develop is
altogether obscured.
The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Irrefutably, the inner experience of faculty engaged in transforming contexts such as service-learning is linked to the scholarship of teaching and learning, described by Huber et al. (2005) as “a vigorous, emergent field of thought and practice, engendering new forums and outlets for scholarship in departments, programs, and centers in colleges and universities across the country” (p. 34). Conceptions abound, such as that provided by McKinney (2004): “The scholarship of teaching and learning goes beyond scholarly teaching and involves the systematic study of teaching and/or learning” (p. 8). While models of faculty development around teaching, learning, and engagement will be reviewed and critiqued in the latter portion of this chapter, this section takes a deeper look at the scholarship of teaching and learning, revealing its intersections with engaged learning. A brief review of the overarching literature on learning will be followed by further analysis of the work of Ernest Boyer. No one of his four spheres has received more attention – and the least amount of overall consensus – than that of teaching (Braxton et al., 2002). Then, an understanding of what the scholarship of teaching and learning entails for faculty, illuminating connections to the thesis of this dissertation, will be presented.

First, a brief review of student learning grounds our comprehension of the emergent scholarship of teaching and learning. Broadly, learning involves procuring, interpreting, and sharing wisdom, knowledge, and development. Brooks and Brooks (1999) define learning as “a complex process that defies the linear precepts of measurement and accountability” (p. viii). In her survey on student cognition and learning, King (1996) noted that learning and education are synonymous with education
and knowledge. That is, “to be a learned person” (p. 219) and to learn from stimuli (e.g., books, conversation, etc.) are aspects and conditions of the learning process. King (1996) relates learning “with acquired wisdom, which involves showing good judgment; being able to discern what is true, right, or lasting; and being prudent and informed” (p. 219). Thus, the acquisition and discernment of wisdom and knowledge are both outcomes and processes:

Learning thus defined – as an outcome – includes the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that serve as a foundation for wisdom. Learning defined as a process, on the other hand, focuses on the kinds of strategies people use to solve new problems, how they respond to feedback and new information, how they gather and interpret data, how they determine its relevance, and how strong the evidence needs to be before they are satisfied that they can make a decision or solve a problem. *Learning* is both a noun and a verb, representing both an outcome and a process of education. (p. 219)

Scholarly inquiry on student learning and development can be further traced to the early twentieth century, when the work of Freud, Jung, Skinner, and others was applied to the collegiate setting. Building on this early scholarship, the American Council on Education collected a range of data between 1925 and 1936; this resulted in the landmark document entitled *Student Personnel Point of View* [SPPOV] (Young, 1996). This piece affirmed the need for “holistic” learning within and outside of the classroom, prompting educators to guide students to realize their “full potential and contribute to society’s betterment” (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998, p. 6). Revised in 1949, *SPPOV* integrated aspects from *Higher Education for American Democracy*, which was authored
in 1947 by the President’s Commission on Higher Education. Also influenced by global politics, the revised SPPOV reflected two overarching objectives: the education of the whole person and the call for socially responsible citizens (Evans et al., 1998). In both philosophy and outcome, these seminal documents catalyzed the foundational scholarship on learning, prompting subsequent work like Greater Expectations (AAC&U, 2002) and Learning Reconsidered (NASPA & ACPA, 2004). This literature informs our understanding of the experiences and patterns through which students learn during the late adolescent and early adult years, reflecting a “focus on intellectual growth as well as affective and behavioral changes during the college years” (Evans et al., 1998, p. 5).

Among the first contributors to the scholarship on student learning, Sanford (1966, 1967) viewed development as a positive growth process reflecting degrees of cognitive-structural and psychosocial expansion. He viewed higher education as a developmental center where students learn through (1) encounters with support and challenge; and (2) cycles of differentiation and integration. Influenced by Erikson’s work on dissonance, Sanford (1966) suggested that a balance of challenge and support must be present in the environment for students to experience growth. Differentiation and integration take place when students delve inward, reflecting on how characteristics of personality and identity shape their understanding of self and others (Evans et al., 1998). These concepts – support and challenge, differentiation and integration – shaped the development of student learning scholarship. With his contemporaries (e.g., Piaget, Erikson), Sanford contributed to what would become three major categories of student learning and development theory: psychosocial theory, cognitive-structural theory, and typological theory.
Indeed, our knowledge of the scholarship of teaching and learning is invariably fueled by past and contemporary research on undergraduate learning. How, why, and with whom students learn implicitly and overtly shapes the faculty experience. Still, teaching remains elusive and misunderstood. In his review of the National Survey of Faculty conducted by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement for Teaching, Boyer (1990) submitted this participant’s (anonymous) comment: “It is assumed that all faculty can teach, and hence that one doesn’t need to spend a lot of time on it. Good teaching is assumed, not rewarded… This is the most frustrating aspect of my work” (p. 32-33). Boyer (1990) likens teaching to a currency that cannot be converted; excellence in the classroom is seldom valued and frequently underplayed. Interestingly, teaching represented the primary interest of 70 percent of college and university professors through the 1990’s (Boyer, 1990).

Rice’s (1991) work further enhances our comprehension of the relationship of teaching and scholarship. He encourages colleges and universities to expand their conceptions of scholarship and what it means to be a scholar beyond the myopic, one-dimensional notion “tied to the advancement of research and defined in zero-sum terms” (p. 8). Just as learning is seen as diverse, non-linear, and multidimensional, scholarship must likewise be viewed within this lens. Connecting teaching to learning, Rice (1991) roots this scholarship in three contributing elements: its ability to enrich meaning and coherence, its transcending capacity to connect the substance and process of learning, and its inquiry into how meaning is made by the learner. Further, Rice (1991) reminds the reader that the four forms of scholarship are “interrelated and often overlapping – an interdependent whole, with each distinctive form encompassing each of the other three”
He proposes a more comprehensive, less discrete view of the four spheres within which the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Essentially, the scholarship of teaching enhances engagement, application, and discovery. Viewed in this way, “…these different forms of scholarship can interact, inform, and enrich one another, and faculty can follow their interests, build on their strengths, and be rewarded for what they spend most of their scholarly energy doing” (Rice, 1991, p. 15-16).

In the decade following Scholarship Reconsidered, new developments added depth and substance to our understanding of the scholarship of teaching and learning, such as scholarship on the nature of faculty knowledge, the character of learning, the assessment of teaching and learning, the role of teaching portfolios, and the development of peer education initiatives (Huber & Hutchings, 2005; Huber et al., 2005; McKinney, 2004). Teaching and learning centers proliferated while national enhancement projects were led by the National Science Foundation, the American Association for Higher Education, the Carnegie Foundation, and others (Huber et al., 2005). Throughout the 90s, conferences and initiatives abounded, including the Campus Colloquium on the Scholarship of Teaching, the Crossroads Project of the American Studies Association, an Academy of Management meeting on teaching, and AAHE’s conference entitled Scholarship Reconsidered Reconsidered (Hutchings & Shulman, 1999; Huber & Hutchings, 2005). In a Change article entitled The Scholarship of Teaching: New Elaborations, New Developments, Hutchings and Shulman (1999) bring to life an impactful initiative – the work of the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL), one of many forces that enhance our understanding of what the scholarship of teaching and learning entails for faculty members nationally.
Within and across these above mentioned contexts, conceptions of teaching and learning as a form of scholarship have grown, induced partially by the queries cited by scholars such as Hutchings and Shulman (1999):

What Boyer did not do was to draw a sharp line between excellent teaching and the scholarship of teaching. Now, however, we’ve reached a stage at which more precise distinction seems to be wanted. Indeed, we sense a kind of crankiness among colleagues who are frustrated by the ambiguities of the phrase. How, they’re asking, is excellent teaching different from the scholarship of teaching? If it is, why should anyone care about it? Is there a useful distinction to be made between the scholarship of teaching and “scholarly teaching”? Where does student learning fit in? (Hutchins & Shulman, 1999, p. 13)

With these questions in mind, the authors note that all faculty members have the responsibility to teach well, engaging self, students, and peers in reflective critiques of teaching and learning (Hutchings & Shulman, 1999). The latter is paramount; this process of inquiry draws the distinction between excellent teaching and a scholarship of teaching. The scholarship of teaching and learning “requires a kind of ‘going meta,’ in which faculty frame and systematically investigate questions related to student learning – the conditions under which it occurs, what it looks like, how to deepen it, and so forth – and do so with an eye not only to improving their own classroom but to advancing practice beyond it” (p. 13). To advance as a field, Hutchings and Shulman (1999) underscore the importance of “inquiry into the process of inquiry itself” (p. 15).

Essentially, this entails digging deeper, expanding our knowledge of the nuances of teaching and learning. To begin, we must move beyond highlighting good practices to
excavating what it really means to learn – deeply, intellectually, morally, and civically (Hutchings & Shulman, 1999). Such learning begins from within.

Notably, this form of scholarship also “draws synthetically from other scholarships… [and at best] it creates new meanings through integrating across other inquiries, negotiating understanding between theory and practice” (Hutchings & Shulman, 1999, p. 15). Scholars like Rice (1992) and McKinney (2004) regard Boyer’s spheres as inherently interdependent; McKinney further notes that the *scholarship of teaching and learning* can be topically focused on teaching while embracing the activities of discovery, integration, and engagement. While ideal, such practices are easier espoused than enacted. Challenges abound. For one, the emphasis on the *scholarship of teaching and learning* is recent, thus privy to growing pains. And the *scholarship of teaching and learning* is often considered an “alternative social movement” (McKinney, 2004, p. 5), limited in scope and specific to colleges and universities. Further, this scholarship entails risk on the part of faculty members; while risk bears rewards, its downside could jeopardize one’s tenure and promotion process (Hutchings & Shulman, 1999). Even faculty intent upon expanding their teaching and learning repertoire remain, at times, ambivalent. Will their peers see the *scholarship of teaching and learning* as a credible form of inquiry? Is it worth it to expand one’s scholarly inquiry around these areas? Indeed, we struggle with how to define, conceptualize, and enact the *scholarship of teaching and learning*. The opportunity, notes McKinney (2004), lies in our ability to “continue the conversation about the nature and meaning of this work, and to find sufficient common ground to allow understanding and collaboration” (p. 7).
The Advancement of Learning: Building the Teaching Commons (2005) adds promise to the scholarship of teaching and learning as an imperative for higher education. Building upon their own studies and those of their predecessors, authors Huber and Hutchings (2005) emphasize the shifting ground upon which the college classroom resides: “If it were possible to swoop down over the nation’s colleges and universities and peer into the work of teaching and learning today, it would be clear, very quickly, how dramatically in the last two to three decades that college classroom has changed” (p. 11). What incited these changes varies: student demographics, content, methods, technology, assessment, and so on (Huber & Hutchings, 2005). The teaching and learning movement is, all at once, drawn from historic lines, etching out “new dimensions, new angles, [and] new ambitions” (p. 17). Teaching and learning are moving, albeit slowly, from the province of individual faculty to a community practice. Consequently, “pioneers have become activists for teaching and learning in their own disciplines and on campus…the networks of people aware of such work are becoming larger, denser, and more interconnected” (p. 60).

Published by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, The Advancement of Learning: Building the Teaching Commons excels in providing an exhaustive exploration of the past, present, and prospective future of the scholarship of teaching and learning. The reader comes to understand the movement’s claims, nuances, traditions, possibilities, and promises. Capitalizing on the work of CASTL and other scholars, Huber and Hutchings (2005) aptly propose an operational definition built upon four practices germane to this form of scholarship: questioning and framing questions; gathering and exploring evidence; trying out and refining new insights; and going public,
which entails “producing knowledge that is available for others to use and build on” (p. 27). The latter frames a cogent connection between this scholarship and that of engagement. Again, the four practices are not mutually exclusive (McKinney, 2004; Rice, 1991); in fact, they arise iteratively, in a looping fashion (Huber & Hutchings, 2005).

Where *The Advancement of Learning: Building the Teaching Commons* makes its mark is in its application to current needs and contexts. The authors suggest the creation of a teaching Commons; herein, faculty are granted and permitted conceptual space for the exchange of ideas and resources regarding teaching and learning. However conceptualized, the Commons enables exchange; therein, faculty may be “…further motivated by the likelihood that their work will find an audience, be enriched by colleagues’ comments and critique, and contribute to a larger community of thought and practice” (Huber & Hutchings, 2005, p. 35). The authors liken the Commons to a city, within which distinctiveness lies in the variety of disciplinary neighborhoods; disciplines, then, “are the ports of both embarkation and arrival for [faculty] work” (p. 71). Beyond establishing opportunities for exchange, the authors make note of other action steps: engaging students in discussions about the multiple ways they learn; recognizing teaching as substantive and intellectual work; developing new genres for documentation and research; and maintaining the fiscal and personnel infrastructures necessary for sustaining this work (Huber & Hutchings, 2005). The latter is congruent with McKinney’s (2004) call for individual and systemic change “in our views of our roles as faculty and staff who work to enhance student learning” (p. 12).
Essentially, the emergent *scholarship of teaching and learning* broadens and deepens our comprehension of teaching and learning as vigorous, reciprocal, and reflective processes. While scholars make note of the inherent intersections between and among Boyer’s spheres, the field lacks concrete, empirical research on the faculty experience of teaching and learning, engagement, discovery, and application. Further, few connections exist in the *scholarship of teaching and learning* on how faculty themselves learn, grow, and develop. This gap will resurface in the literature on engagement and service-learning. And while initiatives such as teaching Commons, conferences, and teaching and learning centers co-create physical and conceptual space for advancing Boyer’s (1990) aims, vigorous empirical inquiry across all disciplines is necessary for moving teaching and learning from peripheral praxis to the center of college and university discourse.

*The Scholarship of Engagement*

Ultimately, the *scholarship of engagement* is overtly and implicitly tied to the thesis of this dissertation. This literature frames our conception, albeit abstract, of the inner experience of faculty engaged in this work. Our understanding of the *scholarship of engagement* begins with Boyer’s (1990) concept of *application*, which implies a one-way flow of knowledge from academe to an external area, issue, or need. Ultimately, *engagement* encompasses a two-way, reciprocal effort; it “requires going beyond the ‘expert’ model that often gets in the way of constructive university-community collaboration” (Rice, 2005, p. 28). Through practice, scholars derive new theoretical understandings about prevalent social issues; more broadly, this form of scholarship explicitly connects the campus to the world. While Boyer asserts the importance of
applied scholarship – cautioning the reader to conceive of service beyond a ‘catch-all’
category – s/he is left with more questions than answers. What constitutes applied
scholarship? How does engagement connect to and/or transcend the formal classroom?
To what extent are students, fellow faculty, and/or community partners involved?
Pragmatically, how does application intersect with discovery, teaching, and integration?
Do faculty members learn, grow, and/or develop as a consequence of engagement?

More recently, scholars have offered insight into these and other queries in
Documenting Professional Service and Outreach (1999), Faculty Service Roles and the
Scholarship of Engagement (2003), and Faculty Priorities Reconsidered (2005), among
other popular and peer reviewed articles. Despite overall attention in the literature to
Boyer’s four spheres, Braxton et al., (2002) argue the scholarship of engagement has
received least consideration. Perhaps this is an artifact of the times; Johnston (1998)
contends that each of Boyer’s domains is temporally situated. Braxton et al. (2002)
wrote: “It is not unrealistic to say that many in the professoriate agree it is time to give
service higher priority in the profession once again” (p. 28).

Before Scholarship Reconsidered, the late Ernest Lynton (1983) wrote
extensively about professional service in a Change article entitled A Crisis of Purpose:
Reexamining the Role of the University. While Boyer noted the importance of faculty
responding to local and global challenges through this sphere of scholarship, Lynton
(1983) took the argument a step further, noting that it “is the increasing responsibility of
the university not merely to be a principal source of new knowledge but also to be
instrumental in analyzing and applying this knowledge and in making it rapidly useful to
all societal sectors” (p. 53). That is, professional service is inimitably tied to the
betterment of society first and foremost; what the college or university gains is positive,
but not primal. Further, Lynton (1983) argued that faculty, by necessity, must carry out
these responsibilities.

In *Making a Case for Professional Service*, Lynton (1995) attends to the need for
faculty to focus on the implementation of professional service. The latter refers to “work
based on the faculty member’s professional expertise that contributes to the mission of
the institution” (p. 17) and may take on multiple forms: policy analysis, program
evaluation, community development, and so on. Professional service precludes what the
author refers to as *institutional citizenship* (e.g., committees, advising), *disciplinary
citizenship* (e.g., professional association membership), and *civic contributions* (e.g., jury
duty, philanthropic work). A working document, Lynton’s monograph translates
principles of professional service into policies, procedures, and case studies for
successful implementation and documentation of service. Importantly, Lynton (1995)
makes note of the call for service, grounded in the historic application of an institution’s
intellectual resources to the needs of broader, collective constituent groups. In post
World War II decades, service connoted “good deeds rather than creative, intellectual
effort… [resulting in] a very distant third, behind research and teaching, in institutional
attention and incentives” (p. 9). To tilt this paradigm, Lynton (1995) urges the systemic
recognition of service as integral to an institution’s mission – not the province of
individual faculty.

Where Lynton’s (1995) work differs from and extends beyond that of prior
monographs is its explicit insistence that service enriches the quality, vigor, and
intellectual life of higher education institutions. While discovery contributes significantly to the progress and advancement of knowledge, engagement bridges theory and practice; it tests “the validity of basic paradigms and identifies new targets of inquiry” (Lynton, 1995, p. 11). Further, a commitment to professional service fuels excellence in teaching and learning. Extending Schön’s notion of reflection-in-action, Lynton suggests pedagogic implications; there exists no better way for faculty to “understand firsthand the relationship of their discipline to the complexity of actual situations” (p. 12) than professional service. Also, service enables creative opportunities for students and faculty to co-engage around prevailing intellectual, social, and cultural quandaries.

Making the Case for Professional Service is unique in its exhortation of the relationship between faculty experience and professional service. The monograph consists of five case studies within which faculty in history, geology, ethics, engineering, and education respectively offer narratives addressing: the context and goals of their professional service, personal expertise brought to the project, choice of method and resources employed, reflections on one’s unique experience, the impact of service on teaching and research, and a self-evaluation of perceived outcomes (Lynton, 1995). Laden with elements of personal, inner experience, these factors are altogether muted in Lynton’s (1995) subsequent “assessment” of the five studies. His concern is systemically oriented toward making a case for professional service, not uncovering the impact service has on the faculty member and/or her own teaching, learning, and development. Still, Lynton (1995) anticipates, in time, that “higher education will fully recognize the
essential unity and reciprocal relationship among the full range of its knowledge-based
tasks” (p. 61).

*Making Outreach Visible* (Driscoll & Lynton, 1999) builds upon Lynton’s (1995) work, offering cogent guidelines for documenting engagement. Documentation entails a “combination of narrative, explanatory, and illustrative material that allows the faculty member’s peers to understand his or her purpose and process as well as the outcomes of the professional service activity” (p. 7). While documentation may contribute ultimately to a faculty member’s promotion or tenure, equally critical are considerations of the impact of service on self, colleagues, students, and community partners. Only then can the seemingly invisible become transparent to academic colleagues and administrators.

Co-editors Driscoll and Lynton (1999) make note of the “vague and excessively inclusive” (p. 5) use and application of the terms service and outreach. Honing in on service as a manifestation of scholarship, the authors stress service as “a professional activity to which professional standards of quality can be applied” (p. 5), eliminating a range of on- and off-campus volunteer work. Still, the authors recognize the near universal tension around lack of an accepted definition, further noting the importance of ‘contextually derived’ terminologies aligned with an institution’s history, mission, and priorities (Driscoll & Lynton, 1999, p. 6). The reader anticipating clearly demarcated boundaries of what does and does not constitute service will be left disappointed. What Driscoll and Lynton (1999) make salient, however, is the need for institutions to address issues of nomenclature within a localized context. Consequently, campus constituents “can begin to generate and discuss what criteria of excellence they might use to judge this thing they now have defined” (p. 6).
With support from the Kellogg Foundation, Driscoll and Lynton (1999) enlist the support of 16 faculty across various fields – art to veterinary medicine – to share their documentations of outreach. A preliminary review of the prototype portfolios reveals great diversity; community-based projects varied with respect to purpose, goals, stakeholders, contexts, processes, duration, outcomes, and so on. While some participating institutions (e.g., Portland State University) encouraged faculty to align documentation with the criteria described in *Scholarship Assessed* or other rubrics, others provided little guidance (Driscoll & Lynton, 1999). Across the board, participants made note of processes and outcomes such as: individual and group contributions, impact and scope of contributions, situation of contribution in a context or discipline, link to scholarship and research, and connection between academe and the community.

Interestingly, *Making Outreach Visible* offers a rare contribution by opening a window into our understanding of faculty members’ outreach experiences. From participants’ documents, we learn a great deal about faculty conceptions of engaging in community-based learning and scholarship. Valuing the interchange of their experiences with others, participants urged the consideration of documentation/reflection as an ongoing, iterative experience between and among colleagues (Driscoll & Lynton, 1999). Inspired, Driscoll later teamed up with Lorilee Sandman, creating the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement (Driscoll, 2005), which deepens our understanding of the interchange between teaching, research, and service through the provision of a clearinghouse for credible, external evaluation:

[Portfolios submitted to the National Review Board] consistently reflect, first, an *ongoing* and *substantive* agenda of community partnership work, be it teaching or
research. They pay attention to the collaborative aspects of the work and clearly acknowledge each constituency’s contribution. The portfolios display a seamless integration of teaching, research, and service that is powerful and undeniably scholarly. Reflection is critical to the documentation, enabling readers to understand rationales for decisions, interpretation of successes and failures, and implications of work for future agendas. (p. 41)

Making Outreach Visible was followed by an ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report entitled Faculty Service Roles and the Scholarship of Engagement (Ward, 2003). Ward (2003) urges the reader to view the role of faculty beyond that of iconoclast scholar, buried in research papers and prepared to offer sardonic lectures. She contends that most faculty members spend considerable energies on the “hidden curriculum of faculty life” (p. 51) – service. While the meaning behind service remains elusive and difficult to quantify, Ward (2003) distinguishes between service to the campus and service to the community. Internal service includes departmental and institutional work, “but it also encompasses similar activities at the disciplinary level, such as service to national and regional associations and conference activities” (p. 52). External service involves the translation of one’s institutional mission to the public, “making teaching and research relevant and connected to community and societal needs” (p. 69).

Ward’s (2003) intention is to bring meaning to how important internal and external service are to faculty work. Interestingly, internal service warranted considerable attention in the monograph, constituting a third of the document. Multifaceted, it includes service to the institution, department, discipline, students, and other agents – such as participation in shared governance and academic oversight.
Rewards vary by institution; while some faculty receive course releases, others might garner financial incentives. While service to one’s discipline is seldom rewarded monetarily, the discipline is a dominant force, providing “a foundation for faculty expertise in the classroom and in research” (Ward, 2003, p. 57). Service to students is manifest in advising and counseling; these are valued but rarely rewarded. Ward (2003) notes that it “is this aspect of expected but unrewarded service (to students, but also to the institution) that fills the day of the faculty member and leads to people working on research on weekends or late at night” (p. 59). Herein, we begin to understand the complexities of the faculty experience and its multifold implications for personal development.

With respect to external service, Ward (2003) distinguishes between extension, consulting, service-learning, community-based action research, and volunteerism. Since service-learning and community-based action research will be later explored in this chapter, a brief distinction between extension and consulting is helpful. The former, traced to the land grant and agricultural movements, refers to an infrastructural connection between campus expertise and community needs. Faculty serve as agents or extenders, bridging the college or university mission with “research and technical assistance needs, publications, community development, and cultural enrichment” (p. 73). Consulting, on the other hand, entails the natural connection between one’s disciplinary or teaching expertise and the needs of external constituents (Ward, 2003). Consulting is regarded as important to faculty development, yet authors debate its connection to service when remuneration is involved (Boyer & Lewis, 1985; Brawer, 1998; Ward, 2003).
Throughout *Faculty Service Roles and the Scholarship of Engagement*, Ward (2003) cautions the reader to heed *the difference that difference makes*; one cannot render the faculty experience homogenous. The scholarship on faculty service, both internal and external, yields some insight on the influence of mitigating factors like institutional type, gender, race/ethnicity, and discipline. Still, extant studies are overtly quantitative and void of faculty voice. The research does suggest variation; generally, service is tied intimately to the ethos and mission of the institution and its surrounding community. Much is left unknown and under-researched; within the *Scholarship of Engagement* literature, we learn little about the faculty member’s inner experience – as teacher, learner, scholar, or practitioner. Germane to this dissertation is a deeper, qualitative understanding of the inner experience of faculty engaged in service-learning across multiple disciplines at a private, liberal arts institution.

**Service-learning: Transforming Lives**

While service-learning is discretely viewed as “a special case of the scholarship of application” (Braxton et al., 2002, p. 30), it may also be conceptualized as the confluence zone between two scholarships: engagement *and* teaching and learning. Ward (2003) elucidates this position, defining service-learning as an “integrated strategy because faculty are simultaneously enacting service roles and teaching roles” (p. 79). This section is built upon the latter premise, recognizing the scholarships of engagement *and* teaching and learning as mutually enhancing the inquiry, practice, and methodology of service-learning. While other scholarships (i.e., application and discovery) are irrefutably linked to service-learning, the research on engagement *and* teaching and learning connects explicitly to the thesis of this dissertation. Service-learning provides “a framework of
unity” (Ward, 2003, p. 79), tying together teaching, research, and service for students, faculty, staff, administrators, and community partners.

Historically and epistemologically, service-learning can be traced to the intellectual musings of Jane Addams, John Dewey, and Dorothy Day (Speck, 2001). Today, Rice and Stacey (1997) remind readers that service-learning is “a philosophy, a methodology and a pedagogy” (p. 64). With respect to philosophy, Battistoni (1997) distinguished between philanthropic and civic service-learning. While the former has altruistic aims, civic service-learning focuses on “mutual responsibility and the interdependence of rights and responsibilities, and it focuses not on altruism but on enlightened self-interest” (p. 151). The latter requires shared purpose, mutually engaging faculty, staff, and the community.

While conceptions of service-learning differ; Bringle and Hatcher (1996) present one of the most cogent, integrated definitions:

[Service-learning is] a credit-bearing educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility. (p. 222)

Lott and Michelmore (1997) expand on this definition, noting four goals for service-learning courses: enhancing student development through increased self-concept; exploring moral and ethical constructs; participating actively in democratic practices; and linking practice to academic subject material. Essentially, students’ learning comes alive as knowledge translates to utility and practice (Lott & Michelmore, 1997). Howard
(1998) argues that service-learning extends well beyond the addition of community service to an academic course: “…the students’ community service experiences are compatible and integrated with academic learning objectives of the course, in a manner similar to traditional course requirements…[and are] as pivotal to the students’ academic learning as class lectures and library research” (p. 21). Indeed, most notions of service-learning focus explicitly on the student experience; until recently, little has been written about the impact of service-learning on educators, institutions, and community partners.

A brief history of the service-learning movement over several decades reveals intersections with the evolving literature. Through the 1980s, scholar Garry Hesser (1995) noted an ebbing of faculty interest in connecting service, learning, and teaching. Looking at the previous decades, Hesser (1995) posits several factors contributing to this decline:

[Faculty interest declined due to] the high water marks of the Urban Centers which sprung up all over the U.S. in the ‘60’s and ‘70’s, the widespread state internship programs in the southeast U.S., the extensive Urban Corps network (utilizing work-study funding), University Year of Action in the early 70’s, and a large number of experimental and experiential programs around the nation, including the creation of the 4-1-4 academic year. (p. 34)

By the late ‘80s and early ‘90’s, the tides began to change, despite students’ interest in “private materialism” over “public interest” (Myers-Lipton, 1998, p. 243). The National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE), in partnership with the Johnson and MacArthur Foundations, set forth a vigorous agenda for connecting service with learning; by 1989, they had worked with over 500 educators to strengthen and advance experiential
learning (Hesser, 1995). These and other developments seeded local and national initiatives, notwithstanding the acclaimed evolution of Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) in 1984 and Campus Compact in 1985 (Maas Weigert, 1998). Meanwhile, college and university presidents highlighted the importance of education that addresses social concerns (Myers-Lipton, 1998). Service-learning was endorsed publicly by the National and Community Service Act (NCSA) of 1990; passed with bipartisan support, NCSA would “create the Commission on National and Community Service (CNCS) to provide funds, training, and technical assistance to States and communities to develop and expand service opportunities” (Smith, 1994, p. 38).

Capturing the evolving movement, Hesser (1995) identified ten interrelated factors contributing to change: growing sophistication in the theory and practice of experiential learning; enhanced emphasis on active, engaged modes of learning at the post-secondary level; emergence of the faculty development movement; prominence of college and university-sponsored initiatives such as Campus Compact; near-universal concern about the downfall of community virtue; support of major foundations (e.g., Kellogg); evolution of political support (e.g., AmeriCorps); and increased faculty, community, and student-led support for community-based learning. By 1993, AmeriCorps offered 20,000 citizens the opportunity to engage in a year of domestic service (Myers-Lipton, 1998). Counteracting the materialist trend, these efforts emphasized “the need to prepare our young adults for their responsibilities as citizens in a democracy” (p. 244).

Despite an “assault” on Clinton’s 1993 Corporation for National and Community Service by a conservative Congress, a “more decentralized interest in service linked to
higher education” (Zlotkowski, 1996, p. 53) peaked by the mid ‘90’s. At the same time, many institutions integrated an ethos of public service into vision and mission statements; and while such commitments slowly infused campus cultures, other colleges and universities remained only “rhetorically committed” (Ward, 1996, p. 55). Nonetheless, the ‘90s bore an increase in campus-based service-learning and volunteerism centers (Ward, 1996). Locally and nationally, initiatives aligned: “Combined, national policy to promote service and campus conversations about service [inspired] many administrators to make the integration of service on campus a goal for the 1990’s” (p. 56). This, in turn, induced what Howard (1998) considered an explosion in faculty interest.

While service-learning initiatives afforded students many benefits throughout the 90s, these programs have been paralleled by the evolution of faculty development models for service-learning. The latter became “the cornerstone for the implementation of academic service-learning in colleges and universities” (Rice & Stacey, 1997, p. 64); colleges and universities developed short-term initiatives that included seminars, workshops, grants, and speakers. Jacoby (1996) pointed out the important nature of combining short-term initiatives with longer, more intensive activities: summer institutes, regular meetings, and so on. Philosophically, approaches also varied. Some began by addressing cognitive knowledge bases; others approached faculty development through the lens of peer support (Rice & Stacey, 1997). Citing the importance of small group development, Rice and Stacey (1997) suggest these settings best enable faculty to “share ideas, help each other understand concepts, and strengthen each others’ commitment to academic service-learning” (p. 65).
Zlotkowski’s (1998) conceptual matrix presents a heuristic approach to faculty development around service learning; it also enriches our understanding of the systems with which faculty contend when co-engaging with their students. Transitioning from director of service-learning at Bentley College to a senior associate position at the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE), Zlotkowski (1998) needed a device to explain “the bigger picture; namely, how and where [he] saw service learning interfacing with other, for the most part, far more established institutional concerns” (p. 82). Pulling from empirical, personal, and anecdotal sources, the author developed the matrix depicted in Figure 1. While the matrix intentionally emphasizes academe’s educational agenda – it “also insists that the very thing that makes service learning distinctive is its willingness to admit community concerns (quadrant $D$) as one of the academy’s essential responsibilities” (p. 83). Zlotkowski’s (1998) integrative approach implies a deepening and broadening of what service-learning entails in both theory and practice. On the brink of the new millennium, the author was among the first to respectfully integrate community-based issues and common good concerns with service-learning as an educational undertaking.
Indeed, faculty development models, programs, and institutes ready, initiate, and prepare educators to develop service-learning courses tied to their academic discipline. Almost void from this literature, however, is an understanding of the faculty member’s inner experience. Does s/he grow, change, or evolve? What lessons are derived from one’s own engagement with the community? Is one’s scholarship of teaching and learning enriched? With few exceptions, faculty members are positioned in the literature as researchers, informants, or experts. Overall, the peer-reviewed scholarship reveals gaps in two areas pertaining to our knowledge of the faculty experience with service-learning: content and representation. While each area will be reviewed and critiqued respectively, neither is mutually exclusive from the other. This section will conclude
with commentary on narrative and conceptual pieces (i.e., not necessarily peer-reviewed) that deepen our knowledge around the faculty experience in service-learning.

Content

Scholars began researching and documenting learning outcomes connected with service-learning and experiential education in the 1990’s. Giles, Honnet, and Migliore (1991) noted a paucity of “replicable qualitative and quantitative research on the effects of service-learning on student learning and development, the communities in which they serve, or on educational institutions” (p. 2); this prompted a surge in research, writing, and scholarship on service-learning. With respect to content, scholarly inquiry through the 1990’s focused explicitly on why service-learning is important (Erlich, 1995; Giles & Eyler, 1994; Harkavy, 1992; Morse, 1989), how service-learning can be implemented (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996), and what students gain with respect to learning and developmental outcomes (Astin & Sax, 1998; Astin, Sax & Avalos, 1999; Batchelder & Root, 1994; Boss, 1994; Bringle & Kremer, 1994; Cohen & Kinsey, 1994; Corbett & Kendall, 1999; Giles & Eyler, 1994; Markus, Howard & King, 1993; Mabry, 1998; Myers-Lipton, 1998; Potthoff et al., 2000; Sax & Astin, 1997; Wechsler & Fogel, 1995).

However, few scholars address how service-learning closes the divide between rhetoric and practice for today’s generation of college students. Do potentially transformative pedagogies like service-learning work differently for various student populations (e.g., public/private, traditional/non-traditional, and female/male) or across various strata of privilege/power? Does the pedagogy itself enhance students’ ability to learn, grow, and develop during the formative college years? What is the long-term effect or impact of such experiences? Ten years after one has graduated from a liberal
arts curriculum infused with leadership and service, for instance, what has s/he applied? How has s/he made meaning of constructs like responsible leadership and global citizenship? Until the late ‘90’s, moreover, most studies altogether lacked content pertaining to the institution, faculty, or community.

Driscoll (2000) and Astin (2000) identify the gaps in content in their respective publications. *Studying Faculty and Service Learning: Directions for Inquiry and Development* is the title of Driscoll’s (2000) journal publication; while the all-important role of faculty in service-learning is documented, she notes the lack of research on faculty motivations, support requisite for successful service-learning, impacts and influencers of service-learning, satisfaction associated with service-learning, and obstacles/challenges. Driscoll (2000) notes:

Faculty play key roles on campus that affect service-learning’s future. They develop and teach courses, oversee the curriculum, initiate and maintain relationships with students, and design and make many program decisions. Therefore, it is essential to study faculty in the context of service-learning and from multiple perspectives to expand our understanding of their role and direct our support of that role. (p. 36)

Further, Driscoll (2000) calls for a move from anecdotal to empirical evidence; “like so many higher education reforms, we lack the scholarly study of our own work” (p. 39). Research can help address whether service-learning renews teaching, stimulates faculty leadership, presents opportunities for interdisciplinary work, helps faculty make meaning of their – and students’ – learning, and enriches scholarship (Driscoll, 2000).
Not only would such insights seed faculty development efforts, but they could also assist with faculty motivation and retention (Driscoll, 2000).

Astin (2000) expands both the content and representation of service-learning scholarship, noting the lack of research on faculty outcomes. He writes: “While a growing body of anecdotal evidence suggests that teaching service-learning courses can have a transforming effect on college faculty, there has so far been little systematic research on the question of how faculty are actually affected when they teach service-learning courses” (Astin, 2000, p. 101). Applying a four-fold scheme for growth and change, Astin encourages researchers to look at several outcome measures to gauge faculty impact: individual actions (e.g., teaching practices, time allocation), individual consciousness (e.g., beliefs of how students learn, attitudes toward service-learning, personal career plans and intentions), institutional structures (e.g., curriculum, criteria for tenure and promotion), and institutional culture (e.g., shared beliefs about teaching and pedagogy). Astin’s (2000) ideas broaden prospects for inquiry related to the impact of service-learning on faculty.

Representation

First, the majority of what we know about service-learning is reflected in studies about undergraduate college and university students. On the surface, this scholarship appears rich, lively, and informative. Seldom do researchers elicit the voices of those on the margins of our studies, such as the populations served or the community partners who so often assist as co-educators. Importantly, all too little is known about the faculty experience of engaging in service-learning. Hammond (1994) notes that while the scholarship “is burgeoning with exhortations for faculty participation in student service
activities” (p. 21) we know little about the educator’s role in supporting service-learning. How are faculty ‘positioned’ within the service-learning context and how do they ‘position’ themselves? Is the instructor enriched, changed, or impacted through her/his co-engagement with students and community participants? How and why do such experiences matter in the contexts of disciplinary and multidisciplinary agendas?

To date, much of what we know about the faculty experience with service-learning is informed by scholarship on institutional support (Ward, 1996, 1998), faculty motivation and satisfaction (Hammond, 1994), attitudes (Hesser, 1995), and outcomes (Driscoll, Holland, Gelman & Kerrigan, 1996). Identifying a dearth in our understanding of the motivations of faculty who integrate teaching and service, Hammond (1994) conducted a quantitative study on service-learning faculty. The project was intended to realize four goals: identify faculty in Michigan colleges and universities who were teaching service-learning courses; compose a network of service-learning faculty; pull together information about the structure of service-learning courses; and identify factors that motivate, encourage, and/or discourage faculty engagement in service-learning.

Hammond’s (1994) paper elucidates the latter aim. With a 65.2% response rate (n=163) across an array of colleges and universities, the author presented a range of data that affords us significant “insight and understanding about a faculty population that has been previously unpollled” (Hammond, 1994, p. 22).

Hammond (1994) drew three conclusions from the findings. First, those surveyed differed significantly with respect to their motivations for using service-learning. At large, the strongest motivators were inextricably connected to faculty members’ investment in teaching and curriculum development (Hammond, 1994). Second, findings
were synchronous with general research on motivation and satisfaction. That is, the data reflected a general consensus in the faculty development literature; educators are most satisfied when afforded: freedom, autonomy, and control; meaningful and purposeful work; and feedback indicating their work is successful (Hammond, 1994). Finally, the data revealed a relationship between initial motivation and subsequent satisfaction. In essence, “faculty who were ‘very satisfied’ with their efforts in service-learning had been more strongly influenced by pedagogical motivations than they had been by personal or co-curricular motivations” (p. 25). While these data are important, the study does not provide information on (1) faculty who choose not to connect teaching and service; (2) faculty new to service-learning; and 3) faculty experience by demographic (e.g., size or rank of institution, department or discipline, etc.).

Hammond (1994) also touched on faculty dissatisfaction; though “respondents report a high degree of satisfaction and commitment to service-learning, they acknowledge that such efforts are not without difficulties” (p. 26). Pressures and challenges include, but are not limited to: issues of time and task, pedagogical difficulties, tenure and promotion processes, and monetary support. Opening the door to future scholarship, Hammond (1994) implores the reader to expand knowledge around the faculty experience:

A better understanding of the experiences of faculty who have adopted service-learning affords us the opportunity to consider whether this pedagogy might allow faculty members an opportunity to integrate service and teaching, perhaps even allowing an integration of personal commitments with professional expertise...Continuing to discover faculty motivations and sources of satisfaction
and dissatisfaction with service-learning will strengthen our efforts to advance the service-learning agenda at colleges and universities across the nation. (p. 26-27)

Interested in faculty *attitudes* about service-learning, Hesser’s (1995) exploratory study focuses on “what faculty report about the learning outcomes of course embedded service-learning and how faculty attitudes toward field based experiential education have done a significant ‘about face’ in the past decade” (p. 33). His qualitative study is premised on a straightforward assumption: faculty can provide valid, legitimate measures of the learning that transpires in a service-learning classroom (Hesser, 1995). Hesser’s (1995) methodologies – focus groups and interviews with faculty across diverse institutions – deepen the reader’s understanding of those outcomes afforded through experiential, field-based learning. While the detailed results of this study are not germane to this dissertation, the use of the *faculty voice* as observer of the student experience is unique. Though Hesser (1995) explicitly unveils *student* experiences through the lenses of faculty respondents, the educators’ own learning and development become salient. They arrive at the “conclusion that this rediscovered, experiential approach to teaching and pedagogy is resulting in the desired learning outcomes they have for their courses” (p. 36). Further, faculty acknowledge that learning does not occur surreptitiously; rather, outcomes arise when faculty intuitively and consciously apply practices of experiential education to effective teaching (Hesser, 1995).

Hesser’s (1995) closing remarks attest to the importance of learning more about the faculty experience with service-learning. First, he draws the reader back to the foundational work of Schön (1983) and Kolb (1984). Referencing the latter, Hesser (1995) notes that faculty, too, are engaged in cycles of active learning. Educators *try* new
teaching methods, observe and reflect on their experience, make generalizations, and revise prior theorizing about learning, teaching, and engaging. Through active, engaged experimentation, faculty “as well as our students, have become practitioners and beneficiaries of experiential education” (p. 40). Rich opportunities for future studies exist utilizing the work of Schön (1983) on reflective practitioners and Kolb (1984) on experiential education.

Building on the work of Hesser (1995), Driscoll et al. (1996) designed a case study model to assess the impact of service-learning on students, faculty, community, and the institution. Blending qualitative and quantitative measures, the authors fill a gap in the literature: “Currently there are and have been multiple projects focused on student outcomes, but the profession has concentrated little effort toward assessing faculty impact, and has only begun thinking about the process of assessing community impact” (Driscoll et al., 1996, p. 67). Impact variables were developed with each of the four constituencies; to measure these variables, Driscoll et al. (1996) denoted variables, indicators, and measurements. Table 1 presents those variables, indicators, and measurements pertaining to faculty engaged in service-learning.

Essentially, Driscoll et al. (1996) contend that measuring the impact of service-learning requires multiple approaches: in-person assessments (i.e., interviews, focus groups, observations); independent reflection (i.e., journals, pre-post surveys); and review of existing documentation (i.e., syllabi, vitae, institutional reports, activity logs). While the development of their case study model was preliminary at the time the paper was published, they predicted that some of the assessment strategies would prove valuable, while others would not. Most importantly, the case study model was co-developed by
faculty, administrators, students, and community representatives; further, it takes a mixed-methods approach to data gathering and output. Further, the authors’ work bears heuristic implications for other scholars interested in variables, indicators, and measurements that impact the faculty experience with service-learning.

Table 1. **Faculty variables, indicators and measurements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement with community</td>
<td>Quantity/quality of interactions/contacts</td>
<td>Logs, surveys, interview, journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of community</td>
<td>Definition of community, knowledge of history, strengths, problems</td>
<td>Interview, written comments, journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of volunteerism</td>
<td>Valuing personal volunteerism, actual volunteerism</td>
<td>Vita, interview, survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>Influence of community-based learning in conference/seminar attendance</td>
<td>Vita, interview, journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>Influence of community-based learning in articles, presentations, etc.</td>
<td>Vita, artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>Influence of community-based learning in class format, organization, interactions</td>
<td>Class observation, journals, surveys, teaching and learning continuum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/student interaction</td>
<td>Content, variety, frequency, direction</td>
<td>Class observation, journals, teaching and learning continuum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of teaching/learning</td>
<td>Faculty/student roles, outcomes, pedagogy, curriculum</td>
<td>Interview, class observation, syllabus analysis, journals, teaching and learning continuum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role in community-based teaching</td>
<td>Self perceptions of role</td>
<td>Log, interview, survey, journals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1996, Ward was among the first scholars to publish a study on institutional support for service-learning; this bears implications for our understanding of the faculty experience. Using organizational theory as a framework for both methodology and findings, Ward approaches her work from a systems perspective: “If service-learning is to be more than a ‘movement’ it must be integrated into the foundation of the institution. In essence, service, and the role of service in institutional mission, must be considered in the curriculum, student affairs, faculty work, and even fundraising” (p. 57). Drawing from five case studies, the author’s findings yield recurring themes connected to the institutionalizing of service: faculty participation, funding, and leadership for service-learning. Most relevant to my study is faculty participation, without which few strides can be made. While the study presents a resounding claim for the importance of faculty engagement, Ward’s (1996) conclusions are systemically situated. The greatest contribution of Ward’s (1996) study to this dissertation is its recognition of the multiple, interrelated constructs influencing faculty commitment to service-learning.

Ward’s (1996) study opened new avenues for the exploration of the link between academic culture and service-learning. Tying her work to that of Boyer (1990), the author published a follow-up piece in the 1998 issue of New Directions for Teaching and Learning, within which faculty work was brought to the forefront of her analysis. Notably, she beckons the reader to consider these questions: “What does service learning mean? Where does it fit organizationally? What implications does it have for faculty work?” (p. 73). While her piece lacks empiricism, she acknowledges that faculty involvement is among the most significant challenges facing the institutionalization of
service-learning. While faculty members are, at large, arbiters of the curriculum through systems of shared governance, they are reluctant “to participate in work that is not recognized and rewarded by their institution… [and this] cannot be addressed without discussing faculty work and rewards” (p. 76). Invariably, the issues that Ward (1998) highlights – such as research, rewards, tenure and promotion, and departmental affiliation – impact faculty members’ experiences with service-learning.

Abes, Jackson, and Jones (2002) authored one of the most exhaustive and compelling empirical studies of faculty use of service-learning; these scholars pay homage to the work of Hammond (1994) and Hesser (1995), drawing extensively from these and former studies. Their research determines the factors motivating and deterring faculty from using service-learning. Unlike Hammond (1994), Abes et al. (2002) also looked at faculty who do not employ service-learning in their courses. Responses were drawn from over 500 surveys spanning 29 institutions of higher learning affiliated with Ohio Campus Compact. Forty-nine percent indicated engagement with service-learning in their pedagogies; of those who did not utilize service-learning, 27% had not heard of it, 22% had not considered incorporating it into their teaching, and 51% had given thought to incorporating it into their teaching (Abes et al., 2002).

The data analysis and discussion reveal great insight into faculty use of service-learning. First, the data indicate who directly and indirectly encourage faculty to integrate service-learning; they “most frequently received encouragement from other faculty members, with 60% of respondents receiving encouragement from faculty in other departments and 56% from another faculty member in their department” (Abes et al., 2002, p. 8). With faculty, community members and students were among the most
influential encouragers of service-learning. Regarding motivation, those surveyed selected up to three factors from a list of 15; those selected most frequently included increased student understanding of course material, increased student personal development, increased student understanding of social problems, provision of useful service to the community, and creation of university-community partnerships (Abes et al., 2002).

The authors also made note of those factors detracting faculty from using service-learning, such as “time, logistics, and funding; student and community outcomes; reward structure; and comfort with ability to effectively use service-learning” (Abes et al., 2002, p. 10). Strongest deterrents involved the ability to balance and coordinate service-learning. As an interesting aside, only 16.7% indicated tenure and promotion as a potential deterrent; this contradicts much of the anecdotal literature about reward structures. Also, the authors found no statistically significant difference in this question by institutional type, discipline, rank, or gender (Abes et al., 2002).

For those faculty who do not use service-learning, four deterrents surfaced: logistical/coordination concerns, not knowing how to use service-learning, perceived irrelevance of service-learning to coursework, and not being given release time (Abes et al., 2002). Interestingly, variation existed within academic disciplines: “Physical and biological sciences faculty were also strongly deterred by their perception that service-learning is not relevant to the courses they teach. Lack of relevance was also a strong deterrent for respondents from the arts and mathematics, engineering, computer sciences” (p. 12). Again, concerns pertaining to promotion and tenure did not surface for this
category of faculty; this “relative unimportance…is the most apparent difference between this study’s results and the prior literature” (p. 15).

This study bears a range of implications for faculty and service-learning professionals, underscoring the importance of engaging other faculty, community members, and students in recruiting new service-learning faculty (Abes et al., 2002). Also, the data suggest that while service-learning faculty are strongly motivated by student learning outcomes, non service-learning faculty “were deterred by not having evidence that service-learning will increase student learning” (p. 14). These results highlight the importance of engagement between and among all faculty members.

Among the greatest limitations of this study is its overtly quantitative nature; while the data broaden our understanding of the motivations and deterrents of all faculty – those engaged and disengaged from service-learning – no light is shed on the more intimate, potentially transforming effect of service-learning on faculty development, growth, and learning.

The empirical literature turns more deeply to the faculty experience with Bacon’s (2002) qualitative study on the differences between faculty and community partners’ conceptions of learning and knowledge. Data were collected via two focus groups: one comprised of service-learning faculty and the other consisting of staff from community agencies. Thematic analyses revealed interesting foci, intersections, and differences. First, the groups differed “in their representation of the movement from not-knowing to knowing, with faculty demonstrating more commitment to the idea of expertise and to their own identity as experts” (Bacon, 2002, p. 37). Faculty asserted their knowledge in three areas: having knowledge of the community, understanding teaching as process-
oriented, and holding disciplinary expertise. While staff members valued expertise, they viewed expert knowledge as resident in higher education – the province of faculty and graduate students (Bacon, 2002). When considering their own learning, they viewed it as life-long, grounded in experience over expertise. In short, “...the faculty had a greater investment in the idea of expertise – an endpoint in the learning process, achieved through study – while the community partners tended to speak about learning as being continually achieved through experience” (p. 38).

The data also revealed differences across groups and between faculty in the means and ends of learning. Community partners conceptualized learning as knowing how to solve social problems (Bacon, 2002); this view was concurrent with theories expressed by the special education and social work faculty. On the other hand, humanities faculty viewed service-learning as the means to enhance course theories. Yet another difference arose in how faculty and community partners conceptualized learning. While faculty considered learning to be an individual achievement, staff conceptualized learning as collective (Bacon, 2002). Though faculty valued the process of collaborative, collective engagement, learning is ultimately individualistic. In all, Bacon (2002) typified faculty conceptions as cognitivist, focusing “on symbolic representations of knowledge and the growth of individual understanding” (p. 43). Community partners, on the other hand, embraced situated learning theory, wherein collective learning is critical and eminent.

As a qualitative study, these results can be neither generalized nor tested for significance (Bacon, 2002). Still, the study creates new space in the literature for qualitative, constructivist research. Also, it informs our understanding of how faculty members and community partners – both vital in students’ educative processes – make
meaning of knowledge and learning. Still, we learn little about how using service-learning impacts faculty. Several years later, Pribbenow (2005) inhabits this divide with a qualitative study on the impact of service-learning pedagogy on faculty teaching and learning.

Pribbenow’s (2005) study excels in its ability to achieve both depth and breadth. The study questions how service-learning pedagogy impacts faculty, more explicitly how “implementation of this approach affects faculty teaching and learning” (p. 25). Rooting his design in an embedded case study model, Pribbenow (2005) conducted semi-structured interviews with 35 faculty members at a mid-sized public institution. Sampling criteria included: use of service-learning within the past three semesters, department and discipline, academic rank, and gender. To expand or illuminate those perspectives gained from faculty, Pribbenow interviewed three campus administrators and included limited data sources: syllabi, materials, institutional documents, and observation.

Pribbenow’s (2005) findings take the form of six themes, described as “…interpretation of [teachers’] voices describing the ways in which using service-learning pedagogy shaped and influenced their understandings of, and approaches to, teaching and learning” (p. 27). These themes involved (1) more meaningful engagement in and commitment to teaching; (2) deeper connections and relationships with students as learners and individuals; (3) enhanced knowledge of student learning processes and outcomes; (4) increased use of constructivist teaching and learning approaches; (5) improved communication of theoretical concepts; and (6) greater involvement in a community of teachers and learners (pp. 28-33). Overall, this study affords benefits to
“those who participate in, coordinate, and support innovative pedagogy in higher education” (p. 35). Though not the ultimate aim of his study, the author addresses the need for future research to “determine the factors that shape how faculty are affected by using service-learning pedagogy” (p. 36).

Narrative and Conceptual Work

For the most part, quantitative research continues to drive scholarly agendas in academe. Few scholars have applied phenomenology, grounded theory, situational analysis, or action research to service-learning and faculty development. Even rarer are the deep, insightful, and methodologically relevant designs that Greene and Caracelli (1997) reveal in Advances in Mixed-Method Evaluation. The work of scholars like Bacon (2002) and Pribbenow (2005) enhance and make robust our knowledge of service-learning faculty members’ experiences, conceptions, and outcomes. In years to come, one would hope that emergent scholar-practitioners will deepen, broaden, challenge, and support this and other work.

Still, the literature abounds with conceptual pieces, published in Change, Liberal Education, and other journals. Often, these are the portals within which the darker and rawer sides of service-learning are shared. In a piece entitled Linking Service-learning and the Academy, for instance, Zlotkowski (1996), laments the seemingly peripheral role of service-learning in academe. While he applauds growing faculty interest in linking students’ cognitive, affective, and moral development through community-based practices, he notes contradictory phenomena, such as the record increase of service-learning despite its lack of institutionalization. This gap between acceptance and assimilation should not detract educators from moving forward; Zlotkowski (1996)
recognizes the importance of strategic adjusting. The author calls for service-learning to transition, philosophically, from a broadly applicable model (e.g., “one size fits all”) to one grounded rigorously in disciplinary and inter-disciplinary goals. Also, Zlotkowski (1996) heeds the importance of connecting service-learning with other institutional reform efforts, most notably the evolution of the professoriate in the context of Boyer’s spheres.

An article by Lott and Michelmore (1997), published in Liberal Education, presents two faculty members’ reflection on learning through service. The authors admit service-learning “is time-consuming, disruptive, and occasionally controversial for all involved… [but] in promoting its benefits, we need to be clear and convincing for faculty members to undertake this new pedagogy” (p. 40). To the authors, service-learning brings learning to life; it transforms the student experience, bringing even the weakest or most average students from the margins of discourse to the center of learning. In turn, their learning creates ripple effects, impacting the learning of other students. Students become the teachers; further, the educator becomes part of the classroom (Lott & Michelmore, 1997). Not only does service-learning render material more tangible and concrete, but it also invites students to question deeply their values, beliefs, biases, and privileges. In the courses Lott and Michelmore (1997) describe, service-learning transformed both undergraduate behavior and classroom dynamics. In turn, the authors’ own teaching and learning was impacted deeply.

Founder of the Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, Howard (1998) explores the counternormative challenges of service-learning in a piece published for New Directions for Teaching and Learning. Noting the explosion of faculty interest
in service-learning, Howard (1998) observed the following phenomenon in his work with fellow educators: “Some see service learning as a way to prepare students for active citizenship. Others perceive it as a means to involve universities in socially responsible action. Still others find it a panacea for the perceived shortcomings of the information-dissemination model that prevails in higher education” (p. 21). Howard’s (1998) work is relevant and exciting in its insistence that service-learning “clearly ‘raises the pedagogical bar’” (p. 23) for students and faculty. Both are pushed beyond what Freire (1970) typified as the *banking model*, within which courses are structured, uniform, routine, and standardized (Howard, 1998). No longer is learning an individualistic enterprise; instead, students engaged in service-learning take ownership and responsibility for their own – and others’ – engagement.

In a particularly intriguing statement, Howard (1998) remarks that in order to create a classroom congruent with the goals of service-learning, deprogramming and resocialization are imminent: “[These require] that the instructor and the students *travel together* on a journey to remake the classroom” (p. 25). Howard models this journey in Figure 2. Stage one is most common to college and university classrooms; to initiate transformation, “the instructor must begin to carry out her or his role in an intentionally counternormative way” (p. 26). Still, this requires reforming (stage two) for students; the instructor must intentionally and consistently message the importance of active, engaged learning. By stage three, students have taken greater responsibility for their learning; ironically, problems often arise for faculty who may have grown accustomed to being seen as authority or expert figures (Howard, 1998). At stage four, the *performing* stage, the “consistency between the students’ and instructors’ respective new roles and ways of
learning lead to enhanced teaching-learning performance” (p. 26). Essentially, Howard (1998) provides us with a fascinating heuristic device; his model provides insight and depth into the many dimensions of student and, most critically, faculty experiences.


Through the early 2000’s, the number of opinion pieces on service-learning continued to grow; lacking empiricism, they neither proved hypotheses nor elucidated the lifeworlds of those engaged in service-learning. O’Byrne (2001), for instance, wrote a piece geared toward faculty who serve as advocates of service-learning; she offers a set of challenges and solutions for institutional partnerships ranging from incorporating...
service-learning across the disciplines to adding salience to existing definitions of 

service-learning. This type of “primer” is relevant, but all too common in the popular 
literature. Further, these pieces do not always reach the broadest of audiences.

Whereas quantitative research favors a postpositivist approach to developing 
knowledge, qualitative inquiry builds knowledge claims “based primarily on 
constructivist perspectives (i.e., the multiple meanings of individual experiences, 
meanings socially and historically constructed, with an intent of developing a theory of 
pattern) or advocacy/participatory perspectives” (Creswell, 2003, p. 18). Given the 
inherently constructivist nature of service-learning, for instance, qualitative inquiry is 
well-suited for advancing our knowledge of these areas. Still, empirically grounded 
qualitative inquiry regarding service-learning and the inner experience of faculty is 
sparse; though there exists a plethora of anecdotal and non-empirical pieces, few scholars 
have applied methodologically rigorous qualitative approaches (e.g., grounded theory, 
phenomenology, etc.).

Faculty Learning and Development

The vast literature on faculty learning and development further sensitizes and 

informs our understanding of the educators’ inner experience. A detailed culling of the 

scholarship on faculty learning and development reveals several themes, including the 
evolution and utility of faculty development programs (Boice, 2000; Camblin & Steger, 
2000; Gaff, 1994; Millis, 1994; Watson & Grossman, 1994), effective approaches to new 
faculty development (Boice, 1991, 1992, 2000; Colbeck, 2000; Finkelstein & LaCelle-
Peterson, 1992; Pittas, 2000; Sorcinelli, 1994), the role of academic departments in 
promoting faculty learning (DiLorenzo & Heppner, 1994; Swain, 1994), and faculty
development as a holistic phenomenon (Hilsen, 1990; Mintz, 1999; Zahorski, 2002). Also connected are models of human development, some of which apply explicitly to the faculty experience (Kegan, 1994; Mezirow, 1991).

Paralleling the *Scholarship Reconsidered* movement, most colleges and universities offer *faculty development* programs, ranging from informal to sophisticated, designed to support faculty growth in their interconnected roles as educators, scholars, and citizens (Gaff, 1994). However, little emphasis will be given in this review to the enactment of faculty development through departments, disciplines, institutes, seminars, and learning centers. More overtly, this section will focus on the theoretical underpinnings, concepts, and models framing faculty members’ learning, development, and transformation. Herein, the research is scattered. The section begins with Cranton’s (1994) reframed conception of faculty development, which ties together self-directed (Brookfield, 1986; Candy, 1991; Knowles, 1980) and transformative learning models (Mezirow, 1991). Given the dearth of recent theoretical literature on faculty learning and development, we later explore Kegan’s (1994) work on adult development for its implications and connections to the faculty experience.

Critiquing the seemingly superficial and prescriptive approaches to faculty development employed by institutions of higher education, Cranton (1994) acknowledges “the lack of a coherent and comprehensive theoretical foundation for the field” (p. 727). Reframing faculty development, Cranton (1994) connects the processes of self-directed learning (Brookfield, 1986; Candy, 1991; Knowles, 1980) to Mezirow’s theory of transformative learning. In theory and practice, the two are inseparable (Cranton, 1994). Self-directed learning derives from the assumption that adult learners favor self-direction
as a goal and a process (Candy, 1991). So, “self-directed faculty development would have as underlying assumptions that faculty are personally autonomous; would seek to foster faculty self-management of their learning about teaching; would turn over responsibility for decision making to faculty; and would encourage and act as a resource for noninstitutional learning pursuits” (Cranton, 1994, p. 729). Yet faculty do not view themselves in this light; the former model would require transformation in their conception of teaching, learning, teacher, and learner (Cranton, 1994). Consequently, Mezirow (1991) enters the picture.

A constructivist theory of adult learning and development, Mezirow’s (1991) theory of transformative learning presents a comprehensive, idealized model of how adults learn, develop, and change. Both inter- and intra-disciplinary, the model explains how adult learners’ assumptions and expectations – framed within cultural, social, and historic realities – influence meaning-making and change. In adulthood, one’s preconceived assumptions, values, and beliefs – also known as meaning schemes – are continually challenged (Mezirow, 1991). Meaning perspective is the collection of meaning schemes or broader frame of reference comprised of theories, propositions, and evaluations about the world; simply stated, habits of mind and points of view co-create one’s meaning perspective (Mezirow, 1991). As the learner assimilates his or her experience, perspective is reinforced or challenged; perspective transformation occurs when one revises his or her scheme, shifting perspective or paradigm. Further, learning grows more sophisticated as the learner gains awareness of his or her assumptions, revising and revisiting these assumptions in the context of personal reflection: “Rather than merely adapting to changing circumstances by more diligently applying old ways of
knowing, [adults] discover a need to acquire new perspectives in order to gain a more compete understanding of changing events and a higher degree of control in their lives” (p. 2).

Transformative catalysts known as disorienting dilemmas exist outside of the learner’s conceived schemes about the world. Often, disorienting dilemmas trigger one’s reappraisal of assumptions, biases, and suppositions; the potentially ensuing perspective transformation creates a more inclusive, reflective, and integrated paradigm (Mezirow, 1996). The learner’s own experience, seen as socially constructed, creates the container for subsequent reflection, assessment, exploration, and reintegration (Mezirow, 1991, 1996). In critical self-reflection, the adult questions the validity of his/her assumptions and biases; often and in tandem with disorientation, this process evokes change in the lens through which the learner views the world (Mezirow, 1991). Importantly, “transformative learning is not complete without the individual acting on the revised assumptions” (Cranton, 1994, p. 740).

Germaine to Cranton’s (1994) analysis are the psychological, sociolinguistic, and epistemic perspectives through which adults make meaning of the world (Mezirow, 1991). Faculty members employ “a psychological perspective on themselves as educators; they work within the norms of their organization as well as social and cultural norms; and they have an epistemic or knowledge-based perspective on what effective teaching is and the style they prefer” (Cranton, 1994, p. 731). Through critical self-reflection, moreover, faculty become aware of meaning perspectives and potential distortions, creating conceptual space for learning, development, and transformation. Cranton’s (1994) reframing suggests an adherence to self-direction while recognizing
“(1) that faculty have a set of basic assumptions about teaching that guides their practice, and (2) that change in teaching practice will be a product of revisions of those assumptions” (p. 738). Challenges to teaching and learning, further, may arise from many dimensions – such as the self (i.e., in the context of critical self-reflection) and others (e.g., disorienting dilemmas).

The work of Robert Kegan (1994), author of In Over our Heads: The Mental Demands of Modern Life, presents another ‘lens’ on adult development. Kegan’s work exists at the juncture of psychosocial and cognitive theories of human development. Importantly, Kegan (1994) views people as organizers of their own life experiences; learning is “about the organizing principle we bring to our thinking and our feelings and our relating to others and our relating to parts of ourselves” (p. 29). His theory is premised upon five principles of increasing mental complexity: 1st level (Fantasy), 2nd level (Concrete-operational), 3rd level (Traditionalism), 4th level (Modernism), and 5th level (Postmodernism). Those orders most applicable to adult development are traditionalism, modernism, and postmodernism; while an estimated one half to two thirds of adults has yet to reach modernism, the inherent complexities of the world require fourth and fifth-order consciousness (Kegan, 1994).

Several features are important to our understanding of adult development. First, mental complexity is not just about how one thinks, but also about how one relates and connects (Kegan, 1994). Further, knowing “that someone is in the grip of the second principle tells us a lot about how he or she thinks or feels, but it doesn’t really tell us anything about what he or she thinks or feels” (p. 32). The ‘subject-object’ relationship is germane to Kegan’s theory. ‘Object’ to us are those things “we can reflect upon,
handle, look at, be responsible for, relate to each other, take control of, internalize, assimilate, or otherwise operate upon” (p. 32). ‘Subject’ to us are elements to which we are tied/embedded but neither in control of or able to operate upon (Kegan, 1994). Mental complexity develops as one shifts in meaning making from subject to object.

As humans develop, knowing is first organized into durable, disparate, and concrete categories. Enhanced mental complexity, cross-categorical knowing, enables the subordination of one’s own preference, habit, or ability in order to hold a similar or contrary perspective rendered or known by another. In young adults, the evolving of cross-categorical knowing marks the evolution from level two to level three. Many traditionally aged college students may be found in the third level, able to subordinate the ‘concrete’ and think, feel, and relate abstractly. In turn, this habit of mind “establishes the person as a citizen, one capable of joining a community as a fellow participant rather than as a ward who must be watched over for his own good and the good of those around him” (p. 288). Still, those in the third level may find themselves in over their heads, where “they need not just acquisition but also transformation, not just more facts but also metamorphosis” (Tagg, 2004, p. 8). With this in mind, Kegan (1994) advocates for an integrated curriculum wherein “the gradual growth of the mind from categorical to cross-categorical consciousness need not award victory to either ‘side’ [of teaching] but could instead clarify a common enterprise hospitable to both” (p. 50).

Meanwhile, educators are likely developing, learning, and growing alongside of their students. While Kegan (1994) does not discuss parallel developmental patterns of faculty and students, connections can be drawn. Within the third order, for instance, role consciousness abounds; the third order faculty and the third order student would likely
operate from their prescribed roles (i.e., teacher or student) in the social setting. One might surmise that the third-order classroom is one within which roles are relatively affixed; the faculty member, by virtue of her role in the institutional milieu, is responsible for curriculum delivery.

In the fourth order, one begins to understand herself irrespective of societal ‘truths’ and cultural mores; when faced with discord or discomfort, she has the capacity to engage in deep reflection and arbitrate her own reality (Kegan, 1994). Kegan would view the fourth order faculty member as self-authoring, able to see herself across various roles – teacher, learner, researcher, student, and so on. While the traditionalist faculty member is likely role-bound and self-defined by third-party expectations, the modernist negotiates sense of self through more abstract renderings. Kegan (2004) describes this distinction:

No one has fourth order consciousness at birth…It is qualitatively more complex because it takes [values, beliefs, convictions] as objects or elements of its system, rather than as the system itself; it does not identify with them but views them as parts of a new whole. This new whole is an ideology, an internal identity, a self-authorship that can coordinate, integrate, act upon, or invent values, beliefs, convictions, generalizations, ideals, abstractions, interpersonal loyalties, and intrapersonal states. (p. 185).

Through a series of mixed-methods, longitudinal research, Kegan (1994) reminds his readers that levels of mental complexity are developmental. One in the second order cannot be taught fourth order thinking; instead, “they have to ‘outgrow’ the second order and, even then, have to pass through the third order before they can organize the world in


a fourth order way” (p. 187). Preliminary research reveals incremental, “extraordinarily gradual” (p. 188) changes in adults’ mental complexity from year to year. Widespread is the phenomenon of being in over one’s head; studies show that while the fourth order of consciousness is requisite for adult success, both representative and advantaged (i.e., privileged, well educated) samples of adults have not fully reached this order (Kegan, 1994).

The workplace provides fertile ground for adult development. The ‘role’ of employee or worker – like any other role – brings with it a range of expectations drawn from cultural norms and socialization factors. These expectations or attributes include the following: to invent or own one’s work; to be self-initiating, self-correcting, self-evaluating; to be guided by one’s own visions at work; to take responsibility for what happens externally and internally; to be accomplished masters of one’s particular work roles, jobs, or careers; and to conceive of the organization from the ‘outside in’, as a whole (Kegan, 1994, pp. 152-153). While few employees actually invent their own jobs, Kegan (1994) says there is a sentiment of ownership conveyed in or through one’s position regardless of hierarchy. As one’s mental complexity develops, however, s/he “demonstrates the capacity to distinguish between people’s social power in an organization and their psychological power to define who owns the work” (Kegan, 1994, p. 157). The ability to make meaning of these different power positions reflects a developed, internal psychological capacity that transcends position, social status, salary, and so on. This meaning-making is automatic; these “moves we make to neutralize what we experience as unbalancing forces reveal not the commitments we have but those that have us, those with which we are identified” (pp. 161-162).
To add further complexity to his analysis, Kegan (1994) differentiates between informational and transformational views of work-related development. The informational view is skills-based; it presumes one can change what people know or experience through incremental training (Kegan, 1994). The form (e.g., one’s mind) is not changed itself, but its skill set is altered. On the other hand, transformational development “places the form itself at risk for change and focuses on changes in how people know; it is essentially an educational model for personal change” (p. 164). Rooted in Latin, education entails leading from; training gives the worker additional knowledge while education “leads us out of or liberates us from one construction or organization of mind in favor of a larger one” (Kegan, 1994, p. 164). The modern workplace is consumed with skills-based training programs; what is lacking, on the other hand, are opportunities for employees to cultivate new levels of consciousness. Kegan (1994) argues for a mode of education that transgresses constructivist and traditional education, providing “support to modernity’s order of consciousness” (p. 287).

In essence, contemporary adult culture is irrefutably defined by three mentalities – traditional, modern, and postmodern (Kegan, 1994). Rarely achieved is the latter, where one’s conception of self is socially constructed and holistically conceptualized through her interactions in the world. This order “moves form or system from subject to object, and brings into being a new ‘trans-system’ or ‘cross-form’ way of organizing reality” (p. 312). Herein, a faculty member would see herself – and her work – beyond one single role, self, system, or form regardless of external pressures or demands.

Though nuanced and often difficult to grasp, Kegan’s (1994) model presents a fairly exhaustive rendering of developmental orders of mental complexity. From the
outside looking in, one can apply these models to faculty development over time. One begins to understand, also, that *most* adults make meaning of the world through their connected, intertwined social roles across various milieus (e.g., work, parenting, marriage, etc.). A faculty member in the third order of consciousness is bound by others’ opinions and expectations. While a fourth order educator is cognizant of her roles, her work is self-authoring and she is able to make meaning independent of perceived expectations or truths. The uncommon educator of fifth order consciousness is self-authoring, yet her sense of self is wholly independent from roles and identifies; that is, self is created and constantly evolving through iterative and reflexive interactions with others and the environment (Kegan, 1994).

While the literature on adult development is multifaceted, the work of Cranton (1994), Mezirow (1991), and Kegan (1994) presents concepts and processes relative to the inner experience of faculty engaged in service-learning. When we consider ‘what all is happening’ with faculty engaged in potentially transforming experiences, this scholarship offers layered insight into what happens behind the scenes (i.e., within the faculty members’ conscious and unconscious inner development). Cranton (1994) sensitizes our awareness of the inherent connection between self-directed and transformative learning in faculty development. While we often assume faculty favor self-direction in both process and outcome, most – until transformed – are role-bound (Cranton, 1994; Kegan, 1994). Such transformation, notes Mezirow (1991), is prompted by disorienting dilemmas – which change one’s assumptions, biases, and suppositions. In Kegan’s (1994) analysis, such transformation entails movement from one order to the
next; various dilemmas and experiences – especially those linked to the workplace – shape this development over time.

While the literature on service-learning does not refer to ‘impact’ or ‘change’ using the above mentioned language of adult learning, these areas are connected. Service-learning provides ripe opportunities for disorienting dilemmas. In both process and content, those engaged in service-learning are pulled into indeterminate zones as they encounter and work with people of diverse backgrounds and abilities, sites within which ‘chaos’ is often the norm, and practices with few ‘formal’ linkages to textbook theories. Often a chasm exists between the student or faculty member’s expectations of service-learning and the needs of community partners; this alone can prompt disorienting dilemmas in some while for others, resiliency and adaptability come naturally. Since the inner, developmental experiences of faculty engaged in service-learning are complex, nuanced, and multifaceted, no two dilemmas are the same in this socially constructed reality. Loss of control over the ‘formal’ classroom might detract some faculty members from trying service-learning; for others, a disorienting dilemma of this nature might ultimately enrich, provoke, and inform their personal and professional work.

Summary

In grounded theory research, the purpose and scope of the literature review has been subject to much debate. Originally, the founders of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glaser, 1978) advocated for delaying the literature review until after the analysis was completed; they cautioned researchers against building theory in the context of extant, received knowledge claims. Later, Strauss and Corbin (1990) gave voice to the inherent, deep perspective each researcher brings to analysis; regardless of where the
literature review exists in any given research trajectory, no scholar is tabula rasa in her arena of inquiry. Today, constructivist scholars like Charmaz (2006) encourage grounded theorists to locate their work within the literature and, upon analysis, return to the literature for insight and application:

The trick is to use [the literature review] without letting it stifle your creativity or strangle your theory. The literature review can serve as an opportunity to set the stage for what you do in subsequent sections or chapters. Analyze the most significant works… Assess and critique the literature from this vantage point.

Your literature review can do more work for you than merely list, summarize, and synthesize major works. (p. 166)

In concert with these and other recommended protocols for constructivist grounded theory research, this literature review develops our awareness, understanding, and insight into the historic and contemporary dimensions, factors, and perspectives connected to educators’ inner experience of engaging with undergraduates in service-learning experiences. The literature critiqued is qualitative, quantitative, positivist, constructivist, conceptual, and/or theoretical; further, the research is largely interdisciplinary, drawn from faculty, staff members, policy-makers, and even students across various sectors and fields. Since exhausting the literature is an artifact of positivist inquiry, this review expands rather than constricts our theoretical vantage points. Its purpose is not to cast a critique on what is yet discovered, but to illuminate opportunities for vigorous, doctoral-level research on areas within which very little is known.

The literature reveals that the study of the faculty experience from the inside out has been infrequent. Much of what we know about the faculty experience is systemically
situated, connected to the literature on academe, scholarship, and faculty priorities. And while the service-learning scholarship is laden with insights pertaining to undergraduate growth and development, the faculty perspective is often missed. Turning to the literature on the *inner* experience (i.e., scholarship on human development as it pertains to faculty, however, helps us understand – through constructivist lenses – the cognitive, affective, and behavioral growth adults experience over time. Further, we begin to connect developmental shifts to *transforming* experiences such as disorienting dilemmas experienced with, through, and alongside undergraduate students who are engaged in service-learning. These gaps create areas of theoretical sensitivity for this dissertation study and serve as rationale for Chapter Three, which presents a detailed overview of the methodology employed in the study.
Chapter Three: Design of the Study

Through constructivist grounded theory, situational mapping, and dimensional analysis, this dissertation explored the inner experience of faculty members engaged in service-learning with undergraduate students at a small, private liberal arts institution. The chosen methodology was designed to illuminate ‘what all is happening’ (Schatzman, 1991) in the experience of faculty members reflecting on their engagement in one or more service-learning practices linked to their teaching curricula (e.g., anthropological field studies of poverty and homelessness, environmental restoration of marine habitat for a biology course, etc.). Essentially, the study sought to give voice to educators’ inner experiences, including those with which the participant may not initially be aware. In many cases, participants reported not having explored deeply his or her own experience until invited to do so as part of this study. Given the dearth of empirical scholarship relative to this topic, the study was exploratory, reflecting my desire to enhance, expand, and deepen our collective understanding of the faculty experience.

Data for this study were collected over a six month time period, commencing January, 2008. This study’s loci were the voiced experiences of 20 participants engaged in service-learning at a small, private college located in Central Florida. Sources of data included (1) 22 in-depth, recorded and coded interviews of 50-90 minutes each; (2) archival and current artifacts (e.g., quantitative and qualitative data on service-learning and faculty development initiatives, mission statement and strategic plan, etc.); and (3) observation, memos, and field notes from a campus forum on transformative education and a regional conference on service-learning and civic engagement. Interviews were conducted and coded in three consecutive phases. Various iterations of situational maps
were drawn to identify the various social and political forces of the institutional context in which the participants worked. In tandem, the dimensional and situational analyses inform the development of theoretical propositions presented and discussed in Chapter Five.

As an organizing principle, this chapter is divided into two key sections: (1) Methodological Fit and (2) Method of the Study. *Methodological Fit* investigates the underlying principles of constructivist research, epistemological bases of grounded theory (i.e., symbolic interactionism), and distinctions between and among derivations of grounded theory (e.g., dimensional analysis). This section concludes with commentary on the criteria requisite for ensuring credibility, originality, resonance, and usefulness. Together, these sub-sections build a case for ‘fit’ between the research question, culture of inquiry, and chosen method. Subsequently, *Method of the Study* presents a comprehensive, concrete outline for how the study was conducted relative to participant selection, data collection, and analysis of data. As is common in constructivist, qualitative inquiry, this subsection explores how situation of self – the voice, experiences, and biases I brought to the research – inevitably influenced the study.

**Methodological Fit**

*Underlying Principles of Constructivist Research*

To explore ‘what all is happening’ in a faculty member’s experience, constructivist grounded theory and dimensional analysis present a cogent, intertwined methodological approach. The origin of this approach is distinct, revealed in the evolving natures of qualitative and constructivist inquiry. Throughout, scholars straddle multiple paradigms: the modern, the post-positivist, the post-modern, and their inherent,
nuanced differences. Indeed, twenty-first century researchers face unprecedented, complex societal issues that require multidimensional approaches within which one truth, direction, or reality ceases to exist. In a world of increasing complexity, change, and chaos, a new epoch of inquiry has emerged – one that projects our thinking beyond the confines of the positivist, rational framework that has dominated academe for decades (Bentz & Shapiro, 1998; Schwandt, 1996). While the Cartesian vision of truth and certainty linger, “contingency, fallibilism, dialogue, and deliberation mark our way of being in the world” (Schwandt, 1996, p. 59). New worldviews bring about novel paradigms for inquiry.

While traditionalists inquire on human action, the new frontier is contingent upon “inquiry with human actors” (Schwandt, 1996, p. 63). Further, Bentz and Shapiro (1998) heed the researcher to situate her scholarship within a culture of inquiry; this approach is employed in this dissertation study. Inquiry, in its deepest form, is dynamic, evolving, and mindful. When engaged in inquiry, the inquirer inhabits various roles – sharer of wisdom, host of knowledge, and purveyor of narrative. Schön (1995) attests to our “varied topography of professional practice” (p. 2), wherein inquiry reflects one’s immersion into the world of imprecise, unpredictable queries. Inquiry, therefore, mirrors that which is indeterminate, complex, and uncertain (Schön, 1995). A culture of inquiry, then, is “a chosen modality of working within a field, an applied epistemology or working model of knowledge used in explaining or understanding reality” (p. 83).

While the culture of inquiry is situated as part of a greater family of research approaches (Bentz & Shapiro, 1998), the research tradition is “an evolving body of inquiry into a particular topic using a particular method” (p. 85). Within each culture and
tradition exist predominant research methods; these methods respond to the discipline in which the inquiry is associated (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). While the culture of inquiry presents a “general approach to studying the world” (Bentz & Shapiro, 1998, p. 88), the research tradition provides us with methods – concrete ways to observe, explore, and describe phenomena.

This dissertation study of educators’ inner experiences of engaging in service-learning contexts is inherently interdisciplinary, rooted in the complexity of the participants’ experiences and the situations within which these experiences transpire. While opportunities abound for grounding of this study in more than one culture of inquiry, the chosen design is informed by a constructivist approach situated in a sociological culture of inquiry, symbolic interactionism. Inextricably intertwined, constructivist grounded theory, dimensional analysis, and situational analysis are research traditions born from this culture.

Introduction to Grounded Theory, Dimensional Analysis, and Situational Analysis

Broadly, constructivist methods enable us to enter the world of the research participant, to “look at their world through their eyes…and, to our best ability, understanding, although we may not agree with them” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 19). Aptly stated, Charmaz (2006) contends that the role of the grounded theorist is to learn what is happening in research participants’ inner lives. This viewpoint presents the scholar with the opportunity to follow new leads, add new lenses, and reshape the data collection as analysis deepens (Charmaz, 2006). In essence, constructivist grounded theory emphasizes flexible guidelines within a set of heuristic principles.
Inherently constructivist, dimensional analysis offers nuanced tools to understanding the inimitable, personal experience of an educator. Developed by Schatzman (1991), dimensional analysis presents a set of grounded theory procedures and epistemological assumptions aligned closely with my interest in studying the ‘voicing’ of educators’ inner experiences. In brief, Schatzman makes explicit the importance of dimensionality, “…a property and variety of human thinking that turns language towards interrogative and analytic processes…[and] affords an understanding – learned and grounded in past problematic experience – that any phenomenon is more complex than any single name or meaning for it” (p. 309). Dimensionality, then, provides an understanding into the contexts, attributes, and implications of participants’ experiences in service-learning. The researcher looks to ‘what all is happening’ in a given perspective; for instance, educators’ experiences represent multiple perspectives, which are laden with dimensions and sub-dimensions (Schatzman, 1991).

Just as any one phenomenon is inherently complex (Schatzman, 1991), so are the contexts within which language, thinking, and behavior are manifest. Herein, situational analysis allows for the extraction and mapping of core, unspoken, and tacit contextual elements. Situational mapping emerged in this study as an analytic tool for charting discourse, drawing connections between and among emergent data, and refining an understanding of those contexts/conditions co-shaping the dimensional matrices.

Symbolic-interactionism.

As noted above, grounded theory is a qualitative research tradition within which theory is constructed from participants’ voice and experience. Symbolic-interactionism, a social-psychological theory of social action (Blumer, 1969; Mead, 1934), is among the
cultures of inquiry that informed the development of grounded theory. A reaction to the grand theories of functionalism in sociology, symbolic-interactionism focuses theoretically on the individual as opposed to the system. Bowers (1988) notes that the “direction of analysis is from the individual up through social groups, organizations, and institutions rather than from the system down through the parts to the individual role” (p. 36). Rooted in Chicago school pragmatism, symbolic-interactionism is organized around three interdependent constructs: the self, the world, and social action. Humans act toward objects (i.e., human, non-human, material, and immaterial) according to their meaning(s); conversely, meanings are constructed through social interaction (Blumer, 1969). Stated succinctly, reality is constructed socially. Moreover, the self is a social self composed of the ‘I’ – reflector – and the ‘me’ – object of self reflection (Mead, 1934).

Essentially, symbolic-interactionism responded to and reacted against functionalism, which asserted that the social world is a system within which humans are functional parts. Divorced from the whole, the part has neither meaning nor value. Within the context of a functionalist world, then, the human is an actor, destined to fulfill a role in life’s grand narrative (Bowers, 1988). Further, s/he exists to maintain the social system. Bowers (1988) offers this contrast between the functionalist and symbolic-interactionist perspectives:

If the interactionist posits a self which is fundamentally social, created through the internalization of social cues, how then is this different from Parson’s “black box” or “empty vessel?” The answer can be found in the second component of the self, the “I.” The I is the active, interactive, dynamic, interpreting component of the self…Rather than simply taking on a role by internalizing external
expectations, the self is the accumulation of all previously experienced social interaction as interpreted and synthesized by the I…Because the I is an interpreting process rather than an objective structure, the self is fundamentally a process. (pp. 37-38)

In this dissertation study, symbolic-interactionism presents a good theoretical fit for an exploration of the individual experience of faculty members; emphasis is placed on the meaning making derived from the interactions, encounters, and learning experiences of faculty members within the transforming contexts of service-learning. Chapters Four and Five unveil the dynamic interplay between the faculty ‘self’ and its interactions with and interpretations of social and human objects in the milieu of academe.

*The postmodern turn: grounded theory, dimensional analysis, and situational analysis.*

Just as symbolic-interactionism arose from scholars’ discontent with a dominant culture of inquiry, grounded theory as a research tradition was spawned from similar convictions. Grounded theory is inherently inductive; theory is developed from inquiry grounded in participant experience, rather than testable hypotheses that come from theories derived from positivistic research. Developed and advanced by scholars Glaser and Strauss (1967), grounded theory, in one regard, reflects Strauss’s background in Chicago school pragmatism, symbolic interactionism, and field research/ethnography. On the other hand, pragmatism is met by a seemingly divergent tradition: Glaser’s rigorous, positivist background at Columbia University. So, grounded theory is imbued with both “dispassionate empiricism, rigorous codified methods, emphasis on emergent discoveries, and its somewhat ambiguous specialized language” and “notions of human
agency, emergent processes, social and subjective meanings, problem-solving practices, and the open-ended study of action” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 7).

From grounded theory’s conception in the mid-60s through today, the theory-methods package has evolved considerably, perhaps to the chagrin of one of its founders, Glaser. Much of grounded theory’s methodological development has been wrought with tensions derived from its competing foundational paradigms. From 1965 through the mid-1990s, for instance, Strauss, Glaser, and their contemporaries published a series of books and research articles, staking intermittent and often divergent claims to the emergence of grounded theory. While Strauss readied himself to embrace post-positivism and the onset of constructivism, Glaser held steady to his positivist roots. Their open, often acerbic disagreements throughout the 1990s were manifest in keynote addresses and scholarly publications.

Among those scholars responsible for edging grounded theory around the postmodern turn were Schatzman, Charmaz, and Clarke. A colleague of Strauss and Glaser, Schatzman (1991) introduced dimensional analysis as “a methodological approach to the grounding of theory in qualitative research” (p. 303). Though its methods are consistent with traditional grounded theory, dimensional analysis makes explicit a theory of natural analysis, the “normative cognitive process generally used by people to interpret and understand problematic experiences or phenomena” (Kools et al., 1996, p. 314). Bearing great importance to Schatzman’s (1991) work was his interest in locating a theory of analysis that expounded processes occurring within and outside of the research context; he critiqued extant scholarship for its inability to structurally link “the analyses involved in both research and common interpretive acts” (p. 304).
What appears to have informed Schatzman (1991) the most was his own field experience: the teaching and advising of graduate students who were completing grounded theory dissertations. Herein, he made three observations of his students: they grappled with the analytic process, were inclined to work from received theories and ideologies, and perceived grounded theory to lack a substantive framework or paradigm for theorizing. That is, grounded theory was seen “as designed strictly for method and linked to no particular substantive paradigm; hence no theoretical anchorage is given, though interactionist vocabulary abounds in the pedagogy” (p. 306). Consequently, students progressed through grounded theory research as if it were a series of linear, analytical steps devoid of theoretical foundation.

Essentially, dimensional analysis made practical the ‘analytical’ processes of grounded theory, as analysis is linked to common, interpretative, and natural actions. Each inquirer is uniquely situated to derive meaning from a phenomenon by noting its attributes, context, processes, and meaning (Schatzman, 1991). To provide structure and direction to the explication of said phenomenon, Schatzman presented the dimensional matrix, likened in the following excerpt to story-telling:

An explanation, after all, tells a story about the relations among things or people and events. To tell a complex story, one must designate objects and events, state or imply some of their dimensions and properties – that is, their attributes – provide some context for these, indicate a condition or two for whatever action or interaction is selected to be central to the story, and point to, or imply, one or more consequences. To do all this, one needs at least one perspective to select items for the story, create their relative salience, and sequence them. Thus, “from”
perspective, “in” context, “under” conditions, specified actions, “with” consequences, frame the story in terms of an explanatory logic… (p. 308)

The matrix, then, becomes the “structural and procedural” (p. 309) centerpiece for dimensional analysis; it tells the story of where we are and where we might venture to build theory. In traditional grounded theory, a matrix is often utilized to create dense, coherent categories during the process of axial coding. As an important distinction, Schatzman’s (1991) explanatory matrix is utilized at all phases of dimensional analysis: designation, differentiation, and integration (i.e., initial coding, axial coding, and selective coding).

In lieu of inquiring into the basic social process underlying the phenomenon of interest (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), Schatzman’s (1991) analysis addresses ‘what all is happening’ within a given context. This question is tied directly to the symbolic interactionist perspective, reflecting “the researcher’s interaction with the data” (Kools et al., 1996, p. 316). One begins to understand that any phenomenon is more complex than it appears on the surface of inquiry; through dimensionality, the researcher delves into its properties, implications, and interconnections. Via dimensionality and natural analysis, the inquirer “draws on past experience and knowledge as a cumulative and integral part of the individual’s thinking process” (p. 315). In effect, dimensional analysis departs from traditional grounded theory’s rejection of received theory in the analytical process.

Four conceptual components frame the explanatory matrix (refer to Figure 3): context, conditions, processes, and consequences. Context refers to the environment in which dimensions exist. Conditions are what “facilitate, block, or in some other way shape actions and/or interactions” (Kools et al., 1996, p. 318). Processes are those
actions or interactions propelled by conditions, whether intended or unintended, while consequences are outcomes of these processes (Kools et al., 1996; Schatzman, 1991). Strauss and Corbin (1990, 1998) employed conditions to explain questions like when, where, how come, and when. Processes address how and by whom, while consequences address ‘what happens’ (Charmaz, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1998).
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**Figure 3.** Schematic illustration of an Explanatory Matrix utilized in Dimensional Analysis. *Note.* Adapted from *Dimensional Analysis: Broadening the Conception of Grounded Theory* (p. 318), by S. Kools et al., 1996.

In *Constructing Grounded Theory: a Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*, Charmaz (2006) presents an accessible and user-friendly introduction to the art and science of grounded theory research. While the work of Schatzman requires the reader to possess intermediate to advanced knowledge of grounded theory, Charmaz appeals to both novice and expert. The applications of constructivist grounded theory to social contexts are manifold. The inquirer looks beyond how research participants view
their world, acknowledging how the phenomena of interest is connected to networks, positions, contexts, people, and relationships (Charmaz, 2006).

Imbued with a constructivist worldview aligned closely with that of Charmaz, situational analysis pulls grounded theory around the postmodern turn (Clarke, 2005). Germane to Clarke’s (2005) work are several assumptions: grounded theory is epistemologically and ontologically rooted in symbolic interactionist theory; and the inquirer must, at all times, commit herself “to representing all understandings, all knowledge(s) and action(s) of those studied – as well as [her] own – as perspectival” (p. 3). Interactionist constructivism makes vivid the Chicago school theorem that situations defined as real are real in their consequences; further, the material world is given meaning by, for, and with the self and others. Of further relevance is what Clarke characterizes as the “long-standing ecological bent of symbolic interactionism… a form of analyzing relationality that is highly compatible with postmodern concerns with difference” (p. 10).

Like Schatzman, Clarke’s (2005) work reacts to several intractable errors of traditional grounded theory, including lack of inquirer reflexivity, oversimplified analyses, emphasis on one ‘basic’ social process, and the quest for methodological purity. To Clarke, neither data nor inquirer is pure; each is socially constructed and inextricably linked. While Schatzman utilizes dimensionality as locus of analysis, Clarke finds analytic grounding in the situation of the research phenomenon, with emphasis on discourse. Clarke looks beyond what is basic, seeking to uncover deeper, embedded assumptions around the phenomenon of interest: “Basic for whom? Basic for what? What/whose perspectives have been ignored or given short shrift? And why only one
process?” (p. 24). Further, situational analysis pulls the researcher away from the analytical tendency to produce theory, an inherently modernist conception. Her work focuses, instead, on “grounded theorizing through the development of sensitizing concepts and integrated analytics” (p. 28). Still, situational analysis is premised upon grounded theory traditions of coding, sampling, saturation, and memoing. Where it differs is the specification and mapping of “all of the important human and nonhuman elements in the situation of inquiry broadly conceived, the social worlds and arenas that organize the situation at the meso level of collective discourse and action, and the discursive positions taken and not taken…” (p. 292).

Situational analysis replaces uni-dimensional analytical renderings with multi-representational mappings that allow the inquirer to “understand, make known, and represent the heterogeneity of positions taken in the situation” (Clarke, 2005, p. 25). Variation is at the foreground, a process articulated yet marginalized in traditional grounded theory. Empirical maps serve multiple purposes, summarized in Table 2; more overarching, however, is the “radical reflexive act we perform as mapmakers” (p. 31) – the revealing of self-as-inquirer within, through, and of the phenomenon of interest.

In summary, dimensional analysis as a research method is contingent upon the use of methods that ground the researcher, bringing her into the inner and outer experiences of her participants to unveil ‘what all is happening’. The method “dictates the use of a technique, but the technique is not the method. The method is a way of answering a question by selecting, approaching, and making sense out of information and fitting it into a wider intellectual context” (Bentz & Shapiro, 1998, p. 87). In this vein, situational analysis elucidates the dynamic interplay between self and context – keeping mindful at
all times that “the conditions of the situation are in the situation” (Clarke, 2006, p. 71) – through recursive, iterative maps.

### Table 2: Three Forms of Situational Maps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Map</th>
<th>Locus of Analysis</th>
<th>Questions addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situational</strong></td>
<td><em>The situation:</em> “…all the analytically pertinent human and nonhuman, material, and symbolic/discursive elements of a particular situation as framed by those in it and by the analyst” (p. 87).</td>
<td>Who is in this situation? What is in this situation? Who and what matters? What makes a difference?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social worlds/arenas</strong></td>
<td><em>Collective social action,</em> which achieves “a working big picture of the structuring of action in the situation of inquiry” (p. 116) and attempts to represent “most if not all of the major social worlds in a given arena” (p. 124).</td>
<td>What are the patterns? What social worlds are operating here? Which worlds, sub-worlds, and/or segments come together in an arena and why? What are their perspectives – and what is achieved through collective action? What nonhuman actants and technologies are present?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positional</strong></td>
<td><em>Major positions taken in the data on their own terms,</em> such as “topics of focus, concern, and often but not always contestation” (p. 126). Important to note that positions are positions in discourse, not associated with an individual or group.</td>
<td>What positions are taken in the data? What positions remain unarticulated or silent? How can positions be framed without tendency to connect to a social world, organization, or individual?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criteria for Grounded Theory**

The purpose of this sub-section is to introduce those criteria utilized to ensure credibility, originality, resonance, usefulness, and reflexivity of interviewed, coded, and analyzed data. Underscoring the importance of evaluating grounded theory with respect to process and product, Charmaz (2006) placed emphasis on credibility, originality, resonance, and usefulness. While interconnected, each is explored respectively, broadly
situated in the scholarship of qualitative inquiry. Inspired by the writing of Adele Clarke (2005), I added reflexivity to this section as a personal criterion for exemplary qualitative analysis. In addition to providing an overview of these criteria, I also draw applications to the study itself.

**Credibility.**

To ensure credibility, data must be empirical and related logically to what is stated (Schatzman & Strauss, 1973; that is, even if “the propositions are not particularly brilliant, they are grounded and the research has found no negative evidence bearing directly upon them” (p. 133). Qualitatively, credibility can be checked through host verification and phenomenon recognition (Schatzman & Strauss, 1973), in addition to other strategies shared by Creswell (2003) and Kvale (1995). Credible research involves “continually checking, questioning, and theoretically interpreting the findings” (Kvale, 1995, p. 27), which inherently built into the grounded theory process.

The process of host verification – also known as member-checking (Creswell, 2003) – increases credibility when core dimensions are checked by others (Schatzman & Strauss, 1973). The purpose of verification is not necessarily to ensure that parties concur with all claims, but “that they recognize rather the validity of the grounds (events) upon which the propositions rest” (Schatzman & Strauss, 1973, p. 134). In essence, host verification acknowledges the inherently interpretive foundations of dimensional and situational analyses within which reliability has a different meaning. Phenomenon recognition involves anticipating readers’ proclivity to test validity, generality, understanding, and universality of the phenomenon against their own conceptual renderings. To arrive at this, Charmaz (2006) recommends making certain the reader
achieves “intimate familiarity” (p. 182) with the setting and that claims and clarity of writing reflect systematic, logical analyses.

Creswell (2003) recommends other strategies for increasing credibility, such as triangulating data sources; clarifying researcher bias; utilizing peer debriefing in the form of a research team; and bringing an external auditor or reviewer into the process. In this study, various measures were taken to increase credibility. Host verification entailed testing and checking propositions at all phases of the study with participants and the research team. Peer debriefing was built into the dissertation process (i.e., external reader); triangulating data sources and clarifying bias was employed at various stages of data collection, analysis, mapping, and writing.

Originality.

Interpretative research is fresh and insightful (Charmaz, 2006); dimensional and situational analyses elucidate new ways of understanding phenomena of interest – aesthetically, analytically, and creatively. To ensure originality, my analysis presents a novel way of looking at faculty members’ inner experience, later linking this depiction to social, cultural, and theoretical areas of significance (Charmaz, 2006). Beyond understanding ‘what all is happening,’ the overt aim of this dissertation was to extend, refine, and contribute to empirical scholarship and grounded practice.

Resonance.

A study is resonant when credibility and originality are abundant (Charmaz, 2006). Strides were taken to make sure perspective, dimensions, and properties aptly portrayed the phenomena of interest. Explanatory mapping and constant comparative analysis enabled perpetual oscillation between and among participants, data, and
emergent dimensions. Routine and ongoing data checking assisted with meaning-making and contextualizing.

**Usefulness.**

While the above mentioned criteria address the ‘what’ and ‘so what’ of research, usefulness makes certain that scholars address the ‘now what.’ This criterion reminded me to cycle back to both the literature and the field of inquiry. Charmaz (2006) recommends mindfulness of the following questions (p. 183): Does your analysis offer interpretations that people can use in their everyday world? Do your analytic categories suggest any generic processes? If so, have you examined these generic processes for tacit implications? Can the analysis spark further research in other substantive areas? How does your work contribute to knowledge? How does it contribute to making a better world? Each of these questions is woven into propositions explored in Chapter Five.

**Reflexivity.**

Bentz and Shapiro (1998) believe that the self is always at the center of mindful inquiry; research is “intimately linked with your awareness of yourself and your world…and your development as an aware and reflective individual should be embodied in your research” (p. 5). As both actor and instrument, one must be continually aware of the cultural, social, and historical biases through which I interpret participants’ experience. Systematic introspection around privileges, interests, values, and understandings is viewed as reflexivity (Creswell, 2003). Charmaz (2006) expands this definition, describing reflexivity as a form of introspection that allows “the reader to assess how and to what extent the researcher’s interests, positions, and assumptions influenced inquiry” (p. 188). To Clarke (2005), reflexivity means understanding and
“outing” ourselves as “fully participant observers in the social worlds they have studied… [having] addressed [our] simultaneous situatedness as participants and as researchers” (p. 14). Inimitably, our experiences and interests inform, direct, and encourage the study. In effect, there is no easy way to address the seemingly paradoxical yet intrinsically connected nature of being a participant-researcher. Reflexivity cannot be simplified; it is a complex, nuanced undertaking. What is most important is that one reflects deeply and analytically on how perspective is represented, rendered, and created.

Summary: Methodological Fit

Methodological Fit presented an overview of constructivist research, evolution of grounded theory, and development of two forms of grounded theory – dimensional analysis and situational analysis, ultimately presenting a case for ‘good fit’ between the research question, culture or inquiry, dimensional analysis, and situational mapping. Also reviewed are strategies for assuring and increasing credibility, originality, resonance, usefulness, and researcher reflexivity.

To bring voice to educators’ inner experiences of engaging in service-learning with undergraduates, this dissertation study employed intensive interviews and triangulated data until a point of saturation was reached. Intensive interviews created space for deep, focused exploration of the participant experience, asking him/her to “describe and reflect upon his or her experiences in ways that seldom occur in everyday life” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 25). Importantly, this process was iterative and inductive, cycling through collection, analysis, and reformulation (Creswell, 2003). The ensuing section will describe this process in detail.
**Method of the Study**

This section presents an overview and synthesis of the study method, commencing with descriptions of participants and purposeful sampling techniques. Second, this *method of the study* section details data collection procedures, situated in the nuanced, analytic approach common to grounded theory methodology. Following data collection, I present my three-phased approach to data analysis, transpiring concurrently with interviewing, artifact analysis, and observation. This sub-section also purviews the team approach utilized throughout all phases of this study. I conclude with a reflection of self as instrument.

**Participants**

Participants in this study were adult educators (i.e., faculty, professors, teachers) engaged in service-learning with undergraduates at a small liberal arts college in the southeast. Primarily, data were gathered through an evolving, three-phased series of 22 intensive, individual interviews with 20 purposefully selected participants. As interviews progressed, data were triangulated via the analysis of field notes and memos, observations, and review of archival materials. As noted by Seidman (2006), it was “this process of selecting constitutive details of experience, reflecting on them, giving them order, and thereby making sense of them that makes telling stories a meaning-making experience” (p. 7).

**Sampling.**

Critical to this research was the process of initial or purposeful sampling, described by Patton (1990) as the selection of information-rich cases, or “those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the research” (p.
Creswell (2003) expanded, noting the importance of selecting both sites and participants that best foster an understanding of the research question. Importantly, purposeful sampling in the qualitative tradition differs significantly from random sampling, typically associated with quantitative studies (Creswell, 2003). While the latter seeks breath and generalizability, purposeful sampling emphasizes depth and meaning-making. With purposeful sampling, the researcher establishes “sampling criteria for people, cases, situations, and/or settings before [she enters] the field” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 100).

The chosen site of inquiry was a residential liberal arts college located in a suburban, residential area one mile from a mid-size city. The metropolitan area is home to an estimated 4,000 non-profit agencies, some of whom partner with the college on one-time volunteer initiatives or sustainable community-based learning processes. While the college’s revised mission to educate for global citizenship and responsible leadership is relatively new, efforts to infuse service-learning and community-based initiatives into the curriculum abound. Rewards and recognition for service-learning are manifest in monetary incentives, some course releases, co-teaching opportunities with community partners, professional development resources, and staff assistance with course development. While the current promotion and tenure process rewards excellence in teaching, research, and service, the latter refers more explicitly to in-reach (i.e., internal service to one’s department, discipline, or college committees).

To select participants within this context who best represent the attributes and knowledge sought by the research question, several criteria served as guideposts. The first criterion for purposeful sampling was to interview educators currently employed at
the above mentioned institution. The small course size (n=17) and intimate faculty-to-student ratio (1:10) permitted a study that was deep and grounded. The second criterion ensured that participants were engaged at the time of the study in a transforming learning context with undergraduates, specifically: an academic course within which service-learning is employed (e.g., semester experience, immersion, or field study) or a community-based research opportunity involving undergraduate students. This allowed for the gathering of information-rich data rooted in participants’ tacit and reflexive awareness. To ensure the study represented what ‘all is happening’ in the faculty participants’ life worlds from the inside out, diversity and uniqueness of perspective was embraced, sought, and voiced. That is, the final criterion was designed to make certain multiple perspectives were illuminated, such as those of tenured, tenure-track, and junior faculty; general-education, intermediate, and capstone-level courses; and various disciplines and departments. This enabled the preliminary, pilot exploration of a range and diversity of experiences reflected upon by faculty.

I began the process of initial, purposeful sampling upon dual receipts of approval by the Antioch University Institutional Review Board and the Office of Institutional Research at the selected site. I sent an electronic letter (refer to Appendix A) to educators who met criterion one; their names, departments, divisions, tenure status, and contact information had been made available through administrative offices on campus that support faculty development and community-based learning initiatives. The electronic letter provided a detailed overview of the study, including criteria for selection. Faculty members were invited to self-nominate or recommend other educators for the study.
Given my internal knowledge of the site and its participant pool, I estimated that up to 20 prospective interviewees would surface through this invitation process; further, I surmised that the bulk of self-nominations would arise from the social sciences. Surprisingly, I received 19 affirmative responses to my query within several hours of having sent it; respondents proportionately reflected the College’s four divisions: humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and expressive arts. Within two weeks, 43 respondents had self-nominated and/or been endorsed by other educators. The contextually diverse pool of nominees would later provide me with the unique opportunity to assure breadth, depth, and perspective.

Because grounded theory involves iterative, comparative analyses of data, I intended to interview participants as themes emerged, information was corroborated or rendered divergent, and saturation was reached. Further, I recognized that theoretical sampling was endemic to “both early and later stages” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 107) of my research, allowing me to follow new leads and seek data to fit emerging theoretical perspectives. This, in turn, would help “to check, qualify, and elaborate the boundaries of [data]” (p. 107). This in mind, I responded to each nominee within two weeks of sending the initial letter, explicating the phased, intentional nature with which my study would take place. Prospective participants were informed that while not all nominees would be selected for interviewing purposes, each would be provided the opportunity to share his or her service-learning journey during a roundtable held at the College’s upcoming conference on transformative learning, the 3rd Annual Summit on Transforming Learning.
Safeguarding.

The researcher is obliged to “respect the rights, needs, values, and desires of the informant(s)” (Creswell, 2003, p. 201); various processes safeguarded participants’ confidentiality and privacy. First, research objectives were made salient in the invitational letter and interview process. Each interview required written consent from its participating faculty member. To further ensure confidentiality and anonymity, each participant was identified by an alphanumeric code; in no particular order, interviewees were labeled and referred to as A1, B2, C3, and so on. I retained sole access to the coding legend, which was encrypted in a computerized file. Further, participating faculty were informed of data collection procedures, which involved digital recording and transcription by a third-party, contracted entity. Within 24 hours of the interview, digital files were transposed to a private, encrypted internet site, accessed solely by the contracted transcriptionist and me. Upon receipt of the transcript, I audited the record for accuracy and anonymity; transcripts were sent to participants for their review. Each participant reserved the right to audit, delete, or add content as deemed necessary. Only those with direct ties to this study (e.g., research team and dissertation committee) had access to written transcripts, field notes, and memos.

Data Collection

Grounded theory differs from other research methods with respect to sequencing of the research process (Bowers, 1988). That is, phases of “literature review, question/hypothesis generation, and data collection and analysis occur simultaneously rather than as a sequence of distinct phases” (p. 45). Though described independently in this chapter, ongoing and constant analysis of data invariably shaped data collection. In
turn, new questions and hypotheses evolved as I discovered ‘what all was happening’ in the context of participants’ service-learning experiences (Bowers, 1998).

**Demographics.**

The study’s 20 participants represented various spectra of academe. At the time of study, 18 were full-time faculty; two served as College administrators. Of the administrators, one held a tenured faculty position in the social sciences (i.e., critical media and cultural studies); the other served as adjunct instructor, also in the social sciences. Of the 18 full-time faculty members, divisional representation was as follows: four represented the Natural Sciences and Mathematics (1=biology; 2=chemistry; 1=environmental sciences); three represented the Humanities (2=modern languages; 1=philosophy and religion); nine represented the College’s largest division, Social Sciences (1=anthropology; 1=communication; 1=economics; 2=education; 1=history; 1=psychology; 1=sociology; 1=critical media and cultural studies); and two represented the Expressive Arts (1=art; 1=art history).

Data were also gathered on gender, race, tenure status, and number of years at the College. Of the 18 full-time educators, 11 were female and seven were male. Six of the female educators were tenured (i.e., two full professors, four associate professors); five were on tenure-track. Of the male educators, four were tenured (i.e., two full professors, two associate professors) and three were on tenure-track. Four of my participants (three females, one male) served as chairs of their departments (i.e., art, psychology, critical media and cultural studies, and environmental sciences) during the time of the study. With the exception of three participants, who self-identified as Black or Latino, all participants identified as White, Caucasian, or Eastern European. The mean number of
years participants had been employed at the College was 10; interestingly, the modal (i.e., most frequently reported) number of years was 3.

*Interviewing.*

Invariably, my research question shaped the method utilized. To understand the inner experience of faculty co-engaged with undergraduates in transforming learning experiences, the method of intensive interviewing created the most cogent fit. The grounded theory interview is opportune, unique, and rich in its ability to bring to the surface the lived experience of the other. As issues emerge, interviewing presents opportunities for follow-up, pursuit, and explication (Charmaz, 2006).

The interview protocol commenced with an introduction to the study, review of the informed consent form, and permission to begin. Participants were invited to respond to a guiding, overall question, which is germane to grounded theory research (Bowers, 1988): “Tell me about your experience participating in service-learning with undergraduate students.” Following Charmaz’s (2006) advice to devise several broad, follow-up questions, which “encourage unanticipated statements and stories to emerge” (p. 26), I developed and followed an interview guide (refer to Appendix B). This protocol presents open-ended questions and prompts designed to elucidate participants’ inner experiences. At times, the initial question guided the entire interview; on other occasions, it was necessary to restate and reframe this question. Emphasizing flexibility over rigidity, the guide provided me with a loose framework, allowing the interview to go deeper than ordinary conversation. Indeed, this enabled participants to “break silences…tell their stories…reflect…be experts…choose what to tell…share significant
experiences…express thoughts…[and] receive affirmation and understanding” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 27).

The technique utilized, which entailed listening on three levels, was just as critical to the interview as the research question itself (Seidman, 2006). First, I tuned into what the participants were saying, which was the substance of the interview (Seidman, 2006). Secondly, I was attuned to participants’ use of outer and inner voices when conveying their experiences; in this vein, I relied heavily on field notes and memos. The outer voice “always reflects an awareness of the audience…a voice that participants would use if they were talking to an audience of 300 in an auditorium” (p. 78). Less tentative and unguarded, the inner, more introspective voice is accessed through prompting and cueing the participant to tell his or her story. Third, “interviewers – like good teachers in a classroom – must listen while remaining aware of the process as well as the substance” (p. 79). Exploring, inquiring, following up, and asking open-ended questions abetted this process. I also kept a separate log of all questions and prompts utilized throughout the course of my 22 interviews, which assisted in the tracing of my methodological journey and devising of dimensional matrices.

Grounded theory scholarship yields little consensus on how many interviews substantially inform theory building and dimensional analysis. A cursory review of recently published grounded theory dissertations yields diversity in the number of interviews, ranging from 13 to 22. Seidman (2006) noted that while many researchers prefer an emergent and fluid research design, some estimate the number of participants ahead of time. Regardless, strict concentration on number of participants may elude more purposeful consideration of sufficiency and saturation (Seidman, 2006). With
respect to sufficiency, I wanted to be certain that my data addressed the core question in this dissertation study. Herein, purposeful sampling enabled the selection of participants who, when prompted, would purvey the inner experience of service-learning engagement. Regarding saturation, I continually sampled until no new information was presented (Seidman, 2006). At times, this led me to wonder what constituted enough data. To Seidman (2006), ‘enough’ is “an interactive reflection of every step of the interview process and different for each study and each researcher” (p. 55). Ultimately, ‘enough’ was manifest in the data revealed through 22 interviews, iterative memoing, reflective field notes, and participant observation – all transpiring over the course of the three phases of data collection and analysis.

**Memoing.**

A critical component of data gathering and analysis (Bowers, 1998), memo writing served several interconnected purposes. First, memoing recorded my path through all facets of theory development; while initial memos unveiled formulaic ideas and comparisons, subsequent memos were “progressively more abstract and integrated as analysis proceeds” (Bowers, 1998, p. 52). Also, memos recorded components of analysis that I chose not to pursue, but may be later relevant in a follow-up study. Third, memoing captured my sentiments and observations around methodological issues ranging from interview-related concerns to theory discovery (Bowers, 1998). In many cases, memos took the form of messy and positional maps as I sought to better understand the milieu within which participants lived their experiences.

Charmaz (2006) considers memoing to be a conversation with oneself. She notes the importance of spontaneity and informality: “The methods of memo-writing are few;
do what works for you. Memos may be free and flowing; they may be short and stilted – especially as you enter new analytical terrain” (p. 80). On many occasions, I found catharsis in memoing and mapping; these processes furthered preliminary and provisional analysis of the data collected during the interviews, later assisting me in raising dimensions to core, organizing perspectives auditioned in the explanatory matrix. Refer to Appendix C for several sample memos employed in this study.

*Triangulating.*

In the text *Field Research: Strategies for a Natural Sociology*, authors Schatzman and Strauss (1973) note the importance of getting “close to the people [we study]…in the natural, ongoing environment where they live and work” (p. 5). Further, the researcher “views the substance or reality of his field in creative, emergent terms: it is neither fixed nor finite, nor independent of human conception and subsequent redefinition; therefore, it is not ‘all there,’ needed only to be located, measured and then rendered as ‘findings’” (p. 7). When considering context, field observations round out dimensional analysis; the process of triangulation enriches, enlivens, and shapes the data.

As I collected and analyzed my primary data, I remained open to the analysis of other discursive practices informing ‘what all is happening’ in the study’s milieu. I toured four active community-based learning sites and observed two participants engaging in service-learning with their students. In addition, I attended a meeting of service-learning educators that included five of my participants, an all-campus conference featuring a roundtable of service-learning faculty and staff, and a regional conference that brought together 500 service-learning educators from Gulf Coast and southeastern institutions of higher education. Memos and maps of these experiences
filled several notebooks. Also, I reviewed campus policies and protocol pertaining to service-learning, tenure and promotion policies for service-learning, college mission statement and guiding documents, and documents and journals authored by service-learning educators; to respect IRB procedures, direct excerpts do not appear in this dissertation. Further relevant to my study – and informed by theoretical sampling protocol – was the interviewing of two campus administrators.

**Data Analysis**

The analysis of data collected under the auspices of constructivist grounded theory is inherently iterative, inductive, and emergent. This section weaves together a recursive outline of analytical strategies and the evolution of dimensions through a three-phased approach. While Schatzman (1991) presents an idealized process, my strategies changed, evolved, and flexed as data were rendered and dimensions revealed. What is particularly critical to note is that situational mapping and dimensional analyses – while presented separately – occurred simultaneously and interdependently throughout all phases of data collection and analysis.

**Situational and Dimensional Analyses.**

Situational analysis was employed to analyze and locate those elements – obvious, intrinsic, and invisible – that inform educators’ experiences engaging in service-learning with undergraduates. Three frameworks were utilized to examine conditionality, positionality, intricacy, disparity, differences, and silences in data (Clarke, 2005): situational maps, social worlds/arenas maps, and positional maps. Critically, situational analysis of educators’ experiences presented a nuanced cartography of the contexts
within which dimensional matrices were simultaneously rendered. During all stages of data analysis, these maps informed, intersected with, and completed emergent themes.

Visually and analytically, dimensional analysis presented a methodological framework for interpreting, rendering, and making meaning of data derived from interviews, field journaling, and memoing. Schatzman (1991) believed each of us possesses the natural analytic tools to interpret phenomena; this process is learned “through early socialization and provides individuals with a schema that they can subsequently use to structure and analyze the intricacies of phenomena of ordinary life as well as in complex scientific problem solving” (Kools et al., 1996, p. 314). While Glaser and Strauss (1967) wanted to understand the basic social processes underlying a phenomenon of interest, Schatzman (1991) sought to dimensionalize a phenomenon to elucidate ‘what all is happening’ – all attributes, parts, processes, contexts, and connections are critical to our understanding of the phenomenon of interest. Connecting these forms of grounded theory analysis, three interwoven processes served as organizing schema for both situational and dimensional components of my study: dimensionalizing, differentiation, and integration (Kools et al., 1996; Schatzman, 1991). These phases are explored below.

Also known as designation, dimensionalizing is referred to in dimensional analysis as the “naming or labeling of dimensions and properties observed in data” (Kools et al., 1996, p. 316). Essentially, this process entailed my designation of data to their first level of abstract representation. Herein, coding was initial and provisional; it served to “identify and name multiple dimensions involved in the phenomenon without consideration of the relative importance, relationship, or meaning of specific concepts”
Schatzman (1991) notes that while dimensionalizing is equivalent functionally to open or initial coding, it differs with respect to its operational utility. The researcher is only concerned with analysis of those experiences that address ‘what all is happening’ (Schatzman, 1991); in this stage, “the analyst requires a critical mass of considerations and is satisfied to wait for sufficient understanding… all codes take the form of dimensions presumed or found to be in some way related to a phenomenon and universal to samples or variations of it” (p. 310).

Entering into the first phase of data analysis, I wanted to ensure a broad spectrum of participant experience – individually and situationally – in preparation for further inquiry. During the dimensionalizing process, I interviewed seven educators– three tenured faculty and four untenured faculty, in that order. Each taught in a different academic department and – per background data afforded to me through an academic office – were engaged in qualitatively different service-learning experiences with undergraduates. When interviewing, I stuck close to the questions prescribed in my protocol, adding prompts and clarifying queries when necessary.

I liked Schatzman’s dimensionalizing process to Charmaz’s (2006) depiction of the initial coding phase, within which the researcher is open to exploring a range of analytical possibilities. Charmaz (2006) heeds the researcher to stick close to the data, invoking actionable words (e.g., gerunds) to describe ‘what all is happening.’ For these first interviews, I employed line-by-line coding, which required the ‘naming’ of each line of transcribed data in the context of ‘what all is happening.’ Illuminating “implicit concerns as well as explicit statements” (Bowers, 1988, p. 50), line-by-line coding helped me evaluate data critically and analytically, while presenting invaluable insights into
where to go with subsequent interviews (Bowers, 1988; Charmaz, 2006). Concurrently, I engaged weekly with a research team comprised of one Ph.D. methodologist, two newly minted Ph.D. scholars with expertise in grounded theory, and four Ph.D. candidates with professional backgrounds different from my own. Of my seven initial interviews, five were coded and cross-validated by the group and/or individual team members.

Iteratively, 588 initial codes (i.e., free nodes) were sub-dimensionalized under the auspices of 35 dimensions (i.e., tree nodes) in order “to identify the range of properties that could be attributed to each” (Kools et al., 1996, p. 323). (Please refer to Appendix D for a complete spreadsheet of these codes.) That is, initial codes were grouped during the latter portion of phase one into higher order, more abstract classifications called dimensions. Prospective conditions, processes, and consequences would form theoretical propositions, segueing into potential questions and cues for impending interviews. To portray the richly hued backdrop within which the dimensions were resident, I also sketched a series of messy situational maps. At this point, the purpose was not to identify relationships or designate positions, but to ‘open up’ the data, “interrogating it in fresh ways within a grounded theory framework” (Clarke, 2005, p. 83).

Phase two of my study – differentiation – entailed focused coding, which involved deciding which initial codes made analytical sense in the context of constant, comparative analyses of data (Charmaz, 2006) and ongoing discourse with my research team. In effect, the differentiation process limits “the data by determining the salience of dimensions and by organizing them within the explanatory matrix into a logical configuration that would provide meaning” (p. 317). As I proceeded into this phase, my goal was to interrogate, cue, and critique the 35 emergent, phase one dimensions while
listening and coding for novelty – spoken and potentially unvoiced. Herein, my ensuing eight interviews were focused and lengthy, sensitized to emergent dimensions and new possibilities.

Toward the middle stage of differentiation, by which time the above mentioned ‘phase two’ interviews had been coded and analyzed, 35 preliminary dimensions (refer to Appendix D) had converged with, co-created, or fractured into contexts, conditions, processes, and outcomes/impacts informing nine higher-order dimensions. Situational maps abounded, adding explanatory power to emerging dimensions. Of the 35 preliminary dimensions, some no longer held explanatory power in the context of comparative analysis; others grew more salient and were auditioned to the above mentioned, higher-order categories. Differentiation led me deeper into theoretical sampling, which further refined the data by developing dimensions until nothing new emerged (Charmaz, 2006). At this point, I focused resolutely on refining situational maps and saturating emergent dimensions with data gathered through additional interviews, several observations/field visits, and the review of print materials. Paralleling additional data gathering and dimensionalizing, this phase directed and focused my analysis, resulting in a number of situational maps and the emergence of preliminary explanatory matrices. At this point, a core organizing perspective had not been identified, though several prospects were under consideration.

By this point in my methodological journey, I had completed, coded, and analyzed seven phase one interviews and 13 phase two interviews. No new contextual conditions had arisen and a core, organizing perspective – evolving learning – began to take form. Figure 4 maps these pathways, showing the gradual emergence of a central
dimension that explained the phenomenon under investigation. The purpose of this figure is to showcase the methodological journey through various phases, processes, and considerations. Kools et al. (1996) further describe this endeavor:

> Each potential perspective provides a different configuration to the data and results in a different interpretation of meaning. The dimension that provides the greatest explanation for the relationship among dimensions is ultimately selected as the central or key perspective… When one dimension is conceptually raised to the level of perspective, remaining dimensions are accordingly relegated as either salient, relevant, marginal, or irrelevant. Once selected, this perspective is then used to organize the placement of all but the irrelevant dimensions within the explanatory matrix as either context, conditions, processes, or consequences. (p. 319)

Phase three of my study was integration/reintegration. At this stage, limited data are collected through theoretical sampling as “means of challenging and verifying the validity of the emerging theory” (p. 328). How these data are collected varied; theoretical sampling can entail “studying documents, conducting observations, or participating in new social worlds as well as interviewing or reinterviewing with a focus” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 107). I conducted several additional interviews and two follow-up discussions, all the while mapping emergent patterns and relationships. What emerged were five intersecting dimensions guided by an organizing perspective co-constituting the voices of educators engaged in service-learning with undergraduates. These data are explored fully in Chapter Four.
Figure 4: Schematic Illustration of Research Journey

*Constructing Theory.*

What is theory and how does it emerge in dimensional analysis? Though structured and procedural, dimensional analysis is inherently interpretative and abstract. Imbued with creativity and imagination, constructivist grounded theory “assumes emergent, multiple realities; indeterminacy; facts and values as linked; trust as provisional; and social life as processual” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 126). This differs from positivist theory, within which verification, truth, and prediction are preeminent. Thus, the emergent interpretive theory – explored in Chapter Five – is congruent with the epistemological roots of dimensional analysis: the social psychological theory of
symbolic-interactionism. Indeed, this was among Schatzman’s (1991) aims; he envisioned dimensional analysis as a theory-methods package.

Charmaz (2006) reminded her reader to consider the rhetoric, reach, and practice of theory development, stated cogently in the following passage:

Theories flash illuminating insights and make sense of murky musings and knotty problems. The ideas fit. Phenomena and relationships between them you only sensed beforehand become visible. Still, theories can do more. A theory can alter your viewpoint and change your consciousness. Through it, you can see the world from a different vantage point and create new meanings of it. (p. 128)

Together, my participants and I made sense of our co-inhabited world, bringing new insights and understandings of learning to life. Key to the construction of theory was my role in the process; just as I interpret and bring meaning to the data, my participants will do the same of me (Charmaz, 2006). The emergent theory, then, is a co-interpretation of participants’ experience; as Charmaz (2006) notes, the resulting theory “depends on the researcher’s view; it does not and cannot stand outside of it” (p. 130).

Both the data collection and concurrent analysis are socially constructed, situated contextually and temporally.

*The Self as Instrument*

Van Manen (1990), author of *Researching Lived Experience: Human Science for an Action Sensitive Pedagogy*, contributes a provocative statement germane to my own situatedness in this dissertation study:

From a phenomenological point of view, to do research is always to question the way we experience the world, to want to know the world in which we live as
human beings. And since to *know* the world is profoundly to *be* in the world in a certain way, the act of researching – questioning – theorizing is the intentional act of attaching ourselves to the world, to become more fully part of it, or better, to *become* the world. (p. 5)

Indeed, my research interests reflect my own familiarity with the world, with emphasis on the inner experience of students and faculty. These experiences – past and present - as both instructor and student engaged in transforming learning contexts have prompted curiosity, inquiry, and professional development in service-learning, pedagogy, leadership, and social justice. Always, I am seeking to become more fully aware of phenomena. Anecdotes, observations, and experiences comprise my compass, directing me this deep, empirical study of educators’ inner experiences. My study entailed inquiry *with* actors, not *on* action (Schwandt, 1996).

Van Manen (1990) further noted that through research, “we question the world’s very secrets and intimacies which are constitutive of the world, and which bring the world as world into being for us and in us” (p. 5). Through my dissertation, I seek to bring to light the very questions left unanswered yet experienced within the world I know, a reality shaped situationally and symbolically. The grounding of my research in symbolic-interactionism makes this methodology exceedingly aligned with my persona, values, and beliefs. The very crafts of the explanatory matrix, memoing, and mapping brought to fruition ideas, insights, and thoughts I had, at some time, tacitly pondered but were brought forward by participants.

Situationally, I brought personal perspective to the site and context of inquiry. That is, I am employed full-time at the institution chosen for this analysis; for 8 years, I
have worked with students, staff, and faculty to advance leadership and service-learning initiatives, locally and internationally. To many of my participants, I will be viewed as a well-intentioned colleague and ally; in my pilot study, for instance, trust was immediate and inherent throughout the interview and analysis. Still, others’ conceptions of my intent may vary, which is why ethical procedures to ensure trustworthiness and confidentiality are vital. Schwandt (1996) recommends establishing a relationship of openness with participants, further viewing them as “engaged in performing a practical art” (p. 64). This perspective eschews technical rationality, placing emphasis on contextualization of knowledge (Schwandt, 1996).

It was critical that I be continually and reflexively aware of my own biases, predilections, and suppositions. Memoing served as the easel upon which I was able to explore, interrogate, and render understanding of who I am and what role I played in the inquiry process. Of great importance was the role of my research team, an intact unit of diverse grounded theorists and doctoral students representing a range of career fields that meets weekly to discuss, explore, and analyze one another’s emergent work. To ensure credibility, data will be subject to peer-to-peer analysis. Herein, theoretical playfulness entered; with emphasis on processes and actions illuminated in the data, we were able to see the possibilities, make connections, and dig deeper (Charmaz, 2006).

Overall, I am satisfied with my choice to study the very context within which I am located. Given my desire to study the faculty experience from the inside out – as opposed to from a bird’s eye view – this decision is well aligned with the criteria for constructivist grounded theory. Further, this study existed at the capstone of my research with, by, and for the educators who I interview. While this dissertation captures a
snapshot of participants’ experiences, rendered analytically and creatively, the study is
historically and culturally situated in the very climate I have co-constructed for a number
of years.

Summary

This dissertation explores the inner experience of faculty members engaged in
service-learning with undergraduate students at a small, private liberal arts institution,
utilizing grounded theory and dimensional analysis. In any study, it is important to align
culture of inquire, research tradition, and method with what the inquirer seeks to elicit
from her participants. This chapter made the case for a constructivist, grounded theory
study within which epistemology (i.e., symbolic-interactionism), method (i.e., intensive
interviewing), and analysis (i.e., constant comparative method) align with the desire to
learn more about ‘what all is happening’ in the experience of faculty members who co-
engaged in service-learning with students. Little empirical scholarship exists on this
topic; an exploratory study of this nature can pave the path for additional knowledge and
understanding of the faculty experience from the inside out.
Chapter Four: Results

The inner experience of educators engaged in service-learning with undergraduates may be best typified by the term *evolving*. Through situational mapping and dimensional analysis of varied discursive practices (i.e., in-depth interviews, observations, artifacts, etc.), ‘what all is happening’ in the faculty experience was unveiled, opened, rendered, clarified, and/or made explicit. This chapter, divided into three sections, presents the findings from these data. Section one describes the phased approach undertaken in this study. Varied cartographies produced under the guiding auspices of Clarke’s (2005) *Situational Analysis* comprise section two; these maps create the contextual scaffolding for subsequent dimensional analyses. That is, contexts – human and nonhuman, voiced and invisible – are visually elucidated as the architectural ‘framework’ upon which explanatory matrices coexist, populated with processes and outcomes/impacts.

Section three reveals the visual and narrative results from the *Dimensional Analysis*. The study’s core, organizing perspective – *evolving learning* – is discussed, followed by descriptions of five intersecting dimensions: (1) *bearing witness*, (2) *navigating*, (3) *reconciling expectations*, (4) *resolving and reorienting*, and (5) *locating self in humanity*. Notably, these dimensions are recursive and iterative; informed and connected to each other, they are guided in content and process by the core dimension, *evolving learning*. While presented in a linear fashion, it is critical that the reader keep in mind that no one dimension necessarily succeeds, precedes, or subsumes the other.

An extensive array of quotations is presented in this chapter, supporting emergent dimensions. All quotations drawn from interview data are single-spaced, indented, and
italicized. When derived from a participant interview, the quotation is followed by the alphanumeric code described in Chapter Three (e.g., A1, Q17). Quotations drawn from personal memos, observations, or field notes are single-spaced, indented, bolded, and labeled with my initials (i.e., CM) and a corresponding number. Each excerpt from other artifacts (e.g., college mission statement) is also single-spaced, indented, bolded, and subsequently labeled Artifact with a corresponding number (e.g., Artifact 11). A complete list of utilized artifacts can be found in Appendix E.

Situational Analysis Results

Clarke (2005) proposed three kinds of situational analyses – social worlds/arena maps, situational maps, and positional maps; the former two were vital tools in this dissertation study. In the context of Clarke’s philosophy and the purpose of this dissertation, these maps served several core, intersecting purposes. Perhaps the greatest utility of mapping was its ability to ‘open up’ the data, prompting consideration of novel pathways, analyses, and opportunities (Clarke, 2005). Mapping – occurring simultaneously with interviewing, memoing, and coding – operated as an “analytic exercise” (p. 83) necessary for meaning making; as such, “the researcher will notice new things already in the data that should receive analytic attention now or later, note areas of inadequate data where further materials should be gathered, [and] note areas of theoretical interest” (p. 84).

What Clarke (2005) deemed the most radical tenet of mapping is the use of researcher reflexivity throughout the cartographic process. This requires making explicit the often invisible role of self as instrument, acknowledging that our “ideas and preconceptions become intellectual wallpaper of sorts, background tacit assumptions
sometimes operating, as it were, behind our backs in the research process” (p. 85). Each of my maps co-constitutes a discursive interplay between my experience, my participants’ voiced experiences, my interpretation of their ‘inner’ and ‘outer’ voices and experiences, the clarity and wisdom of my research team, and data ascertained from artifacts.

**Social Worlds/Arenas Mapping**

Social worlds/arenas maps provide a figurative representation of ‘what all is happening’ at the meso-level of social action and interaction (Clarke, 2005). The meso-level presents the bird’s eye or balcony view. Arena mapping enables us to “see individuals acting both as individuals and as members of social worlds… [allowing] the fluidities and actions among structures and agencies to become visible and, thus, theorized and memoed” (Clarke, 2005, p. 110). In effect, social worlds/arena mapping presents an aerial view of the social worlds and subworlds within which the faculty experience resides, visually rendering the porous, flexible overlap between and among such worlds. This level of mapping illustrates the meta-narrative, the story or stories behind the stories. As Clarke (2005) surmised, “It is highly unlikely that the final reports of a given research project…will tell even all the ‘big stories’ framed by the social worlds/arenas map. Rather, the map should help [the researcher] determine which stories to tell” (p. 111).

Figure 5 constitutes a social worlds/arenas map developed at the tail end of axial coding; the process of rendering this map provided me the opportunity to analyze the data with greater insight and acuity, thinking more critically about intersections, overlaps, and boundaries. Memoing occurred simultaneously, abetted by conversations with members
of my research team. When ‘reading’ the map, several points should be understood. First, dotted lines indicate fluidity; this “porousness is what gives social worlds/arenas its flexibility, its plastic capacity to take change and heterogeneous perspectives into account” (Clarke, 2005, p. 111). Also, the map displays overlap between and among social worlds and subworlds; this is meant to illustrate how faculty members exist in more than one arena at once. While these worlds are “actor-defined” (p. 110), Clarke (2005) reminded her reader that one’s participation is not always transparent or salient. One may, for instance, wish not to participate in a social arena yet his or her actions, interactions, and experiences are irrefutably shaped by the social milieu.

![Social Worlds/Arenas Map](image)

*Figure 5: Social Worlds/Arenas Map*
The study domain – represented by an orange star – is inherently bracketed given the nature and purpose of this study (i.e., to understand the inner experience of service-learning faculty at a small, private liberal arts institution). Critically, this arena is irrefutably, simultaneously, and consequently influenced by other social worlds. While the arenas map is not exhaustive of influential social worlds, it displays those most salient to the faculty experience, namely the interconnected milieus of academe, faculty politics (e.g., tenure, pressures, discipline), and the ever-expanding litany of community needs – local, national, and global.

*Situational Mapping*

*Abstract Situational Maps.*

While the social worlds/arenas analysis unveils broader and often eluded “constraints, opportunities, and resources” (Clarke, 2005, p. 119), situational mapping allows for the deeper interrogation of contextual elements and their relationships. Various renderings of abstract, situational maps laid out “all the analytically pertinent human and nonhuman, material, and symbolic/discursive elements of a particular situation as framed by those in it and by the analyst” (Clarke, 2005, p. 87). A series of preliminary, messy situational maps explicated those elements germane to faculty members’ experience, voiced during early phases of the study. The situation serves as the locus of study; inherently ‘messy’, the initial map makes explicit who and what comprise, reside in, and influence the contextual milieu (Clarke, 2005). Critically, the example shown (refer to Figure 6) is not static; it represents one map in a series of recursive renderings reflecting comparative analyses of interviews, dialogues, observations, and artifact data. When
viewing situational maps, the reader might imagine the words dancing, spinning, and swirling among the others; like stars, some terms are dimmer, while others purvey bold, effervescent power.

![Abstract Situational Map: Messy/Working Version](image)

*Figure 6: Abstract Situational Map: Messy/Working Version*

**Ordered Situational Maps.**

Illustrated in Figure 7, the second situational map conveys an analytical attempt to cluster discursive, contextual elements of “what all is happening” in the faculty experience. While seemingly fixed, neither elements nor clusters are unchanging; notably, clusters and their elements may appear, reappear, or be altogether ‘disappeared’ depending on who the faculty member is, what his/her experience has been over time, and with whom or what his/her experience intersects or has intersected. Some elements appear in multiple clusters; further, the clusters overlap with and influence one another.
As Clarke (2005) noted, there exists “considerable fluidity through negotiations, repositionings, and so on in the relations portrayed in these maps, including the addition and deletion of actors and actants…” (p. 90). Again, situational analysis served as an analytic tool through which I developed questions, organized emergent themes, and made meaning of participants’ experiences. Importantly, situational mapping precluded me from getting too caught up in the nuances of individual participant’s story-telling; both messy and ordered versions reminded me to look at the bigger picture. Explored later in this chapter, such positionings and negotiations become integral to the dimensional analysis.

Figure 7: Ordered Situational Map: Clustered Version
Context Areas of Situational Analysis

Through various renditions of ordered maps – informed by all stages of the research process – six contextual themes emerged: role, service learning experience, community partner, US-academe, college milieu, and student populous. In the dimensional analysis – methodological locus of this study – the six themes surface as the conditions within which processes and outcomes/impacts coexist. As conditions, these themes facilitate and/or block aspects of faculty members’ experiences of engaging in service-learning with undergraduates.

Role refers to descriptive and nominal elements, both voiced and unvoiced by participants, including demographics (i.e., race, age, gender); discipline, department, and division; years at the college; and tenure status. Service-learning experience entails participants’ experiences of engaging in service-learning as children, teenagers, adults, educators, learners, and scholars. Community partner introduces the complexity of contextual elements made salient through educators’ connections with field sites, agencies, grants, and actors. US-Academe encompasses situational themes related to the greater milieu influencing faculty learning and development. More specifically, college milieu highlights internal, context-specific challenges and elements impacting the faculty experience. And student populous refers to the contextual reality of who is being educated at the site of study.

Role.

Participants voiced or intimated role-specific behaviors, influences, or conditions that shaped their experiences as faculty engaged in service-learning. Some roles were demographic (i.e., race, class, gender); others were earned or bestowed (e.g., tenure) and
some were chosen (e.g., department and discipline). Other roles were participant-specific, not to reappear in other interviews (e.g., one’s participant’s ‘role’ as a woman with an autoimmune disorder; another participant’s ‘role’ as an ESL speaker). Role surfaced during sampling, noted as critical and contextual to our understanding of the inner experience of educators.

What follows are data excerpts relative to participants’ voicing of *role*.

Transcripts were flush with participants’ expression of gender and age characteristics, particularly when the educators interviewed were female and/or over the age of 50. Race was named as salient only for those educators who self-identified as non-white.

*I don’t know that I would have had the self confidence to do this when I first started teaching. It may even be a gender issue, it’s hard… I think I would have hesitated… At this stage, I don’t have those worries anymore. I think that is, I think it was a legitimate worry for a young female. Um, I don’t have that concern anymore because I’ve sort of become the matriarch. Um, I think when I was younger, I was so concerned about being taken seriously as a scholar that I, that was part of the difficulty in my letting myself or letting the students have room for community engagement.* (#G7)

*I have my own insecurities. And I have my own history that creates those insecurities. It comes with being a female.* (#T20)

*I’m actually the spokesperson for these particular people. I’ll talk to the people [in the community] on the phone and then go out and meet them and we’ll have this weird moment where they pause which happened to me recently because they just aren’t expecting me to be a Black guy.* (#F6)

*I’ll be sixty-four in another couple of weeks and I’m within five or six years of retirement probably. And so, I mean, I’ve done a lot of thinking about my life and where I’m going and what I’m doing… I’m learning something new and I had a fantastic time and these students had a great time and they learned a whole lot.* (#C3)

*And I guess in some regards I’m reflecting and some of that may be that I’m getting old and trying to change the way that, you know, change some of my priorities.* (#B2)
I'm filling in the gaps but anxious in the sense that I'm figuring out what to do in the future... And I have seen and dread counting the years until retirement. (#G7)

Whether faculty members were tenured or tenure-track also factored into real or perceived perceptions of role, facilitating or blocking aspects reported upon in the dimensional analysis.

I'm really down on my job. I'm really tired. I'm burned out. This whole tenure thing, I think, soured me. (#T20)

I get a sense that I think before, maybe five years ago, before I was even here, service-learning was a kind of thing that was, like, nice to be involved with but it's not going to get you tenure. I think it's a lot more valued, from what I hear. Now, we'll see in two years when I go up for tenure if that's something that people really value or is it just talk? (#R18)

Um, and for a younger faculty member, particularly one that isn’t yet tenured there’s a self interest issue there right? What is going to get you that ‘Happy Harvard’ tenure? (#G7)

And so, as a non-tenured person, I run the gamut of offending one [colleague] and pleasing the other. Um, but you have to ultimately do what you believe is right. You know? And go from there. But, yes, there are faculty members in my department, um, who feel that theory is what a college class is all about. And that service learning comes later when they're actually going out with their student teaching experience. (#H8)

Also contextually salient in participants’ voicing of role were considerations related to department, discipline, and college division (i.e., natural sciences, humanities, social sciences, or expressive arts).

For an anthropologist [service-learning] was perfect because it gives the students a chance to go interact with people and have sort of what I call baby fieldwork experiences...So, it was good for both anthropology and it was good for my pedagogy and good for their development as anthropologists...and it also just helped me too. (#E5)

I see the value of [going] beyond the community especially the sort of urban location. I’m an urban historian, [studying] issues of race and class and ethnicity and gender. This is the bedrock of historical investigation. You can’t ignore it. It doesn’t go away. (#F6)
I offered a course on Vertebrae Zoology and this is straight taxonomy... no clear way of taking that into the community but in, um, conversations with [another faculty], what we ended up doing was have my students teach her art students about particular issues in the marine environment. (#J10)

So what I’ve done is identify research based instruments of observational assessment that students can easily learn to do really, really professionally in a semester. And then offer that assessment service to the community. So my students go [into the community] as psychologists. Right now we are finishing one project evaluating sixteen afterschool programs. (#N14)

So, analytical chemistry directly interfaces with society. Anything else is a stretch right, if I’m talking about physical chemistry? I mean, now I’m talking about the mathematical understandings of the atom. Tell me how that relates to society. I mean, I could concoct some kind of story... and really what I’m talking about is the science faculty whose disciplines do not have a direct societal client. It’s all ‘add on’, right? And so if you notice, the only courses that I’ve used service learning in are my medicine, my medicine courses. If anything is going to have an implication with society it’s going to be medicine, right? From a scientist’s perspective. (#K11)

Service-learning experience.

Participants disclosed a range of past and present service experiences, detailing their backgrounds in service-learning, civic engagement, and volunteerism. These experiences are indelibly linked to the guiding perspectives unveiled in the dimensional analysis. Some participants told stories of childhood service, while others relayed anecdotes about their community-involved parents, partners, or children. In many cases, such experiences readied participants to engage with and beside undergraduate students.

In some regards, [I have been involved in the community] ever since I was a little kid and my grandmother moved from Iowa where she, where she had been actually a professor and then she started the, um, she was well off enough back in the late 1880s and 1890s and early, uh, 20th century to actually start the Iowa School for the Deaf and the Blind. (#B2)

Well. My influence, my ethnic influence is very Russian. So there has always been a very socialist, shall I say, viewpoint in my family. And, I mean, I remember my father saying that you do this for society, not for you. (#H8)
Okay I come from a family background of a lot of volunteers. My father worked for the American Red Cross for his whole life. My experience with service learning started before I came [here]. (#N14)

And so I found myself partnering [as a teenager] with individual children in the community who needed to have a richer experience in the community: children living in poverty, children who have been abused, individual children in many cases. (#M13)

[College was] where I learned the value of being involved in that kind of work and it sort of deepened my commitment to feminism and I just needed that, I’ve come to need that outlet in my life. That, you know, feeling like I’m doing something active for women. (#L12)

Type and scope of service-learning experience also factored into educators’ disclosures. Some engaged with their students in intense field studies or intersession immersions, while others employed service-learning at various phases of the semester (e.g., weekly, monthly). For some, service-learning was scripted before the course commenced; for others, the service-learning experience emerged organically. Regardless, service-learning was inextricably linked to pursuit of course and discipline-specific learning outcomes.

I will always have at least one form of outreach in some way where they are getting out in the community doing some form of environmental impacts. (#J10)

A cohort of mine from graduate school had suggested this model to me where the major project for the class would be that the students identify a campus and/or local problem that in the first part of the class that they would research and report on. And then, um, in the second part of the class that they would work with an agency to try to address the problem in some measurable and meaningful way. (#O15)

I know in the case for this past year...the very first thing we did was cook this meal at the Ronald McDonald house. We didn’t know each other at all...I couldn’t think of a better way to start the semester. You know, for my students and for myself? It set a tone that carried all the way through the class, that sure, we’re learning about the politics, the economics of food, but there’s a whole set of values that is sort of behind it that was always not too far from view. (#I9)
I really want them, the students, to take full responsibility. When they conduct the interviews [with the community] they have a way to figure out how different groups of people and income and gender effect perceptions of trust and reciprocity. And then they will be teaching trust and reciprocity to school children at Fern Creek. (#D4)

So after doing, you know, these two large intersession trips, I really believe in immersion. And sort of a sustained experience in the field. But I guess I’m really, um, I believe that then in having sort of a sustained academic period to debrief and dissect, in the context of an academic course. (#B2)

Participants also described their own adaptation of service-learning experiences to fit the multifaceted needs of the community, students, course, and discipline. In this vein, service-learning was seen not as static pedagogy, but flexible.

My [Sociology of Childhood] class was good but was way too traditional. The [senior seminar] was amazing because I realized we have to have this class. We have to offer this class to students studying service-learning, learning service, not just service-learning but learning service because this would have prepared them for the childhood course if they’d had this first. (#T20)

I did two back to back [service-learning courses] that year which was intense. I did another [elementary school] project with print making. Same idea, work with the students all semester, mentor them, get to know them, talk about their aspirations, turn into images, uh through various print media and my students were learning the print media and then turning around and teaching it to the [elementary] students. And that whole thing using students as peer educators I guess, um, that’s been a really valuable tool because students who have to turn around and teach someone else to do something, are going to learn it so much better. They, they’re terrified of little kids at the beginning and so having to turn around and interact with them and be the teacher in the situation, they step it up and they don’t come to class unprepared because they have five little kids depending on them, not me, five little kids. It’s a different scenario... So um, I basically still use that model except in my most recent service learning projects, I have focused on taking um the topic of the art making into more, into the realm of activism. (#Q17)

I think this year being the third year that we are [partnering with Junior Achievement] looks a lot less, um, I’m trying to think of a word. Cumbersome. It seems it has its rhythm. I anticipate what problems the students are going to have. (#S19)

It’s very important for me, I think, to have, like, some product at the end that’s presentable to [the community] and I have, in the past, felt frustrated by the oral
history part. Um, which is why my stuff that I do now, which is less oral history and more primary document and biography...is way simpler for the students. (#F6)

Community Partner.

The community partner (e.g., agency, non-governmental organization, school, etc.) plays an integral role in the establishment, integration, and success of the student and faculty experience in service-learning. In many cases, agency personnel were named as vital co-educators, enhancing the experience of both students and faculty:

Essentially, [I got] in contact with Haggio, the director of the [agency]. Ah, I worked with Haggio on Saturday and [I said] we’d like to do these medical interviews, we’d like to do other types of things, what would you like us to do? What kind of projects would you like [my class] to do? [And] when you work with people like Haggio who, who, um, have a love for people that you know, that, that’s inspiring. It makes you want to carry a little bit of that into you. (#K11)

The work that students did at [an elementary school in an impoverished section of town] and continue to do...to me, is really important. Because, for example, we had a student working there in the fall, actually we had three students working there in the fall. And when they got there their first day, the principal had put a big sign up welcoming them and physically met them at the door. Introduced himself and expressed his gratitude and then he did something that I’ve never seen a principal do...he told them that he wanted to take them for a little ride...He probably piled these students, all of them were white women, into his car and gave them a tour of the neighborhood. And all three of them independently came to me and told me about this and how profoundly it affected their understanding of the lives of the children who go to that school. (#M13)

And then my most recent experience was working in collaboration with the Global Peace Film Festival...I was familiar with the Director of the Global Peace Film Festival as well as faculty colleagues, who had a lot more experience partnering with the festival. And so it was really through that that I was able to be plugged into what the festival most needed... [And] in the fall we’ll have this relationship with the Global Peace Film Festival. And so it’s permanent, it’s established and then we can build on it year after year after year. (#O15)

And I have this amazing partner over at [the elementary school] who’s just fabulous. He’s fabulous to work with, he’s such a good partner, he’s up for any crazy stuff that I’m up for and he’s, um, really good at integrating it into his class. But not just that, not just, um, taking what I’m offering, but also going, ‘how can I make this really fit what I need to accomplish in my class?’ (#Q17)
Some faculty expressed initial discontent with community partners, which led to reorientation of course goals, pedagogy, or process:

Well, the resignation of key staff [at the agency] has changed the relationship that the partner has had with us, with my class. I had to come up with a new plan, another plan and they didn’t want us to create the whole survey from scratch. So, I would say that the number one challenge is the flexibility and time that the community partner has. (#D4)

At the beginning of the Junior Achievement project, it wasn’t going well at all. The students weren’t communicating well with the teachers, the [community partners]. There was miscommunication on their end, on the teachers’ end. A couple weeks had gone by, some students hadn’t even started yet. I got a little frustrated...I was getting a little turned off by, by the managerial part. (#R18)

It wasn’t the smoothest of partnerships but the first day was great...we went down to [the Spanish-speaking retirement community] the first day that I had even met my students and I kind of presented the, you know, adopt a grandparent project to them and they were kind of scared but got down there and did very well...And the students have, as part of their writing assignments, to write to one of the seniors there. A number of them never got any response back. So it wasn’t a perfect project. (#S19)

Depending on structure, leadership, funding, and type of agency, faculty played various roles in maintaining and navigating logistics, tensions, and dilemmas; while the nuances of these relationships will be explored in further detail in the dimensional analysis, the following quotations present background and context:

Yeah, I’m probably more, I’m aware of [racial dynamics between students and community members] then the students are. Probably more, probably more then the community partners are because I listen and I will talk to them and be like, ‘what happened?’ I know from my own experience that there’s all kind of things that can happen... it’s a huge problem. And one I don’t have a solution for it because it’s not the kids’ fault. It’s not the students’ fault. (#F6)

It [has to be] a partnership, sort of an egalitarian relationship. You don’t walk away feeling that you did good but that it was a growing experience for the student. (#A1)
The partners in the community are people who know that I’m the person they can speak to if they have any questions or concerns. That the student is sort of in the middle, responsible for delivering the support but nonetheless you know an 18 or 21 year old who sometimes might not fully understand how important that support is on a consistent basis. So you know you deal with idiosyncrasies, not just with partners in the community, but [with] college students. (#M13)

[I worry] this is going to be a disaster and this, we’re going to do some harm. You go in with a mission of do no harm and you worry when something comes up that you are doing harm. (#E5)

US-Academe.

The United States academic milieu is a critical background tenet in faculty members’ voiced and unspoken experiences of engaging in service-learning with undergraduates. More often than not, both real and perceived definitions of the American professoriate played into how faculty described, named, or depicted their experience – particularly when noting challenges and frustrations. In many cases, such presumptions were derived from participants’ graduate school experiences, especially when they had attended large, public ‘research one’ institutions. Other suppositions were discipline-specific.

I think one of the things that surprised me when I came here was the idea that this should be somehow integrated into academic learning because that is a very foreign idea for me. My training is from a University situation so there wasn’t any other stuff that could be described as the ‘fuzzy fluffy’ stuff that’s offered on this campus, and I’m not by any means intending that to be a downgrading statement. (#J10)

I don’t need my desk, I don’t need my PhD. In fact, the truth is I’m going to be very honest. I don’t know that my PhD taught me anything in terms of [this kind of] pedagogy, nothing. I mean and also most of what I teach now didn’t exist when I was in graduate school so I can’t even say that graduate school gave me the content that I teach. It did give me a methodology of learning about, as did my undergraduate experience, but um, so I don’t need the PhD, I don’t need to be ‘doctor’. (#P16)

I think I was socialized [in graduate school] to perform perfection and being the expert and I think after I made tenure I felt more liberated, too...And so I think
that shift in orientation also allowed me to experience my relationships with students differently... I can remember my academic advisor telling me at one point that I was spending too much time on my teaching, which is sort of a sad commentary for the state of higher education in some of our big state institutions. But frankly, it was also good advice. (#O15)

I’m probably never going to define myself as somebody who does service-learning because it is not, as a paradigm of biochemistry, accepted professionally as being something that’s relevant or important or whatever. But research is, right? (#K11)

Nobody talked about [service-learning] in graduate school... It’s very contested in anthropology and I know it’s contested in a lot of other fields. (#E5)

I think you know the professors are their own mystery mysterious world. They approach things, graduate school of course, they teach you how to be – not even how to be a teacher in the liberal arts institution—they teach you how to be a researcher, a professor at a research institution dealing with graduate seminars, directing dissertations. It is very different from this is what it means to be a professor...but nothing about this sort of stuff. How you relate to students. That just...how do you learn? You learn by doing it, I guess. (#S19)

Most interviewees noted that despite tensions in the professoriate, there still exists a universal – yet often unspoken – need for academic institutions to partner with and support the community. Sometimes, this need was self-derived; other times, the need was modeled by mentors, staff, students, or other faculty at the institution. In many cases, participants felt that this responsibility – or need – outweighed preconceptions of what the ‘professoriate’ valued.

I do think that there is an obligation of historians to sort of engage with the real world...in a critical way, um, and this particular, and this is sort of like a careful thing. You have to sort of be careful. Like, I’m very aware of my [department’s] position. I mean, I recognize and indeed fully accept that I’m sort of like the rare, rare bird... [But] the black community is on the other side of the tracks. I mean, it’s a story that clearly needs to be told. (#F6)

So the idea is you create some sort of environment that’s going to enhance our students’ education but the only way to do it is to load things onto your own back, right? I’m getting no overload at all but the number of contact hours that I have is mind-numbing. Right? And so then you ask yourself, okay, why in the world...would you do that? And it goes back to the fundamental thing, why do we
do, why do any of us do service-learning? Because we fundamentally believe, philosophically and theoretically, that service-learning is going to do something good. (#K11)

Um, [service-learning] is not something that’s coming under review for the tenure process. I mean, it’s nice but it’s kind of like all the other ad hoc committees we go, we belong to. We do it because we think that this is important not because we’re going to get anything out of it. (#J10)

College Milieu.

As the fifth contextual element, college milieu overlaps significantly with each of the others, especially US-academe and faculty role. Several aspects of college milieu are uniquely salient, as the College was engaged in year two of a three-year curriculum reformation process at the time of the study. The following excerpt, derived from a memo, provides relevant background information.

I've just returned from a meeting of the Academic Affairs Citizenship task group [which I’d been asked to join in June 2007]. Essentially, the 'task groups' comprise stage 2 of our curriculum reform and review process. Stage 1 took the form of the work of a faculty-led committee; their work is described on their website as follows: "In the spring of 2006, a subcommittee was charged by the Academic Affairs committee to begin laying the groundwork for a reform of the [institution’s] curriculum, which was last reformed in 1979. In the interest of educating our students for responsible leadership and global citizenship for the 21st century, there is a growing concern that the curriculum be adapted to meet these new challenges. We invite your participation and feedback as we begin this vital undertaking.” Each of the five 'stage two' tasks groups serve as 'research' groups charged with formulating an exhaustive, comprehensive synthesis of resources, best practices, literature, and scholarship related to our topic of interest. Ours focuses comprehensively on the curricular infusion of leadership, service-learning, experiential learning, and international learning. Those stewards of Stage 3 will utilize the interconnected work of these 5 groups to form various curriculum 'models'. (CM3)

Administrators and faculty estimate launching a new curriculum as early as fall of 2010. Thus, the backdrop of curricular reform factored heavily into participants’ commentary:
And quite frankly as we’re in curriculum review, I think that our campus is committed to community service learning but I don’t think it’s appropriate for every single class to be trying to do that. Um, and I actually think that if we are committed, that should be a [general education] course.  (#J10)

Right now, I think the institution is actually debating stuff and like, they are using [different] language and they are miscommunicating so everything surrounding an issue...is under debate, right? So everyone is sort of gathering around and talking about service learning or leadership or whatever the hell it is.  (#F6)

What we are seeing here is a group of faculty I believe who are really, really advocates of that liberal arts tradition. And I say more power to them. I think that the real strong liberal arts tradition needs to be respected, it needs to be honored, and it needs to be maintained. I think that there is an obligation to be open... so when we define a liberal arts education in the year 1950 and we try and define it again in the year 2008, I would expect it to be slightly different. Not turnaround and throw out everything that we’ve done so well for so many years. I think I’m talking about recognizing that the world is changing.  (#M13)

I think we’re having an issue with an institutional identity with respect to that right now, what and maybe this is a broader, um, issue in the academy but what is our role about the knowledge, is it about shaping people? I mean if we really are teaching students not to memorize facts but to be...engaged citizens, then [the curriculum] has to be broader then what education used to be where the professor just stood at the front of the classroom and talked at the students.  (#L12)

During phase 3 of the reformation process (i.e., transpiring during the 2007-2008 academic year), several of the study’s participants proposed a curriculum model to the academic task force:

At a unique liberal arts institution like [this], students should have the opportunity to engage in transformative learning experiences as they accumulate knowledge and develop an understanding of how different disciplines view the world. These experiences should have a cumulative and measurable impact on the development of behavior that is rooted in the importance of personal and social responsibility. As we consider curriculum revisions, it is clear that this type of transformational education ought to continue to be offered to our majors, but also be infused into our future core curriculum. We know from research and national surveys that these experiences can provide our students with a clear pathway to heightened social and personal responsibility, civic and moral development and aid in the development of other key learning outcomes and skills... There are many
pedagogical approaches that would work to make these learning outcomes happen, i.e. service-learning. (Artifact 3)

In their interviews, a number of participants also discussed the extent to which their departments valued, devalued, or neutralized community engagement; respectively, examples are integrated from departments within each of the College’s four divisions (i.e., natural sciences, humanities, social sciences, and expressive arts).

If you look and survey the science courses, I can guarantee that very few of them are going to have a service-learning component. Where possible, I use [service-learning] but a lot of times, it’s not appropriate. In the sciences, it’s not quite so easy... I think that I mean, again, it makes, it makes sense that an anthropology or sociology department would, of course, have maybe a significant aspect of community engagement but a chemistry department, biology department, a physics department, it’s not a natural fit. There’s a lot of pressure that I’m sure you are aware, there is a lot of pressure for us to be trying to reduce our majors. (#J10)

I am ‘the’ German department so there is nobody within a circle of colleagues saying ‘you can’t do this because I’m going to get your students next semester and if they don’t know the genitive prepositions, I’m going to fail them’. I can make that decision. I have a tremendous amount of freedom. (#G7)

I was hired as an applied developmentalist. So my department has been a little bemused that I put so much work into [service-learning] and I never publish anything from it. There’s a sense that community engagement, service-learning had to be done on top of my life as a scholar. (#N14)

I was totally surprised to know that [the art] department saw me as not contributing to the department when I thought doing service-learning was contributing to the department. And so it took this formal mid course [tenure] review for them to express to me that they felt that I was doing a lot of work...for another kind of entity and that the needs of the department were not being met because I simply was distracted by doing something else. (#Q17)

In the context of describing departmental demands, some participants alluded to incentives and overload. While some faculty received stipends or overload for service-learning, others described incentives in the form of collaborative teaching arrangements. Participants were likewise grateful for the Office of Community Engagement, which
provides comprehensive support to faculty and community partners. At the time of study, the College did not offer course releases for faculty who integrated service-learning into their curricula.

*I’m glad that there’s grants for service-learning on the campus. I think those help spur you to do some things because if you choose, some money [will] help to influence your project. I think have [transportation] now is a wonderful thing. Um, to be able to promote service-learning. (#H8)*

*[My colleague and I] are teaching this course as an overload because we want, we took, we wanted the opportunity. So this was with the FDA grant, so we received one of those. We wanted to take the opportunity to be able to do our interdisciplinary work. (#J10)*

*Student Populous.*

Those interviewed expressed, described, and voiced characteristics of the student populous; these characteristics would impact or relate to the faculty members’ engagement experiences. According to institutional data, the undergraduate populous hails from 45 countries; twenty-five percent of the students are of minority status. In total, the institution enrolled 3,622 undergraduate and graduate students during the 2007-2008 academic year; 1,750 were enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences, which is comprised of traditionally-aged (i.e., 18-21 years of age) students, the majority of whom reside on campus. Ranked among the top regional universities by US News & World Report, the institution attracts high-achieving students interested in a quality liberal arts experience. Excerpts from the institution’s marketing materials (refer to Appendix E) reflect both the premium placed on applied learning and students’ desires to engage in hands-on experiences across the disciplines.
All interviewed faculty expressed fervent concern and consideration for engaged, applied learning that would respond not only to how students learn but also to why and what students know and might learn as informed, active citizens.

*I get uncomfortable sometimes with some notions that I hear of transformative learning that suggest that students are coming to us in a kind of tabula rasa and it’s our job to then mold them into, you know, something different where there’s nothing there to start with and I think our failure many times as educators is we don’t spend enough time figuring out where they are to start with, assuming they aren’t anywhere or they are much closer to the end result then actually maybe they really are.*  (#P16)

*It turns out I convinced myself [to do service-learning] because students are different and so if you are a teacher, you have to figure out what works with them and at least even if you theoretically think students are lacking something that they ought to have here, and I’m convinced they need to get it, you still need to figure out how to give it to them in a way that will work.*  (#C3)

*I think [service-learning] has been a really great learning experience for a lot of [my students]. What I hope for is that they have a sense of their own ability to act as agents for change in the world. Because my impression of [this College’s] students more then other students that I’ve worked with is that they don’t feel like they can make a difference... Um, then a number of students that have been in these [service-learning] classes have [become activists], many of them are leaders in all different ways.*  (#L12)

*I didn’t know exactly what I wanted [my students] to find out in the end [of service-learning]. But I wanted them to go somewhere other than where they were, ’cause here they are, sociologists, and on one hand they understand sociological perspective, which says things are social issues, not personal problems... and a good sociological perspective can be good but it can also reinforce every prejudice you ever had.*  (#T20)

Faculty were also pragmatic, understanding that service-learning might not be impactful or worthwhile for all students in the short run.

*I don’t know if it’s true across the board, but [some students] are, in my experience, trying to get the damn grade. You know? Check the box, check the box. So, they’re like, ’What do I have to do this semester?’ [By the end of the semester], oh, it’s huge. The learning is huge.*  (#A1)

*And [service-learning] works pretty well, but I’ve been a little frustrated over time with the quality of the interaction between the students and the subject. Not*
in a sense that the interactions were bad, but the students tend to like it after it’s done and they hate it before they do it. (#F6)

One of the positive things is that both through design and not through design, students have been required to come in my office and talk with me about their service projects. And the hardest thing for students to do is to get their butts into a faculty member’s office and talk about that, it’s not related to problems they have. So, with respect to that, it’s been a positive thing because at least I’m having conversations with students about what they want to do. Um, obviously the frustration related to it is that they never do what they are supposed to do! (#K11)

Overlapping constructs.

While the above mentioned contextual variables are introduced as discrete elements, each irrefutably impacts or connects with the others. Situational analysis entails an understanding and interrogation of individual parts; however, the spaces between and relationships among these parts co-create integral elements of the faculty experience. Clarke (2005) noted, “Relations among the various elements are key… [An analysis helps] the analyst to decide which stories – which relations – to pursue” (p. 102). This sub-section presents several of the more cogent exemplars of these overlapping constructs; relational analyses were derived from a series of memos and maps rendered during the second and third phases of this study.

From the outside, the extant dynamic among role, college milieu, and US academe is implicit, made salient during the more ‘vulnerable’ depths of the interview process. At the intersection of age, tenure, and department exists an element of freedom – the ability on the part of the tenured faculty member to pursue service, teaching, and research at his or her leisure. For younger faculty, especially those untenured or situated in the natural sciences, engagement in service-learning becomes a choice, and often a difficult one, at that. Remarks from tenured faculty included:
I get, you can tell, I get a kick out of this community engagement. I just, oh my God. I get, there’s a huge satisfaction out of it. I’m lucky, jeez, I’m tenured if they pull the plug on the German program, which could be a possibility. I can do anything I darn well please and I’ve decided it pleases the heck out of me to engage with the students like this. (#G7)

I’m getting old and trying to change the way that, you know, change some of my priorities...and I think [the College needs] to have the conversation again [about what it values]. We need to reconfirm that this is what our, you know, I think some of the folks, you know, say ‘Responsible leadership and global citizenship, okay that sounds good but how [is] it really going to affect me? What does it mean really to me, to my job here? I’m going to have to teach all of these classes and do labs and grade all of this? You know, what’s this, someone else is going to have to do this?’” (#B2)

Well, it [has been] really interesting. I think having [the administration] as a kind of ally in the work was super important and, um, you know, every department has different dynamics and things happen for all sorts of complicated reasons... [It] depends on the dynamics of your department. I was able to start educating allies in my department about what [service-learning] is and they were really impressed with it and once I sort of started explaining it, they got it, they still, uh, you know, there are more people in my department doing it, but not everyone still. (#Q17)

And younger, untenured faculty made these comments, which imply disconnect between the College’s espoused values and enacted practices:

I think it was easy to get involved with service learning here because it’s explicitly in our mission. Whereas it’s senior colleagues who’ve been in my department who don’t quite understand service-learning, [who say] ‘Alright, that’s nice and all, but you can go ahead and do that but where’s your publication?’” (#S19)

[This is] something I really struggle with...I would like to do more service learning but it’s really hard in art history. I’m having a really hard time and I’ve been thinking about this for years now...You know, there’s only two faculty in my discipline really. And so a lot of what we do is sort of more traditional bread and butter courses that people need to graduate so, I don’t know, I’m a little bit stuck with that right now. And I would have that right, and I can share that there are many faculty who feel the same way and, ah, and see how for many departments service-learning is a natural fit...without ever seeming like an add on but for others it’s very tricky and, um, and to sort of plug service-learning in meaningfully takes a lot of thinking. (#L12)

My calling is to be in academics but you know, I could do more. Right? What does service-learning do to detract from your professor’s thing? Well, the thing
that everybody says about me all the time is that I overcommit to things... And you know, so then things, other things suffer, and I’m not worried about tenure but, you know, time with my family suffers. Well, it’s never a balance. It’s always a juggling act. (#K11)

Other intersections exist between and among role, service-learning experience, community partner, US-academe, college milieu, and student populous. These areas of overlap – in concert with the dimensions explored in the ensuing section – will formulate the emergent model described and discussed in Chapter Five. In effect, situational mapping evoked awareness and new insights of those conditions – clustered, discrete, and overlapping – within which dimensions of the faculty experience reside.

Dimensional Analysis Results

Through mapping and narrative excerpts, this section reveals data derived from a dimensional analysis of faculty members’ engagement in service-learning with undergraduates. Respectively, each of the following dimensions is explored: (1) bearing witness, (2) navigating, (3) reconciling expectations, (4) resolving and reorienting, and (5) locating self in humanity. Their intersections and implications are explored in Chapter Five.

A core, organizing perspective serves as the umbrella under which the five dimensions co-exist; this perspective – evolving learning – prevails in each interview, site visit, and artifact. Learning is a journey that evolves, morphs, changes, and transforms as faculty members bear witness, navigate, reconcile expectations, resolve and reorient, and locate self in humanity. All at once, learning is omnipresent: a condition, process, and outcome/impact. Just as participants purvey a strong desire for students’ transformative learning, their own learning, growth, and development took center stage in the data.
Following the presentation of data excerpts and dimensional renderings for each of the five dimensions, additional data evolving learning will be presented.

**Dimension One: Bearing Witness**

Depicted in Figure 8, bearing witness describes one of the preeminent modes through which educators learned, grew, and developed. Learning evolved as participants witnessed students’ and community members’ transformation; this played out before the educators’ eyes like a prophetic documentary film, causing many to reflect on their own learning. One faculty member likened his own bearing witness experience to that of “focalization”:

> I have noticed [that students are] much closer to the end result then actually maybe they really are so, um, so that’s one of the images that I think [of] when I think of transformative learning. The other one is the reason why I much prefer glasses to contacts [is] because you are still here, you’re not in focus now and I can make the world go away by [taking off my glasses] right now. I can bring it all into focus and part of transformation is also about that process of bringing it into focus. They use a term in that community in Northern Scotland called focalizing and that’s their version, we might call facilitating, so you sit around with people and talk about their ideas and help them figure out how to see things in a different way. And so transformation to me is also about focalization, [what I see] in students. (#P16)

The contextual elements described in the situational analysis – role, service-learning experience, community partner, US academe, college milieu, and student populous – serve as conditions that facilitate and/or block the dimension of bearing witness.

**Condition 1 (Bearing Witness) – Role:** A number of role-related constructs readied faculty to bear witness to students’ learning, particularly years at the College, age, and gender. Depending upon the extent to which service-learning was valued by a
department or discipline, role might obstruct or make possible educators’ abilities to engage deeply in the witnessing process.

*Condition 2 (Bearing Witness) – Service-learning Experience:* A number of participants came into service-learning by witnessing civic engagement in parents, siblings, teachers, and other role models. Some service-learning experiences, especially those that were short-term and deeply immersive, provided faculty with the opportunity to bear witness to near-immediate development in students and the community. Semester-long experiences would, in many cases, cause consternation; often, faculty members witnessed students and community partners navigating a series of ups and downs.

*Condition 3 (Bearing Witness) – Community Partner:* This condition facilitated faculty members’ experience of *bearing witness* when both faculty and partner had negotiated terms of reciprocity and interdependence. A presence of leadership and support on the partner’s terms was paramount. When the faculty member was encumbered with logistics, details, or problems related to the partnership, these conditions blocked the participant’s ability to witness students’ experience and participate as a co-learner.

*Condition 4 (Bearing Witness) – US Academe:* Less salient in participants’ voiced experiences, this condition covertly suppressed new faculty members’ abilities to bear witness – especially those who had recently emerged from graduate school. A culture of watching or witnessing students’ learning seemed foreign and abstruse to newly minted PhDs given both real and perceived expectations from the ‘professoriate’.
**Figure 8: Dimensional Analysis of Bearing Witness**

**Conditions-Context**
- **Role:** Gender, Age, Years at the College; Departmental and Disciplinary Membership
- **SL Experience:** Role Modeling; Type, Scope, and Role of Service-Learning (immersive, fixed)
- **Community Partner:** Presence; Reciprocity and Leadership
- **US-Academe:** Graduate School; expectations of the 'professoriate'
- **College Milieu:** Curriculum priorities, overload; Departmental variables
- **Student Populous:** Readiness; Learning style

**Processes**
- Witnessing students
  - Recognizing students' transformation
  - Witnessing students transform 'on the ground'
  - Watching students find their way
  - Seeing students grow and change; 'grow up'
  - Seeing students overcome their fears
  - Learning by watching them learn
  - Sharing exemplars of students' learning
  - Watching excitement grow
- Witnessing community
  - Seeing the impact of community engagement
  - Reflecting on disorienting experience
  - Seeing leadership become spontaneous
- SL Experience: Role Modeling; Type, Scope, and Role of Service-Learning (immersive, fixed)

**Outcomes/Impacts**
- Learning by watching
  - Growing conscious of the impact of service-learning
  - Gaining patience and perspective
  - Reflecting on one's own learning journey
  - Thinking about the impact of service-learning
  - Growing more trusting of students; seeing them in a different way
  - Deepening relationships with students and community members
  - Becoming more inspired to continue service-learning
  - Hoping students will continue engagement
  - Wondering if we’re doing the right thing
Condition 5 (Bearing Witness) – College Milieu: This condition facilitates bearing witness when faculty are rewarded for/and or encouraged to engage in service-learning with undergraduates. The milieu blocks bearing witness when faculty feel burdened or weighed down by competing priorities.

Condition 6 (Bearing Witness) – Student Populous: Without elements of this condition, the experience of bearing witness would not exist. In many cases, students’ own readiness and willingness to learn though applied pedagogies was critical to bearing witness, though it should be dually noted that faculty also witnessed students’ discontent with the service-learning process.

Processes of Witnessing: Faculty participants divulged their experiences of bearing witness with candor and, in some cases, emotion. This dimension was manifest in participants’ vivid recollections of watching, viewing, and reflecting upon the experience – voiced and intimated – of students and community members. While the term bearing witness was derived from language described by a participant during a site visit, equally provocative was the rich language evoked by interviewees to describe the act of witnessing – such as seeing, noticing, observing, watching, viewing, and tracking. While some faculty witnessed first-hand the power of the service-learning experience in others, other faculty read – then imagined, albeit voyeuristically – the experience in students’ journals and papers. The following excerpts vividly depict exemplars of the process of bearing witness to students’ learning, engagement, and change.

I think I learn a lot from observing their projects and sometimes tagging along with them and going to their field sites and seeing what they’re doing... and that’s always been really valuable because it’s really interesting to see the setting of things that they are in. Sometimes there are places that I wouldn’t necessarily go and so I learn from them and I learn from what they are doing and so that’s been, I guess that’s what, it’s like that’s the thing that I’m learning from them. (#E5)
When I started reading the journals...the first couple of journals were just incredibly touching. Uh, as to what their fears were and how they were overcoming their fears and how they were learning something. I mean, the first set of journals, I almost sat there and cried. It was amazing. (#C3)

Sure we think that our students should come out having had these kinds of transformative experiences because [they do]. I’ve seen how you can have a student who really isn’t engaged in anything and then they are forced to do something, um, and they respond well to it and they actually want to get more involved. (#J10)

I started [service-learning] in my first semester, my second semester, my second year here. Um, I didn’t fully anticipate this outcome but [I see the students gain] a new perspective on their own privilege. (#L12)

You can’t do a service project and not have constant exchange and dialogue about what you’re doing and why you’re doing it and see the excitement that students have. You know? And really getting excited about something...And once again, you know, you really see the enthusiasm in the students. They’re not just down [in Costa Rice] trekking around the forest. (#I9)

We’re just now in the second semester to the point where I’m seeing [students] who are putting themselves out there. (#G7)

You see [students] thinking in ways they’ve never thought. You’ve seen them very uncomfortable. (#B2)

Participants also reflected on their experience of bearing witness in the community, observing the potentially profound impact of service-learning, for better and for worse.

You can see a color change. But then when you think about what’s happening on the level of molecules in the change, you just could see the third graders’ eyes light up and you could see our students just really, as our weekly visits [to the school] started to intensify, there was growing excitement about doing this. And they developed large magic shows that they put on for the whole school... so I was really excited about the possibility. Turned out two of those seven [chemistry undergraduates] became teachers. (#B2)

We got to the mall and got out of the car and [the children from a very poor neighborhood in the United States] stood there and just looked at the building. They had never seen it. I finally said, ‘let’s go, let’s go.’ Went inside and walked in the door and they stopped again and just stood there drooling with their
mouths open. And we went to the bathroom because one of them said he had to go...They literally ran into the stalls, started playing with the toilet seats, swinging the doors, flushing the toilets...They had never seen a bathroom like this. The bathroom at their school was stripped of all kinds of normal, it didn’t have toilet paper, it didn’t have sinks, didn’t have mirrors. (#M13)

And so I finally said to one of my physician colleagues who’s helped me a lot with our relationship with the local hospital, and I said, ‘it’s almost as if medicine has nothing to do with caring about people.’ And his response was, ‘welcome to my world’... [But the senior citizens] want somebody to go with them to the doctors’ office. So, that when the doctor is rambling off all of these medicines and the diagnosis and whatever they don’t feel like they can absorb it all in. They can feel tunnel vision and they want someone to sit there with them to absorb it, record it, and help them understand it later on. Well, we can’t do that because there’s too many legal implications. (#K11)

Outcomes/impacts of Bearing Witness: Witnessing gave birth to reflection on the part of the educator, also enticing collaborative learning. The witnessing process created space for faculty members to think more critically about the impact of service-learning, grow more trusting of students and community members, deepen relationships with students, and become more inspired to continue engagement in service-learning – not only for the students and partners, but also for themselves.

It made me really aware and conscious of, of the impact [service-learning] will have. If it’s not clear why you are doing this, then a lot of times they are going to resent it because it’s extra work. (#J10)

Pretty soon I said we should just let [the students] run the show [in New Orleans, at a field site]. Let’s see where [the student leader] goes. We’ll be there to advise him, help him, work through decisions, we won’t let him hang himself. He’s got a group of people, some staff, his own students – he is the youngest one of them – but let’s just see what he can do with it. (#B2)

I’m experiencing so much myself. I do see changes [in the students and community] everyday and I see this as an ongoing process. I’m sure what I’d known then was different and it keeps changing and changing. If I focus only on me, myself, I see progress and change occurring everyday as I discuss, as I prepare. (#D4)

Teaching a women’s studies class has always been more personal... Um, so that class always has a different feel to it. Um, and the service learning, I think, only
kind of intensified that because I’m reading their journals which are often very personal reflections on their identities and how they are coming to understand their social identity as a result of the service work that they are doing. (#L12)

So I really get a lot out of [learning from my students] and in terms of my own development, like I said, I didn’t have any training in [service-learning]. (#E5)

[With what] you could consider not the best classroom students, the service projects brought out something in them that wasn’t there in the classroom... It helped me see some of my students in a way that went beyond them just being people sitting in the classroom. You know, it broadens my conception of what my students can do and who they are and what they care about. (#I9)

Summary of Bearing Witness: Faculty members’ voiced experience of engaging in service-learning with undergraduates was laden with learning, particularly when participants observed learning, growth, change, development, and transformation in their students. The following memo excerpt, written after my own observation of an educator co-engaging with her students at a Saturday morning feeding of 300 homeless, serves as an apt summary of this dimension.

At first, I was stunned by what seemed, on [the faculty member’s part] to be astounding courage. Here she was, in a remote, seemingly ‘unsafe’ part of the city, with several handfuls of undergraduates in tow. How would she manage this level of complexity, the chaos – not to mention the emotion – of feeding 300 homeless individuals and attending to students’ learning? I erroneously assumed that she would run the show: delegating tasks, responsibilities, and ownership to the students. Instead, she became one of them – relatively unsettled, highly vulnerable – while retaining some level of authority, unspoken but understood. From a bird’s eye view, she was one of them, dressed similarly in a tee and sweats, hair bundled under a graduate school baseball cap. I watched her watch them; several students knew precisely what to do. They jumped in; some made peanut butter sandwiches while others engaged in conversations with the homeless clients. Some began to distribute mail. All the while, the professor tracked her students and attended, when necessary, to those students who appeared overtly lost, confused, or afraid... At the end, we engaged in a group reflection. Evoking the term witnessing, the faculty member shared the extent to which she had been inspired and changed by watching their learning. Though she saw herself as a full participant in the service-learning process, her greatest take-away came from the students. (CM6)
Dimension Two: Navigating

Navigating is, at once, an art and a science. Similar terms or synonyms for navigating – such as steering, sailing, shepherding, plotting, and piloting – imply that one is at the helm, leading the way, or setting the course. Apt navigation requires elements of precision; when instrumentation fails, however, one might resort to following his/her intuition or instinct in order to move forward or stay on course. Navigating entails some level of linearity; there exists a destination, course, or outcome.

In this study’s context, navigating – depicted in Figure 9 – describes a critical aspect of educators’ inner experience of engaging in service-learning with undergraduates. There are times when the faculty member is literally navigating – for instance, providing transport to students engaged in immersive field experiences. More figuratively, however, the faculty member is constantly setting the course, steering the ship, and changing lanes. Sometimes, conditions (e.g., student populous, community partner dynamics) present road blocks, while others (e.g., service-learning experience) facilitate a smooth, fluid ride. To arrive at the learning destination, faculty steered around and through institutional politics, perceptions of the ‘ivory tower’, timing demands, and partnership logistics and obstacles.
Navigating institutional-departmental politics
- Feeling pressure
- Navigating uncertainty
- Wondering who 'buys in'
Navigating ‘ivory tower’ perceptions
- Considering town/gown relationships
- Coming down from the ‘ivory tower’
- Trying service learning
Navigating timing demands
- Organizing, setting up, frontloading
- Getting students there
- Dedicating, preparing, ‘carving out’
- Juggling, balancing, struggling
Navigating partnership logistics and obstacles
- Tailoring, fitting
- Coordinating community partners
- Preparing students
- Changing schedule
Understanding not everyone will, or can be, on board
Feeling uncertain about how it will turn out
Recognizing the curriculum – and the community & students – require service-learning
Grounding
Recognizing it’s worth it
Cultivating patience in self and others

Figure 9: Dimensional Analysis of Navigating
Condition 1 (Navigating) – Role: Role-related elements such as age, tenure status, and department/discipline readied faculty to navigate obstacles, successes, and challenges. Newer, tenure-track faculty found this experience frustrating and cumbersome. For seasoned faculty with service-learning experience, navigating was smoother and less anxiety-producing; two participants remarked upon their desire to ‘pay it forward’ by mentoring new faculty who wished to integrate community-based learning into their courses. Faculty members in disciplines (e.g., social sciences) where other colleagues engaged in service-learning found their wisdom and guidance invaluable.

Condition 2 (Navigating) – Service-learning Experience: The confluence of this condition with others – namely role and college milieu – facilitated or blocked the navigating process. A background in service-learning, regardless of role, helped faculty prepare to navigate with relative ease; those with more experience than others understood the process to be inherently messy and chaotic. An overarching lack of training and background in service-learning served, at times, as an impediment; faculty remarked upon knowing neither what to expect from students nor what to anticipate from community partners.

Condition 3 (Navigating) – Community Partner: Similar to bearing witness, this condition facilitated faculty members’ experience of navigating when both faculty and partner had negotiated terms of reciprocity and interdependence. When the partnership was initiated without up-front dialogue, the navigation process grew trepid for both parties. Often, prospective partners held their own ‘stereotypes’ about the participants’ intended outcomes (e.g., Ivory Tower). Faculty members who had partnered with the
same agency and/or school over time described considerable ease in the navigation process, often able to forecast obstacles and prepare to deal with logistical nuances.

**Condition 4 (Navigating) – US Academe:** A perceived ‘premium’ on scholarship and discovery – particularly in the natural sciences – steadied many participants, particularly those who had recently graduated, to voice comfort with research over community-engaged practice. Participants remarked upon the dearth of professional training and preparation afforded to faculty who are interested in service-learning; while conferences and conventions of this nature abound, these are not well promoted through participants’ primary academic associations.

**Condition 5 (Navigating) – College Milieu:** The more recent evolution of a fully functional Office of Community Engagement and hiring of a faculty Dean with expertise in applied Sociology have considerably eased navigating for faculty. While participants sensed administrative advocacy for the development of community-based partnerships, departmental and disciplinary politics – tied to the conditions explicated in US-Academe – create grounds for tensions, timing concerns, and obstacles.

**Condition 6 (Navigating) – Student Populous:** The navigating process become more fluid with upper-level courses, within which many students assumed co-leadership and responsibility for navigating community-based partnership. In many cases, faculty felt unduly burdened by 100-level and first-year courses; participants took on the responsibility of navigating a role similar to that of parent.

**Processes of Navigating:** As an important note, the process of navigating was universally described by participants as messy, chaotic, and unpredictable. While the above mentioned conditions may present road blocks or short cuts, neither their presence
nor absence makes service-learning a perfect, predictable experience. Perhaps the
greatest outcome/impact for new faculty was the realization, through navigating, that
learning exists in the process. This section begins with excerpts detailing participants’
experiences navigating institutional and departmental politics. Herein, they describe the
sub-processes of feeling pressure to justify courses, coping with competing demands,
reconciling multiple viewpoints, and surmounting hurdles.

So that’s the pressure...I’m still busy doing my day to day thing here with my
students. I would love to [learn from] someone who was doing a lot of community
engagement in another institution, perhaps that was teaching science courses. I
would love to see how that’s being done. It’s not, it’s not a natural thing to
happen. I can do it in my non-majors but I have a very hard time doing it in
majors courses and of course then you have to turn around and justify it to your
department. (#J10)

I don’t know how [service-learning] is going to turn out... So, yeah, I mean that
bothers me but there’s not a lot I can do about it. I mean, I hear stuff all the time
[from my department] like, ‘where did that come from, why did we do that?’ But
that’s the nature of institutional politics. (#F6)

We better not see hypocrisy floating around in this institution because, you know,
because people talk the talk but they just don’t walk it and I guess I’m tired of it.
And so if we, if we’re saying that we’re going to be doing service-learning and
you’re not doing something as a member outside of the community, if you are
telling your students that it’s important to do service-learning and you have no
desire to do it yourself, then there’s a problem. (#K11)

When I hear [an administrator] saying, ‘I’m sort of going out on a limb here to
support this,’ then I’m like, ‘what does this mean?’ When you hear people raise
questions about the academic integrity of what you’re doing, you know, then it
makes you sort of wonder. (#B2)

My background, and if you look at our department, the departmental scholarly
production is in literature, in language. Mostly literature, so this is year another,
there’s another hurdle. (#G7)

I don’t think I could not do what I do. Or maybe a little voice in my head would
say, ‘You know this is taking up too much time. Just do your class normal, don’t
have service learning. Protect yourself first.’ But I do, I do have faith that the
institution values this and that our curriculum is benefiting and our students are
benefiting. (#R18)
Faculty also navigated ideals, ideas, and perceptions about the ivory tower, some internally derived and others drawn from external stereotypes:

*I mean, our college is an urban college...and at some level you kind of have to expect that the faculty is going to reach out to the immediate community. Even if they haven’t in the past, it sort of runs counter to logic.* (#F6)

*[My course] in the past has been pretty abstract so what this is forcing me to do is...to come down from the ivory tower and to think about the course, which has always been one of my most successful courses, and I’ve taught this course for years and years. So I’m changing it again but I’m taking one of my most successful courses and I’m trying [service-learning] out.* (#C3)

Timing-related concerns, pressures, and demands abounded as faculty navigated new and competing priorities.

*Service-learning requires a time commitment. Organizing, setting it up, working with the students and getting them from off the campus to wherever we’re doing the service learning experience. Getting them there. And looking at all that is time consuming.* (#H8)

*It’s one of those things where unless you dedicate the time, it can’t be just an add-on. You know, we get very busy with other things.* (#I9)

*I don’t know if I could do more [service-learning] because I feel like I spend all my time working... I have all these other balls that I’m trying to keep in the air, too.* (#E5)

*I’m carving out space [in my curriculum for service-learning] and that means, it does mean that something has to give. But I’ve decided genitive prepositions are not as important as these experiences are.* (#G7)

*I think I’m like everybody else here, struggling with, ah, how to find the time to do the things that I want to do. The things I think I should do.* (#F6)

Also, faculty recollected experiences of navigating other obstacles and conditions, especially student and community partner dynamics:

*I could probably get away with doing something a little bit more complex but freshmen and sophomores, there is a great benefit from this kind of activity, but it has to be very tailored to where they are.* (#F6)
The other challenge is coordinating community partners and the problems that come about with scheduling and wanting to cover everything that I want to cover. I didn’t know how time consuming this is but it’s worth it. (#D4)

Whether they are education majors or first year students or students traveling to another country, they really do have to have a lot of preparation in order to be effective in their role working in the community and that responsibility typically falls on me. (#M13)

People who run not for profits are busy and underpaid and overworked and they could just not show up one day when you really need them to show up and that reflects poorly on you unfortunately in the students’ eyes. Um, but if you are honest with your students about that up front and that’s what I do, and this took me awhile to figure out but at the front end, I said this is what doing service learning is like. You can expect to have your schedule changed multiple times. You can expect to have your community partner be running late or not be able to come that day. (#Q17)

Outcomes/impacts of Navigating: While navigating could be both frustrating and enlightening for those interviewed, participants conceptualized this dimension as a learning experience. In reflection, participants were reminded that, despite extant obstacles and uncertainties, service-learning was considerably important – never haphazard, always grounded, and critical to students, community agencies, and other partners. While some participants found ways to navigate with greater efficiency and precision, others discovered the importance of taking a ‘back seat’ and allowing students to lead the way. Perhaps one of the greatest outcomes/impacts was cultivating patience. The following quotations capture the diversity of sentiments expressed as outcomes/impacts of the navigating experience.

How do [these logistics] affect my desire to do [service-learning]? The important thing is, being the idealistic person that I am, it requires it. It requires that we do service-learning, not because of the immediate gratification that we or the students get, but for the hope of some sort of difference later on in life. (#K11)

It keeps me grounded, especially in education, by being out in the classrooms and out in the real world environment. I don’t get the ‘box’ of just academe. So being
out there helps me... instead of being a professor who never gets off the college campus and loses touch with the real world. (#H8)

If you are into instant gratification this is probably a pedagogical approach that’s going to leave you deflated most of the time. (#P16)

I fully expect, from my own experience, to see some messiness. I mean there are, um, people not showing up, there are people not responding, there are, uh, people doing things that you hadn’t planned on doing all the time. But that’s people and that’s building relationships. You don’t know these people, you don’t know their background well enough and can’t judge their actions so hastily because of a couple of things that don’t fall in line with your plan. (#M13)

I’ve come to realize that community engagement cannot be haphazard. (#G7)

I guess I’m convinced [now that] service-learning can add something to it, even that course. Um, but then realizing I just can’t add service learning on top of it. I’ve got to prepare the students and I’ve got to focus the course a little bit more to give service-learning a chance to do what I saw it do in [my first-year seminar]. (#C3)

I’d like to say that I believe that 90% of good community engagement teaching is learning how to get out of the way... I think over the years I have had many different roles. I certainly started out in a much more structured role then I have now. I have evolved into a less structured role over time. (#N14)

Summary of Navigating: In essence, the experience of navigating is processual; it evolves over time as faculty members steer through and around human and nonhuman elements, circumstances, and conditions. While some aspects of navigating provoked frustration or discontent, the process – for the most part – cultivated patience, insight, strategic thinking, and pragmatism on the faculty member’s part. Most critically, navigating incited learning.

Dimension Three: Reconciling Expectations

Service-learning, for most participants, creates the surreptitious, often unexpected opportunity to reconcile expectations (refer to Figure 10) of what teaching entails, how learning transpires, and how service-learning enriches the classroom – and beyond. The
inner life of faculty is replete with expectations shaped by one’s interface with the conditions described below.

**Condition 1 (Reconciling Expectations) – Role:** To female professors, gender was noted as a facilitator of and impediment to *reconciling expectations*. Two female participants described the experience of fitting into a man’s academic world; service-learning provided an opportunity to teach in a way that was more fully aligned with their personality, style, and ethic of care. A young, untenured participant voiced her passion for service-learning, also noting her need to temper ‘control’ of the classroom. One’s membership in a department or discipline – regardless of personal demographics – also presented pathways and blockages to *reconciling expectations*. Faculty in the natural sciences (e.g., biology, biochemistry, chemistry, and marine biology) found this role to impede their ability to reconcile and realign expectations of teaching, learning, and community-based work. Consequently, a near-universal choice was made not to align service-learning with majors and lab courses. For faculty in the humanities, social sciences, and expressive arts, the process of *reconciling expectations* was more fluid, but caused consternation or doubt.

**Condition 2 (Reconciling Expectations) – Service-learning Experience:** Regardless of one’s background or experience in service-learning, the experience of *reconciling expectations* was common given the unpredictable, ever-changing nature of this work. Immersion opportunities (i.e., short term field study or intersession courses) offered faculty and students a qualitatively different experience than semester-long service-learning experiences. Generally, faculty and students traveled out of state or internationally, partnering with relief efforts, environmental justice initiatives, or human
rights organizations. In this regard, one faculty described immersive service-learning as a 24-hour venture.

*Condition 3 (Reconciling Expectations) – Community Partner:* Few participants referenced the agency or community partner relationship as a condition or precursor to *reconciling expectations* unless the partner took on an active teaching role in the classroom.

*Condition 4 (Reconciling Expectations) – US Academe:* Participants consistently reconciled their expectations of what teaching and learning entailed; many had been socialized to believe that good teaching entailed hierarchy, distance, and classroom control. As noted previously, a lack of integrated training and development led many faculty to consider themselves amateurs.

*Condition 5 (Reconciling Expectations) – College Milieu:* For three years, the College – with support from the Office of Community Engagement – has offered service-learning roundtables and an annual *Summit on Transforming Learning*. Participants named both as invaluable opportunities that prompted them to reconcile and revise their expectations of classroom teaching. Still, a number of participants noted that these endeavors attract ‘usual suspects’, eluding those educators and departments who believe service-learning is neither rigorous nor valuable.

*Condition 6 (Reconciling Expectations) – Student Populous:* The reconciling process was inimitably tied to characteristics of the student populous. In many cases, students surprised faculty participants with their depth of engagement, learning, and transformation. This, in turn, evoked a desire in many interviewees to *reconcile expectations* of what teaching entails and how learning transpires.
Figure 10: Dimensional Analysis of Reconciling Expectations
The sub-processes of reconciling what teaching entails, how learning transpires, and how service-learning enriches the classroom are intertwined and mutually reciprocal. In some regards, one’s reconciliation of what teaching entails prompted a deeper consideration of how learning transpires. In other cases, a discovery of how service-learning enriches the classroom fostered deeper reflection upon and reconsideration of what teaching entails. In all cases, the umbrella process of reconciling expectations entailed a debunking or ‘unlearning’ of normative (i.e., stereotypical) teaching and learning behaviors.

Participants had been socialized to believe that good teaching implied maintaining control over the classroom, the students, and the curriculum/content. With control came a need – real or perceived – to see oneself and be seen as expert, an authority figure. Service-learning derailed many of these expectations, causing faculty to engage in a process of reconciling expectations derived from external loci of control. The shift from following external expectations about teaching to developing internal expectations about learning was paramount. The following excerpts contain aspects of this journey:

*You give up control [with service-learning]. But that’s also the benefit because you sort of like giving up control and you’re putting an emphasis on [the students] to find their way and put some of the theory in the practice.* (F6)

*I learned long ago that if you can get past, you know, that um, sort of power thing and you can treat people like people, they understand that ‘Okay, here’s somebody that’s an old geezer that’s been around a long time, he’s my professor but now we’re on a first name basis. We’re doing the same thing. He’s not supervising, he’s down there getting dirtier than me.’* (B2)

*When I got here, my vision of teaching was lecturing in the classroom, pretty much. I knew I’d, I had taken students on field trips when I was at [my previous institution], but they were just field trips where we went out and I pointed things out. It wasn’t really anything where the students were directly engaged in anything but listening to me talk... [Now I realize] you can’t do a service project*
and not have constant exchange and dialogue about what you’re doing and why you’re doing it and see the excitement that students have. (#I9)

[Before teaching with service-learning] I was in control of everything. Right? And I think that’s particularly the case in language classes because I [thought I] had to be the expert...You have to be the authority to say that this is right or wrong. And now, I’m engaged in an entirely different enterprise. (#G7)

I’m such a control freak... So it’s a lesson that sort of counters my personality which is very controlling and um between the engagement and servicing learning definitely caused me to get much more self reflective as a teacher. (#N14)

We got [to our service-learning site] and no one was there. I was a little flabbergasted and frustrated. [The students] were like, ‘No, professor don’t worry it’s not your fault.’ I think they saw kind of like a little more human side. So I told them, ‘Alright, let’s move on, there is a little Cuban café a couple of blocks away. I will treat you all to breakfast and we will try to make the most of this.’ And we drive up to the Cuban café and it’s closed, too. And I just kind of threw my hands up in the air and said ‘I’m really sorry.’ Um but they were sympathetic so I think that’s a little bit of a different dynamic for the students to see their professor not being able to fix everything, not being able to make the class go perfectly. So I think it was good for them it was good for me. To not be the expert, to not be the one in control all the time. (#S19)

There’s a lot of things that you give up control over...so there’s that risk to your persona as the teacher, as the one in control, which I think is where some faculty are still comfortably only in that role of the expert in the room. The one who asks you a question because they know what the answer already is, and that role of, maybe it’s just more natural in the arts not to take that role because there aren’t exact answers for things. And our expertise comes from trial and error... [But] the risk is also like how the work might emotionally affect you. (#Q17)

Participants found service-learning to be among the most powerful tools in their pedagogical toolbox, advancing students’ understanding of content and creating excitement about the course and community. As faculty reflected upon this lesson, they revisited and debunked previously held expectations of what it means to convey content and create space for learning.

As students have come back to me...one of the things they keep reminding me of was this [service-learning] excursion out to this German American community, to the old church, to the old graveyard, um, and they remember that more than just about anything else. So I’m, I guess what I am realizing, and it makes perfect
sense as I think about my own memories, um, sure you want to provide them with the linguistic skills. And if I don’t teach them how to communicate at sufficient levels in the language then I’ve not done my job. I’ve come to realize that [service-learning] is propelling students past some of the drudgery that is involved in my discipline. (#G7)

I guess that all of this is pretty ambitious… addressing a [community] problem and doing research. But, um, what I can tell you is that the atmosphere of the classroom is 100% different when I’m doing service-learning than when I am the principle speaker. Students feel how important this is. (#D4)

[The students] integrate the course material into their worldview more fully then they would if it were just book learning... How it’s not just statistics or theory but actual people who are impacted by [art and art history]. (#L12)

[Before service-learning], the students are all very [politically correct]. But, like, personalizing their activities by talking to a real person and making them connect the real person’s life to, like, changes and the period they’re studying it sort of humanizes the process…they would’ve never thought of [history] that way. They would have never humanized it. It’s sort of like abstraction with no connection to them as people. Much of what has happened in the history books has no connection to them as people... so the [service-learning] crystallizes the changes. (#F6)

Outcomes/impacts of Reconciling Expectations: The outcomes/impacts associated with reconciling expectations are manifold, including: seeing students in a different light, changing relationships with students, and reengineering existing and future courses to meet new ideals of teaching and learning. These excerpts exemplify faculty members’ emergent relationships with students, coupled with their desire to continue engaging in service-learning:

You know, you see students in a different way. You know, I’ve [said], ‘look, I’m just here as one of you. I want you to accept me as that. I’m taking orders from you.’ (#B2)

I’ve questioned my abilities to teach, a lot. Especially coming back from sabbatical and kind of struggling… feeling, just kind of, discouraged, and um…never sure am I giving to them or not…is it working or not? Am I a good teacher still? I mean, I believe I’m a good teacher. You know, it’s, I’m scared because I don’t have, I don’t walk into a class that I’m going to teach with these 10 things and we just got to get through these 10 things and it means “I’m a good
teacher”. And on the test you got to know those 10 things. That, to me, would be average. For me, I want to see. I want to see it. I want to see them changed, fundamentally changed. I want them to have ah ha moments... I try to open myself to any ideas that might occur to me because I tend to get the best ideas, the best ideas I ever get from my kids. And [service-learning] was one of those... And I kept pushing, pushing them to explore. (#T20)

[I realized the class] gets deeper because the students take it there. It doesn’t get deeper because I set it up that way. (#A1)

You have such a high and you want it to continue...The students did it, they were there and they got excited about it. It just clicked. And I don’t know I mean, this is it. I don’t know how much is dependent on upon these students or the process itself. That’s why I’m anxiously awaiting doing this same sort of thing in my Intro to Philosophy. (#C3)

The only thing I can say is that it’s incomplete, [service-learning] has left me anxious in both senses of the word. I’m filling in the gaps but anxious in the sense that I’m figuring out what to do in the future. (#G7)

Summary of Reconciling Expectations: The inner life of faculty members is burdened, enhanced, and driven by expectations. While some expectations are internally derived – indelibly linked to aspects of self – others come from external, systemic loci. For this study’s participants, the experience of engaging in service-learning with undergraduates may be written as a counter-narrative, an experience qualitatively different than that of ‘normative’ teaching and learning. Through this experience, a number of participants were inspired to move service-learning from margin to mainstream in the institution’s curriculum.
Dimension Four: Resolving and Reorienting

The process of resolving and reorienting was laden with vulnerability, pain, fear, and elation. A deeply personal process, resolving and reorienting (refer to Figure 11) meant coping with, reflecting upon, and bringing meaning to one’s experiences of discomfort and disorientation. Not only did various conditions facilitate this experience, but they also served, in some respects, as the mirrors upon which faculty gazed, reflected upon, and reinterpreted their own lives.

Condition 1 (Resolving and Reorienting) – Role: Coping with pain, fear, or vulnerability is a deeply personal process; while seemingly ineffable or difficult to describe for some participants, dialogue around these constructs came naturally for others. For some participants, past role (e.g., abused daughter) or present situation (e.g., divorcée) factored into one’s experience, serving as facilitator, block, or mediator to the process of resolving and reorienting. It is critical to note, therefore, that a litany of roles – many voiced, others unspoken – comprise aspects of the faculty members’ engagement experience.

Figuratively, most professors entered role-bound into their service-learning experience; some emerged relatively unshackled by title or position, others altogether eschewed hierarchical relationships between and among self, students, community partner, and institution. Many participants continually revisited their own understanding of role through the resolving and reorienting process.
Coping with, reflecting upon, and bringing meaning to:
- Fear; Vulnerability; Pain; Elation
- Stepping outside of one’s comfort zone
- Being honest with oneself about what comfort does and does not entail
- Sorting through disorientation and discomfort
- Recognizing it’s not a feel good experience
- Placing self in the shoes of the ‘other’
- Recognizing it is okay to be fearful
- Going through anxiety, intellectually and physically
- Rationalizing oneself out of the experience

Wondering if service-learning will be impactful for the community, students, and/or faculty member

Achieving catharsis; bringing more ‘holistic’ meaning to the experience
Fostering a deeper understanding of service-learning; Recognizing the work must continue
Developing stronger relationships with students; Bringing a ‘fuller self’ into the classroom
Enabling a greater willingness to take risks for the sake of community advancement and student learning
Continually reorienting

**Figure 11:** Dimensional Analysis of Resolving and Reorienting
Condition 2 (Resolving and Reorienting) – Service-learning Experience: No one service-learning experience was the same, even when faculty members attempted to duplicate context, learning outcomes, and expectations. While faculty members grew more confident over time and with more service-learning practice, no one community-based experience arrived without some degree of resolving and reorienting, especially when the experience involved what faculty perceived to be high-risk partnerships. In addition, faculty reflected on early, childhood or adolescent experiences of resolving and reorienting, drawing connections between those experiences (e.g., volunteering in 1992 with Hurricane Andrew rescue work) and their decisions to pursue service-learning during their academic careers (e.g., creating a course that connects poverty and economic relief).

Condition 3 (Resolving and Reorienting) – Community Partner: This construct was especially facilitative of resolving and reorienting, especially when conditions (e.g., poverty, abuse) triggered or incited disorientation, emotion, or reflection. For some participants, a fear of certain types of community partnership (e.g., homeless citizens, disabled veterans, greyhound rescue) altogether precluded them from choosing potentially transforming – albeit risky – partnerships.

Condition 4 (Resolving and Reorienting) – US Academe: Externally-derived perceptions of what it ‘means to be a professor’ blocked some participants from pursuing pedagogies that would elicit emotion in students or evoke vulnerability in the faculty member. Female and post-tenured faculty were less reticent to engage fully in the continual, cyclical process of resolving and reorienting.
**Condition 5 (Resolving and Reorienting) – College Milieu:** Physical spaces (e.g., department meetings, summits, faculty development roundtables) conducive to dialogue around fear, vulnerability, anxiety, and control facilitated educators’ experiences of resolving and reorienting. Herein, faculty were each others’ learning conduits, especially when a mentoring relationship was involved.

**Condition 6 (Resolving and Reorienting) – Student Populous:** The resolving and reorienting process could be blocked or facilitated by students’ own maturity, vulnerability, and desire to engage fully in the oft-messy, unpredictable work of service-learning. A number of participants remarked upon the extent to which their students not only co-taught the class, but evoked powerful, penetrable lessons in the faculty member him or herself.

**Processes of Resolving and Reorienting:** Engaging in service-learning with undergraduates was rarely, for this study’s participants, a comfortable experience; the following sentiments capture the overall essence of this dimension:

*We want [the students] to experience failure and that sometimes you can get a better learning experience out of the being uncomfortable, the discomfort and the experiencing failure then you can if you go in and everything runs really smoothly and they feel good about themselves and they leave. I think that’s the same thing that’s true for professors and I think you, ideally. I think you have to be used to being uncomfortable yourself and having things not work. (#E5)*

*I think that the only way to grow as a professor [is through discomfort] ... it’s easy to get into certain patterns in your teaching that you’re very comfortable with. Something’s been successful, you continue to do it that way. It becomes that way you do it. But you don’t grow a lot doing that... And, you know, I think those [service-learning] experiences all came through, sort of, stepping outside the comfort zone, kind of thing. (#I9)*
Faculty expressed their own fear, anxiety, emotion, and discomfort as co-learners and co-participants in the service-learning process; their interface with and reflection upon various conditions or circumstances are described as follows:

*I think I got involved in [service-learning] because it made me feel good. And at some point in time, and I don’t really know when it was, it began to click with me how badly I felt about what I was seeing. I became really um, overwhelmed with injustice, in the sense of injustice in the society and in the world and um, I think it is still true now, it’s almost like eating really hot Thai food... you suffer through the whole thing of boy you really like the food and I, I sort of feel that way about really good community engagement work too is that while I see the good that’s coming out of it, there’s something um, that’s very painful I think to recognize that hey, we have to be doing this. That there are conditions and whether they are social or economic, that led to the reality that someone has to be here or someone needs to be here doing this kind of work. Um, as opposed to can’t we build a more just society that will eliminate the need for us to be here? Um, I’m really concerned about kind of the feel goody aspect of, of, I mean, I um, I think if real learning is taking place, it’s most often incredibly painful. (#P16)*

*I didn’t know how sharp [the community members] were going to be, how much they were going to be able to remember. Um, I didn’t know I was also fearful of – and it turns out [the students were] too... of the elders. (#C3)*

*You know, that rush you get when you’re in poverty and you’re afraid of it and you’re thinking these kids are going to have a heart attack when they’re here? I get this, like, rush of fear, you know, it’s like, oh my God, my mother will get me. I can’t tell people [where] I’m going. What am I thinking? Who do I think I am? And that’s some of it, you know? You go through this self-doubt, like, what have I got to contribute anyway? You try to rationalize yourself out of placing yourself in those positions. (#A1)*

*You know, my heart just sunk. I mean, I just, there’s one other time I felt that way and it was when I was in this big ship board fire on, when I was in the Navy and you get that, you know, your heart sinks and you get this, you know, real rock in your stomach. Like fear. I felt that again, first time in almost 30 years I felt that way. (#B2)*

Participants also experienced fear, anxiety, and discomfort when considering whether or not service-learning would be impactful for the community, students, and/or faculty member.
When you go out in the community, especially when interacting with homeless people, anything can happen. Well not anything. But, you know, something unanticipated could happen. And I thought a couple of times, wow, I’d be, kind of, that seems, it’d be really challenging... I think I’d be nervous if I were taking my students to Lima, doing a service project in Lima. I’d be hesitant to do that, to be honest with you, because of my own sort of, maybe fear...That takes some courage I think to do that, some courage on the part of the professor to sort of open things up like that. (#I9)

I kind of go back and forth. Am I challenging my students or am I doing some kind of hurt to them by throwing them out there, by making them do [service]? So there’s a lot of things beyond my control, which I don’t like. You know, as professors we like to have our classroom be a sanctuary and a space where we run the discussion, control the participation. In service-learning projects, it is very much letting loose the reigns. (#R18)

And [service-learning] is where I feel totally inadequate, right? ...I don’t know whether I’m going to be successful to get [the students] to do this or not. It’s frightening a little bit. (#G7)

You are letting [the students] go in a way so that’s, that’s part of the fear. And because you’re letting go, [the class] can bomb much more easily... So it was a fear of loss of control. It was a fear of not being able, not being as successful. I mean, if you’ve been successful, ah, who of us likes to leave what has been successful? It was a fear of how much are [the students] really going to get out of this. Um, and can they translate it beyond the mere feeling of it. (#C3)

Outcomes/impacts of Resolving and Reorienting: For many, engaging in the sub-processes of pushing through fear, anxiety, and discomfort fostered a deeper understanding of service-learning, a stronger relationship with students, and a greater willingness to take risks. It is important to note that the outcomes/impacts are not static; just as the process is never fully resolved, the faculty member is continually reorienting. These are iterative, interdependent processes and outcomes/impacts contingent upon a continuous interplay of context and conditions.

I don’t want to leave the impression that anxiety outweighs the positive sides...It’s causing me to reexamine what I do...as I’m talking about anxiety. I wasn’t willing to take some of those risks then that I’m now willing to take. (#G7)
I’m just far more comfortable I think then a lot of people living in [what] Parker Palmer [called] the ‘zone of anguish,’ I love that phrase. Living in that ‘zone of anguish’. Most [faculty] aren’t very comfortable, and comfort is the wrong word here but tolerable, that’s probably right. Or they want to get out of that field, and I think that’s why pedagogically people are so adverse to dealing with material that starts affecting students on a psychosocial level or a spiritual level is because there is nothing in your pedagogical training, there’s certainly nothing in the academy that prepares people well for that and so I think they either go God, I can’t do that, or they go, that has no place here. (#P16)

I got to go through all of the anxiety levels myself and experience it so then I could process it. And then reposition it in terms of how I might help [the students] understand it…and you look at it again differently... You really do [go through] a lot of self doubt but I’ve had enough experiences with fear like that, that I know if I push myself through fear, it’s the other side, it’s amazing. (#A1)

And as faculty reoriented, many commented upon having developed new, changing relationships with students:

There is a different level of vulnerability in [bringing my full self] into the classroom and sometimes students are not mature enough to handle that. And so it’s always a delicate balance of I don’t want them to feel, sort of, you know, I am still in the adult role. I don’t want them to feel responsible for taking care of me in some way. But at the same time I want to be a full human being in the classroom. (#O15)

You don’t know whether you are the teacher, the friend, the dad, the child, the student, I mean, you know because the roles get really messed up when you are not in control of the learning process. I mean, and anything can happen when you’re out there interacting...I mean this is, this is a lived experience that because you’ve got double layers, triple layers then and you’ve got all these structural boundaries that are saying you shouldn’t cross over... and I put myself and others at risk perhaps through the experience or disclosure or sharing of stories in ways that I don’t know if they are appropriate, you know. Certainly not, certainly not unprofessional but I don’t know, nobody ever gave me a manual on what was the appropriate relationship. Um, I am lucky; I don’t think I ever had a student to take advantage of that. (#P16)

I’ve been on trips where unexpectedly my ability to haul brick has endeared me to students in a way that my knowledge of Piaget’s stages never does. So there is something about coming alongside students and being who you are and letting them see that. I’ve also learned that although you have to be careful with it – what the psychologists call the ‘judicious use of self disclosure’ – it’s okay. Students sometimes need to know something about us to relate to us... [But you
need also to be willing to step in and understand when you have to be the mom. #N14)

You want to show and you don’t want to show too much vulnerability as a professor. Because then they get scared and they think you don’t know what you’re doing and so I think that I don’t share too much of it but I definitely, we definitely work through the issues. (#E5)

Summary of Resolving and Reorienting: As with the other dimensions, the process of resolving and reorienting is laden with learning, both introspective and experiential. One faculty member described his experience as reorienting daily, sometimes hourly, when he is engaged in service-learning with undergraduates.

Capturing similar sentiments as those expressed by his peers, resolving and reorienting was – all at once – a fearful, frightening, invigorating, and in some cases, cathartic process.

Dimension Five: Locating Self in Humanity

Locating self in humanity, depicted in Figure 12, is an evolving process within which the participant – in his or her interface with conditions, perspectives, and experiences – gradually develops and internalizes an awareness of self as part of a greater whole. The following excerpt from a memo drafted toward the end of the study further describes this emergent dimension:

I attended a conference on service-learning and leadership during which time a female presenter described the very perspective elucidated by those I have interviewed for my dissertation study and for which I had named locating self in humanity. The presenter, a service-learning faculty member at another liberal arts college, relayed the South African, humanist philosophy of Ubuntu. With partial derivations from the musings of Nelson Mandela, ubuntu refers to discovering one’s humanity as a construct inseparably integrated with that of others. One is part of a greater whole; in that vein, I exist because you exist or I am because you are. In other words, I can only understand myself in the context of others and, as such, the plight of the ‘other’ is, in turn, my own. This is precisely what most of my participants have described in reconciling their service-learning engagement with the
complex, inner and reflective experience of being and becoming fully human… in the classroom, outside of the classroom, and in the community. (CM12)

As with the other perspectives explored in this chapter, the fifth dimension is connected to the others while facilitated, blocked, or moderated by role, service-learning experience, community partner, US-academe, college milieu, and student populous. Given the especially reflective nature of this construct, a seventh condition has been added: reflective space. Without the presence of this necessary condition, locating self in humanity was altogether obstructed or diminished.

Condition 1 (Locating self in humanity) – Role: Many participants described the experience of moving away, emotionally and intellectually, from being ‘bound’ or labeled by their roles (e.g., scholar, anthropologist, etc.). By giving oneself permission to be seen in a multidimensional facet, participants described greater awareness and understanding as the ‘self’ as more fully human, integrated with the lives of their students and the whole of humanity. Some interviewees continued to struggle, persistently and constantly balancing, juggling, and integrating various role-based perceptions with an emergent desire to find greater meaning.

Condition 2 (Locating self in humanity) – Service-learning Experience: Without doubt, the accumulation and culmination of service-learning experiences – each different from the other – presented faculty members with contexts for learning, development, and transformation. For some, more recent community-based experiences evoked lessons from childhood; others carried past experiences of locating self in humanity into their work with undergraduate college students.
Condition 3 (Locating self in humanity) – Community Partner: Relationships with community members, partners, agencies, and settings facilitated and triggered one’s awareness of self, provoking introspection upon one’s own privilege, agency, and transformation.

Condition 4 (Locating self in humanity) – US Academe: Given the highly personal nature of locating self in humanity, this condition appeared less salient. If anything, the process of locating self in humanity provoked some participants to critique the modern professoriate, also criticizing what was perceived as a growing ‘consumerism’ in college and university management models.

Condition 5 (Locating self in humanity) – College Milieu: Again, conference-style arrangements (e.g., summits, faculty development roundtables) were conducive to exchange and conversation around faculty members’ inner experiences of engaging in service-learning with undergraduates. Seldom did the department or discipline, however, provide opportunity for this level of dialogue.

Condition 6 (Locating self in humanity) – Student Populous: The relationship between student populous and locating self in humanity was reciprocal and interdependent. Just as students’ readiness to see faculty members as co-learners in the community provoked self-awareness in participants, faculty members’ own modeling impacted students’ learning, growth, and development. As faculty members engaged in the process of seeing the self as inextricably connected to humanity, s/he conceptualized students as co-learners in this journey.
Locating self in humanity

Processes

Developing an awareness of self
Developing an awareness of self and others
Developing an awareness of the connection between self, others, and the community.

- Who am I?
- Who am I in relation to the other?
- Who are we in and of one another?

Making meaning of emotion and pain; Stepping away from overtly ‘intellectual’ tendencies; Growing okay with emotion.
Becoming more fully human, vulnerable.

Outcomes/Impacts

Internalizing awareness of self, others, and community.
Acting upon awareness; Developing life-long connections to the community; Becoming an activist.
Learning more about the self.
Being ‘transformed’.
Replanting the seeds of transformation.

Conditions-Context

Role: ‘Boundedness’ of roles (title, position, department); Relative multidimensionality
SL Experience: Background (e.g., child and adolescent experiences), accumulation and culmination of experiences
Community Partner: Relationships with community members, partners, agencies
US-Academe: Consumerism; competing models of academe and academic priorities (e.g., civic engagement)
College Milieu: Synchronous arrangements such as physical spaces, faculty-to-faculty interchange; departmental politics and norms
Student Populous: Readiness, reciprocity, maturity, vulnerability, development
Reflective Space: Personal (intrapersonal) or Interpersonal; cultivation of various media (e.g., journaling, sketching, etc.)

Figure 12: Dimensional Analysis of locating self in humanity
**Condition 7 (Locating self in humanity) – Reflective Space:** The cultivation of reflective space was vital to facilitating faculty members’ process of *locating self in humanity*. For some, such space was manifest in conversations with partners, loved ones, fellow faculty, or students; other participants divulged their experiences with blogging, journaling, or sketching. Regardless, the ability to ruminate – for which the interview itself also provided space – allowed faculty to engage in reflection and introspection which, in turn, cultivated higher level consideration of self in humanity.

**Processes of locating self in humanity:** The process of *locating self in humanity* is emergent; while no one participant’s journey mirrored that of another, common thematic elements exist across interviewees’ voiced experiences: making meaning of emotion and pain, discovering connections to self and others and, in turn, becoming more fully human. The following excerpts entail what participants describe as a necessary, critical experience – making meaning of the emotion, vulnerability, and pain induced in community-based contexts – which, for some, required stepping away from a tendency to intellectualize experiences:

*And on a personal note, I think my experience being 19 years old and working in an emergency room probably gave me, I won’t call a comfort level by any means, but it probably gave me an exposure to dealing with painful things of a different nature. Some of my own experiences in my own family probably gave me more of the personal nature as to where I think that I’m not as averse to getting in situations that are about pain as I think a lot of people are. I’ve recognized that the older I have gotten, I’m unusual in that regard... [And now I realize] it’s unreasonable of me to expect that other people can go into what they might perceive as a place that puts them in danger. And usually it’s not physical danger, but it’s danger of creating this equilibrium of this self and universe that we all design so that we actually get from day to day. (#P16)*

*If you are really in the trenches with your students and you are really vulnerable...that can be an incredibly meaningful experience in how the professors’ lived experience informs what they talk about in and out of the classroom. But it’s also a very high level of vulnerability. (#O15)*
I think [service-learning] requires that you are very close. And if you are the type of person who is not easily transformed, that requires you to get very, very vulnerable. And sometimes that can be very painful. But I think that is a good kind of pain. (#M13)

[In that community context with students] I was scared to move. I should have. I kept thinking, ’I need to get all of these people back to the hotel. It’s dark, we’ve got to walk.’ I was scared to move because it was so ephemeral... [And] that changed me. Um, it changed me, uh, to a place where I’m comfortable setting the scene for things to happen and then letting them happen. As opposed to always trying to script and make them happen. (#N14)

And the risk is also, like, how the work might emotionally affect you. And you might lose it one day...You just lose it, right? I mean, some days, it’s got to just get the better of you and so, yeah, you become vulnerable in front of the students. And you have to be prepared for that...you just have to be honest about it, I guess, with them. But I think that’s always a good thing. I mean, it can’t be a bad thing. Students see you, the professor, as a human being. (#Q17)

Connected with the emotional experience is, for many participants, an emerging desire to know students in a deeper way.

[I am] wanting to be closer to [my students] in a more holistic way, wanting to partner with them on projects that I thought were of some significance and could be meaningful to all of us. And so, in that sense, I think my [service-learning experience] has been radically developmental. And liberating in that way. (#O15)

You know, that [service-learning] experience carried over when we came back to campus, so my relationship with those students was ‘us’, not ‘me’ and ‘them’. And I’ve always tried to keep it that way. And so after all those trips I have students I never see in the classroom, I have a relationship. They know me; they call me by my first name, which is how I prefer to be referred to. (#B2)

I see service-learning as being as much about the development of the person as it is about everything academic so if I’m really committed to students as people then that has to occur inside and classroom and out. And what attracts me most to working with this age group is what a transformative time it is in your life. (#L12)

Becoming more fully human entailed reflecting upon – and reconsidering – what it meant to be human. Several participants noted that the more they worked in the
community, the more they recognized their own privilege, power, and necessity to incite change. Evocatively told, the following excerpt conveys one faculty member’s experience teaching a Hurricane Katrina recovery course in New Orleans.

The bigger impact was when we actually went into people’s homes. And first of all, I’d never been in somebody’s house without being invited. But here we are, busting the door down to try to get in to gut the house and remove the debris and, you know, the first house is the one you remember. And you’re going through someone else’s life. Here is all their possessions; they raised their children and their grandchildren in this house, you know, they’ve been there for 30 years. This was, in many regards, the sum total of their lives at least materially and even more than that. And to be, to have to be going through, to remove that, in some regards it became a religious experience when you found a picture. Even if it was waterlogged, you knew that it meant something to somebody. When we met the homeowner for this house...we couldn’t get him to walk in there. The things that we thought we’d save that we thought he’d appreciate he didn’t want. He didn’t want to get near it. I mean, he was trying to deal with this. And I guess the only way he figured to do it was to walk away from it. He couldn’t face his loss. And, uh, that started me thinking about my own life and what was truly important. You know, just, even on a material basis, you know? You know, if under the threat of a hurricane, what am I going to save? Besides my family, what things are really the most important that are totally irreplaceable? (#B2)

Outcomes/impacts of locating self in humanity: At best, locating self in humanity is a continual process laden with ongoing learning about the self, others, and community. As participants gained greater awareness and perspective, a number of learning outcomes emerged. One outcome/impact, common across a number of participant experiences, was that of personal transformation:

I don’t have any business feeling sorry for myself no matter what happens, you know, if I go through death, divorce, personal injury, anything, my life is easy street. And I can spend a lot more time helping than I do. So, that’s made a profound effect. It was no question about it, nothing religious about it, but it was very transformative...Well, I have to admit that [this transformation] has continued to impact my thinking. (#M13)

I mean, I know I’m changing and I’m reorienting, you know, how I look at things and the way I look at the ways I conduct my daily life and what I’m thinking about in my daily life... You know, instead of thinking I can’t change the world because
it’s too hard, you find sort of the way around that. You start in another place. It may be the bigger difference in their lives. (#B2)

Participants also considered ongoing, life-long connections to the community; this was manifest in what interviewees described as doing everyday, planting the seeds in others, or paying it forward:

[Service-learning] has led more to thinking about how can you serve and still learn from the experiences? How can you help somebody else? Um, I don’t believe in Sunday Christians. Um, I believe in doing everyday. Alright? I think that’s more important than just going to church on a Sunday... [For example] it’s this weekend from Friday and all day Saturday to 10:00 at night volunteering in our community. That’s what you do. You have to give back. (#H8)

[My wife and I], when we walk, we walk into our little town, to the blinking light, you know, to buy newspapers two or three times a week. And we now pick up the trash on the side of the road...for about a seven mile stretch of road...So somehow, you know, this issue is just part of citizenship, I guess. Being a good citizen, a good neighbor. I never really thought about doing something like that, necessarily, before [I taught service-learning courses]. (#B2)

Because I saw this happen in my own life, the seed was kind of gently planted in me...I saw that expand dramatically over the course of a number of years, almost, well, really a decade. Um, into something much bigger in me... [And] I hope there’s a seed on this campus, in the community, that people speak up and shift the culture a little bit. (#L12)

Summary of locating self in humanity: This study’s participants became more than educators engaged in service-learning when describing the process of locating self in humanity. In sharing this narrative, emotion abounded; participants gave themselves permission to delve deeper, unveiling a complex labyrinth of who they were becoming in communion with students and the community.

Intersections between Dimensional and Situational Analyses

The constructs expressed through the situational analysis can be discussed as conditions that both facilitate and limit faculty members’ overall evolving learning experience. Table 3 synthesizes facilitating and limiting conditions by dimension; while
six themes surfaced as the conditions within which processes and outcomes/impacts coexist, some were stronger than others. Notably, these were role, service-learning experience, and college milieu.

Within role, the tenure and promotion process proved remarkably important; in most departments, faculty were not rewarded tenure ‘points’ for service-learning though the work was implicitly valued. For scientists, neither held true; their rewards arose through the scholarship of discovery. In many cases, the evolving learning experience prompted faculty to revisit expectations around what becoming a professor should – and should not – entail. This bears implications for how faculty members are rewarded, particularly in the hard sciences. Given global emphasis on the application of STEM (i.e., science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) to contemporary problems, for instance, it grows more critical for faculty to consider community-based work.

In all cases, faculty members’ prior experience in the service milieu (e.g., volunteerism, field excursions, and charitable work) readied them to engage in academic service-learning. Previous experience did not render faculty experts; instead, it gave them a level of insight, perspective, or awareness that they might not otherwise have had. Whereas type, scope, or duration of experience were expressed as relatively unimportant to ‘what all is happening’, faculty were involved in a broad variety of service-learning projects, all grounded in academic content. That faculty background in service may drive future engagement is particularly critical, especially as academe recruits new cadres of educators.
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Issues pertaining to the college milieu were also salient, notably an ongoing curriculum reform process and issues related to departmental authority and expectations. Regarding the reform process, a number of faculty members felt stuck between hope and fear – hope that the institution would place values into action through the provision of an active service-learning agenda and fear that the converse would hold true. This perennial debate bears consequences for faculty choice; regardless of what values are espoused, faculty members may cue into what the culture informally enacts.

*Evolving Learning: A Summary*

This chapter presented data in the context of a phased, grounded theory approach; illustrated frameworks for looking at data in new ways; and revealed the visual and narrative results from the situational and dimensional analyses. Essentially, this chapter unveiled ‘what all is happening’ in the inner experience of educators engaged in service-learning with undergraduates. This experience entails *evolving learning*, which is a core, organizing perspective comprised of five intersecting dimensions: (1) *bearing witness*, (2) *navigating*, (3) *reconciling expectations*, (4) *resolving and reorienting*, and (5) *locating self in humanity*. These dimensions are recursive and interconnected, both fostered and limited by six situational constructs: role, service-learning experience, community partner, US-academe, college milieu, and student populous. Chapter Five delves into discussion, implications, and recommendations for practice relevant to the analysis presented in Chapter Four.
Chapter Five: Discussion

Educators’ inner experiences of engaging in service-learning with undergraduates are evocative, nuanced, and multidirectional. Bringing to life the data revealed in Chapter Four, this chapter presents points of discussion; proposes implications for teaching, learning, service, and personal development; unveils recommendations for practice; addresses both contributions and limitations; and directs opportunities for future scholarship and inquiry. In the context of this chapter and the guiding auspices of constructivist grounded theory, points of discussion around each of the five emergent dimensions are presented. These dimensions are explored and modeled both discretely and holistically in order to draw discussion points and implications for evolving learning in practice.

Following points of discussion about the dimensions and organizing perspective (i.e., evolving learning), the chapter segues into implications. Herein, discussion points meet the perspectives, theories, and models explored in Chapter Two; ideas are explored through the lenses of three pools of inquiry: the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, the Scholarship of Engagement, and theories of faculty development. The purpose of this section on implications is to lay the foundation for practical recommendations. While the study’s methodology precludes generalization to other institutions or faculty, its implications are portable and bear innumerable applications for practice. Situated in two fields – inner development and organizational change – these ideas for enhancing faculty development and the ‘academy’ at large are formulated. Before concluding, both limitations and directions for future research are presented; the latter highlights opportunities for: qualitative inquiry utilizing constructivist grounded theory, particularly
those methodologies employed in this study; inquiry that broadens and deepens our understanding of potentially transformative practices in higher education; and inquiry that leads to greater understanding of the evolving professoriate.

Summary of Findings

An exploratory, pilot study, this dissertation created the opportunity for discovery around a question of profound interest to me for a number of years. In the context of engagement in service-learning with college students, I had wondered what transpires, develops, or changes within the faculty mentor him or herself. While dimensional analysis permitted grounded inquiry focused on ‘what all was happening’ in the milieu of faculty members’ inner experience, a complementary methodology – situational analysis – ensured a bird’s eye view of the situation. Situational analysis also provided opportunities to represent, populate, and envisage ‘literal’ data in novel, ‘figurative’ ways.

Revealed through these methodologies were grounded data born of faculty members’ expressed experiences. These data are represented by an organizing perspective (i.e., evolving learning) and five dimensions (i.e., bearing witness, navigating, reconciling expectations, resolving and reorienting, and locating self in humanity). Also, six themes emerged through several iterations of social worlds/arenas maps, abstract situational maps, and an ordered situational map: role, service-learning experience, community partner, US-Academe, college milieu, and student populous. As a critical note, no one of the five core dimensions necessarily precedes, succeeds, or subsumes the other. To have made that supposition would have forced the data in places antithetical to their origins or representations. Also, such linearity would undermine the
richness of the human experience, a condition that cannot necessarily be ‘generalized’ but can be explored and understood for its richness, diversity, and multiple perspectives. As this chapter reveals, no such ‘one size fits all’ model exists for evolving learning, nor does a series of defined stages. In more ways than one, this study reminds us of the pluralities each educator brings to the academic context. And perhaps one of this dissertation’s greatest contributions is the recognition of how remarkably each faculty member grows, develops, and evolves individually alongside of students, community partners, and others.

While seemingly cliché, the whole of this study – evolving learning – evokes an energy, power, and effervescence much greater than the sum of its component parts. As an organizing perspective, evolving learning captures, all at once, faculty members’ growth and development in a way that enhances not just the self but, transformatively and reciprocally, the students, the community and, in some cases, varied facets of the institution. Evolving learning prevailed in each interview, site visit, and artifact. A lifelong journey, evolving learning evolves, morphs, adapts, and transforms as educators bear witness to others’ learning and development; navigate novel frontiers, both literally and figuratively; reconcile extant norms and stereotypes of what teaching, learning, and engagement entail; resolve and reorient fear, courage, and vulnerability; and locate their own place in humanity. Resulting from the methodologies used, evolving learning draws from both the voiced foreground and once hidden background of faculty members’ experiences, rending the study deep, robust, and intimate.
Discussion of Findings

While Chapter Four reveals each of the core dimensions in the context of participants’ experiences, this section adds another layer, unveiling my interpretation and understanding of these dimensions. The term ‘theory’ carries with it varying connotations, some positivist and others more constructivist in nature. A ‘proposition’ lays groundwork for exploration and intrigue. From Charmaz (2006), the following excerpt captures the essence of how theory is rendered in this study and where it may diverge from normative constructions of theory in the social sciences:

Interpretive theory calls for the imaginative understanding of the studied phenomenon. This type of theory assumes emergent, multiple realities; indeterminacy: facts and values as inextricably linked; truth as provisional; and social life as processual. Thus interpretive theory is fully compatible with George Herbert Mead’s symbolic interactionism, which shares these assumptions. Mead takes a sophisticated view of action as the starting place for analysis…We interpret our participants’ meanings and actions and they interpret ours. (p. 126-127)

The ensuing discussion, therefore, acknowledges and builds upon an interpretivist viewpoint; in bringing meaning to these data, I do not enter this discourse without some degree of bias, opinion, naiveté, or experience. In this vein, I invite the reader to make note of his or her ideas, abstractions, and conceptions of these data. How do these ideas fit our social realities? From what interpretive frames do we view, deconstruct, and bring meaning to others’ experiences, particularly those of this dissertation’s participants? How and why do we construct the interpretations that we do? As Charmaz (2006) simply stated, theorizing “entails the practical activity of engaging the world and of constructing abstract understandings about and within it” (p. 128). The ensuing discussion puts theorizing into action, beginning with the dimension of bearing witness and concluding with an integrated understanding of evolving learning.
Bearing Witness: A Discussion

During the early phase of integration, the personal relevance of participants’ bearing witness experiences struck me with an unexpected salience. This had no longer become their witnessing experience alone; it had also emerged as mine. Interview after interview, participants evoked ‘visual’ language to recall their witnessing experiences, recalling seconds, minutes, and hours on end of watching, seeing, viewing, and focalizing. I began to see myself – and my own service-learning experiences with undergraduates – in my participants’ sentiments, admittedly to my own surprise. Just as I had witnessed their unveiling of vulnerable, often saturating experiences, I recognized with fervor and emotion how much I had learned, grown, and changed in the context of watching, watching, watching, and finally, making meaning of the watching itself.

Bearing witness is far from a complex phenomenon; if anything, it is primordial. All of our life, we see, view, and watch others. As infants and small children, we become instantaneous voyeurs, mimicking and intimating the world presented to us through sensory stimuli. As we age, these processes become more sophisticated with respect to cognitive, moral, and psychosocial development. Bearing witness is always a learning process both fostered and limited by the situational factors explored in Chapter Four (e.g., role, service-learning experience, college milieu, etc.); the stimuli created by these factors moves the faculty experience beyond mere watching, seeing, and viewing to a deeper intra- and inter-personal experience.

Worthy of discussion are three areas: witnessing family, witnessing students, and witnessing the community. Universally, participants’ past, childhood experiences of engaging in service-learning, most often beside or with parents and siblings, created a
witnessing experience that would ready them for lifelong engagement in service and volunteerism. The adage ‘history repeats itself’ is particularly relevant here. Participants’ experience of witnessing student learning was particularly provocative, especially when faculty imagined themselves in the students’ shoes – ultimately recognizing that their positions were interchangeable. When terms of reciprocity were present in community partner relationships, furthermore, some participants bore witness to the individual or agency experience, later relating it to their own. Most provocative were participants’ commentaries on witnessing turmoil and tumult; herein, the process of bearing witness brought to life the gravity and beauty of our human condition. If watching is understood to be carnal and instinctive, bearing witness is rendered more intimate and precious, even divine to some participants. Peering into the experience of another – bringing meaning to it in the context of one’s own learning and development – connects the threads of our existence to the tapestry of humanity.

As with many things in life, faculty members can be distracted and distracting. Though many in academe value interconnectedness, community, and other ideas relative to bearing witness, we do not always enact these ideals in ways that create potentially transformative learning experiences for one another. Time after time, participants revealed factors that limited their evolving learning experience, with particular sensitivity to the tenure and promotion process. If one focuses myopically on her scholarship, for instance, what might she fail to witness in the world around her? What becomes obscured when one’s core focus is service to her department or allegiance to a discipline within which service-learning is misunderstood?
If witnessing is a portal through which learning evolves and if the outcomes (e.g., deepening relationships with students and community members, gaining patience and perspective, growing more trusting of students while seeing them in new ways, etc.) persist as explicated in Chapter Four, what precludes academe from embracing learning of this nature? Certainly, the academy contends with itself; laden with hierarchies, bureaucracies, and structures of dominance, it becomes difficult for faculty to understand what is real, perceived, and true. Yet for those privileged to experience its effects, *bearing witness* inspires hope and mitigates cynicism, bringing faculty members closer to the stated academic mission of the institution, which is to educate students for global citizenship and responsible leadership.

*Navigating: A Discussion*

As shared in Chapter Four, *navigating* is both an art and a science. Unlike the *bearing witness* process, which is more recessive and recursive, *navigating* bears elements of linearity. Figuratively or literally, the faculty member begins somewhere and ends elsewhere, most often with students aboard or in tow. Whether one sees herself as novice or seasoned, she continually steers around a number of situational elements, navigating institutional politics, perceptions of the ivory tower, timing demands, and partnership logistics. Still, past experience readies her for the trip itself; while no two voyages look or feel the same, she is able to draw from history to inform the present. Just as a captain at sea learns as much – if not more – from an experience in stormy oceans, the service-learning faculty member grows, develops, and changes when confronted with challenging circumstances.
It is difficult to surmise how one learns best: through the school of hard knocks or through formulaic training, development, and support. For most of this study’s participants, the former presented the only option; only recently has the latter been made available to faculty members through the development of support services for academic service-learning. If we instruct faculty on how to navigate the *navigating* process, however, do we risk obscuring or obstructing aspects of their learning experience altogether? For instance, some academic institutions hold faculty members’ hands through the process, going so far as to navigate every logistic, question, or concern on their behalf. Yet what emerges from the process of *navigating* was essential to educators’ learning: faculty members felt grounded in their community, cultivated patience in self and others, and recognized the importance of messiness and chaos. They also recognized mistakes and embraced fallibility; they saw that while not everyone can or will be on board, both community and students need service-learning. If we take away the fullness of this experience, will educators grow, learn, and develop to the extent expressed in this study?

As noted above, *navigating* was described by participants as a linear, sequential process. While the beginning is clear and the end in sight, no one person’s path is precisely the same. Some faculty members navigate through treacherous, near devastating circumstances to find later that they cannot imagine not integrating service-learning into future sections of the same course. Others hit a few obstacles only to discover that service-learning just does not fit that one course. Still others find themselves navigating the same ironic politics and logistical nightmares over, over, and
over again, always with the students’ and community’s greater interests in mind and at heart.

Why these faculty members persevere – bearing witness to difficult situations and navigating myriad obstacles – is both obvious and mysterious. Learning is paramount. At the end of the day, a premium of learning supersedes an overwhelming presence of mitigating and limiting circumstances. These faculty are not gluttons for punishment, nor are they martyrs. These are educators who recognize in both subtle and overt ways that learning may entail aspects of sacrifice, courage, and due diligence. Consequently, all parties change, grow, and develop.

Reconciling Expectations: A Discussion

What does teaching entail? How does learning transpire? Who is ‘teacher’ and who is ‘learner’? Does service-learning enrich academic content or is it seen and experienced as an add-on? These are the very questions with which faculty members grapple daily, most especially when teaching service-learning courses with undergraduate college students. Reconciling expectations means, quite literally, resolving these quandaries in the context of one’s own experience and identity. In most cases, reconciling expectations entails moving from an externally-derived locus of what teaching, learning, and engagement mean to an internally-situated compass. Ultimately, the latter is directed and defined by what these experiences evoke in self, others, and the community.

The data made clear that no two faculty members begin with precisely the same expectations of teaching and learning, nor do they emerge having gone through replicate processes of reconciling. In essence, faculty reconcile expectations pertaining to the
contextual elements (e.g., role) most salient to them. Let us compare, for instance, the reconciling expectations experience of two interviewees: a pre-tenure female in the social sciences with that of a male, full professor in the physical sciences. The former brought with her a bastion of expectations, some shaped by her discipline and others influenced by age, gender, and experience. As member of a predominately-male department, gender is particularly salient; not only does she hope to prove herself as an excellent scholar, but she also envisions someday holding a leadership post in the department. Though her day-to-day departmental experience involves ‘assimilating into’ a man’s world, she gains strength and insight when, weekly, she teaches a course in a local shelter for women, children, and families. Herein, she is perennially revisiting and reconciling expectations relative to her experiences, both real and perceived, of what it means to teach, learn, and engage.

Now, let us view the experience of the male, full professor in the physical sciences who discovered service-learning after 30 years of involvement in teaching, research, and service to his department and profession. For years, his pedagogy was relatively unchanging yet fairly successful. If anything, his expectations of self and department were static, well understood, and unyielding. An experience in service-learning, however, turned everything on its head. Not only did he see students learn and engage in ways he had never before imagined, but he began to discover plasticity in his own learning. Consequently, he felt significantly younger; retirement appeared no longer an option, as he had shed his own expectation that it was time to assume emeriti status.

These cases are more similar than they are different; both educators experience a phenomenon that causes them to revisit and reconcile internal and external expectations
relative to internally driven and externally induced conceptions about teaching, learning, and engagement. What is also important to note is that some situational elements altogether inhibit faculty from experiencing, reflecting upon, and reevaluating expectations. Faculty in the natural sciences, for instance, expressed an inability to teach service-learning in major courses due to departmental regulations, politics, and needs. While they experienced the process of reconciling expectations in non-major or elective courses, these faculty were persistent in their belief that service-learning would be conceptualized as an add-on in core courses.

Perhaps the most exciting and ubiquitous outcome of reconciling expectations was the emergent realization on the participants’ parts that they are co-educators. This does not mean that faculty members shirk responsibility as authority figures, nor do they give students full terrain over the teaching and learning processes. Rather, these educators began to understand teaching, learning, and engagement as intertwined contexts within which multiple teachers and learners take stage as various needs arise. There are spaces, for instance, within which it is most appropriate to advance learning by allowing the community members to share their stories, challenge normative perceptions, and present ideas. There are times within which other students can – as co-educators – entice learning in their peers. And there are occasions within which the faculty member must bring her ‘expertise’ into the experience, helping students understand the intimate ties between academic content and practical experience. Essentially, faculty emerge, through reconciling expectations, as authors of their teaching, learning, and engagement experiences. Not only do they see students in a different light – as co-learners and co-
educators – but they find themselves readied to reengineer existing and future courses to meet new ideals of teaching and learning.

*Resolving and Reorienting: A Discussion*

**Evolving learning** is an intellectual, moral, and psychosocial journey. Just as faculty members grow more sophisticated in their intellectual understanding of abstract concepts when theory meets practice, encounters with complex ethical and emotional phenomenon add depth and complexity to the learning process. In the cases of *resolving and reorienting*, participants’ journey through vulnerability, pain, fear, and elation allowed them to gaze, reflect upon, and reinterpret aspects of their lives. For some, the experience of resolving and reorienting was painful and emotional. Others found the experience cathartic, even joyful. Again, no two faculty members endured the same process, yet each participant expressed learning as a result of one or more uncomfortable, disorienting experiences.

There exists both myth and truism that ‘the modern faculty member’ is a cool, collected expert; with a freshly minted PhD and myriad publications in tote, she delivers expert knowledge, filling students’ minds with exciting, stimulating knowledge. The students, in turn, receive, interpret, and feed back this information, which is ultimately reinterpreted by the faculty member in the form of grades and evaluations. In this scenario, the faculty member is relatively unemotional; an intellectual, she may be closer to the knowledge in her discipline than she is to her students. She retains, at all times, authority and control. Though abstruse to some, this scenario is safe; the faculty member experiences little if any risk. A sage on the stage, she may be misunderstood, challenged,
or provoked by students; still, this risk is inconsequential compared to those challenges endured in service-learning.

Yet the familiar adage holds true that she who risks much may be exceedingly rewarded. What provokes faculty members to step off stage and engage in service-learning is fodder for another study; more important, herein, is that most faculty knowingly entered unfamiliar territory, took significant risks, and emerged transformed relative to their prior experience. What was unknown to most, however, was the extent and expanse with which they would grow, develop, and transform – all in the context of emotive experiences. As Chapter Four described, faculty members traversed the uncomfortable (i.e., fear, vulnerability, pain, elation) and sorted through disorientation (i.e., placing self in others’ shoes), ultimately achieving levels of self-described catharsis, developing stronger relationships with others, and demonstrating a greater willingness to take risks in the future.

With respect to the latter, it held true for these faculty members that past experience positively mitigated present and future risk-taking. Those educators who had experienced discomfort in the past – as children, students, or teachers – both readied and steadied themselves for continued engagement. Other faculty members found themselves on their own risk-taking trajectory; while unready to yield to working with certain populations (e.g., homeless), they were willing to take risks, be vulnerable, and feel discomfort in other venues.

Despite the fortitude of this experience, the whole of academe seems ill poised to embrace the ‘emotive’ experience. Like service-learning itself, emotions are messy, unpredictable, and far from scientific. Fear, pain, and vulnerability are elements of the
human experience; this experience contradicts the above mentioned, normative model of what it means to hold expertise, retain control, and serve in the role of authority figure. Yet again, contradictions abound. The institution of study espouses the desire to educate students for global citizenship and responsible leadership leading to productive, meaningful lives. Can we enact this value, by limiting opportunities for real, raw, risky experiences? Or, do we follow the lead of the faculty in this study by challenging our students – and ourselves – to live lives of real consequence?

_locating self in humanity: a discussion_

Recently, I had the great honor of hearing Dr. Betty Siegel, former president of Kennesaw State University, speak with candor and grace about the role of teaching and learning in contemporary academe. To express her ideas, she relayed her tale of having viewed the sequoia for the first time. Naively, she assumed that the 300 foot tree grew roots just as deep; to her surprise, she found the contrary to be true. The sequoia’s roots are shallow, intertwined with those of the sequoias around which it grows. No one sequoia can exist without at least one other; they know their roots and understand that neither can stand alone.

In more ways than one, the educators engaged in service-learning with undergraduates have discovered, in the process of locating self in humanity, that education is a collaborative venture. Service-learning undermines the notion that the educator’s expertise alone cultivates student learning. Further, service-learning fosters an experience within which the faculty member reflects deeply upon who she is, what she stands for, who she serves, what her legacy might entail, and how she contributes to the betterment of society. The educators in this study have enmeshed themselves in a life-
long exploration of these questions, coming to understand the ‘self’ as more fully human, both rooted and intertwined with all of humanity.

A critical facet of one’s experience of locating self in humanity is the presence of reflective space. Reflective space differs from reflection or introspection; it is a place within which faculty members can become vulnerable and honest in their exploration of self with other individuals. For some, reflective space entailed the sharing of blogs, journals, artwork, or stories with others. Other faculty met informally with friends, loved ones, colleagues, students, and mentors, ever seeking to understand how, why, and to what extent the fabric of their existence was threaded through the lives of others. Almost always, the cultivation of this space was unplanned; academe seldom afforded faculty members the opportunity to interact with others – aside from several planned workshops and an annual conference – to address the very questions asked daily by students.

**Coming Together: Evolving Learning**

Together, each of the five dimensions – all contextualized by the presence and absence of situational factors unique to the milieu of study – comprise an organizing perspective, evolving learning. Throughout all facets of educators’ experience of engaging in service-learning with undergraduates, learning was preeminent and paramount. Regardless of where they were in their personal journeys, faculty members were focused in both process and outcome on ensuring students learned, grew, and developed. As an often unexpected corollary, the faculty member also evolved, transforming his or her understanding of what it meant to be a teacher, learner, and community steward. To best understand evolving learning as theory, several considerations must first be explored: the interplay and interaction between dimensions,
the presence of discomfort and disorientation, and the situational constructs unique to this particular academic context.

**Interplay and interaction.**

Unlike many theories or models pertaining to learning, the findings of this dissertation will neither culminate in a linear model nor result in a series of finite, defined stages through which faculty traverse. That is, one does not necessarily endure the process of *bearing witness* in order to *locate self in humanity*. Rather, the constructs are mutually reinforcing; one may have entered the process of **locating self in humanity** later to find, through a *witnessing* experience, that new learning incited a change in mind or heart. Similarly, a faculty member who is experiencing vulnerability for the first time with undergraduates – thus **resolving and reorienting** – will likely find herself **reconciling expectations** around what it means teach, learn, and engage. As faculty experience multiple dimensions at once, their learning magnifies; essentially, the presence of multiple dimensions deepens the faculty members’ overall experience.

Each faculty member, however, begins the **evolving learning** process somewhere; that is, one of the five **evolving learning** dimensions anchors the experience. The model portrayed in Figure 13 displays a prototypical **evolving learning** experience. The model depicts a three-dimensional vessel within which *bearing witness* is foundation for Dr. X’s experience. We might imagine that this faculty member entered into the **evolving learning** process after witnessing students’ excitement or placing herself in the shoes of a community partner. She also voices the experiences of **resolving and reorienting, locating self in humanity, reconciling expectations, and navigating**. These do not necessarily occur in a linear form but are preceded and anchored by *bearing witness*. 
For instance, it is plausible that this faculty member experienced *locating self in humanity, reconciling expectations*, and navigating simultaneously. Herein, the model is dynamic and cyclical; one might imagine the figure turning on itself. As the faculty member navigates a tenuous community partnership, for instance, she may begin to think deeply about the expectations set forth by her discipline and department. Taking over where the community-based agency left off, the faculty member realizes that being an educator requires more than lecturing and publishing. Further, she is seen by agency clients not at Dr. X, but as a human dedicated to community empowerment and change. This incites continuous *reorienting* and *navigating*.

**Figure 13: Organizing Model of Dr. X’s Evolving Learning Experience**

| Key: | Bearing Witness | Resolving and Reorienting | Locating Self in Humanity | Reconciling Expectations | Navigating |
Expanding the example of Dr. X, Figure 14 illustrates the complex interplay between situational constructs and the faculty member’s experience. The base of the model replicates Figure 13 turned 90 degrees counter-clockwise. Above the base is a pie chart, illustrating the relative interface of the situational constructs with the faculty member’s navigating experience. This figure is intended to illustrate interaction within the broader milieu of Evolving Learning, showing how situational variables may differ for each dimension.

Figure 14: Integrated Model of Dr. X’s Evolving Learning Experience
In Dr. X’s prototype, role facilitates the navigating process; this faculty member is acutely aware of her age and gender, as she is a young female working predominately with middle-aged homeless men. Having never engaged in service-learning before, the faculty member finds herself navigating unforeseen logistics. Relatively, service-learning experience shapes and defines her endured process and outcomes. The community partner is neither absent nor particularly present, so the faculty member finds herself and her students assuming leadership across various levels. In the foreground of her experience, US-Academe is important; Dr. X is figuring out whether the college values service-learning. While the construct is important, it does not preclude her from doing service-learning. The student populous, however, has a profound impact on her overall experience of navigating as is seen its relative weight. Most of the students in her section have experienced service-learning before and, to her surprise, are eager to help with the experience. Several step up as peer educators, alleviating her tension and assisting with a learning-centered approach.

Figures 15 and 16 illustrate the evolving learning experience of Participant Y, a faculty member interviewed for this study. Participant Y is a full, tenured professor in the physical sciences. While service-learning was relatively new to him, it has rejuvenated his career and, in his own words, both changed and challenged his life. As Figure 15 details with phrases extrapolated from his interview data, Y’s process of evolving learning began with navigating a tenuous, often unpredictable partnership with a local elementary school. Simultaneously, Y was involved in the development of an immersive off-campus learning experience involving rescue work.
As Participant Y grew more comfortable with navigating community-based partnerships, he moved confidently into the service-learning experiences. In tandem, he voiced experiences of *bearing witness* (i.e., allowing himself to see students and their learning in new ways) and *reconciling expectations* of what teaching meant and learning entailed. Continuing through these dimensions, Y began to engage in deep, permissive introspection, arousing the processes of *resolving and reorienting* and *locating self in humanity*. Coming out of a particularly immersive experience, Y recollected moments within which he knew he had changed; he no longer viewed his role as ‘educator’ in the same light.

*Figure 15: Organizing Model of Participant Y’s Evolving Learning Experience*
Figure 16 illustrates the interaction between dimensions and context, showing the extent to which situational constructs mitigate Participant Y’s experience of Resolving and Reorienting. While each of the situational constructs is present, most salient are those of role and student populous. For years, Y had assumed a hierarchical, teaching-centered role in the classroom. He was referred to as “Dr. Y” and held most, if not all, of the power in the classroom. Role was particularly salient in resolving and reorienting as Y found himself cherishing closer relationships with his students. He started introducing himself by his first name; in time, this became norm rather than exception. Whether teaching service-learning or traditional courses, he adopted a learner-centered approach within which power was shared and students were afforded opportunities to make decisions about content and pedagogy.

Figure 16: Integrated Model of Participant Y’s Evolving Learning Experience
Discomfort and disorientation.

Evolving learning never takes place without discomfort or disorientation. Within each of the five dimensions, faculty members’ ability to overcome, navigate, rise above, advance, cope with, or resolve a contextual item (e.g., from the situational analysis) expanded their learning. What is common to the faculty experience is precisely the discomfort or disorientation itself. Why one experiences discomfort or how disorientation impacts him or her, however, is different for each educator. That faculty members acknowledge, accept, and move through these zones of disorientation is critical; only then, do they appear to have traversed self- and other-defined boundaries. In some cases, the discomfort or mere idea of discomfort precludes the faculty member from evolving learning. Several faculty, for instance, described the experience of wanting to engage in certain ways with students or community partners but could not locate the strength, conviction, or courage to move ahead. While these faculty members grew in the context of other dimensions and experiences, their overall evolving learning experience may have been qualitatively different.

Summary of Discussion

Evolving Learning: Educators’ Inner Experiences of Engaging in Service-Learning with Undergraduates is a complex, multidimensional study. This section synthesized core, theoretical elements of the dimensional and situational analyses, revealing discussion points, questions, and insights relative to each of the five dimensions. Ultimately, evolving learning was discussed and described as an integrative, encompassing vessel within which faculty learn, grow, and develop always with (1) the
experience of three or more dimensions (e.g., navigating, locating self, etc.), (2) elements of disorientation; and (3) the presence or absence of situational constructs.

Evolving Learning: Implications

This dissertation presents unique opportunities for scholarly and practical implications. An exploratory study, this dissertation enhances extant gaps in the literature and scholarship relative to teaching and learning, engagement, and faculty development. Also, its results – which capture the voices of faculty enmeshed in deep learning with students and community members – bear significant implications for learning as an adaptive leadership practice. While the previous section of this chapter discusses evolving learning with respect to its theoretical ‘parts’ and ‘whole’, this section delves into the nuanced underpinnings of the faculty role, interrogating extant literature and presenting points of discussion, interpretation, and intersection. Respectively, I look at dissertation findings in the context of the scholarship of teaching and learning, the scholarship of engagement, and faculty learning and development. Later, this will lead into recommendations for practice, emphasizing personal growth and organizational change.

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered

The experience of faculty engaged in service-learning with undergraduates bears implications for the scholarship of teaching and learning, which encompasses a systemic, reflective, and public study of teaching and learning (McKinney, 2004). This dissertation makes an essential contribution to the literature by integrating faculty development with the scholarship of teaching and learning. That is, evolving learning is the first study to ‘open up’ the inner life of faculty engaged in service-learning with undergraduates; what
was once private is made public, with both scholarly and practical implications for teaching, learning, and engagement. This sub-section summarizes and discusses these timely contributions.

The five dimensions of *evolving learning* created or provoked in faculty a level of disorientation within which previously held viewpoints – real or perceived – were reconsidered, debunked, and re-normed; this illustrates a tangible connection between how faculty develop and what they experience in teaching and learning. Clearly, the process of *bearing witness* opened educators’ eyes to a multiplicity of teaching and learning styles. Seeing students’ excitement created, in turn, energy in the faculty member. Noticing the extent to which interactions with community partners and agencies solidified students’ learning led faculty to imagine, adapt, and innovate new pedagogies and curricula. Most critically, participants found themselves – often for the first time – co-learners engaged in an evolving, intertwined process alongside students, community members, community partners, and other faculty. Alongside of *reconciling expectations*, this enticed reflection on what learning meant, what teaching entailed, and the extent to which community-engaged practice reinforced academic content.

Participants’ experiences of *navigating*, often frustrating or disconcerting, helps paint a systemic picture of academe in the institution under consideration. Faculty members perpetually navigate tensions, logistics, and obstacles – many created by perceptions of the ivory tower. While the tower looks glorious and refined on the outside, parts of its insides have crumbled or deteriorated. That is, what academe espouses and what is enacted are, often, at odds. Herein, faculty found themselves inhabitating the gap between mission and practice, often stretched to reconsider their own
ideas, thoughts, and values. What prevailed, even when faculty recognized their inability to change academe, was their own learning.

Also ubiquitous in navigating was a recognition that engaged learning – while not universally or systemically valued – enhanced the learning experience of all involved. Most importantly, service-learning created or reemphasized in most faculty members the belief that students are co-participants in the learning process. Not only are students capable of co-teaching, but they are gifted leaders and peer educators, often able to incite, evoke, and engage learning in a way that the faculty member him or herself would not have been able to accomplish alone. While we think broadly in academe about how, why, and with whom our students learn, we seldom consider students and faculty co-delivering learning in an integrative fashion.

Reconciling expectations involved for many faculty the debunking and unlearning of stereotypes related to ‘what it means’ to be a teacher, professor, or scholar. Acknowledging and/or letting go of control issues was a freeing process for many educators; this fostered both subtle and abrupt transitions from externally-derived norms to an internal loci of what teaching, learning, and scholarship mean. Inherently connected was resolving and continually reorienting in the context of expressed and experienced pain, discomfort, emotion, and vulnerability. Attempting to be one’s full self brought with it inner struggle; these learning tensions were never fully resolved, but drove faculty to think differently about student learning, take judicious risks, and experiment in new ways.

While the study contributes many layers to the scholarship of teaching and learning, it also reveals a gap in faculty members’ own knowledge of teaching and
learning as scholarly, public practices worthy of empirical research. That teaching and learning might be considered scholarly – or public, for that matter – was neither named nor intimated in the data collected.

Contextually, most – if not all – participants had been socialized to view teaching as a relatively top-down process within which the teacher teaches and the students receive, integrate, and reproduce knowledge. Seldom had participants experienced training or development to the contrary, particularly during their graduate school years. If anything, participants’ inner desire to stretch beyond dominant models was nudged by what they witnessed in colleagues and students or experienced themselves.

In essence, this dissertation study paves the way by presenting concrete, empirical research on the faculty experience, offering connections between the scholarship of teaching and learning and how faculty themselves learn, grow, and develop. For most of my participants, the unveiling of experience was novel. Interviews played out before my eyes like life stages. At first, a number of my participants looked to me to guide, direct, and provide reassurance. As the interviews continued, participants landed on their own two feet but struggled, in some respects, to find language or emotion to express in full their experience. While some remained in defiant, seemingly adolescent mode for minutes on end – often blaming elements of their experience on individuals, groups, and institutions – the majority of my interviewees claimed ownership and authorship of their experiences. Several saw themselves in the role of mentor, matriarch, or guide. What was altogether private became, in our interpersonal domain, semi-public.
As noted in Chapter Two, emphasis on the scholarship of teaching and learning is recent, privy to growing pains, limited in scope, and not universal to all institutions of higher education. Further, this scholarship involves risk-taking, potentially jeopardizing the tenure and promotion process for new and advancing faculty (Hutchings & Shulman, 1999). Still, the scholarship of teaching and learning is viewed by many as an educational imperative (Huber & Hutchings, 2005). It is critical, then, that we build upon what this dissertation contributes. Let us encourage faculty members to express their experiences in scholarly ways, moving from private to public domain. We ought to create space for discovery relative to one’s own teaching, learning, and engagement with undergraduates. To paraphrase Rice (1991), expanding our conception of scholarship is essential; just as learning is considered non-linear and multifaceted, so is discovery. Until this occurs, the all-important experiences of faculty adaptation and growth remain as counter-narratives.

The Scholarship of Engagement Reconsidered

The scholarship of teaching and learning and the scholarship of engagement draw from and mutually enhance one another (Hutchings & Shulman, 1999). To review, the scholarship of engagement “draws on the expertise of the discipline, makes connections with audiences beyond the campus, and connects the faculty career to the community” (Ward, 2003, p. 112). Faculty engaged in both internal and external service do so in ways that mutually enhance their work in the classroom, discipline, and research (Ward, 2003). While the scholarship of engagement encompasses multiple forms, this dissertation focuses specifically on service-learning experiences with undergraduates. Service-learning – viewed by some scholars as a subset of the scholarship of engagement
Herein, this dissertation makes a number of important contributions to this relatively new and understudied area of scholarship; foremost, it answers Driscoll’s (2000) call for more grounded, empirical research on service-learning and the faculty experience. First, this study is the first to look intimately—through the fresh lens of constructivist grounded theory—at the inner experience of faculty members engaged in service-learning with undergraduates. Critically, the dissertation allowed for the exploration of ‘what all is happening’ in the faculty members’ worldviews from the inside out while retaining, through situational mapping, a bird’s eye view of the greater context. While complementary, this study differs in context and method from the few, empirical studies of the faculty experience (i.e., motivation, satisfaction, attitudes) as well as those that research, interrogate, and report upon faculty members’ perceptions and understanding of undergraduates’ learning. Significantly, it presents implications for the role of vulnerability in academe. Heeding a call for greater institutional support, furthermore, the study bears critical implications for whether—or not—the goals of academe are foremost tied to the betterment of society. While the musings I explore below are germane only to the context under consideration, the assumptions and questions provoked are portable to other contexts.

_Vulnerability: inner change._

A thorough review of the literature on the _scholarship of engagement_ reveals how little is known about the inner experience of faculty engaged in service-learning contexts with undergraduate students. Extant studies of the faculty experience in service-learning
are more systemically situated, offering breadth over depth. The study closest in context and methodology to this dissertation was that of Pribbenow (2005), who discovered through in-depth interviewing six themes relative to how service-learning pedagogy impacts educators. The pedagogy enhanced the following for faculty: commitment to teaching, connections to students, knowledge of student learning, use of constructivist teaching and learning approaches, connection to theoretical propositions, and involvement in a community of teachers and learners. While each of these themes surfaced to varying extent in my data collection, my methodology fostered a deeper, more vulnerable portrayal of faculty learning, development, and change.

That the faculty in my study experienced service-learning with such depth, vulnerability, and conviction is refreshing and insightful. The bearing witness process took faculty to new places in their learning, allowing them to deepen relationships with students and community members, express candor and emotion, learn with and from others, and grow inspired to continue experimentation with alternative pedagogies. While navigating, faculty found themselves interfacing with community agencies, contexts, and partners in new ways. Herein, faculty voiced success when they had dually and reciprocally negotiated terms of reciprocity with community partners. This, too, bears important implications for how we continue, as educators, to interface with those external to our colleges and universities. To maximize everyone’s learning experience, it is critical that faculty be humble and experience the community from the ground up.

Just as reconciling expectations ultimately enriches the teaching and learning experience, this process – in many cases – radically transformed preconceived conceptions of how service-learning enhances classroom discussion, energizes student
learning, and brings academic content to life. Seldom did participants envisage service-learning as an add-on; rather, they discovered service-learning as an integral, irreplaceable pedagogy. Few service-learning scholars would debate this sentiment, yet seldom does the scholarship of engagement allude to faculty learning, growth, and change as an essential consequence of community engagement. Here, resolving and reorienting and locating self in humanity present exciting, novel discussion points.

In tandem, the data on resolving and reorienting and locating self in humanity allow us to peer into and open up the inner abyss of faculty vulnerability, pain, and emotion. We begin to see each participant as neither ‘sage on the stage’ nor diploma-toting intellect. Instead, each is a fully capable, culpable, and contributing human being. The participants in this study felt pain, contended with anxiety, experienced loss, and resolved discomfort. Some cried during their interviews; many shared stories of concern, discontent, and fear. Others relayed stories of courage, conviction, and – in almost every case – unveiled vulnerability. In the emergent journey of evolving learning, faculty members ventured upon the discovery of their full, imperfect selves. That we need, in academe, to cast aside notions of punditry and embrace vulnerability cannot be understated. Service-learning presents a rare, experiential context for this level of engagement; s/he who enters remains, it seems, forever changed.

Inhabiting the chasm: outer change

Vulnerability allows faculty members to bridge the inner abyss, becoming more fully human with, of, and from those with whom they interact. As educators change, grow, and develop, however, what transpires for the college or university? Does it also evolve, reciprocally? Who are its agents of change and adaptation? While these
questions may be saved for future inquiry, they bear relevance to our understanding of
the holding environments within which faculty are inimitably situated.

Inhabiting the chasm between what the academy espouses and what is enacted is
not a new quandary. Ubiquitously, participants commented upon derivations of this
situation, asking complex, multifaceted questions that I have paraphrased as follows: If
the academy says it values global citizenship, why won’t my department reward my
work? What is the real call of academe; do we serve the students, our research, the
global community – or everyone at once? Where do I draw the line between what I
perceive to be my duty to humanity and my community and work that enriches, enhances,
or furthers my department, discipline, or promotion clock?

* A New Lens on Faculty Development

This study contributes significant insight to faculty development in terms of how
faculty members learn, grow, adapt, change, and develop through service-learning
experiences. This section begins with a critique and integration of my data with the
literature on active learning in faculty members; this is followed by an in-depth
discussion on how this dissertation’s findings complement the work of Cranton (1994),
Mezirow (1991), and Kegan (1994). Most critical are the implications of *evolving
learning* for transformation – a frequently utilized yet often misunderstood terminology.

As Hesser (1995) noted, faculty are engaged in cycles of active learning; they try
new ways to teach, observe and reflect upon their experience, make generalizations, and
revise prior theorizing. Drawn from the work of Schön (1983) and Kolb (1984), Hesser’s
(1995) work intimates a removal of the full self from the academic material and context.
Though it accounts for learning styles, it does not discuss any notion of the inner
experience – *evolving learning* – within which chaos, uncertainty, anxiety, passion, and other experiences are rendered real and indeterminate.

Perhaps the experience of active learning is, on the surface, portrayed and enacted as Hesser (1995) claimed. Yet a deeper, intentional analysis of the faculty experience as seen in service-learning reveals layers upon layers of faculty development, ever changing, evolving, and adapting to meet the needs of students, community, and institution. Never a static process, *evolving learning* is – as the conceptual model and metaphor imply – an ongoing journey. How we support this journey for faculty members is paramount and will be further discussed in *recommendations for practice*.

As Cranton (1994) aptly acknowledged, institutions of higher education lack a coherent foundation for faculty development. Integrating self-directed learning (Brookfield, 1986; Candy, 1991; Knowles, 1980) with Mezirow’s (1991) theory of transformative learning, Cranton (1994) reframed faculty development, acknowledging several tenets. While it is often assumed that faculty members are autonomous or self-directed, many do not see themselves in that light until otherwise transformed. One changes through the context of a transformative catalyst known as a *disorienting dilemma* (Mezirow, 1991); this ultimately shifts one’s current scheme or extant frame of reference.

My study complements this work, adding data to flesh out Cranton’s (1994) suppositions. As discussed in *navigating* and *reconciling expectations*, faculty members found themselves privately engaged in inner dialogue around issues of personal autonomy, self-derived expectations, and externally-induced expectations. For many, what Cranton (1994) would label confusion was manifest in my participants’ experiences of *reconciling expectations* around what teaching entails and how learning transpires.
And with few exceptions, participants ultimately discovered themselves as self-authored, but never named this having occurred prior to their engagement in service-learning with undergraduates.

The work of both Cranton (1994) and Mezirow (1991) makes theoretically explicit the elements of this dissertation, adding fiber to our understanding of adult faculty and faculty learning. Through the course of engagement in service-learning with undergraduates, my participants’ realities were continually reframed by changing cultural, social, historic, and other realities (i.e., situational analysis themes) as their meaning schemes reoriented (Mezirow, 1991). That is, as participants assimilated their new experience throughout each interdependent loop of the evolving learning process, perspectives were challenged and paradigms subtly shifted. Learning, then, grew more complex, multifaceted, and sophisticated as faculty gained awareness of assumptions, particularly in the context of personal reflection.

Indeed, disorienting dilemmas served as a transformative catalyst; for my participants, such catalysts encompassed bearing witness to something they had never before seen in students, navigating tenuous relationships with community partners, reconciling expectations of what it means to be a female, tenure-track professor with what one wishes to bring to the classroom, resolving and reorienting one’s pain of seeing community in turmoil – later to recognize that inner tumult creates courage, and locating self in humanity. For each, reflection cemented participants’ reappraisal of role, context, process, and outcome. For locating self in humanity, it was the intentional creation of reflective space – most often with another human being – within which one recognized his or her ‘place’ as part of a greater whole.
Though nuanced and complex, the work of psychologist Robert Kegan (1994) offers cogent connections to the experiences described and voiced by my participants. What appears most coherent is the expanse with which faculty members unknowingly traverse the subject-object relationship (Kegan, 1994), most particularly when *locating self in humanity*. While each of the *evolving learning* dimensions connects with Kegan’s (1994) work, no one dimension is stronger in this regard than *locating self*. As faculty begin the process of considering self as part of a greater whole, they describe a shedding or lessening of previously held roles, norms, or stereotypes. What seems, at first, to be counter-normative becomes, for that faculty member, normative until she or he encounters or navigates another dilemma, issue, or area. As explicated in my conceptual model, learning always occurs – even when faculty members are disoriented or limitations present themselves.

I imagine many of my participants *locating self* as they expand from Kegan’s third to fourth order of role consciousness. As Kegan (1994) surmised, a third order faculty member would likely operate from her prescribed role; herein, the faculty member sees herself as responsible for formulaic, top-down curriculum delivery. The students, in turn, are responsible for learning. In the fourth order, however, the faculty member begins to see herself irrespective of how she is perceived, labeled, or acculturated. This faculty member is self-authored, capable of seeing self and others as co-learners, co-teachers, and co-engaged in the community. While Kegan (1994) did not discuss parallel developmental patterns of faculty and students, my data – particularly *bearing witness* – illustrate a connection. For several faculty, students co-engaged in service-learning showed *them* the way. Reciprocally, participants developed the
psychosocial capacity to evolve as co-learners, often showing behavior seen in community-engaged students. The implications are manifold, explored later in this chapter.

Summary of Implications

The discussion of evolving learning – educators’ inner experiences of engaging in service-learning with undergraduates – has many implications related to the scholarship of teaching and learning, the scholarship of engagement, and faculty development. While this dissertation contributes significantly to the scholarship of teaching and learning, we are also reminded of how critical it is for faculty to express and share their experiences beyond the private domain. Also, we must ensure educators know that this pool of scholarship exists and how, when appropriately applied, it mutually enhances engagement, and discovery. Also, this study significantly enhanced the scholarship of engagement by opening a window into a field of inquiry – faculty members’ inner experiences in service-learning – that had never before been studied. While we have known for years about the extent to which students change, little empirical work had been published on the educators’ experience. Finally, this study contributes to the psychosocial research on faculty development, adding depth of insight and opportunities for future inquiry.

Evolving Learning: Recommendations for Practice

While recommendations for practice have been acknowledged, mentioned, or discussed at various points of this chapter, this section takes an integrated approach by collapsing recommendations under two areas: inner development and organizational change. Inner development relates to those recommendations within the direct purview
or control of individual faculty members; these involve choice, leadership, and courage. Recommendations for organizational change are more ambitious and systemic; these relate to the need for administrators and leaders to inhabit the chasm between what institutions espouse (e.g., mission statements, marketing materials, etc.) and what is valued in day-to-day practice (e.g., tenure and promotion, fiscal expenditures, etc.).

*Inner Development*

In the view of Brooks and Brooks (1999), “the face of what education can be has been changed…but educators have not been looking into the mirror” (p. 27). At times, faculty members become our own worst enemies. We evoke and enact the same policies, practices, and norms bestowed upon us. (Sadly, many of those ‘hazed’ by abject tenure processes become, in turn, those who inflict similar punishments on others.) Also, we often grow discouraged when change we inspired does not come to pass, but when change happens to us, we grow disgruntled, often retreating into our silos. All too often, we act powerless instead of recognizing the extraordinary power within. This is the inner force we have to make change, albeit small or seemingly mediocre. Service-learning is one of many areas within which every faculty member has the opportunity to involve a class, advisee, or research project. Through engagement in service-learning, every faculty can incite change and, in turn, experience change herself.

As the research shows, service-learning fosters a process of growth, change, and development in faculty. As faculty experience change, it is critical that they share their stories. Story-telling becomes collective narrative. Collective narrative becomes truth. Truth engenders systemic change. To debunk the normative perception that learning is one-sided and authoritative, faculty themselves must push forward an agenda for change
by acknowledging, foremost, their own agency and authorship. Conduits for inner
development include grassroots arrangements such as faculty commons, story circles, and
mentoring opportunities. With respect to the latter, the mentor opens the door; the
protégé enters, comforted in the space created for vulnerability, exploration, and growth.
Later, the protégé becomes mentor to another faculty new to the service-learning
experience. So the cycle continues; counter-narrative becomes institutional lore.

Cultivating and sharing knowledge does not come without practice; as Horton and
Freire (1990) argued, “[as] progressive teachers and educators, we have first to get the
knowledge about how the people know” (p. 98). Once we understand the knowledge of
the other, we “invent with the people the ways for them to go beyond their state of
thinking” (p. 98). Upon knowing the self, the faculty member must strive to know the
other, dually considering how her own awareness, beliefs, and development shape
contexts. Education transgresses its own boundaries, evolving into a way of being that
evolves, ever adapting to the needs of those engaged.

Organizational Change

While the focus of this dissertation is on educators’ inner experiences,
implications can be drawn for the greater, organizational context or academic milieu.
Often, the educator exudes willingness to transgress boundaries, but the environment in
which s/he operates is steeped in bureaucracy and resistance. How, then, do we adapt
and expand our curricula to meet the learning needs of our students and respond to
community needs when the context or structure is resistant to change? Like leadership,
change is a diffuse and multifaceted concept, one that is rich and textured. Several
theories of leadership and organizational change bear relevancy to higher education; my
recommendations are built upon the following foundations: engaging in routine dialogue; creating slow, judicious change anchored in systems thinking; and valuing adaptive leadership.

*Engaging in routine dialogue.*

While all members of an academic context may exercise leadership, there exist multiple individuals in the academy whose leadership is formal and positional. These include, but are not limited to, trustees, senior administrators, deans, and department chairs. All too often, there are extant and perceived chasms between faculty and administration; lacking communication, each misunderstands the other’s intentions, perspectives, and values. Engaging in routine, authentic dialogue breaks down these barriers, emphasizing what Kouzes and Posner (1995) called leader-follower dialogue: “Leaders do what we say we will do” (p. 235). Clearly, such communication must take place at multiple levels and in open, transparent settings. Closed door meetings breed distrust; secret sessions emphasize top-down bureaucracy that contrasts with faculty members’ predominantly collegial approach.

Relative to this study, few participants sensed systemic, ongoing advocacy from multiple levels for their service-learning work despite the presence of materials (e.g., mission, marketing documents, etc.) and an academic service-learning office that espoused a clear, coherent message valuing community engagement. The lack of incentives, support, and funding for service-learning bred distrust in many faculty engaged in service-learning; given the predominately grant-funded nature of the service-learning office, many feared its ultimate futility in the context of budget cuts, economic deprival, competing priorities, and administrative turnover. In this vein, routine,
transparent dialogue was altogether lacking between and among levels and layers of the institution.

Creating slow, judicious change anchored in systems thinking.

Leading Change presents a vision for transforming organizations through an eight-stage sequence (Kotter, 1996): establishing a sense of urgency, creating the guiding coalition, developing a vision and strategy, communicating the change vision, empowering broad-based action, generating short-term wins, consolidating gains and producing more change, and anchoring new approaches in the culture. The author is pragmatic in his assumption that change happens over time: “Because changing anything of significance in highly interdependent systems often means changing nearly everything, [change] can become a huge exercise that plays itself out over years, not months” (Kotter, 1996, p. 143). This level of transformation requires diligent, patient, visionary leadership that slowly and judiciously anchors new approaches in the culture of the organization. It also requires an awareness of culture as normative and behaviorally entrenched, operating within and outside of our realms of consciousness.

Written by Peter Senge (1990), The Fifth Discipline connects with Kotter’s notions by introducing the language of systems thinking. Herein, each ‘part’ in a system serves as ‘lever’ for change. Organizations are expansive and adaptive; those systems that excel are those that nurture new patterns of thinking and enable people to learn together. For this to occur, an organization must tap leadership at all levels – not just at the top: “People talk about being part of something larger than themselves, of being connected, of being generative” (p. 13). This kind of learning – generative learning – enables the organization to co-adapt. As learning becomes generative, each contributor
develops personal mastery (Senge, 1990). In effect, this creates a cycle of learning and opportunity for the organization; personal mastery becomes a connecting discipline, enabling us to clarify what is important, ultimately shaping the ‘network’ we create with others.

These models are particularly relevant to academe; they assume that every member of the community works together to derail the status quo, embody a persistent sense of urgency, and co-adapt to meet issues of collective importance. Relative to this study’s findings, it is imperative that faculty narratives move from private to public domain; only then may the status quo be challenged and, perhaps, eventually debunked. Perhaps it is not enough to name issues of global importance (e.g., poverty, environmental sustainability, economic recession, global warming, and population crises) as urgent; unless felt and deeply understood through dialogue, these become obtuse, intellectual constructs. What appears to be lacking in the context of this study’s domain are two constructs. First is the emotive edge, the opportunity to utilize vulnerability, passion, courage, and disorientation to shape issues of collective urgency and universal importance. Second is the recognition that learning is ongoing and generative; each member of the community is – at once – an expert and a novice; while seemingly contradictory, this rule of thumb reminds us that everyone has something to offer, no one person is ever right, and each of us has much to learn.

*Valuing adaptive leadership.*

Heifetz’s (1994) work reflects themes explored above: learning, leadership, and change are inextricably connected; furthermore, the postmodern condition calls for adaptive, developmental, and networked behavior on the part of individuals, groups, and
communities. Despite this call, it is critical that we acknowledge our futility; everyday, we embody and enact behaviors that create adaptive challenges. Heifetz (1994) considers these to be voids “between the shared values people hold and the reality of their lives” (p. 254). To create and sustain change, therefore, it is essential that institutional leaders embody inner discipline. This, in turn, requires an ability to participate and observe; distinguish one’s self from one’s role; externalize conflict; engage in authentic partnerships with confidants and allies; listen to others; and discover a “sanctuary to restore one’s sense of purpose, put issues in perspective, and regain courage and heart” (p. 273).

The subtext is this: educators and administrators must embrace the very same disorienting dilemmas that provoke learning in our students. Adaptation is essential to survival; only when we embrace discomfort do we grow, change, and develop. Too often, we hold on to notions of perfection, authority, and control. Around us, the ‘narratives’ from our media and public figures promote the conception of leadership as a number one position – one of hierarchy, prestige, and entitlement. Yet, these constructs keep us from exploring, individually and collectively, our full humanity. These deter us from delving into the very experiences expressed by this study’s participants. The irony is that disequilibrium offers us many gifts; it prompts “robust adaptation to a new challenge” (Heifetz, 1994, p. 28) and it provides “leverage for mobilizing people to learn new ways” (p. 22) – adaptive ways. In essence, adaptive work requires us to take a snapshot of reality and clarify both shared and disparate values.
Summary of Recommendations

Recommendations for practice encompass two broad areas, inner development and organizational change, supported by contemporary literature and scholarship. With respect to inner development, it is critical that faculty members share their stories and experiences from the grassroots; irrespective of whether top-down support is present, educators can embody community values by collectively debunking dominant narratives on what teaching, learning, and engagement entail. Seeking opportunities for scholarship and professional development in progressive, transformative pedagogies such as service-learning is likewise vital. With respect to organizational change, the implications are multifaceted yet bear implications for the involvement of every member of the learning community. Administrators carry the privilege and responsibility of serving in adaptive ways, ensuring daily and transparent opportunities for leadership at all levels. Further, the embracing of disorientating dilemmas is vital in creating opportunities for full, robust understanding of prescient, urgent issues germane to both student learning and global interdependence.

Directions for Future Research

In both content and methodology, this study unveils many opportunities for directed, empirical inquiry in the future. With respect to content, there are clear directions for scholarship given the exploratory nature of this study. Notwithstanding the service-learning experience, little is known about the faculty experience overall. The scholarship of teaching and learning encompasses inquiry on the teaching and learning processes; such inquiry needs to be focused on more than how and why students learn, but on how and why educators learn, grow, develop, change, and transform. As we learn
more about the latter, we reciprocally enhance our understanding of student, community, and institutional perspectives. Qualitative inquiry in the forms of ethnography, case study, portraiture, participatory action research, and phenomenology will add depth of perspective, enabling us to gaze upon the hued array of educators’ lived experiences.

With respect to educators’ service-learning experiences, future inquiry might delve into each of the five dimensions explored in this study by looking critically at situational factors germane to the overall faculty experience. For instance, a study might investigate the connection between tenure and promotion and faculty members’ development. Or, a researcher might explore the intersection between role identity and perceptions of vulnerability. Essentially, the opportunities to investigate in depth the connections between this study’s findings and relevant contextual elements are seemingly endless.

There also exists a dynamic interplay between the experience of students, faculty members, and community agencies that may best be studied through action research. While engendering a sense of collective ownership, an action research approach may culminate in opportunities for systemic change and present publishable opportunities on teaching and learning, engagement, and faculty development. If a study can accomplish various agendas (i.e., enhancing academic scholarship and enriching community practice), it meets multiple needs.

This dissertation study also piloted an elegant, nuanced form of constructivist inquiry that had not previously been employed in the college and university milieu. While developed separately, dimensional and situational analyses operate in tandem; mutually enhancing, each adds fiber to the other, rendering the study more robust,
diverse, and rich. Together, dimensional and situational analyses purvey a thorough, meaningful approach reflecting the theoretical underpinnings of symbolic-interactionism. Thus, in both theory and practice, this tandem methodology ought to be greater utilized to explore and understand the human experience.

*Limitations of the Study*

As with any empirical study, limitations abound; these limits, however, do not mitigate the power and essence of the study’s findings, implications, and recommendations for practice. Perhaps the greatest limitation of this study is its exploratory nature, which necessitated a focused approach within which all participants came from one context, one milieu. While the study’s findings cannot be generalized to the experience of all service-learning educators, they are portable, adding a rich and evocative understanding of what *some* service-learning faculty express and how such experiences might provoke future research.

Another limitation of this study was the inherently constructivist nature of its content and its methodology. Though aligned with the essence of symbolic-interactionism, room for interpretation abounds. Many may view my own ‘situation of self’ as a deterrent; just as faculty deconstructed and explored their experiences with me, my own experience as service-learning educator was salient. While I believe this substantially enriched the study – allowing faculty to go deeper with me than they might have envisaged with an ‘outsider’ – the opposite may have also held true. Critical to my own ‘bracketing’, moreover, was the perspective afforded to me by my research partner, methodologist, advisor, and coding team, without which an extra ‘lens’ on my study would have been missed.
This study strove for quality of perspective over quantity; hence, saturation was reached with 22 interviews and 20 participants. As noted in Chapter Three, grounded theory scholarship yields little consensus on how many interviews substantially inform theory building (Charmaz, 2006). I concentrated, therefore, on sufficiency and saturation (Seidman, 2006); purposeful sampling allowed for the selection of participants who thoughtfully conveyed their experiences while saturation entailed sampling until no new information was presented. Still, the question of ‘enough’ is far from straightforward, creating an inherent limitation. My conception of ‘enough’ was manifest in the data revealed through 22 interviews, iterative memoing, reflective field notes, and participant observation – all transpiring over the course of the three phases of data collection and analysis.

Finally, it is important to note that grounded theory scholarship involves substantial decision-making on the part of the researcher. Constant, comparative analysis entails documenting and following the data as analytical propositions emerge; memos and maps trace this journey, illustrating the data I followed and the data I left behind. While the latter formulate bases for future inquiry, of critical mention is this: had I chosen to follow other data paths, the dissertation may have resulted in other findings. In essence, this illustrates the risk and reward of qualitative analysis.

**Conclusion**

This dissertation provokes questions, presents insights, and stimulates discussion related to the inner experience of faculty engaged in service-learning with undergraduates. The essence of this study, *evolving learning*, returns us to our roots. We are reminded that each of us is a teacher, all of us are learners, and everyone has the
opportunity to serve as an agent of change in our community – local, national, and global. Learning is not linear; it is evolving – a lifelong process that allows us to look inward and reach outward, extending hands of hope to all of humanity.
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Appendix A: Electronic Letter

Electronic Letter

Dear (insert name):

Greetings. As you may know, I am a PhD candidate in Leadership and Change at Antioch University. My dissertation entails an exploratory, grounded theory study of faculty engaged in service-learning with undergraduate college students. I am writing to request your assistance as I seek faculty to interview for this qualitative study.

To ensure a purposeful sample, I will be interviewing faculty at our College who are currently engaged in service-learning with undergraduates. Participation in this study will entail a 90-minute interview, which may be followed by a subsequent meeting or group interview in the spring. Confidentiality will be safeguarded throughout this process. If you are interested in participating, please reply to this e-mail at your convenience. Also, please nominate other faculty who you believe might fit the above mentioned criteria.

In advance, I am grateful for your help with this study. Should you have any questions, please contact me directly.

Sincerely,

Cara Meixner
cmeixner@rollins.edu
407-646-1553 campus
407-256-0929 cell
Appendix B: Interview Protocol

Interview Protocol

Process:

1. Welcome participant to the interview
2. Introduce the purpose of the study *to elicit participants' experience of engaging in service learning with undergraduates*
3. Review informed consent form; ensure faculty sign off
4. Begin interview with initial, guiding question
5. Wrap up interview by 90 minutes

Questions:

1. Introduction:
   - Thank you for signing the informed consent form and agreeing to participate in this interview. May I have your permission to begin recording?"

2. Initial question:
   - Tell me about your experience participating in service-learning with undergraduate students.

3. Follow up questions:
   - Tell me more about the role you played in this service-learning context.
   - How did this experience add to or detract from your work as an educator?
   - Tell me about a time or instance when you grew, changed, or developed as a result of service-learning.
   - How did that instance or these experiences shape your conception of service-learning?
   - What meaning did you make of that instance or these experiences?
   - What *all* was happening in this experience? What were you thinking? Feeling? Tell me more about this [thought/feeling/action/development].

4. Ending question:
   - What might I have asked you that I didn’t think to ask?
Appendix C: Sample Memos

1.29.08

Today I interviewed participant B2, a 60+ year old chemist (tenured) who has led a number of service-learning relief trips to New Orleans. While his SL experiences extend back to the 1990s, B2 focused largely (in his interview) on the recovery efforts. The transcript is phenomenally vibrant; he uses rich, evocative language in a straightforward manner to describe his own growth, development, and transformation. I found myself reflexively drawn to his language and affect, almost mirroring him. As the interview progressed, B2 started to cry as he relayed the story of helping a young man start over. Reflecting his affect, tears sprung to my eyes. We exchanged a knowing look; B2 continued to emote as if there had been an invitation and insistence that he do so.

There’s no doubt, from this interview, that B2 was transformed; his inner experience – which moves from tacit to explicit – is testament to this.

I need to think deeper about the emotional experience; perhaps LK or AG can assist me here. I will follow up with them. (How does one ‘code’ for emotion?)

I’m beginning to see layers of development congruent with the work of Mezirow and Kegan, too. These are sensitizing concepts that inform foreground and backdrop of this study…. But I also need to ‘bracket’ this and ensure I’m noting ‘what all is happening’ as it relates to the participant’s inner experience.

2.21.08

Okay. To date, I have interviewed, transcribed, and coded three interviews with tremendous help from my buddies and team members. Hurrah. I have hundreds of nodes. Wow. As I noted above, I am ‘bracketing’ myself from deeper analysis of these interviews until I have had the time to engage in interviews with nontenured faculty. The literature sensitized me to differences in the positional expectations and developmental experiences of junior faculty; and since some of the concerns voiced in my pilot interviews (during the ILA-b process) did not resurface in my interviews with tenured faculty, I'm more assured of my decision to pause for a bit.

This evening’s coding session was especially helpful; instead of coding on top of each other as we’ve done in the past, we took turns doing ‘open coding’ as if we were utilizing N-Vivo. For the most part, the process reassured me of my coding to date. At the same time, I was made aware of several things I hadn’t previously considered, such as:

- When participants are discussing the student experience, they might also be referring existentially. Do people tell stories about each other to tell stories about themselves?
- It’s critical, in open coding, to always stay in the language of the participants. There were some times when I was being interpretive. I need to remind myself to account for what all is happening in the inner experience of faculty engaged in SL with undergraduates.
- One can never err on the side of having too many free nodes.
- Coding becomes too risky when one is tired! Remember to step back from the coding process when necessary.

Since I’ve begun my interviews with non-tenured faculty, I’m using a field book to record my own ‘in vivo’ memos and observations. I’ll transcribe them into this document when I reflect on the coding process.

3.7.07

Progress report: Things are going fairly well; I still feel a bit encumbered and overwhelmed by the sheer quantity of data that lies in front of me. At present, I have transcribed and open-coded five interviews: three with tenured faculty members (A1, B2, and C3) and two with untenured faculty members (E5 and F6). Before I comment upon E5 and F6, I’ll note that I plan to transcribe and open-code D4 and H8 before beginning the process of axial coding and developing tree nodes. This is a strategic decision shared and documented above.

E5 is an untenured anthropologist who, like F6, is in her 6th year at the College. Informally, she is considered by her colleagues to be an expert in and spokesperson for service-learning (and is cross-referenced by C3 as such). She did not reference herself in that regard. Our interview felt terse and unemotional; though her responses were meaty with respect to their ‘theory-to-practice’ relevance, E5 was not particularly introspective about her own development. She believes vehemently in (a) making anthropology real to its consumers and (b) ensuring students are making a difference in their communities. But when we shifted to discussions and questions about her own learning and development, E5’s remarks remained, in my estimation, fairly intellectual and abstruse. When I think about ‘what all is happening’ in this interview, I would surmise from E5 that various tensions are perpetually at play: (1) the tension between ensuring academic rigor and practical application; (2) the tension between retaining one’s role as content expert and recognizing the delimiting nature of community-based work; and (3) the tension between doing well for a community long term and assisting with short-term fixes… this latter tension was evidenced by her remarks about international service-learning.

In many ways, I found F6’s affect similar. He is an untenured historian and, if I’m not mistaken, the only Black male social scientist at Rollins. I have worked with F6 for six years and have found him to be among the most cynically intelligent people that I know. He is quintessentially critical, ever the academic puritan… yet there’s this unbelievably compassionate side to him that few really come to know. His self-described ‘detachment’ – a complex factor of his race, gender, discipline, and beliefs – resonated with me… and helped contextualize many of his remarks. Interestingly, the outside ‘reader’ of this transcript might scoff at the apparent lack of ‘emotion’ in many of the comments…. But since I’ve known him for years, I can say unequivocally that this is profoundly deep for F6. I think he reached well, well within, especially in his comments about the ‘obligation’ we have – as historians and humanitarians – to tell each others’ stories. Of course, memos and thoughts are embedded within these interviews – but I wanted to take some time to ‘blah’ them out here, too.

My goal is to check back in by Tuesday, March 10 – by then I would have coded my other two untenured interviews… and I’d like to begin the axial coding process from there.
Appendix D: Coding Summary

Open and Axial Coding Summary

588 open codes → 35 axial codes → 9 tested out in theoretical sampling → 5 dimensions

---

**Open Codes (588)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>O-Chase Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>O-College MISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>O-Connie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>O-Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>O-Lisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>O-Marvin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>O-Micki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>O-OCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>O-Rachel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>O-Sharon C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>P-Abandoning SL for some courses, too hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>P-Abstractly believing in SL, knowing the theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>P-Acknowledging the 'trade off' between oral his and biog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>P-Addressing a problem and doing research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P-Allowing students to put theory into practice
P-Alluding to institutional politics
P-Alluding to the curricular tensions at RC right now
P-Always bringing 'SL' back to the text
P-Always refining and fine tuning SL
P-Always, usually works out well
P-Awaiting anxiously the next SL experience
P-Balancing theory and time with SL project
P-Becoming excited after first SL experience
P-Being a good citizen
P-Being a part of who s-he has been-history
P-Being afraid in poverty situation
P-Being an 'old geezer'
P-Being careful about work because of department's position
P-Being deliberate about first SL experience
P-Being easier than he thought it'd be
P-Being fearful of 'letting go'
P-Being fearful of the elders
P-Being influenced by mothers' 'helping' ethos
P-Being inspired by students
P-Being involved is service on and off for a long time
P-Being involved with Habitat
P-Being known on first name basis with students
P-Being motivated by the people, by humanity
P-Being part of who he is now
P-Believes the institution hasn't done its duty
P-Believing in 'model' teaching
P-Believing in SL
P-Believing professors are still the experts, hierarchy
P-Believing she still runs the show
P-Believing SL is a way for students to experience something different, new, diverse
P-Believing students need to think about the world critically
P-Believing that the everyday 'stories' affect students
P-Bothered by students' mindsets about poverty and plight
P-Breaking down 'mindsets' as a ROLE of the college
P-Building confidence
P-Can't ignore issues of race, class, ethnicity, gender
P-Carrying students as far as they can go
P-Challenging people to understand things in a new way
P-Changed-ing his-her life
P-Changing a few students' mindsets as most valuable to professor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>P-Changing an already successful course to be SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>P-Changing and Reorienting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>P-Changing SL so it's simpler, less stressful for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>P-Changing the world slowly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>P-Changing, adapting to community partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>P-Choosing a topic, choosing a book for the class, economic approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>P-Cleaning out houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>P-Coming down from the ivory tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>P-Coming full circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>P-Coming up with other ways to engage the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>P-Comparing SL to non SL classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>P-Comparing SL to non-SL course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>P-Connecting to Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>P-Connecting to History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>P-Connection to Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>P-Continuing to go back to help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>P-Contributing something useful to homeless organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>P-Convincing self that SL is what's best for new generation of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>P-Coordinating CPs as a challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>P-Crafting ethnographies with students re elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>P-Creating an environment for student transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>P-Crystallizing historic changes for the students through 'humanization'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>P-Dealing with ethical issues that come up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>P-Debriefing and dissecting in a sustained immersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>P-Deciding she 'wanted to do service learning' projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>P-Deepening of SL as 'student directed'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>P-Defining as 'partnership, sort of egalitarian'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>P-Defining 'safe' versus 'uncomfortable'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>P-Defining SL as a 'continuum'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>P-Defining SL as 'doing with'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>P-Defining SL as growing-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>P-Defining social capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>P-Describing book-to-practice connection as messy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>P-Describing first SL experience as coincidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>P-Describing oral history process as innovative and not innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>P-Describing SL project with homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>P-Describing students' change as cumulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>P-Describing the 'back end' of the process for him as prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>P-Describing the rush you get when in poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>P-Describing Transforming versus Transacting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>P-Describing 'wavering' students - science and premed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P-Designing a long-term project after initial SL experience
P-Developing as a human
P-Devoting time to SL
P-Did some really good stuff with agencies
P-Didn't have opportunity to do SL while in administration
P-Doing bullying workshops with kids
P-Doing everyday, not just Sunday
P-Doing for society, not for you
P-Doing harm, doing no harm
P-Doing oral histories now because of our area-town
P-Doing serious academic research with students
P-Doing SL for three years
P-Doing SL in moderation, spreading self too thin
P-Doing SL selfishly
P-Draining energy, spreading self too thin
P-Emphasizing to students the connection to history
P-Engaging critically in winter park history
P-Engaging students in problem-based research and surveys
P-Enhancing students' understanding of the books
P-Enhancing, not an add on, to the classroom
P-Ensuring a good fit between students and environ
P-Ensuring it's a two way street
P-Everyone has a story to tell, to share - beyond metanarrative
P-Examining what you and others are thinking, feeling, culture
P-Experiencing disbelief
P-Experiencing discomfort and failure as a professor
P-Experiencing so much herself, changing, changing
P-Experiencing what it's like to work with different SL students now
P-Fearing how much students will get out of SL
P-Fearing it wouldn't work, worried about first time
P-Fearing loss of control
P-Fearing not being successful with SL
P-Fearing-Doubting for students
P-Feeling another persons' loss
P-Feeling he needs to do something 'different and indifferent' for this class of 3-2 students
P-Feeling heart sinking, rock in stomach for first time in 30 years
P-Feeling less relaxed with seniors than first years
P-Feeling like a failure, working through failure
P-Feeling like a hypocrite if she backs down
P-Feeling like he's a rare bird
P-Feeling more relaxed the second time around
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Feeling peaceful after agonizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Feeling pressure of the challenges and the rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Feeling professors are too attached to idea of content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Feeling that 'middle class' kids are devoid of life experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Feeling touched to the point of tears by students' journal experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Feeling unable to convey structural inequities in a believable way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Feeling we don't do a good job communicating the transformative power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Feeling worried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Figuring out a new way to meet students' learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Figuring out what kind of teacher she wanted to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Figuring out what's next for him in SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Figuring out where we are and where we are going as a culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Figuring RCC 3-2 are fairly concrete thinkers, not philosophers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Figuring things out, not knowing how to handle things, intervening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Finding that 'poor' is relative to reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Finding ways to support people whose lives have been changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Focusing on third graders needs in chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Getting a sense of how it turned out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Getting away with something more complex for older students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Getting beyond the charity model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Getting excited about SL tie to anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Getting help from another faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Getting older and reflecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Getting past the power thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Getting resistance before not after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Getting resistance from students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Getting students connected with people they'd never interact with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Getting students excited about history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Getting students to interact with those different from they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Getting students to think about their own lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Getting the agency connected-- role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Getting things ready- 'front loading'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Getting used to feeling uncomfortable yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Getting, feeling anxious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Giving SL a chance in other classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Giving students a new way of thinking about what they want to do with their lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Giving students a taste of field work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Giving students baby fieldwork experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Giving students 'explicit' context before they engage, preparing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Go and reposition the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Going back to Plato</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Going back to the well, building sustainable relationships. Going down there during Reach Out, to AL, going there 2-3 times a year to NoLA. Going through all the anxiety herself, going through self doubt, going through someone's life. Going through weird, disconnected thoughts. Got training here because no one else was doing this work. Grappling with solving system versus solving problem. Grounding her beyond the 'bubble'. Grounding her in the real world. Hating when SL not taken seriously. Have only had one SL class. Haven't thought too seriously, intellectually, about all of this until now. Having a deeper impact on the community, more sustainable, over time. Having a higher level impact. Having a religious experience. Having a 'rewarding' new experience with Rollins students - opening new doors. Having elders confide in students. Having goal to 'get more faculty involved' to see it for selves. Having his work misrepresented by fourth parties. Having many balls in the air at once. Having multiple outcomes. Having students preflect helped a lot. Having students put 'feelings aside' to learn about process and structure. Having students talk to elders in AL. Having students work with elderly. Having the opportunity as teacher to affect students in a new way. Having to decide if this is what the College wants to be about. Heard about elder project. Helping people start over. Helping students dvp leadership. Helping students prepare for SL. Helping students with coordination, logistics. Helping your neighbor, the American way. Here as one of you, taking orders from you - the students. Holding students in higher esteem now. Holding students to a higher standard than self. Hoping SL will always be part of her pedagogy. Hoping students will make the 'reflective leap' with her.
Implementing SL as a challenge

Interest in SL coming from the changing student demographic, changing of HE

Involving colleagues, Involving students

Involving with 'hillbilly' culture

Journaling beyond 'intellect' into 'emotional'

Knowing every trip back is more positive

Knowing he's been successful without SL

Knowing more work needs to be done

Knowing people 'can't do it by themselves'

Knowing some students have to go back to do some more to sort out the disequilibrium

Knowing that there are concrete and abstract thinkers in a classroom

Knowing that what's 'read in class won't travel'

Knowing this will be a long, dedicated process

Knowing what 'he wants to do' in a traditional classroom

Knowing you cannot stop culture from happening

Learning about what 'community engagement' or 'SL' was

Learning better through her own reflection

Learning by doing, constantly learning herself

Learning by observing students' projects, tagging along

Learning by watching the students learn

Learning herself beyond the charity approach

Learning he's doing the right thing

Learning something new at 65 years of age

Letting go of control

Letting students 'almost' get the noose around their neck

Letting students run with it

Letting the students find their way

Linking 'sustainable' work to purpose as an anthropologist

Linking to Communication perspective-discipline

Listening to subjects and partners' experience

Living discomfort in order to do something

Living her values, placing words into action

Looking at agency instead of group

Looking at things differently after panic

Making activities for self, colleagues, and students

Making mistakes

Making SL relevant to the topic

Making the classes more exciting

Making the classes more interesting

Managing logistics, devoting time to obstacles

Marveling at students' activism
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>P-Meaning and depth as challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>P-Missionaries go all of the time - reframing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>P-Moving away from charity model during semester experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>P-Moving into a new way of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>P-Moving students beyond fear and tackling change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>P-Naming his own detachment around race and PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>P-Naming how SL is 'contested' in anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>P-Naming obligation of historians to engage with real world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>P-Naming tension bt SL and what is academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>P-Naming things in our own back yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>P-Naming 'town gown' relationship as benign paternalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>P-Naming work with 'underrepresented' groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>P-Naming, acknowledging the institutional 'partner'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>P-Navigating 'rigor tension' by grounding in discussion and texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>P-Needing more time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>P-Needing 'product' to be presentable to people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>P-Needing to be contributing something to the world somehow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>P-Needing to tell the story of winter park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>P-Never been in someone's home without being invited before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>P-Never having been in a disaster area like that before- first time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>P-Nice easy fit - first time SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>P-Not caring if students become anthropologists or academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>P-Not driving every moment of the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>P-Not feeling that past oral history efforts at RC tied to curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>P-Not having any experience w SL before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>P-Not having any training in SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>P-Not knowing how to 'do things differently' or reframe SL experience to keep students involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>P-Not sitting around waiting for government, do it with a middle solution instead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>P-Not sleeping, couldn't sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>P-Not talking about science students, talking about Rollins students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>P-Not thinking he contributed to the students' learning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>P-Not thinking she could do more SL due to time, energy constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>P-Not wanting to be a hypocrite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>P-Not wanting to 'ignore a duty at some level'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>P-Not wanting to show too much vulnerability as professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>P-Noticing students' ability to influence the class success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>P-Noting that this work is serious, it is critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>P-Opening students up to possibilities of transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>P-Panicking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>P-Participated in 3 SL activities to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>P-Participating in economic impact of social capital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
302 P-Passing SL along to own family
303 P-Paying 'homage' to the developmental curriculum
304 P-People are not playing on a level playing field - cxt to SL
305 P-Personalizing the students' learning experience
306 P-Picking up garbage in VA
307 P-Placing students in a safe situation
308 P-Positioning personal agenda
309 P-Prefers a different kind of SL for his work - not 'oral histories'
310 P-Prepping students to own the process
311 P-Prompting by students v. admin to do SL
312 P-Protecting, reframing what's important
313 P-Providing history and background
314 P-Pulling self up by their bootstraps
315 P-Pursuing SL subjects afterwards
316 P-Pursuing, becoming 'hooked' on service
317 P-Pushing self through fear to 'amazing'
318 P-Pushing students beyond 'knee jerk' reactions to racism
319 P-Putting self in SL situation first
320 P-Putting them into an experience where they can figure it out on their own
321 P-Questioning superficiality
322 P-Questioning whether it was good to do SL
323 P-Race is part of America's identity
324 P-Realizing 'critical thinking' may not be the most important thing
325 P-Realizing engagement is 'freeing' for students
326 P-Realizing his courses are a reflection of his OWN personal and intellectual development
327 P-Realizing his expectations might differ from their learning
328 P-Realizing it's 'an enormous amt of learning'
329 P-Realizing learning can be obscured at times
330 P-Realizing oral histories can be exhausting for the c partner
331 P-Realizing SL has 'given more confidence about trying new things'
332 P-Realizing SL really works at all academic levels
333 P-Realizing SL takes reflection, engagement, and contribution seriously
334 P-Realizing students are different now
335 P-Realizing students can't mess it up
336 P-Realizing students need to be talked to as the whole person
337 P-Realizing students will carry certain lessons forever - SL
338 P-Realizing students won't ever learn all you hope
339 P-Realizing teaching is a hard profession
340 P-Realizing things are changing in academe, new pedagogies, new conception
341 P-Realizing you can't add SL 'on top' of the course
342 P-Recalling how some students were applying and vocalizing their learning in class
P-Recalling things slowing down after first couple of weeks
P-Recognizing community partners will hold back, don't want to share fully
P-Recognizing from experience the deep suspicion people have of institutions
P-Recognizing his goal in the course is to change students' lives
P-Recognizing his own transformation, walls are down
P-Recognizing how impersonal her own theory courses can be
P-Recognizing reading isn't enough to understand poverty
P-Recognizing SL as good for students' development as anthropologists
P-Recognizing students' stress with oral history vs biography
P-Recognizing that SL is good for pedagogy and discipline
P-Recognizing this is life changing even for the victim
P-Reestablishing community
P-Referencing mother and her Alzheimers
P-Reflecting herself
P-Reflecting on experiences where students work was garbage
P-Reflecting on first time teaching this subject and doing SL at the same time
P-Reflecting on his very, very interactive 'lecture' way of teaching
P-Reflecting on how students' garbage becomes a learning moment
P-Reflecting on if SL is a backdoor or top-down approach at RC
P-Reflecting on 'start' of SL with underrepresented groups and oral histories
P-Reflecting on the changes in HE, changes in culture
P-Refining tension bt SL and academic
P-Reframing-Processing panic, anxiety, fear
P-Reinforcing history as a science and an art
P-Reinforcing the reading with application
P-Relating SL to what people are talking about in Anthro
P-Relating students' learning to hers
P-Reprioritizing his/her life
P-Robbing institutional partner of good stories bc of race issue
P-Rollins Relief
P-Running into same problems as students do
P-Running the gamut as untenured - offending and pleasing
P-Saw SL program transform in past 5 years
P-Saying atmosphere of class is 100% diff with SL
P-Saying SL is 'a lot of work' for professor
P-Scheduling as a challenge
P-Scheduling is a pain
P-Seeing 5th graders getting into research
P-Seeing admins 'going out on a limb' to support SL
P-Seeing her conception of SL grow more complex each semester
P-Seeing 'majors' transformed 'intellectually'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>P-Seeing NoLA folks 'divorcing' themselves from their houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>P-Seeing people struggling to survive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>P-Seeing self as part of the 'history of the place'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>P-Seeing SL as allowing students to bring self AND their experiences into the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>P-Seeing SL as necessary, critical to teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>P-Seeing SL as 'not perfect for all classes' or professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>P-Seeing students being transformed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>P-Seeing students differently now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>P-Seeing students 'fight' through and sort out the disequilibrium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>P-Seeing students grow and change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>P-Seeing students have 'these transformative' experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>P-Seeing students 'learn things I couldn't' teach them from books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>P-Seeing students overcoming their fears to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>P-Seeing students starting new things, taking over leadership positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>P-Seeing students thinking in new ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>P-Seeing students uncomfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>P-Seeing students worn out by core theory alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>P-Seeing the 'sum total' of people's material lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>P-Seeing what his students become - professionals, teachers, part of their lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>P-Seeing what works and what doesn't work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>P-Seeing, visualizing destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>P-Self as old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>P-Semester change in students is 'more so than expected'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>P-Sending white kids to white folks, black kids to black folks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>P-Serving in elementary education-teaching chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>P-Sharing a multifaceted tension - student, subject, and community partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>P-Sharing an example of a student's transformative experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>P-Sharing her history with migrant and native children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>P-Sharing the influence of her Russian heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>P-Sharing the nuances of 'reflection'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>P-Shifting 'role' based on SL class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>P-Shifting SL to meet curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>P-Shifting-deepening personal conception of SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>P-Showing EMOTION during interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>P-Sinking heart at sight of the destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>P-Sitting back and letting students decide-see what happens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>P-Society not liking to think about race, poverty, governmental neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>P-Started with small groups class first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>P-Starting as a professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>P-Staying closely aligned with academic piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>P-Staying grounded in her own discipline through SL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P-Struggling with being 'defined' by SL
P-Struggling with duration of international SL trips, charity model
P-Struggling with the academic tension
P-Surveying effectiveness of SL
P-Taking SL to a new level through research
P-Taking students out of comfort zone to understand material better, be affected more
P-Talking about curriculum, general education
P-Talking about frustration over time with interaction between students and subject
P-Talking to people, finding out new things
P-Teaching Intro to Philosophy with SL in 2nd half now
P-Teaching students to be teachers
P-Teaching two Phil classes now, one is SL
P-Thinking 'a lot more about service' at this time of life- near retirement
P-Thinking about a solution
P-Thinking about conducting surveys herself
P-Thinking about doing SL differently next time around due to first learning experience
P-Thinking about future in SL
P-Thinking about his/her own life
P-Thinking about how some fac see SL as non-desirable, easy
P-Thinking about more structured ways to do SL in future
P-Thinking about new models for SL
P-Thinking about opportunity for change if there was political will and leadership
P-Thinking about retirement
P-Thinking I don't have the right to push my biases
P-Thinking it's more complicated than 'setting them loose'
P-Thinking of SL as an 'academic entree into something' new
P-Thinking of things as an 'abstract' philosopher
P-Thinking SL is 'important tool in combining the past and the future'
P-Thinking students will hate SL
P-Thinking we can gain something from a new student-global culture
P-Thinking 'young people' are figuring things out including who they are
P-Transferring key 'ideals' in the classroom
P-Transforming people, students
P-Transitioning from oral history to biography
P-Trying service-learning
P-Trying to do too much, worried about feasibility
P-Trying to figure out how to bring 'citizenship' into the curriculum
P-Trying to pull student 'back' from experience, grappling
P-Trying to rationalize myself out of this
P-Trying to show colleagues there is a place for SL in any discipline
P-Trying to take an old horse to water
P-Turning NoLA back to nature
P-Turning the tide
P-Tying back to what was happening in classroom
P-Tying SL to curriculum
P-Tying together 'happiness' class and SL
P-Understanding definitional difference
P-Understanding the teaching approach
P-Unsure what brought 'happiness' and 'elder project' together exactly
P-Valuing a 'rock your world' experience
P-Valuing cxn to leadership
P-Valuing 'impromptu' reflective conversations
P-Valuing perspective of other SL professors
P-Valuing 'real world' experiences for her students to draw upon
P-Valuing students as 'actors' in the SL process
P-Valuing students' participation and engagement in and out of classroom
P-Valuing the concept of 'space' in SL
P-Valuing the sustainable impact of SL
P-Waiting to see if SL will be successful the second time around, experimenting...
P-Wanting and valuing student participation in the classroom
P-Wanting freshman to think beyond, to think about happiness in the future
P-Wanting people to engage in dialogue, to share, in community
P-Wanting students to become life long learners
P-Wanting students to experience failure at times
P-Wanting students to feel uncomfortable, disoriented, in order to learn
P-Wanting students to see the world beyond themselves
P-Wanting students to take full responsibility
P-Wanting to continue the high, the excitement
P-Wanting to create a deeper experience for jrs and srs
P-Wanting to give back to the community more
P-Wanting to see SL outside of the disciplines
P-Washing your hands, checking the box
P-Watching students' excitement grow
P-Watching students grow
P-Watching the homeowner try to deal with the salvage, loss
P-Who do I think I am
P-Willing to delay his own happiness, gratification
P-Wondering about our curriculum now
P-Wondering how other faculty design their courses
P-Wondering how SL fits into his own learning
P-Wondering how vulnerable she should be with students
P-Wondering how you effect the lives and minds of students
P-Wondering how you, the traditional academic, educate
P-Wondering if he has the tools, resources to help students in this way
P-Wondering if he should have followed 5th graders to see if they continued in science
P-Wondering if he's bowing to racial conventions
P-Wondering if SL is a good move for him
P-Wondering if the students or the process make the experience what it is
P-Wondering what makes students think we are supreme
P-Wondering what students will get out of the community based research
P-Wondering what to do with SL
P-Wondering what will happen
P-Wondering what's more exciting that learning with students
P-Wondering where we are as a RC community
P-Working all of the time
P-Working as a true team - 'us'
P-Working differently for students' grade levels
P-Working her way through the difficult experiences
P-Working in a deficit model
P-Working in intercity Parramore
P-Working on solutions to 'do no harm' issues
P-Working with Boy Scouts, needing a break
P-Working with document-based research
P-Working with nursing homes and societies
P-Working with students to see if new pockets of 'social capital' exist
P-Writing journals, natural process
S-Adjusting to change, to the environment
S-Becoming better historians over time as SL & curriculum connect
S-Becoming closer to the professor-empathy
S-Being fearful of the elders too
S-Being put in an uncomfortable situation
S-Believing poor are responsible for their plight
S-Believing the text after SL experience
S-Checking the Box
S-Creating new leadership things as a result
S-Deciding to 'spin off' first experience into a research project
S-Digesting what they're doing as a group
S-Doing the 'dirty work' of talking to the people
S-Doing the field work themselves - without professor
S-Easier than they thought it'd be
S-Feeling disillusioned
S-Feeling the importance, connecting to the region
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>S-Finding new things out about themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>S-Freaking out if professor shares mistakes etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>S-Freeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>S-Getting a better learning experience when things are messy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>S-Getting each other excited about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>S-Going on to become teachers themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>S-Having a transformative experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>S-Having prejudices, working through them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>S-Having stereotypical ideas about people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>S-Having too much to do, too much to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>S-Helping 3rd graders get excited about chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>S-Interacting with new gender perspectives, races, narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>S-Journaling, writing beyond the intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>S-Learning about group 'messiness' and dvp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>S-Learning about the self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>S-Learning group leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564</td>
<td>S-Learning more in this class than another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>S-Liking it after it's done, hating it before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>S-Living through conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td>S-Making a connection between healthcare and homelessness and student's life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568</td>
<td>S-Moving beyond oblivion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569</td>
<td>S-Needing 'a bit of help along the way'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>S-Never would have thought of humanity that way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571</td>
<td>S-Not knowing what to do or say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>S-Really getting something out of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>S-Reinforcing learning through experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574</td>
<td>S-Resisting types of S-L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575</td>
<td>S-Rethinking what it means to be successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td>S-Seeing professor as equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>S-Seeing the impact and extending it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>S-Solving their own problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>S-Talking to elders, engaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>S-Talking to someone of same-v-different race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>S-Talking, connecting to real people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>S-Teaching 'trust' and 'reciprocity' to kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td>S-Thinking about history 'as a human process'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>S-Thinking about the American dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>S-Trying to get the damn grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>S-Unable to believe professor from the texts alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>S-Valuing 'getting a good job' as freshmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>S-Wanting to go back</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tree Nodes

1. Processual, ongoing
2. Humanity, culture, duty
3. Who I always have been
4. Who I am now
5. Who I am becoming
6. Emotion, empathy
7. Witnessing students grow
8. Learning from, with, transforming
9. Carrying students
10. Meeting students where they are
11. Sharing background in service-learning
12. Sharing why I do this
13. Naming different types, scope of service-learning
14. Getting through fear, discomfort, disorientation
15. Recognizing limits
16. Dealing with logistics
17. Being frustrated
18. Navigating time, timing
19. Refining, experimenting, trying
20. Examining, reflecting
21. Wondering if?
22. Who’s teacher? What’s learning?
23. Enriching the classroom
24. Connecting to discipline
25. Theory to practice nuances
26. To service-learning or not to service learning?
27. Service-learning not for everyone
28. Moving beyond charity
29. Navigating community partner relation
30. Witnessing the community
31. Ivory tower bubble
32. Navigating politics, institution
33. Dreaming big
34. Naming what students get
35. Naming people, partners, context
Appendix E: Artifact List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Number</th>
<th>Type of Artifact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Institutional Mission Statement, Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Faculty Handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Curriculum Model proposed by service-learning educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Quality Enhancement Plan, esp. section focused on service-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>College Marketing Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>White Paper published on Citizenship Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>