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This qualitative interpretative study explored the factors that contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning and how they promote such learning at a mid-western public university. Intrinsic motivation, which focuses on the internal and psychological satisfactions individuals derive from an activity, is important for faculty engaged in service-learning. Such motivation, however, can be catalyzed by conditions that allow its expression. Human agency, a core concept of social cognitive theory, is the theoretical framework for the study, which posits that as an agent of change, one exerts influence over one’s environment.

Seven faculty members who were members of the university’s Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community and had taught a service-learning course participated in this study. Findings of the study revealed that educational discontent; relationship, collaboration, and communal support; goodness; and gratification and advancement contribute to the intrinsic motivation of these faculty members. Participants promote service-learning through direct personal agency, proxy agency, and collective agency, and these faculty members who teach service-learning courses are theorized as change agents. This study adds to the literature on faculty motivation for service-learning, informs educational stakeholders on service-learning promotion, and opens up pathways for more research.

Service-learning is a credit-bearing pedagogy, which incorporates community service projects that are effectively connected to the curriculum and where students
reflect on such activities for a deeper understanding of the academic content and to
develop enhanced personal and professional skills. Despite its acclaimed benefits, this
pedagogy is currently not fully accepted as a core part of higher education. As a teaching
and learning method, faculty adoption and promotion is essential to the acceptance of
service-learning because of faculty members’ role in course development, curriculum
coordination, and higher education administration.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Universities and colleges in the United States are reported as separated from the problems facing their communities and other larger societal issues (Leeds, 1999). Higher education institutions, although located in various communities, act as separate entities removed from the community and society as a whole. This separation, however, is more class-based than anything else. According to Martin, Smith, and Phillips (2005), these institutions pose as “elite bastions of information and knowledge” (p. 3). Higher education institutions insulate themselves from their surrounding communities by solely focusing on scholastic efforts and within-academy challenges. Although efforts such as the Morill Land Grant College Act (1862) and Lowry Bill (1910) promoted university-community relationships through partnered projects, it further served the elitism of higher education. Both the Land Grant College Act (1962), which focused on agricultural and industrial training, and the Lowry Bill, which focused on teacher education training, were established to provide expertise training for the community. Such partnerships did not necessarily promote a reciprocal learning and collaboration opportunity for the community and institutions.

Similarly, the public has increasingly lost confidence in the U.S. higher education system (Lynton, 1995). Employers are dissatisfied with the quality of higher education graduates and calling for a reevaluation of the theory-practice relationship. Comparably, society wonders if these graduates are able to rise up to life challenges and responsibilities. Boyer (1994) explains the interconnectivity of higher education and society. According to him, colleges and universities possess the intellectual talent needed to transform society. Incorporating community service to teaching and research is a needed response to societal challenges. Although higher education is not a universal solution for societal needs, it plays a special role in producing advanced
knowledge and better-equipping graduates that can discern and respond to societal problems (Lynton, 1995). University and college students are members of society, thus actors and contributors to the development of society. The prevalent dissatisfaction with the present state of the educational practice is the foundation for service-learning (Leeds 1999).

**Background of the Study**

Service-learning is a “credit-bearing” pedagogy in which students undertake a service project that is effectively connected to the academic content and responds to community needs. Students reflect on this activity in order to “gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility” (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995, p. 112). Although the practice and acceptance of this pedagogy continues to grow, it still battles for acceptance despite its acclaimed benefits (Furco, 2002a). Service-learning addresses community needs while educating young people. Students apply classroom knowledge to real-life scenarios by performing service, thereby becoming active citizens and community members. According to Bringle and Hatcher (1996), service-learning differs from volunteering because students are not merely rewarded for performing service. Students earn credit by participating in organized service activities that are effectively connected to their course of study and purposefully tailored to specific community needs. Service-learning emphasizes the curriculum by incorporating reflection components through discussion, writings, and presentations.

Because service-learning incorporates knowledge and expertise from different fields and disciplines to address often complex social issues, it also positions itself as a viable way for faculty collaboration across programs and departments (Furco 2001; O'Byrne, 2001). The practice of service-learning involves taking academic activities out of the classroom, which is not
a regular occurrence for many university faculty members. These outside-classroom experiences enhance the acquisition of relevant teaching skills faculty members may not be familiar with (Bringle, Hatcher, & Games, 1997). Alumni connections and community partnerships, which enhance the university image, are also built through service-learning (O'Byrne, 2001). Such partnerships are developed through service projects done in the community. These projects make the community members feel cared for by the university, thereby foster reciprocal relationships. In addition, students who graduate from the university and get employed in the community act as links between these entities. Many faculty members have reported using these community connections to facilitate their research (Furco, 2001). Depending on the focus of the study, community members are potential research participants and community organizations could serve as gatekeepers for participant recruitment. Community partnerships can also enhance research funding opportunities from agencies working in that area. Service-learning, therefore, benefits students, faculty members, institutions, and the community.

**Research Problem and Purpose of the Study**

Founded in 1985, Campus Compact is an alliance of over 1,100 college university presidents committed to fulfilling the civic purposes of education through various community engagement efforts, including service-learning. This organization annually conducts a membership survey to evaluate the support for, and determine the emerging trends in community-campus relationships. The 2009 membership survey, featured 731 institutions (61% of their member institutions), including two and four year public institutions (55%) and private institutions (45%). Fifty-eight percent of these institutions identified as liberal arts, 21% as research/comprehensive, and 22% as community colleges. The survey results showed that 92% of member institutions offered service-learning courses, with an average of 55 courses per
campus in the 2008 - 2009 academic year. Although these figures represent an improvement from previous years, the number of faculty members who taught these courses (an average of 27 per campus) was only 6% of the total number of faculty members per institution. In essence, 94% of faculty members in these already engaged institutions are yet to incorporate service-learning in their courses let alone the rest of the, according to IES (2009), over 6,500 title IV post-secondary institutions in the United States. Title IV refers to institutions that participate in federal student financial aid programs.

Faculty members both influence and are influenced by service-learning. They are responsible for the development of courses, teach the courses, coordinate curriculum, relate with students, and oversee many program decisions. A greater understanding of faculty motivations and attractions to service-learning will equip higher education institutions to initiate and develop service-learning efforts, including faculty recruitment, support, and sustenance for participation in service-learning (Driscoll, 2000). Abes, Jackson, and Jones (2002) report intrinsic motivation to be the most important factor for faculty engaged in service-learning. Motivation, generally, deals with how actions are mediated; however, intrinsic motivation focuses on the internal and psychological satisfactions individuals derive from an activity and does not require reinforcers (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Intrinsic motivation can be catalyzed by favorable conditions that allow its expression and when intrinsically motivated, individuals choose activities because they find them interesting and satisfying, and not for separable rewards (Deci, 1972). Therefore, the purpose of this study is to explore the factors that contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning and how they promote such learning.
Research Questions

There are three overarching research questions guiding this study:

1. What contributes to the intrinsic motivation of faculty members engaged in service-learning at a U.S. mid-western public university?

2. In what ways have these faculty members actualized their involvement in service-learning engagement at a mid-western public university?

3. In what ways do these faculty members model human agency by their involvement in service-learning at a mid-western public university?

Significance of the Study

Lucas (1994) asserts there is a general reluctance on the part of higher education to embrace curricular reforms even when it is compatible with already existent academic practices. Service-learning still dwells in the periphery of academic mainstream, as a "co-curricular practice, funded through ‘soft’ short-term grants, and viewed by faculty as ‘just’ a theoretical (and time-consuming) pedagogy that may be detrimental for traditional tenure and promotion committees to take seriously" (Butin, 2006, p. 474). Holland (2000) proposes the need for an inquiry into the factors that affect adopting and promoting service-learning in higher education institutions. There is a need to move beyond the function and impact of service-learning to a deeper investigation of challenges associated with implementing, expanding, and sustaining service-learning as a teaching and learning method (Furco, 2002a). Bringle and Hatcher (1996) highlight the critical nature of faculty involvement for the advancement of service-learning.

Service-learning, being at its core a course-driven component of curriculum, requires university faculty in its application and for its support to make the necessary changes. An inquiry into the factors that enable the intrinsic motivation for faculty involvement in service-learning
would inform the design and development of this pedagogy by colleges and universities; therefore, make it a widely accepted core part of higher education (Furco, 2002a). This qualitative interpretive study will explore and add to the body of literature on faculty members and service-learning advancement in the context of a mid-western public university. It also possesses a utilitarian value to the Office of Service-Learning at a mid-western public university, as there has not been such a study on this subject carried out at this site to date.

**Setting**

It is essential to describe the social, philosophical, and physical characteristics of the location in which a qualitative research is conducted (Janesick, 2000). This research is carried out as a qualitative interpretive study of a mid-sized U.S. mid-western public university with a population of over 20,000 students, a 20 to 1 student to faculty ratio, and an Office of Service-Learning established for about five years. Participants were recruited from members of the university’s Service-Learning Faculty Learning Communities who have taught or currently teach service-learning courses. This learning community is a two-year commitment for interested faculty members, to assist them through the service-learning course development stages of research and planning, implementation, and evaluation. A self-selected group, faculty members meet regularly to go through relevant readings, participate in workshops, give presentations, share perspectives, and assist one another throughout the duration of their commitment to the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community.

**Conceptual Framework**

Human agency, a key concept in Albert Bandura’s social cognitive theory (1999, 2001, 2006), is used as the theoretical framework for this study. He posits that as an agent of change, a person exerts influence over his or her environment. One is not merely a product of one’s
environment but also impacts the environment. As a curricular practice, faculty participation through commitment, adoption, and engagement is significant to the advancement of service-learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 1997). Therefore, the extent to which service-learning is institutionalized can be examined from how the faculty members model human agency. The influence exerted by faculty members on their institutional environment can illuminate the direction of the advancement of service-learning in that institution. Consequently, the degree to which faculty members promote service-learning could be an indicator of its growth and practice in their institution.

According to Bandura (2001), human agency is represented by the “endowments, belief systems, self-regulatory capabilities, and distributed structures and functions through which” (p. 2) one exercises personal influence. To be an agent is to intentionally influence one's functioning and the course of environmental events. People are contributors to their life circumstances not just products of them. Research studies (Furco, 2001, 2002a; O’Byrne, 2001) emphasize the importance of faculty members in the advancement and institutionalization of service-learning. The extent to which service-learning is institutionalized on any campus depends on faculty responsibility and administrative support. In higher education, faculty members are not only present in the classrooms but also a part of the administration. Faculty members teach academic courses as well as serve in administrative roles, such as dean and school director. A substantial number of faculty members who support service-learning is crucial to the institutionalization of service-learning. Faculty members can encourage and appreciate each other for implementing effective pedagogies, such as service-learning by providing their colleagues with more information about it and the required support (Furco, 2001). Consequently, service-learning advancement will require faculty members to take purposive actions to promote such learning.
According to Furco (2002a), there is a dearth of higher education policies that support faculty engagement in service-learning. Because many higher education institutions do not consider service-learning efforts in policies such as for terms of review, tenure, and promotion, faculty members are not encouraged to teach service-learning courses and promote the pedagogy in their institution. The research of Abes, Jackson, and Jones (2002), however, stipulates intrinsic motivation, rather than reward structures, as a more significant factor for faculty engagement in service-learning. Although reward for effort is appreciated, many service-learning faculty members are internally motivated to teach these courses. With or without reward, faculty members engaged in service-learning are prone to continue using this pedagogy and teaching such courses. This attribute of service-learning faculty is consistent with the position of human agency. Bandura (2001), in his agentic perspective of social cognitive theory, states that:

If actions were performed only on behalf of anticipated external rewards and punishments, people would behave like weather vanes, constantly shifting direction to conform to whatever influence happened to impinge upon them at the moment… After they adopt personal standards, people regulate their behavior by self-evaluative outcomes, which may augment or override the influence of external outcomes. (p. 7)

Human agency, thus, not only provides a lens for examining the influence of faculty members in the advancement of service-learning, but also expounds the role of intrinsic motivation.

**Organization of Thesis**

This thesis is divided into five chapters. Following this introduction, Chapter Two reviews relevant literature to this study. These include background and origin of service-
learning, faculty, and higher education in the United States and more notes of intrinsic motivation and human agency. Chapter Three describes the qualitative interpretive method as appropriate for this study and a step-by-step description of the research process; including participant selection, data collection, and data analysis. This chapter also gives more details on the demographics of the faculty participants and the structure and procedure of the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community. Chapter Four presents the findings from this study in categories and themes. This chapter includes discussions of each theme as it connects to the research findings, answers the research questions, and serves the purpose of this study. The final chapter, Chapter Five, discusses the research findings and summarizes the study with inferences on the factors that contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning, the impact of how they promote this pedagogy in their institutions, and implications for service-learning advancement in higher education. Suggestions for future research are also discussed.
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter examines the body of literature related to the study. It begins with notes on motivation and regulation of action, which is related to the conceptual framework of the study. Subsequently, this chapter reviews literature on U.S. public higher education as related to faculty and institutional demands, and the development of service-learning, its benefits, and advancement. It also assesses the motivation of faculty to engage in service-learning.

Motivation and Regulation of Action

Motivation is the initiation of action; the degree to which this is expressed is represented in one’s choice of activity and the magnitude and determination of effort (Bandura, 1998). When motivated, people are determined to start or continue an effort and show a great level of self-direction when faced with challenges. However, staying committed to a cause in the face of challenges and setbacks requires a high level of efficacy. “Self-efficacy beliefs determine how people feel, think, motivate themselves, and behave” (Bandura, 1998, p. 421). Perceived self-efficacy describes a person’s belief about their potential to make an impact. It involves people’s perception about their abilities to make a desired level of impact on their life’s circumstances. Self-motivation developed through the assessment of one’s capability leads to personal agency of action (Cameron & Pierce, 2002). People are prone to embark on actions they believe they can do and set goals to realize a conceived outcome. The life course of an individual is determined by the choices the person makes, through which different interests, competencies, and social networks are developed (Bandura, 1998). In group situations, collective efficacy determines group interest, determination, and action for a cause. This kind of efficacy also influences resilience when collective efforts do not produce rapid results, and the group’s overall likelihood of success. Just as one’s achievements and well-being are reflective of one’s sense of efficacy,
the success of any organization of people partly lies in their sense of collective efficacy. People with high levels of efficacy tend to welcome more challenging tasks as growth opportunities rather than threats. Such people set higher goals, stay committed to it, recover quickly from setbacks, and rationalize failure as a result of inadequate efforts or from knowledge and skills yet to be acquired. They are prone to tackle threatening situations with confidence (Bandura, 1998). Many life challenges are group problems requiring joint efforts to make a positive change. Problems can be solved and people can improve their lives when they believe in their unified effort. People, however, tend to steer away from situations and actions they consider above their abilities and gravitate towards challenges they feel capable of (Bandura, 1998). This, therefore, makes self-efficacy a core part of motivation regulation.

**Intrinsic Motivation.** Intrinsic motivation is a derivative of one’s sense of self (Ryan & Deci, 2000); therefore, intrinsic motivation is reflective of self-efficacy. Individuals can be intrinsically motivated when they have the feeling that they know what they are doing and are part of the decision making process. Deci (1975) expands intrinsic motivation to include both internal satisfactions and purposeful engagement of an individual with his or her environment. He suggests that people are intrinsically motivated by their interest in novelty, a need to acquire experience, and the opportunity to flexibly apply their acquired skills. An intrinsically motivated person will carry out an activity when no evident external reward is present except the activity itself or the feelings derived from doing the activity (Deci, 1972). Intrinsic motivation does not negate the need for external rewards, it only depicts that external rewards are insufficient to keep a person motivated (Deci, 1972). Furthermore, intrinsic motivation is necessary for increased creativity, enhanced conceptual understanding, greater cognitive flexibility, and strong behavioral persistence (Deci & Ryan, 1985).
Many social-contextual factors such as competence, autonomy, and performance feedback are essential to the development of intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2001). An individual is more intrinsically motivated when given a choice, the opportunity for self-direction, and acknowledgement for their feelings (Deci & Ryan, 1985). It is, however, not enough to only give positive appraisals to build a person’s efficacy. Fostering self-efficacy requires creating an enabling environment and avoiding circumstances that put people in unprepared situations that could lead to recurrent failures (Bandura, 1998). Personal efficacy can be developed through one’s record of success, seeing other people’s success as a model, encouragement from other people that one has what it takes, and inferences from physical and emotional perceptions of one’s abilities (Bandura, 1998). Self-efficacy beliefs, thus, affect people’s life choices, degree of motivation, nature of their undertakings, resilience to difficulties, and vulnerability to pressure and unhappiness (Bandura, 1998). People gain personal satisfaction when they meet or exceed their expectations for an embarked action (Bandura, 1997), and derive a sense of personal accomplishment, joy and satisfaction when they overcome challenges (Bandura, 1986). In addition, external rewards and positive feedback received from engaging in an activity builds self-efficacy. Such rewards favor a positive evaluation of one’s ability, thus increasing one’s intrinsic motivation and interest in the activity (Bandura, 1986).

**Effect of external rewards on intrinsic motivation.** Psychologists assume different positions on the effects of external rewards on intrinsic motivations. Some believe that external rewards deplete intrinsic motivations while others believe that external rewards are essential to keep intrinsic motivation viable. According to Cameron and Pierce (2002), external rewards can both be beneficial and detrimental to intrinsic motivation depending on “the reward type, the reward expectancy, the reward contingency, whether participants receive maximum or less than
maximum reward, level of initial task interest, the interpersonal context in which the rewards are delivered, and how intrinsic motivation is measured” (p. 97 - 98). Although social psychological theories pose that intrinsic motivation is adversely affected by external rewards, social learning theory posits that parts of personal agency emanates from outside influences (Cameron & Pierce, 2002). As stated by Bandura, (1986) external social rewards can build motivation at the onset before intrinsic effects manifest. However, if intrinsic motivation is not developed, actions are discontinued at the removal of the external rewards; whereas, when intrinsic motivation is present, external rewards increase or sustain the actions. Self-regulatory behavior guides and motivates actions and depends on timely rewards from others and the inherent outcome of actions over time (Cameron & Pierce, 2002). Conclusively, Bandura (1997) takes a position that irrespective of the motivation or the reward, it is one’s feeling and evaluation that makes the difference. The principal reward in activities where people derive sustained pleasure is determined by feelings and evaluations of their performances rather than the action itself or inherent outcomes.

**Human Agency**

Human agency is the process by which people interact with and influence their environment (Bandura, 1999). This process also depicts the way people create and influence social systems. Essentially, people both influence and respond to happenings in their surroundings. Agency comprises of a variety of factors. It “embodies the endowments, belief systems, self-regulatory capabilities, and distributed structures and functions through which personal influence is exercised, rather than residing as a discrete entity in a particular place” (Bandura 2001, p. 2). Consequentially, agency does not occur in isolation. It is impacted by the various ways people make decisions, including personal characteristics, belief systems, social
background, and purpose of action. Bandura (1999) states that "human agency operates generatively and proactively on social systems, not just reactively" (p. 24). This means that for agency to exist, there has to be purpose, action, and response. To influence a situation one has to determine the purpose of the decision, take steps towards realizing it, and respond to the outcome. An agent is any such person who decides the intent of a decision and its expected outcome prior to taking the required action (Bandura, 2001).

**Modes of Human Agency.** There are three modes in which human agency occurs which are direct personal agency, proxy agency, and collective agency (Bandura, 1999). Personal agency refers to actions taken directly by an individual, proxy agency signifies the use of a representative to mediate action, and collective agency describes the process of group action. All three modes of agency are founded in the belief that results can be achieved. Such belief is known as perceived efficacy. People take actions with the expectancy of a desired outcome and do so in ways they consider will be effective. To a large extent, human motivation and action is governed by expectations related to careful considerations of possible outcomes (Bandura, 1997). Therefore, efficacy is a mechanism of human agency. People are motivated to persevere through difficult situations when they believe they can produce desired outcomes and prevent undesirable ones by their actions (Bandura, 2001). Although other factors may serve as motivators, efficacy is grounded in people's belief in the power to make a difference by their actions (Bandura, 1999).

To make their way successfully through a complex world full of challenges and hazards, people have to make good judgments about their capabilities, anticipate the probable effects of different events and courses of action, size up sociostructural opportunities and constraints, and regulate their behavior
accordingly. These belief systems are a working model of the world that enables people to achieve desired outcomes and avoid untoward ones (Bandura 2001, p. 3).

In cases where people cannot directly control the social and institutional situations that affect them, they turn to proxy agency, which is socially driven. In this kind of agency, people rely on others who have the ability, means, power, and influence to facilitate situations for desired outcomes. Everyone is not proficient in every area of life, thus require proxy agency for areas they do not manage directly. Proxy agency is founded upon the belief in the effectiveness of others intervening; this includes parents acting on behalf of children, spouses for one another, and legislators for the citizens (Bandura 2001). In certain situations, people may still resort to proxy agency even if they have direct control. Such scenarios occur when the individual does not have the resources to take action, believes another person is better, or simply does not want the responsibility of direct control (Bandura, 2001).

Collective agency relies on the shared belief in the combined strength of a group to achieve desired outcomes (Bandura, 1997). Groups work together to achieve what could not be done individually or to create a division of labor. Essentially, collective agency operates "through shared beliefs of efficacy, pooled understandings, group aspirations and incentive systems, and collective action" (Bandura, 1999, p. 33). In this kind of agency, the collective efficacy is not merely the collection of the personal efficacy of individual members but a rising characteristic developed from the group dynamic interaction (Bandura, 2001). This attribute develops from the joint actions and beliefs of the individual members. Group attainments include “the product of the shared intentions, knowledge, and skills of its members” as well as the “interactive, coordinated, and synergistic dynamics of their transactions" (Bandura, 2001. p. 14).
When a group possesses a strong perceived collective efficacy, they tend to be more motivated and aspire higher in their efforts. A strong perceived collective efficacy also increases determination when faced with challenges, boosts morale and resistance to distress, and results in greater achievements (Bandura, 2001).

**U.S. Public Higher Education: Goals and Challenges**

Higher education in the U.S. is highly valued internationally for providing access to many students while maintaining its high standards (Altbach, 1994). Many colleges and universities in the United States are making efforts to increase their enrollment through various programs and policies. These efforts include improving their facilities to accommodate more students, providing financial and program support for students, and creating a more culturally diverse population among faculty, staff, and students. Despite the international admiration of the U.S. higher education system, it faces stern criticism that is mainly directed at faculty members (Altbach, 1994). This is because faculty members impact the quality of education by their influence on curriculum, student learning, and institutional management. Academic research carried out by faculty members also contribute to societal growth and development.

Reflective of the social, economic, and political climate of higher education, these pressures come from different quarters, including within the institution itself and from the public. Budget cuts, pressures for accountability, and confusion about institutional and academic goals are some of the numerous challenges U.S. higher education institutions face (Altbach, 1994). Public institutions are prominent in the United States, recording enrollment of almost double that of the private institutions since the mid-1980s (Quigley & Rubinfeld, 1993). These institutions are defined as being governed by the state and, until recently, mainly funded by public sources (Lombardi, 2006). Such institutions are first accountable to their governing boards, and the
public through multiple layers of representation. These layers consist of the many stakeholders of higher education; including students, parents, government, and society, which all have varying degrees of impact and relevance. “Even a constitutionally autonomous public university is ultimately accountable to the legislature for the ways in which it uses its state-appropriated funds and for the effectiveness of its educational services” (Berdahl & McConnell, 1994, p. 61). As a result of such financial pressures, governing and coordinating boards are taking a critical view on institutional roles, effectiveness, use of resources, programs offered, and operating expenses. Colleges and universities are pressed to justify the impact of their programs and to defend their budget and expenditures. The situation is such that only positive results are acceptable, while the standard of expectation keeps getting higher.

Society has become more critical of higher education, placing heavier demands for education and service, and quick to vocalize criticisms when universities do not yield desired results (Berdahl & McConnell, 1994). Colleges and universities, especially public institutions increasingly have to be accountable to the public and other stakeholders on issues such as resource allocation and services offered. As a result of many stakeholders, a public institution faces a wide spectrum of economic interests and diverse socio-cultural demands. These public demands, including funding for different student groups, student enrollments, equipment and resources, programs offered, and faculty matters, have become a complicated issue for many public institutions. As stated by Berdahl and McConnell (1994), an institution can only be effective when it has clearly defined goals, identified its target population, and enumerated teaching, research, and public service programs. To achieve these goals, there must be a high level of autonomy. A public institution, however, remains accountable to its governing boards, the public, and the many groups represented in its fabric.
Role of Students and Faculty in Academia. The interaction of students and faculty is essential in academia. The U.S higher education consists of over 19 million students and more than 1 million faculty members (U.S. Department of Education. IES, NCES, 2011). These faculty members possess varying backgrounds, orientations, and specializations across gender and disciplines. For example, the number of women in academia has steadily grown since the last century comprising 46% in 2007 as compared to 20% in 1909 (U.S. Department of Education. IES, NCES, 2010). There continues to be ongoing demographic changes in gender, racial, and ethnic diversity of U.S. faculty. However, irrespective of the faculty composition of U.S. higher education institutions, pressures on the educational system impact faculty members. One of such pressures is the balance between teaching and research. Various U.S. higher education institutions have different expectations on how much teaching and research is required of their faculty members. Accountability is another issue, where faculty members have to prove their “productivity” and “social relevance” (Altbach, 1994, p. 226).

Even the curriculum, though mainly a faculty’s function, is not protected from possible influence by government and other entities. Funding to higher education generally comes with a designated cause, which sometimes could be limiting to the amount of professionalism a faculty member can offer for the benefit of the curriculum, students, and institution. In terms of the ratio of academic research to other faculty responsibilities, legislators are requesting more undergraduate teaching assignments for faculty (Berdahl & McConnell, 1994). Faculty members work long hours (Altbach, 1994) and for them to perform effectively, institutions have to be free from external interventions and control, which are intellectually limiting and disregard the intricacies of teaching, learning, and research (Berdahl & McConnell, 1994).
Student development and learning are also part of the goals of U.S. higher education and educational institutions are increasingly being pressured to show evidence for such (Berdahl & McConnell, 1994). School ratings and student performances ultimately affect resource allocation. Students, however, vary greatly in “academic aptitude, intellectual dispositions such as theoretical or pragmatic orientation, interests, attitudes, values, and motivation” (Berdahl & McConnell, 1994, p. 67). These differences result in a variation between the learning patterns among students, faculty, disciplines, and institutions and how progress is measured from one level of development to the other. Students’ backgrounds contribute to their various academic abilities, intellect, social and cultural orientations, interests, and career goals. A variety of student attitudes and interests impact the classroom. Faculty members often have to accommodate student needs, including increased class sizes from mass enrollment and students’ change in curricular interests (Altbach, 1994).

There is also variation in the importance academic disciplines and professions place on different research methods, modes of knowledge inquiry, intellectual makeup, personal and social values, and knowledge applications to human experiences (Berdahl & McConnell, 1994). The U.S. public higher education is, therefore, faced with the task of balancing its diverse makeup with the diverse demands of its stakeholders. As stated by Berdahl and McConnell (1994):

Colleges and universities are moving into a period where they will be expected to provide, not only data on the attainment of defined outcomes, including changes in students during undergraduate, graduate, and professional education, but evidence that results have been gained at a “reasonable” cost. Institutions of higher education
will have to specify their aims, stand ready to justify activities by demonstrating their contribution to objectives, and defend the cost of the enterprise (p. 70).

**Service-Learning and U.S. Higher Education**

The term service-learning was first used in East Tennessee between 1966 and 1967 as a phrase to describe a project funded by Tennessee Valley Association through Oak Ridge Associated Universities to link faculty and students with tributary area development organizations (National Service-Learning Clearing House, 2011). There are more than 200 published definitions of service-learning and there is not an established consensus as to what service-learning is and its functions in higher education (Furco, 2002a). Essentially, service-learning is the effective combination of community service to the teaching and learning of specific subject studies, such that students earn credit for the course while contributing positively to the community. In this mutual interaction, learning enhances service for quality, sustenance, and community commitment to change while service revamps learning for knowledge and skill application for community benefits (Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997).

**Foundation of Service-Learning in U.S. Higher Education.** Service-learning differs from practicums and internships because it is essentially not a skill acquisition or professional training (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996). The principles of service-learning “include validating students as knowers, situating learning in students’ own experience, and defining learning as mutually constructing meaning” (Pribbenow, 2005, p. 31). Students are collaborative learners with faculty and the community; they play an active role in their learning process. Unlike the customary method of teaching and learning which is individualistic, focuses on the teacher, and involves information dissemination, service-learning requires a synergistic interaction of teachers and students in the classroom (Howard, 1998). The key strength of service-learning, which also poses
as one of its greatest challenges is that it questions educational mission, technique, and philosophy (Leeds, 1999).

Some advocates of service-learning perceive it to be a key component of social change and justice in higher education with highlighted aims including; to transform pedagogy, advance enhanced democracy and social consciousness in higher education politics, and propel institutions beyond inward academic elitism to an outward demonstration of public service (Butin, 2006). Service-learning challenges the insulation of higher education institutions from their surrounding communities. This pedagogy seeks to contribute positively to the community while achieving educational goals of learning and development. According to Lynton (1995), there is a need for academic institutions to respond to societal needs and reestablish their commitments to society. There has to be an active and effective dissemination of knowledge from the work of faculty members to the community who need the information. Service-learning compels students, faculty, and the university to engage in and reevaluate their role and mission, and provides a framework for re-contextualizing life and learning (Leeds, 1999).

**Benefits of Service-Learning in U.S. Higher Education.** The value of service-learning has been evaluated by its effect on student learning (Pribbenow, 2005). Eyler, Giles, and Braxton, (1997) completed a national study to determine the impact of service-learning programs on students. Research data were drawn from surveys completed by 1,500 participants across 20 colleges and universities, including public and private universities and liberal arts colleges across the east, mid-west, south, and west parts of the United States. This study focused on the assessment of students’ citizenship skills, ability and belief in making a difference in the community, as well as their values and perceptions of social justice and social problems as it affects their community. Parameters include political action, communication skills, and tolerance...
characteristics. Political action measured the students’ ability to lead a group or know the contact person for a required action. Communication skills described students’ attentiveness to listening and correspondence. Finally, tolerance characteristics examined students’ respect for diverse views and ability to empathize. The results of the study showed that involvement in service-learning and close interaction with faculty positively impacts students’ belief in the ability to be connected, effective, and make a change in the community. Political involvement, tolerance, and empathy were also increased by students’ participation in service-learning. Overall, the students believe that community service should be required in schools and for citizens, and that social justice be prioritized in society.

The findings of Eyler, Giles, and Braxton, (1997) infer that colleges and universities should consider making service-learning an integral part of the curriculum rather than co-curricular or only associated with professional programs. Linked classroom and community service opportunities enhance students’ college experiences through connections with the community and help them develop skills for enhanced citizenship participation. Service-learning also provides a better understanding of community organizations and their needs (Pribbenow, 2005). Many U.S. campuses, however, still contemplate the placement of service-learning (Eyler et al, 1997).

**Challenges faced by Service-Learning in U.S. Higher Education.** The increased awareness of the benefits of service-learning has not resulted in the integration of this pedagogy into the curriculum in many U.S. higher education institutions (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000). In a study to identify the main factors affecting the institutionalization of service-learning, Furco (2002a) reported a quantitative exploratory study of 43 colleges and universities who over three years had benefited from a grant program to implement a battery of strategies for
institutionalizing service-learning. This study conducted by researchers at the University of California, Berkeley comprised of 12 two-year community colleges, 18 four-year public institutions, and 13 four-year private institutions across four states in the U.S. Based on previous literature consulted, the researchers classified service-learning institutionalization into four main areas including: “the relationship between institutional mission and the purposes and goals of service-learning; community participation and partnerships; academic issues pertaining to faculty, department, and students; and structural and programmatic issues necessary to advance and sustain service-learning” (p. 43). These areas show the complex nature on institutionalization and the need for all areas to be synergic. The results of the study showed that institutions prioritize some areas over the others. This signifies that some areas are more essential than the others and also that institutions are not fully considering all necessary areas for service-learning institutionalization. Many of these institutions were interested in institutionalizing service-learning for various reasons, including enhancing undergraduate teaching and advancing the civic goals of education. These interests consequently affected their approach to service-learning institutionalization and recorded progress. In addition, some institutions focused on whole departments, while some targeted particular student programs. Community needs, partnership funding, faculty interests, and administrators concerns were also prevailing factors in the institutionalization process. The progress of service-learning institutionalization varied among institutions and was affected more by the purpose for such efforts rather than the kind of institution.

Political affiliations appear to be another major obstacle to the institutionalization of service-learning. The ideologies of service-learning lean towards liberalism and Democratic affiliations, which is not representative of the conservative and Republican views (Butin, 2006).
Many democrats are believed to be more concerned about service to the community, a key component of the service-learning pedagogy. Cardiff and Klein (2005) conducted a study of faculty partisan affiliations in 11 higher education institutions in California, including small and large, public and private, elite and mid-tier, religiously affiliated and secular, and liberal arts and professional institutions. Research participants were tenure–track faculty members, excluding emeriti, in different academic disciplines. Based on academic divisions, the disciplines were grouped into the following categories: fine arts, humanities, hard sciences/math, engineering, business, social-professional, medicine/nursing/health, and military/sports. Data were gathered from surveys and publicly reported voter-registration and campaign contributions. On the high end of the results was a concentration of Democrats in the social sciences and humanities, and a large number of Republicans in the military/sports disciplines. Although the study concluded that there was a high concentration of faculty members with democratic affiliation in U.S. higher education, there is a diverse orientation in political beliefs and religious affiliations of faculty members. Therefore, this means that there is likely to be opposition of any ideology that may be perceived to belong to a particular group or sect. Service-learning promotes pluralism, social justice, and the common good, which may not resonate with political conservatives (Butin, 2006).

The quantitative approach of service-learning efforts and outcomes is also reported, according to Butin (2006), as one of the impediments to its institutionalization. He enumerated three major reasons responsible for this barrier: 1) many variables of sites and teaching styles make it methodologically impossible to quantify the benefits of service-learning; 2) differing paradigms in the academia makes statically significant measures of service-learning inadequate to convince all scholars to accept or reject service-learning; and 3) the tendency to rationalize,
which is typical of quantification disregards the structure of contexts. With the continuous unveiling of different challenges to the institutionalization of service-learning as well as recorded growths in its implementation, Furco (2002a) suggests that there is no general route to institutionalizing service-learning but rather a multidimensional and indeterminate process that takes into account the complex interaction of institutional, academic, and social strands. To be institutionalized and remain so, service-learning will have to keep track of changes and developments within each institution. Some strategies have been suggested to advance the support of service-learning by higher education faculty and administration.

**Current Proposals for Service-Learning Advancement in U.S. Higher Education**

Furco (2001) posits that service-learning stands a better chance of being promoted as a philosophy and not just a pedagogy. He notes that beyond teaching, service-learning takes a theoretical and practical approach to explore and investigate social issues, thus giving students opportunities of academic course content applications and providing faculty the chance of honing of community research. Furco (2001) further exposes that although the primary presentation of service-learning as a pedagogy accounts for its growth in teaching institutions, including liberal arts and comprehensive colleges, the case is different for faculty members in research institutions. These academics are forced to negotiate their time and efforts to get promoted and advance their institutions through the merit of their research, research funds accumulated, and production of significant publications. Because the needs of service-learning varies depending on whether it is a teaching and/or research institution, it is important that service-learning is relevant to the faculty research and scholarly plans through the blending of service-learning with faculties' scholarly activities; relevant to the university mission by fusing service-learning with ongoing institutions academic goals and initiatives; and relevant to academic disciplines by
strategically incorporating service-learning into the university's disciplinary structure (Furco 2001; O’Byrne, 2001). These efforts require both the leadership and participation of faculty members and university administration. Butin (2006) suggests that rather than advance service-learning as "politics by which to transform higher education," it is more practical to embrace "the very academy service-learning movement is attempting to transform" (p. 490). Specifically, service-learning should be advanced with variations in regards to academic discipline, knowledge development, contemplated issues, modes of inquiry, and purpose of learning. Service-learning advocates need to be able to convince faculty members in higher education, especially research institutions, that service-learning does not negate but rather strengthens their research and scholarly efforts (Furco, 2001).

Bringle and Hatcher (1996) proposed a comprehensive-action plan for service-learning. Four stakeholders: institution, faculty, students, and community, were named as essential to a successful implementation of service-learning and a step by step sequence of activities was identified. These steps include planning, awareness, prototype, resources, expansion, recognition, monitoring, evaluation, research, and institutionalization. Furco (2002b) developed a rubric for evaluating the readiness of an institution for service-learning. This rubric was developed as a guide to assess as well as evaluate progress towards the institutionalization of service-learning. Five distinct dimensions are outlined in this rubric as crucial to the institutionalization of service-learning. This includes philosophy and mission, faculty support and involvement, student support and involvement, community participation and partnerships, and institutional support. A myriad of other strategies have been noted as beneficial to the advancement, and eventual institutionalization of service-learning. Bringle et al (1997) suggests that encouraging presidents of institutions to join Campus Compact presents ways to enable the exploration of service-
learning benefits and opportunities as well as leverage towards institutional support. Service-learning incorporates knowledge and expertise from different fields and disciplines to address social issues, which are often complex, thereby making it a viable way for faculty collaboration across programs and departments (Furco 2001; O'Byrne, 2001). Hence it is important to state, in its drive towards institutionalization, service-learning is not an additional program but a vehicle through which institutions can achieve outlined goals and ongoing educational reforms (Furco, 2001).

**Professional Responsibilities of Faculty and Service-Learning**

Teaching, research, and service are the three main functions of faculty members in higher education. These functions, however, are given different levels of relevance depending on the kind of institution. Faculty members at teaching institutions have more teaching assignments, those at research institutions emphasize research and publications, while those at other institutions are usually a balance of both. There are, however, varied meanings attributed to service as it concerns faculty in higher education. Lynton (1995) enumerates various nomenclatures that have been used to describe service activities carried out by faculty members. These include: professional expertise (such as scholarly related efforts), institutional citizenship (e.g. committee membership and student advising endeavors), disciplinary citizenship (related to participation in professional associations), and civic contributions (connected to holding an office and volunteering with philanthropic, religious, and other non-profit organizations). Service in the context of service-learning focuses on the community service efforts carried out in the community by students, as directed by faculty members and effectively connected to the curriculum.
Influence of Faculty Members on Service-Learning. The literature on service-learning literature acknowledges the crucial role and influence of faculty members in the practice and advancement of service-learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996, 1997; Furco 2001, 2002a, 2002b; Pribbenow, 2005). Faculty members are responsible for the core elements of service-learning practice. This teaching and learning method is connected to curriculum, thus making the direct involvement and support by faculty crucial (Pribbenow, 2005). Faculty members, as teachers, are responsible for implementing pedagogy for desired learning outcomes. Other related functions include finding relevant and flexible service placements, connecting the curriculum and community needs, encouraging student reflection, and managing conflict and diversity issues (Eyler & Giles, 1999). Beyond the implementation of a teaching and learning method, service-learning challenges faculty members to understand this pedagogy in their disciplinary context; promotes the recognition of faculty role in advancing leadership and ethical values; and illuminates perspectives of the community as a co-teacher (Zlotkowski, 1998). From developing the course, to seeking community partners, and coordinating students, faculty members have a lot to contend with when implementing a service-learning experience. Faculty members complain about the extra work and readings required to prepare and develop a service-learning course but still consider it a worthy effort to attain its successful teaching experience and learning outcomes (Pribbenow, 2005). However, there continue to be inquiries as to what makes faculty engaged in service-learning take on the extra hard work (Weigert, 1998).

Research on service-learning faculty is crucial to the advancement of service-learning programs, planning of faculty development, mediation of institutional change, and integration of service-learning as a mainstay of higher education (Driscoll, 2000). Until recently, previous research focused mainly on the effects of service-learning on students, and left a void in service-
learning faculty related research (Driscoll, 2000; Pribbenow, 2005). Hammond (1994) started the process of filling this gap with his research on the motivation and satisfaction of faculty who integrated service-learning into their courses. Research data consisted of 130 quantifiable surveys that emerged from an initial pool of 250 faculty members across 23 Michigan institutions. Participants by institution type were 47.2% from four-year public institutions, 46.4% from four-year private institutions, and 6.4% from two-year public institutions. Forty-four disciplinary areas were represented with education-related fields comprising 23%, and the highest concentration of research participants. 82.9% of these faculty members reported teaching as their most important professional responsibility; 98.4% possessed a graduate degree with 58.3% being a Ph.D.; 74.2% had been teaching for ten and above years; 41.4% were tenured faculty with 32.2% being full professors; and 63% reported they had used service-learning in their course four times and above. Age, gender, and racial distribution was identified as 53.5% male, 88.8% white, and 79.7% above the age of 40. Compared to the female, the male participants had more advanced degrees, were older, and were higher in rank. Hammond documented the characteristics of faculty in relation to the service-learning courses they were teaching. The results stated that rather than personal factors, faculty members are motivated to engage in service-learning to facilitate course-based learning, enhance self-direction, and promote student satisfaction. Researchers, including Deci & Ryan (1982), previously affirmed the importance of factors that contribute to faculty satisfaction. These factors include “sufficient freedom, autonomy and control, belief that their work has meaning and purpose, and feedback that their efforts are successful” (Hammond, 1994, p. 24).

**Benefits and Challenges of Service-Learning for Faculty Members.** Service-learning presents numerous benefits for faculty members who already use it. They gain a greater sense of
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**INTRINSIC MOTIVATION AND HUMAN AGENCY**
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collegiality, connectedness to one another, and commitment to the institution through being involved in service-learning (Pribbenow, 2005). For many faculty members, service-learning allows them to connect to other faculty through the sharing of project and curriculum ideas to implement their courses. Feedback from students and other colleagues give faculty members a sense of value and they develop networks through the interaction with faculty from other departments. Knowledge acquired by faculty on the benefits of service-learning usually came more from students’ feedback of their experience than faculty members’ contact with the community. Pribbenow (2005) further explains that service-learning increases faculty commitment to teaching and encourages meaningful engagement. They develop a better understanding of their students and experience an increased level of student-faculty relation. These relations give a deeper perspective to faculty about their students, both as individuals and as learners. This greater understanding of students and an improved commitment to teaching encourages faculty members already teaching service-learning courses to stay involved (Pribbenow, 2005). Despite the reported benefits of service-learning, there are still many barriers to its practice and sustenance.

Bringle et al, (1997) differentiates between faculty recruitment and faculty development for the advancement of service-learning. It is not only enough to persuade faculty to engage and implement service-learning because it is also necessary to provide interventions that help them improve and sustain the practice of service-learning. These interventions include developing institutional and community partnerships to support service-learning. Many faculty members report service-learning as a complex pedagogy requiring some measure of adjustment both for the faculty and students for its development and implementation (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007). Service-learning as a teaching and learning method, when beyond a faculty member’s
pedagogical familiarity could be unpredictable (Driscoll, 2000). For example, there are more risk management measures required when students have to travel to their service site than if teaching and learning all occurred in a classroom. In addition, students interact with various kinds of people in the community and these service locations and sometimes the safety of the students might be threatened. Faculty development in service-learning enables faculty to "provide leadership for other faculty, … become role models for effective campus-community collaboration, advocate for the commitment of resources to service-learning, and … help create an atmosphere that encourages curricular innovation and values its success" (Bringle et al, 1997, p.46 - 47). According to Pribbenow (2005), enabling faculty members to teach service-learning courses does not rest only with prior knowledge and skills preparation; faculty members need to be supported from preparation through implementation and evaluation of the courses. There is great value in having supportive and connected communities for faculty engaged in service-learning. These serve as encouragement and motivation for faculty members who are involved in service-learning. Driscoll (2000) suggests that there may be a correlation between impact of service-learning on students and the satisfaction of faculty with service-learning. The potential for positive outcomes motivates faculty to integrate service-learning into their curriculum (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007). These positive outcomes include enhanced student learning and development and a core part of many faculty members’ roles is a commitment to students.

Motivating and Deterring Factors for Service-Learning Faculty Involvement. In a study of faculty members and service-learning, Abes, Jackson, and Jones (2002) investigated factors that motivate and deter faculty use of the pedagogy. Research data comprised 518 usable samples of surveys collected from faculty who use and do not use service-learning across member institutions of the Ohio Campus Compact. The samples represented 29 of the 43
member institutions of the organization, including research institutions, doctoral and master’s
institutions, and comprehensive and associate of arts institutions. The Ohio Campus Compact is
an organization of colleges and universities in the state of Ohio that are committed to promoting
student and institutional participation in community and public service. Research data were
analyzed based on type of institution, academic discipline, faculty rank, gender, and status. Four
main factors that emerged as deterrents for faculty members who do not use service-learning
include: anticipated challenges in community coordinating logistics, inability to effectively use
service-learning, relevance of service-learning to courses taught, and time availability to develop
the courses. Faculty members from departments including mathematics and engineering were
concerned of the relevance of service-learning to their courses, whereas faculty members in
disciplines like education, social work, and human ecology were more concerned about logistics
and funding. Non service-learning faculty also appeared to value research and publication more
than the service-learning faculty. There were, however, only minor differences between service-
learning and non service-learning faculty in other professional responsibilities such as teaching
and advising, and professional service.

Service-learning faculty members in the study by Abes, Jackson, and Jones (2002) mostly
reported student-learning outcomes as their motivation for using this pedagogy. Other motivating
factors include community outcomes and professional responsibilities. Reported student learning
outcomes were deeper understanding of course content, improved personal development, and
greater understanding of societal problems as part of a system. There were, however, variations
among disciplines on the importance tied to students’ personal development. This appeared to be
more important for some faculty that it was for others. Female faculty members were more in
favor of community service and awareness of systemic social problems than male faculty
members. Another motivator for faculty already engaged in service-learning was encouragement from other faculty members, including those from faculty within and outside the same department. Encouragement from students and community members is also a strong motivator for faculty members engaged in service-learning.

In terms of deterrents for service-learning faculty, Driscoll (2000) reports that some worry if service-learning will always have the desired impact on their students and whether academic course content will be adequately covered. Time, logistics, and funding, however, remain the most reported deterrents to faculty motivation for service-learning, followed by institutional barriers such as reward structures, and goals for student and community outcomes. (Abes et al 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Hammond 1994). Institutional barriers occur when institutions do not recognize service-learning as a scholarly activity, and do not include these efforts in the faculty reward structure (Abes et al, 2002; Hammond, 1994; Stanton, 1994). In cases where institutions have included teaching service-learning in the faculty reward structure, time and logistics still remain a stronger deterrent preventing faculty from teaching service-learning courses (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Hammond, 1994). These logistic challenges include lack of funding for service-learning course design and implementation (Stanton, 1994). Some community partners’ lack of organization, insufficient preparedness to receive students, unclear goals, and inadequate commitment to the partnership also pose logistic challenges (Driscoll 2000). Institutional guidelines on faculty hiring, promotion, and tenure reflects the institutional commitment to service and impacts faculty member’s choices to teach service-learning courses (Holland, 1997). It is however important to note that only 16.7% of respondents in Abes et al’s (2002) study who already use service-learning consider faculty reward structure a deterrent. Faculty members report intrinsic motivation, as contrasted to
external rewards, as the important factor to their involvement in service-learning and are likely to continue even if not rewarded for it.

In their extensive study, Abes et al (2002) also reported the various forms of instructional support available to faculty members engaged in service-learning. These include: “advice from colleagues, professional organizations/conferences, institutional faculty development, professional journals; and faculty teaching handbook” (p. 9). There was a general consistency in the factors that motivate and deter faculty from engaging in service-learning across institution types, academic disciplines, and faculty gender, rank, and tenure status. Abes et al (2002) concluded the study with a few recommendations for engaging faculty in service-learning. Many institutions are unable to identify their service-learning faculty; therefore, making them visible and giving them opportunities to promote service-learning and its scholarship will contribute to the advancement of service-learning. About 27% of the participants in this study who do not use service-learning reported not knowing or not having heard about the pedagogy. This, thus, makes it important for faculty engaged in service-learning to share their success stories with other faculty. In addition, service-learning research and publications with success stories, grants and funding received, and practical evidence of its pedagogical benefits are likely to motivate prospective faculty for service-learning (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007). Such research should be widely published; especially in interdisciplinary journals where other faculty not directly connected to service-learning and higher education studies can have access to this information (Abes et al, 2002). Student and community members are reported to be the most important motivation factors to be included in the recruiting and development efforts of faculty for service-learning. They should be included in workshops and meetings to promote service-learning. Department heads and other faculty were also stated as a strong motivating factor in recruiting
other faculty members for service-learning. Having the support of their department heads and colleagues can encourage faculty members to be involved in service-learning. According to Banerjee and Hausafus (2007), consistent encouragement from college deans, departmental chairs, and other university administrators increases the motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning. The results from (Abes et al, 2002) suggest that any strategy employed to recruit non-service-learning faculty that excludes logistical support, proven academic outcomes, and faculty development on service-learning usage will not be effective. Suggestion for further research calls for in-depth qualitative studies on faculty engaged in service-learning to provide a deeper understanding of their motivation and to highlight particular institutions and disciplines.

Other perceived limits to the advancement of service-learning include preference for different pedagogies across various disciplines including teaching styles and assessments (Butin, 2006). Zlotkowski (2000) calls for a need to emphasize the relationship between service-learning and various disciplines. The kind of discipline mediates the interest of the faculty members and what they pay attention to for teaching, learning, and knowledge development. There, however, has not been much dispute about inclusion of service-learning in community based professional disciplines with inclination to ethics and service such as education and social work (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Eyler et al, 1997). Cost issues for students when needed to carry out their service projects, non-tenure track nature of many faculty appointments, and assumptions of student population with regards to "race, ethnicity, class, (im)migrant status, language, and (dis)ability" (Butin, 2006, p. 482) are other impediments to service-learning institutionalization. Furco (2002a) blames inadequacy of policies that encourage faculty engagement in service-learning in terms of review, tenure, and promotion as an issue in the institutionalization of service-learning. According to him, research centered expectations is apt to present certain activities, such as
building community partnerships, exploring innovative teaching methods, and publishing for non-academic audience as non-scholarly. Such activities, which are part of service-learning practice, can therefore be deterrents to faculty members who prioritize research. This situation is especially challenging to junior faculty whose career is influenced by their early decisions and adjudged level of productivity (Furco, 2001).

The results of Abes et al (2002) infer that many faculty members who do not use service-learning in their courses would do so only with logistical support. This assertion is relative to time difficulties and logistics being frequently mentioned as deterrents to faculty use of service-learning and as a threat to its continued use. According to Bringle and Hatcher (2000), development and support for faculty is essential to institutionalization of service-learning. Background knowledge of learning theory, recognition of the institution’s assessment of teaching, and possession of intrinsic motivation is key to the successful design and implementation of service-learning courses (Stanton, 1994). The similarities of service-learning to the practice of experiential learning also make it important to involve faculty in those areas in the planning and implementation processes of service-learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996). For example, experiential learning involves reflection and sensemaking, which is incorporated to service-learning in form of students’ writing of reflection papers and journaling. Involvements of faculty members in the experiential learning field could be through the formation of a faculty advisory committee. Working groups of faculty members from various departments can also help promote the use of service-learning (Jones, 2001). Such efforts would be most effective through an established office of service-learning on campus (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996). The office would be responsible for facilitating faculty efforts for service-learning, including time and logistics support (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000). Furthermore, O’Byrne (2001) stressed the need for a working
definition of what constitutes service-learning per institution. A general consensus per institution on their definition and goals for service-learning will guide their activities towards its promotion. Other activities that enhance the academic legitimacy of service-learning include disseminating discipline-based publications, and organizing events and conferences that allow faculty to learn as well as share knowledge on service-learning engagement (Furco, 2001).

Various university commitment and efforts in furthering social change has also been recorded as part of faculty motivations for engaging in service-learning (Driscoll, 2000). Faculty members integrate service-learning in their curriculum to contribute to their communities and make a positive change through their disciplinary expertise and resources (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Driscoll, 2000). Service-learning fosters a positive relationship with community partners. In many cases, faculty members reported having great satisfaction in connecting and collaborating with their community partners (Driscoll, 2000). Faculty members also felt more connected to other faculty members and the institution (Pribbenow, 2005). Curricular concerns, however, outweigh personal or extracurricular factors in faculty motivation for service-learning (Hammond, 1994). As noted by Bringle (1997), faculty members presently engaged in service-learning are more interested in the concrete learning outcomes of the pedagogy rather than the mainly idealistic, risk-taking, and visionary characteristics of the earlier adopters. Service-learning is a relevant pedagogy and provides meaningful experience for faculty members (Abes et al, 2002; Hammond, 1994). As a teaching and learning tool, this pedagogy is effective and embellishes academic disciplines (Pribbenow, 2005). Faculty members are more engaged in teaching and feel empowered from course learning outcomes because students develop a sense of self-efficacy and satisfaction. Faculty members gain new insight and often change their approach to pedagogical issues such as class structure and organization, student-teacher roles and
interaction, course content and curriculum, and learning goals and outcomes (Driscoll, 2000). Service-learning leads to a more personal perspective of the students by faculty members, hence a better interaction with them. Through methods like journaling and class discussions, the student-community interaction and reflection component of service-learning offers faculty members a new sense of awareness of their students. Faculty members understand the students’ learning processes better and are able to assess students’ learning more effectively (Pribbenow, 2005). Essentially, student learning, community service, and professional responsibilities respectively remain the top three motivations for faculty members engaged in service-learning (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007).

**Research Directions on Service-Learning and Faculty Involvement.** In addition to current literature on service-learning practice, there is ongoing research on the different areas related to the use of this pedagogy. These areas include faculty involvement and the institutionalization of service-learning in U.S. higher education. Apart from adding to the body of literature and unraveling new research directions, researchers are also comparing studies seeking consistencies across different studies. For example, although institutional support is represented in literature as a major discouragement for faculty use of service-learning (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Hammond, 1994; Holland, 1997; Stanton, 1994), the research of Abes et al (2002) show that only 16.7% of respondents who already use service-learning consider faculty reward structure a deterrent. Intrinsic motivation was considered a more significant factor than external factors such as reward structures. This makes it apparent that the discourse on issues of service-learning will continue. The *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, the first national peer-reviewed journal on service-learning was only established in 1994, indicating that making service-learning research is a relatively recent trend. Furco (2002a) posits that
irrespective of named commonalities across different campuses and institution types, the institutionalization of service-learning is influenced by the uniqueness of each campus' culture. There is a lot to learn from faculty involved in service-learning across different university and college campuses across the U.S. (Pribbenow, 2005). Research comparing faculty engaged in service-learning on different campuses will enable a better understanding of various contexts in service-learning practice and provide more information to facilitate service-learning development and faculty support.

Driscoll (2000) proposed a research framework to consider the relationship between faculty and service-learning, the role of faculty members in service-learning, and how service-learning impacts faculty. This framework includes “motivation and attraction of faculty to service-learning; support needed by faculty for their role in service-learning; impact of influence of service-learning on faculty; satisfactions reported by faculty for their role in service-learning; [and] obstacles/challenges and dissatisfactions reported by faculty” (p. 36). Any such study should consider various institutional contexts and examine the findings based on faculty’s discipline, level, experience, and philosophy of teaching and learning. Motivation influencing factors such as institutional reward systems and various incentives, including course release, graduate assistants, and financial remuneration should also be considered. Such incentives have been reported to give faculty members more time and resources to develop and implement their service-learning courses (Driscoll, 2000). Understanding the motivation of faculty for using service-learning, however, still remains a critical research area with many unanswered questions (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Driscoll, 2000). There are also questions related to effort and resources required to teach a service-learning course when comparing the first time a course was developed and taught to subsequent times the course is implemented (Driscoll, 2000). Research
studies in this area with multiple perspectives will expand our understanding of faculty members’ role in service-learning and direct necessary support of that role. A deeper understanding of faculty motivations can illuminate ways to get more faculty members involved in service-learning (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007). This study, thus, explores and adds to the body of literature on faculty members and service-learning advancement within the context of a mid-western public university. The next chapter describes the research methodology chosen for this inquiry, the researcher perspective, and the various aspects of this research process, including participant selection, data collection, and data analysis.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

This qualitative interpretive study explores the factors that contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning and how they promote such learning in a mid-western public university. The theoretical perspective applied in this study is human agency, a key concept in Albert Bandura's social cognitive theory (1999, 2001, 2006), which posits that as an agent of change, a person exerts influence over his or her environment. In higher education, faculty members take up teaching roles as well as administrative roles. They not only facilitate learning through teaching of courses but also take part in the decision-making processes as departmental chairs, school directors, or part of the senior administration.

Bringle and Hatcher (1996) highlight the critical nature of faculty involvement for the advancement of service-learning. As teachers, faculty members are responsible for the development and implementation of service-learning in their courses. In their administrative roles, faculty members can promote policies to encourage the embracing of service-learning as a department, school, or institution. These teaching and administrative roles make faculty members an important part of the service-learning practice. Conducting research on faculty members, therefore, provides rich data for understanding what contributes to faculty's adoption of service-learning, insight on how to promote this pedagogy to other faculty members who have not adopted service-learning, and perspectives on the role of faculty engaged in service-learning in advancing such learning.

To enable a thorough understanding of this issue, the following research questions guided the study:

1. What contributes to the intrinsic motivation of faculty members engaged in service-learning at a U.S. mid-western public university?
2. In what ways have these faculty members actualized their involvement in service-learning engagement at a mid-western public university?

3. In what ways do these faculty members model human agency by their involvement in service-learning at a mid-western public university?

**Researcher Perspective**

My background and previous experience is pertinent to contextualize my role within this research. As stated by Janesick (2000), qualitative research must provide a description of the researcher’s role, personal biases, and ideological preference. I am an African male, born in the southwestern part of Nigeria, (West Africa) and currently in my late twenties. Born in a multiethnic and multilingual country, I was exposed from childhood to living in and building a community with people of different cultures. We traveled a lot as a family, frequently changing locations within the country as a result of my father's job with the Federal Mortgage Bank of Nigeria. This experience introduced me to the value of community partnership, as we usually had to make new friends and build a social network in every location we moved to.

As a result of the frequent transfers associated with my father's position, my siblings and I were sent to boarding schools for our secondary education. This schooling system featured studying and living in the school during the academic year with other students, teachers, and administrators. I spent most of my preadolescent and adolescent years living with people other than my immediate family. My secondary school was Federal Government College, Odogbolu located in the town of Odogbolu in Ogun State, Nigeria. Besides being a boarding school, this secondary institution brought together students from different parts of Nigeria’s multifarious lingual, ethnic, and religious divides, which is typical of all federal government colleges. This multicultural living and learning environment contributed to my appreciation of the hands-on and
practical approach to learning; to my value of different people and cultures; and to my development of a sense of responsibility to the living-learning community. In addition to our academic work, we were assigned cleaning and other related tasks to care for and maintain our living spaces and the school premises. We lived in a community and were responsible for one another. There were somewhat blurred lines between our classrooms and dormitories, as we had many classmates as roommates and some of our teachers as housemasters and housemistresses. Living and learning in a community has, thus, always been part of my life.

My tertiary education was another experience of building, living, and learning in a community. I attended the University of Ibadan, in the city of Ibadan, in Oyo State, Nigeria. Students who attended this primarily residential university were from different parts of the country, thereby creating a multicultural environment and experience similar to my secondary education. Following my undergraduate studies, I enrolled in the Nigerian National Youth Service Corps (NYSC). Although some students choose not to enroll, participation in the NYSC is a requirement for employment in the public sector and for holding a public office. Many private organizations also consider participation in NYSC for employment decisions. This program was established to unite the Nigerian youth, increase self-reliance, encourage interethnic understanding, promote national loyalty, facilitate integration, and optimize Nigeria's human resources (Nigeria, 1973). Fresh university graduates are deployed to a region of the country different from their state of origin and from where they attended a university. I was posted to the city of Minna, in Niger State, which is in the North Central geopolitical zone of Nigeria.

A key aspect of the NYSC was the Community Development Services (CDS). “Corpers,” as we were called, are assigned to CDS groups with weekly assignments to actively engage in
the development of the community. Some of these CDS groups included Press and Editorial, Legal Services, Traffic and Road Safety, and HIV/AIDS Peer Educators. I was in the Press/Editorial CDS group, weekly gathering news and information for dissemination among the Corps members and the community through a radio program. We produced an end-of-the-year magazine to mark the completion of our service year, which feature news, stories, photos, and articles summarizing the service year. This experience reinforced the need for community participation and service in living and learning, a key component of the service-learning pedagogy.

As my growing up years continued to revolve around community and service, I became interested in leadership and change, specifically the role that groups and individuals could play in making a difference in their community. I participated in a one-year long Youth Leadership Program (YLP) organized by Leadership, Effectiveness, Accountability, and Professionalism (LEAP) Africa. LEAP, a non-profit organization based in Nigeria, has partnerships in Ghana and other parts of West Africa and reaches out to the whole African continent. As part of LEAP’s YLP, I attended an initial five-day leadership institute, a subsequent five-day skills training workshop, and two one-on-one coaching sessions. We were also required to undertake a change project in the community for the duration of the program. My change project featured a motivational segment on a youth focused radio program, and involved encouraging young people to be the change they desired in their community.

My interest in motivating young people to make a difference in their communities blossomed into joining 14 other young people to form African Youth Unite For Change (AFYUCH). This group was formed as one of the “change project groups” of delegates to the 101 Young African Leaders Program at the 2007 African Business Leaders Forum (ABLF) in Accra,
Ghana. All 101 of us were invited from Southern Africa, West Africa, and East Africa, through a competitive application and selection process. We participated in ABLF’s plenary sessions and workshops and were engaged in a tailored leadership training program facilitated by LEAP Africa. Having been challenged and equipped with a deeper understanding of the critical issues facing the continent, we were, thus, encouraged to embark on change projects in collaboration with our peers that share similar passions. As a group, AFYUCH organized leadership trainings for war-affected young people in post-conflict African nations including Liberia, Sierra-Leone, Uganda, Rwanda, and Burundi. These experiences helped reinforce the idea of being a change agent in one's community, which is synonymous with Bandura's (1999, 2001, 2006) concept of human agency.

Currently as an international student studying cross-cultural and international education in the United States, I am still interested in leadership, community development, and social change. I seek opportunities to make people realize they have the power to make a difference in their communities and motivate them to do such. Service-learning as a pedagogy, therefore, resonates with me as it incorporates a community engagement component to the educational curriculum. Service-learning is reported to help students develop citizenship participation (Astin & Sax, 1998) and to enable university faculty to develop community partnerships (Furco, 2001). Having had the experience of building, living, and growing in communities, and encouraging people to see their own power to make a change, I feel more comfortable exploring the factors that contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty members engaged in service-learning and how they promote such learning.
Qualitative Research

Qualitative research is the act of locating “the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive material practices that make the world visible” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p. 4). Its design is holistic and considers “the larger picture, the whole picture, and begins with a search for understanding of the whole” (Janesick, 2000, p. 385). Although, the use of qualitative research methods in service-learning research is increasing in the body of literature, the report of Eyler, Giles, Stenson, and Gray (2001) signifies a largely quantitative research base. Butin (2006) criticized this dominantly quantitative approach as one of the barriers to the growth and acceptance of service-learning. He stated that the variability of sites and teaching styles make it methodologically impossible to quantify the benefits of service-learning. According to Butin, the differing paradigms in academia make mere quantification and statistical significance inadequate to convince all scholars to accept or reject service-learning. Butin further noted that the tendency to rationalize, which typical of quantification, disregards the structure of contexts. Rather than mass categorization, knowledge of the context presents the uniqueness of a situation and the different factors that could impact meaning and interpretation of the participants’ experience. Qualitative research is interdisciplinary, multiparadigmatic, and takes into account the unique setting and contexts of the research site and participants (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008), thus beneficial in exploring the motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning and how they promote it. Qualitative design that is systemic in approach considers the relationships between the various parts of an occurrence (Janesick, 2000) and is interested in the process through which a situation happened rather than just the outcome (Merriam, 1998). In exploring the factors that contribute to the motivation of these faculty members to engage in service-learning, a qualitative
approach can expose the process through which the motivation was developed and how it impacted their choices.

Qualitative studies are context subjective (Coyle, 2007) and thereby focuses on how specific situations could change. Carrying out my study in a mid-western public university presents a unique setting, characteristic of such higher education institutions. Quigley and Rubinfeld (1993) posit that the major difference between a public and a private institution is control and not funding. “A public institution is publicly controlled, whether publicly or privately funded” (pp. 260-261). The use of a qualitative approach in my study, thus, allows the richness of context specificity. This approach also facilitates understanding of experience and associated meanings with a focus on participant and situation uniqueness (Merriam, 1998). This uniqueness of qualitative research also informed my choice of an interpretive study, with a goal to understand the setting, and not necessarily make predictions about the situation (Janesick, 2000).

**Interpretive methodology.** Interpretive methodology is a commonly used qualitative approach in educational research and draws from both symbolic interaction and phenomenology (Merriam, 2002). Phenomenology explores meanings and interpretations of participants’ experiences while symbolic interaction emphasizes “symbols and the interpretive process that undergird interactions as fundamental for understanding human behavior” (Patton, 2002, p.112). By relating their experiences, the faculty members are able to illuminate their motivation for engaging in service-learning. Interpretive methodology is often framed around a concept or theory related to the discipline of inquiry (Merriam, 2002). Human agency, a core concept in Albert Bandura’s social cognitive theory (1999, 2001, 2006), was employed in the theoretical framing of this study. Emphasizing the importance of one’s influence on one’s environment, the
faculty participants’ report of their service-learning experiences would illustrate how they have modeled human agency in promoting service-learning.

According to Flick (2002), qualitative research is essentially multi-methodological. Although not a case study, this research is designed around a bounded system. This aspect of a case study approach, rather than the complete method, was chosen because the research focuses on the intrinsic factors of faculty members’ experience. A full case study approach includes data from observations and documents, which are not as explicit as experiential information reported by faculty participants in the interviews. Despite that the research data for this interpretive study was best from interviews, it was still necessary to have a bounded system to ensure that the participants had closely related experiences. Stake (1995) describes a case or bounded system as having a defined “boundary, … working parts, … [and] is likely to be purposive” (p. 2). The Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community at this mid-western public university constitutes the bounded system around which this research was framed.

Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community

A learning community is an organization of people with an interest in a particular concept, approach, or area of inquiry and pedagogy. These arrangements have become a standard in higher education and are usually cohort-based and interdisciplinary in approach (Goodyear, De Laat, & Lally, 2006). The learning community model has received wide acceptance because it promotes creative collaboration, focuses on its members, and leverages participation for quality outcomes. The Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community at this mid-western public university is a collaboration of the Office of Service-Learning and the Teaching and Learning Support Center. According to Institutional Document (2011a), the learning community was established to encourage and support the development of high quality courses and to
facilitate student-focused learning experiences using service-learning pedagogy. This goal addresses the strategic initiatives and learning outcomes of the university. These learning outcomes differ across disciplinary boundaries but are mainly concerned with developing students that can think critically and constructively, communicate effectively, and engage purposefully with knowledge, people, and ideas so as to be relevant in today's world (Institutional Document, 2011b).

Involving a two-year commitment for faculty members, this learning community focuses on improving the educators’ ability in relation to course design, effective and genuine course assessment, and use of student learning assessment as part of the faculty member’s education research agenda (Institutional Document, 2011a). Membership is by application, which is open to lecturers, instructors, tenure-track faculty members, and administrative staff members as co-applicants when there is a collaborative application. These applications are required to be co-signed by the departmental chair and school dean or director of the principal applicant. The criterion for membership selection is to create a diverse group representing a variety of disciplines, experiences, and colleges at the university’s main campus and sub-campus. The first set was the 2007 – 2009 cohort and to date, there have been five cohorts including the ongoing 2011 - 2013 cohort. Participants for my study were drawn from the first four cohorts, based on the research criterion.

**Participant Selection**

Participants for this study were recruited from members of the different cohorts of the faculty learning community who have taught or currently teach service-learning courses. These participants were identified as suitable for this research study based on their expected understanding of service-learning pedagogy, having participated in the learning community and
their experiences in the implementation of the pedagogy through teaching a service-learning course. Patton (2002) emphasizes purposeful sampling, the need to select participants that would give an in-depth understanding of the research topic or interest. For research on intrinsic motivation to teach service-learning courses and how such learning is being promoted, it was essential to recruit faculty members already using this pedagogy.

Successive contacts were made with the Office of Service-Learning, including visits to the director to familiarize myself with the director’s goals, the office, and their programs. During one of these meetings, I obtained a list of the names and contacts of faculty members from the first four cohorts of the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Communities that fit my research criterion. An email invitation was then sent to all 31 faculty members to participate in the research study. This email included an introductory letter and attached electronic copies of a demographic form and informed consent form. Faculty members interested in the study completed and returned the attached forms either electronically or by campus mail. Questions related to the research, where applicable, were answered prior to signing of the informed consent forms. Participants also had the opportunity to have any other questions answered prior to the commencement of the interview.

All faculty members who indicated interest in the study were contacted for an hour-long individual, face-to-face interview. My criterion for choosing the study participants was to have a range of five to 12 participants representing a diverse mix of faculty members based on the demographic information form they completed. This number range was chosen to enable in-depth interviews with the participants. Factors defining the diverse mix of participants were from the demographic information form. These categories included gender, department and school, cohort year of Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community, number of years spent in
the university, number of years teaching service-learning courses in the university, number of
service-learning courses taught, age range, race/ethnicity, current position, highest degree
obtained, and whether currently teaching a service-learning course in that semester.

Of 31 faculty members contacted, only seven responded as interested, thus constituting
the participants for the study. These participants were represented in the following dimensions:
one male and six females; four tenure-track and three non-tenure-track faculty members; four
from the College of Arts and Sciences and three from the College of Health and Human
Services; three Masters and four Doctoral degree holders; three aged 40-49, three aged 50-59,
and one aged 60-65; six White/Caucasians and one Hispanic/Latino; and one currently teaching
and six who previously taught a service-learning course in the same semester data was collected
(See Table 1). Participants who were not currently teaching a service-learning course either
taught the course in a different semester than when research data were collected, or now had a
different schedule with previously taught courses assigned to a different faculty member. After
determining the study participants, these faculty members were contacted by email to confirm a
meeting date and time for their interviews.
### Table 1. Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Time in University</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Time Teaching S-L at University</th>
<th>Teaching S-L in Current Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meg</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>11yrs</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>2yrs</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>11yrs</td>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>Assoc. Professor</td>
<td>Always&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>20+ yrs</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>3yrs</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>6yrs</td>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>2yrs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>60-65</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>12yrs</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Always&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupe</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5yrs</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Asst. Professor</td>
<td>3yrs</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mollie</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>12yrs</td>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>Assoc. Professor</td>
<td>1yr</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>Note</sup>. S-L = service-learning. All participant names are pseudonyms.

<sup>a</sup>Data was collected in the Spring semester and most of the participants taught their service-learning courses in the Fall semester.

<sup>b</sup>Participant reported to have always incorporated service-learning in courses prior to joining faculty learning community.
Data Collection

According to Stake (1995), there is no defined beginning in the data collection process. Any previous steps taken that lead to a decision to conduct a study and the process of becoming acquainted with the case are all relevant data. The guidance received from the director of the Office of Service-Learning of the mid-western public university facilitated my understanding of the field. Information received included acquaintance with prominent service-learning research studies and expositions on the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community. Interviews were the main form of direct data collection for this study. Interviews are a popular data collection method in qualitative research. This method involves a research-focused conversation between the researcher and participant (deMarrais, 2004). Interviews were used because it presented the most suitable way of obtaining the participants’ perceptions. According to Merriam (1998), interviews are essential when behaviors, feelings, and people’s interpretation of a situation or experience cannot be observed. Interviews allow the researcher to enter the participant’s mind (Patton, 2002). Merriam (1998) further describes interviews to follow a continuum based on the amount of structure required; this ranges from highly structured to unstructured, with semi-structured in-between.

Within two weeks (between the end of March 2011 and beginning of April 2011), one hour-long, semi-structured, individual face-to-face interviews were conducted with each of the seven participants. Semi-structured interviews enable the researcher to obtain specific information desired from the participants while giving room for researcher flexibility in responding to the situation at hand, as directed by the participant’s own responses (Merriam, 1998). According to Janesick, (2000), “qualitative design is concerned with the personal, face-to-face, and immediate” (p. 385). An interview protocol was used and probes were employed to
enable directed and sufficient data collection during the interviews. An interview guide or protocol requires having subject areas and a list of questions within those areas to allow the interviewer to explore and illuminate the topics (Patton, 2002). Interview guides can facilitate participants’ clear articulation of their opinions and effective researcher understanding. The three subject areas in the interview guide used for this study were service-learning background, motivation for service-learning, and human agency. Probes involved seeking more information from the participant, usually after an initial response, to enrich and deepen interview responses (Patton, 2002). For example, in one of the interviews, the participant stated that service-learning helps to empower the students. The corresponding probe used in the interview was: “What do you mean by empowering the student?” Among the different kinds of probes, this question exemplifies a detail-oriented probe, which according to Patton (2002) is used to get more details and a complete picture of an occurrence. I used probes to allow participants to expatiate what they meant at different instances, and for me to gain a deeper understanding of the interview responses.

Participants chose interview times and location for their convenience and comfort. According to Janesick (2000), the qualitative researcher must always be prepared to adjust interview schedules and times when required. All interviews were conducted in the faculty members’ offices. The time each interview occurred varied by participants’ preferences; the earliest interview commenced at 7AM and the latest interview ended at 3PM on the various days. All interviews were conducted on weekdays; one for each day scheduled with an exception of three participants which all had their interview scheduled for different times on the same day. Field notes were taken and the interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. Immediate post-interview supplementary information was also used as part of the data
for the study. This situation can be likened to Patton’s (2002) description of informal, conversational interviewing that is often unplanned. On the first interview, after the researcher had gone through the interview guide and turned off the tape recorder, the participant gave research related information while exchanging final pleasantries with the researcher. The faculty member related a previous service-learning experience while standing with the researcher at the doorway. In this circumstance, the researcher turned the tape recorder back on and courteously used probes to elicit more responses and have the same information repeated. Conversations not captured on tape were immediately written as part of the field notes. Following this first incidence of a post-interview discussion, the researcher ensured to keep the tape recorder on until all conversations were evidently done for the subsequent participants and interviews.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis is an immediate and continuous process. Qualitative data analysis should be at the same time as data collection and not after (Merriam, 2009) and should be an ongoing process (Janesick, 2000). Stake (2005) notes that this process involves giving meanings to both the first impressions and final compilations. Notes of key ideas and episodes were made after each interview. These thoughts and impressions were documented either in writing on paper or in audio format by talking back into the tape recorder.

Merriam (2009) suggests devising a system for organizing and managing data early in the study. All collected data from written field notes and audio recordings from the seven interviews were arranged per participant as appropriate. Written field notes were sorted per participant into different large envelopes and the audio recordings were digitally transferred to a computer in individual folders. Code names and abbreviations related to the participant were written on each envelope to make the data easily identifiable. These include “A-R” for age range
and “CAS” for College of Arts and Sciences. When not in use, the envelopes remained locked in a cabinet and the computer was password protected for safekeeping. Data security is essential for participants’ confidentiality protection, as was stated in the Human Subjects Review Board approved proposal for this study. In addition, the university name was not disclosed and pseudonyms were used to maintain confidentiality of the study participants. Concealing identifying information of participants is to protect them from any possible harm (Patton, 2002). These steps are especially important because the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community is a self-selected group and is small compared to the faculty population at the mid-western public university. Except when participants ask to “own their story,” the common practice is to protect participant confidentiality (Patton, 2002, p. 411).

Data analysis progressed by listening to all interviews prior to transcription to allow for familiarity with the recordings. During this process, I noted possible categories and themes perceived from the recordings. Also known as inductive analysis, this requires that categories, themes, and patterns come from the data and not be determined before data collection (Janesick, 2000). These categories included previous experience, personal philosophy or belief, and teaching or professional commitment. The researcher alone completed all transcriptions of the audio recordings to text. This allowed for additional time and familiarity with the data. More time spent by the researcher with the data allows more opportunities to make meaning of the data (Janesick, 2000). Finished transcripts were stored on the computer as Microsoft Word documents and printed on paper as hard copies. Aside from enabling me to physically highlight text and jot notes on the side margins during analysis, the printed hard copies were also useful for back up in the case of an unexpected electronic data loss.

Coding is the assigning of short descriptors to sections of research data to make the
different parts easily retrievable: numbers, letters, words, phrases, colors, or a combination of these can be designated (Merriam, 2009). Prior to coding, I read the transcribed interviews and written field notes for increased data familiarity and wrote down striking ideas for possible themes in a memo. On a subsequent read, data segments were coded in the interview transcripts and assigned code-labels through an open coding technique. This kind of coding allows as much expansiveness as necessary in highlighting any data segments that may be considered useful. Some of the open codes related to faculty motivation for service-learning included friends, family, mentor, and the like. From going through all the interview transcripts, further analysis resulted in recoding and code condensing, such as described by Corbin and Strauss (2008) as axial or analytical coding. This coding combines open codes into categories based on their interpretive and reflective meaning. An axial coding of open codes “friend,” and “family,” listed above became one category of personal connections, and mentor was merged with the other faculty related motivations.

Following this step, I organized the emerging themes on findings from my thinking notes, memos, and coding into relevant categories. These thematic categories included personal factors, student factors, and professional factors. These factors were then cross-checked with the body of literature to allow for further interpretation on the implication of the results of my study. Final themes that make up the result findings include educational discontent and goodness. Although inductive analysis is representative of grounded theory, this study also required some deductive analysis. Human agency had been determined a priori as the conceptual framework for the study; therefore, it was essential to analyze the research data based on modes of human agency in order to determine the ways faculty members modeled this theoretical framework. Also through the literature cross-checking, I identified and corroborated what was already
known in the field, therefore distinguished new findings, and determined the place of my study in the research and practice of service-learning.

**Trustworthiness**

The degree to which a research study is dependable and authentic can be referred to as its trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1986). To be of value, research studies must be thorough and resonate with its readers, practitioners in the field, and other researchers (Merriam, 2009). Trustworthiness was increased by an audit trail (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). I kept account of all steps of the research process, which is represented in this methodology chapter. According to Janesick (2000), a research study cannot be said to be qualitative just by conducting interviews but through the interpretation of data collected from participants (Janesick, 2000). Beyond just using qualitative techniques, “painstaking, detailed descriptions and explanations of the design and conduct of” the study is required to make a research qualitative (p. 387). Methodological triangulation, the use of multiple methods to study a single problem (Denzin, 1978), was also used. Although a qualitative interpretive study, procedures were borrowed from the case study approach such as having a bounded unit, which was the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community. Qualitative research, in itself, is multi-method in approach (Janesick, 2000; Flick (2002).

Participants were allowed to share their own stories in their own words, and probes were frequently used without assuming a shared understanding of participants’ words and definitions. During the research design, I minimized researcher’s subjectivities by reflecting on my prior understanding and perceptions of service-learning. A term often referred to as reflexivity, Lincoln and Guba (2000) describes this process as “reflecting critically on the self as researcher, the ‘human as instrument’” (p. 183). Sometimes referred to as bracketing, these reflections were
written down and taken into note through the research process, and forms part of the researcher’s perspective reported earlier in this chapter. It is essential that the qualitative researcher acknowledge personal biases and present the basis of the study. This process informs the reader and gives a better understanding of how the research questions developed (Janesick, 2000). Interview questions were compared with the written notes to ensure that leading questions were not being asked, which can “reveal a bias or an assumption that the researcher is making, which may not be held by the participant” (Merriam, 2009, p. 99).

During the interview, participants had the opportunity to speak based on their own understanding of key terms and were not provided a priori definition of terms from the literature. Merriam (2009) emphasizes the need to ask questions devoid of “technical jargon and terms and concepts” (p. 96). The interview involved participants defining service-learning and other key terms used to inquire their understanding of the subject. Another section of the interview questions required participants to describe their perceived role in the advancement of service-learning. This section was essential as I did not assume that teaching service-learning courses meant that the faculty members were advocates of service-learning. All interviews were recorded, transcribed verbatim, and compared with the written field notes. These processes ensured all elicited information was collected for analysis” (Merriam, 2009).

Respondent validation through member checks (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) was another strategy for trustworthiness. This process involved requesting feedback from participants in relation to the resulting findings of the research study (Merriam, 2009). The researcher and participants are co-researchers in determining what information to present that would best capture the findings of the research study (Janesick, 2000). Maxwell (2005) posits that member checking is an unparalleled way for avoiding misinterpretations of participants’ meanings and
recognizing researcher’s biases. In soliciting this sort of feedback from the participants during data analysis, correct interpretations and meanings are derived from the data as inferred by the participants. Emergent findings from this study were sent to the participants by email to review and to provide time for a feedback meeting. One of the participants responded to the email stating the research findings and thematic categories developed fully capture her experiences, and didn’t require a face-to-face meeting for respondent validation. I met face-to-face with the remaining six participants for 30 minutes to one hour each over the course of a two-week period. Participants were content with the research findings, and as faculty members some of them gave ideas for research writing and requested to be sent a copy of the final write-up.

A peer-debriefer was also consulted in the data analysis to give a perspective of “the other” on the data analysis process. It is essential to be able to validate research findings with “something other than reality itself” (Merriam, 2009, p. 213). The debriefer was a graduate student colleague with previous experience in service-learning, and therefore knowledgeable about service-learning. Such previous experience included administrative work in the office of service-learning and teaching of a service-learning course. The peer debriefer examined the result findings of the study with incorporated quotes from participant interviews and made recommendations. Suggestions from the debriefer included revisiting the data for more information where meanings derived by the researcher from specific quotes were not the same as the debriefer’s and integrating additional quotes from participant interviews where more support was needed. This process is synonymous with Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) position on credibility, which is to ensure that research findings can be justified by the research data. The peer debriefer reported to have greatly enjoyed reviewing the results.
Limitations

With regard to limitations, I previously knew some of the participants in a social setting, which raises the question of whether the quality of their responses were enhanced or adversely affected. Furthermore, in designing the study, I had planned to create a diverse mix of participants to represent all the factors on the demographic form. Although the participants were diverse, they constituted the total number of people who responded and showed interest in the research. Only seven faculty members were participants of the study from a total of 31 that were contacted. In addition, interviews, as a self-report method, is both a strength and limitation to the study. It is strength because it gives the researcher an opportunity to ask in-depth questions and really get the participants interpretation as required for this study. It is, however, a limitation as the only source of data collection. The next chapter presents findings of the study.
CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH FINDINGS

The purpose of this qualitative interpretive study is to explore the factors that contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning and how they promote such learning in a mid-western public university. Human agency, a key component in Albert Bandura's social cognitive theory (1999, 2001, 2006), is used as the conceptual framework for this study. Seven faculty members from different cohorts of the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community at a mid-western public university participated in individual face-to-face semi-structured interviews lasting one hour each. Findings presented are from the qualitative analysis of the transcribed recorded interviews. These findings are presented in a narrative format, making use of direct quotations from participants' interviews when required. According to Janesick (2000), the researcher must support inferences from the study with direct quotations from participants. Essentially, a narrative presentation of the findings requires evidence from the research data.

This chapter is organized into three main sections, reflective of the research questions and purpose of the study. The research questions were: (1) What contributes to the intrinsic motivation of university faculty engaged in service learning at a mid-western public university? ; (2) In what ways have these faculty members actualized their involvement in service-learning engagement at a mid-western public university? ; and (3) In what ways do these faculty members model human agency by their involvement in service-learning at a mid-western public university? The initial section answers the first research question with four major themes that emerged from the study which are: (a) educational discontent; (b) relationship, collaboration, and communal support; (c) goodness; and (d) gratification and advancement. These major themes include sub-themes that are explained and elaborated in this chapter.
The subsequent section answers both the second and third research questions by integrating how the faculty members actualized their involvement in service-learning, promoted the pedagogy, and modeled human agency. This group of findings is reported based on the study’s conceptual framework of human agency in terms of personal agency, proxy agency, and collective agency. The final section presents the characteristics of change agents as described by the participants.

**Educational Discontent**

This is the first of four themes that emerged in response to the factors that contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning. Educational discontent describes the various forms of dissatisfaction faculty participants expressed in relation to their currently used teaching and learning approach. According to Mollie, an associate professor in the College of Health and Human Services, questions like “what’s our undergraduate curriculum, where is it going, where are the gaps, [and] where can we improve it?” are such that elicited discussions on the need and use of service-learning. Although some faculty members reported using service-learning prior to joining the faculty learning community, they expressed this discontent in the form of benefits derived from using this pedagogy. The varied responses of all participants in this research reflected this theme of educational discontent, either as an already existent gap that needed to be filled or just a yearning to improve their current teaching and learning methods. This theme includes four sub-themes which are: (a) applied learning, (b) varied assessment, (c) student development, and (d) community engagement.

**Applied learning.** Applied learning refers to being able to practically integrate academic knowledge. Participants in this study were concerned about inadequate connection of theory to practice in their current teaching and learning methods and sought service-learning to facilitate
effective applications of the curriculum to society. Mollie, an associate professor in the College of Health and Human Service expressed that service-learning “is an answer to some of the pedagogical problems we had [of a]… disconnect between our pre-professional teaching and our graduate, very applied, clinic-based teaching.” She further noted that the applied nature of service-learning makes a good transition between the undergraduate and the graduate curriculum. This involves getting the undergraduate students out into the community to use their acquired knowledge for the benefit of society, a process already established in the graduate training. For both undergraduate and graduate level courses, applied learning ensures retention and subsequent presentation of content. Explaining this, Karen, a full professor in the College of Arts and Sciences, stated that this pedagogy helps “to reinforce things to … [the students] about the techniques they are learning and how to go about presenting that to other people.” The connectedness of service-learning is a benefit of this pedagogy that appears to be missing in traditional pedagogy. This deficit is related to the educational discontent, which in turn motivated the faculty members to engage in service-learning. Emphasizing the practicability of how service-learning has impacted her teaching, Mollie stated that:

You are constantly hearing about more engaged, learner-centered pedagogies; all these whatever the buzz words of the moment are but, you know, I’m not a big fan of just changing for changing sake… so I can be hostile to some like fad type things … I mean, I don’t just want to sign on to a new fad just because it’s the flavor of the month… but I… do want to be open to new ideas that really have something to offer. … Novelty alone isn’t enough for me… I really want to look very carefully at the scholarship and the theory behind something. What are the costs and benefits of engaging in something new? … [Service-learning] … was a
good, complex idea that had the potential to solve some of the problems that we have, and as I learned more about it, it does seem like it’s been more carefully studied than some things and also that it has one of the ways in which higher education can create more effective graduates.

In describing effective graduates, Mollie said she wanted her students to be able to work individually as well as in group settings, be self directed, able to make independent decisions, develop individual perspectives about situations, and be able to critically analyze information.

Service-learning helps students develop a better understanding of the course content. Phyllis, an instructor in the College of Arts and Sciences, reports that, “students enhance their learning of the subject matter through [practical] service to the community,” which is a key component of this pedagogy. Mollie also reported that she used the pedagogy “to really help the students make connections between academics and practical application.” These faculty members, therefore, were motivated by their goal of assisting students to connect academics to practical application, which was made possible through community service. As stated by Dawn, an instructor in the College of Health and Human Services, this pedagogy is also beneficial in enhancing already established practical-focused experiences like internships. She continued by saying, “It almost seems like … providing … [the students] with consumer satisfaction for their career… Like ‘Oh, you’ve chosen this career and you’ve chosen this particular degree, and we want you to feel good about it but… here’s how it all applies.’”
As a result of being engaged in service-learning, participants expressed satisfaction with students’ learning outcome in their courses. Mollie stated that she is “opposed to doing hands-on for the sake of hands-on … [but likes]… the model of service-learning where it’s done carefully and correctly to … really help the students make the connections between academics and practical application; … [and] would … continue to do that.” Mollie's students had previously completed classwork on development and disabilities and their service-learning project was geared towards special needs populations in schools and other community agencies who did not have support for such people. Another participant, Karen, noted that: “I intrinsically want my students to get it. To understand …what I’m teaching them but I also want them to have this greater connection to something.” In Karen’s case, her students did art-based projects for kindergarten through twelfth (K-12) grade students, mostly from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, in art-focused schools and after-school programs. Phyllis expressed similar thoughts that “the biggest motivation is… students: I find that the ability to meet the learning objectives of the class are enhanced with service-learning… I could actually see what students are learning, [that] they are able to apply what they are learning, [and] where… they need assistance.” Phyllis's students applied their classroom knowledge by caring for and conducting health and wellness workshops for the older adult population. The students also developed evidence-based programs and services that responded to specific needs of this population.

Additional responses from the faculty members in this study reflected the need to connect theory and practice, such as service-learning where students apply the academic content to help the community. Phyllis emphasized this connection by stating that although “content is important, … students actually need to apply the learning and until they apply the learning, they really don’t have a good idea of what they learned… [or feel] the impact of that learning.” Her
comment showed dissatisfaction with the practice of providing knowledge to students without opportunities for practical applications. Further to this, Dawn expressed a need to go beyond what is already in the textbook to the possible discovery of new content or renewal of current information through field practice. She communicated these thoughts by saying: “I even challenge the students that if you see something in the field or you experience something and it is different from your textbook to let me know, because sometimes there is a disconnect between theory and application.” Dawn's students were training to be administrators of health facilities and had taken related classes, including marketing and organizational management. Such knowledge was made practicable in their service to related community establishments and juxtaposition of classroom knowledge with field experience. Connecting theory to practice is, thus, very important to these faculty members who use service-learning. Mollie summarizes this feature stating that service-learning enables "real engagement with ... information and experience of it ... in terms of connecting the academic content.”

Service-learning as a pedagogy combines both community service efforts and academic learning endeavors. Lupe, an assistant professor in the College of Arts and Sciences, emphasized the importance of this synergy. The need to ensure that service efforts include learning is another gap that this pedagogy fills, thereby attracting her to teach such courses. She reported that:

I make students understand in the beginning that I cannot grade the service and if they are just interested in service, they should just … volunteer at any organization they want and do social work there, which is a very good thing. But that, if they take a service-learning course, they are interested in helping the community …, being engaged, and [providing]… some service to the community as a way to learn. … They need to understand that I will not grade the service but their ability
to reflect on this experience, and to learn from this experience, and to produce some work, essays, or presentations, … in which the service is included.

Lupe taught culturally focused classes of a community different from the ethnicity of the majority of her students. Rather than just offering service, Lupe wanted her students to think through their interaction with this cultural community and how the community enabled the students’ understanding of culture. Faculty participants, therefore, reported a need for students to effectively connect learned academic content with practical applications.

**Varied assessment.** This is the second sub-theme under the major theme of educational discontent. Varied assessment refers to the multiple tools accessible to faculty members to monitor students’ learning progress and test students’ understanding of the course content. Participants in the study reported a need for teaching and learning methods to include multiple ways to measure students’ performance and progress. This discontent is fulfilled in the various approaches prescribed by service-learning for student assessment, including journaling, blogging, and reflection papers. However, Phyllis was the one who really emphasized how using these multiple assessment tools contributed to her motivation for teaching service-learning. She reported that service-learning allows for varied opportunities of assessment which gives her a clearer understanding of students’ learning process and progress. In cases where students failed an exam, Phyllis reviewed their previously written reflection papers from the service provided to see what they had learned, and troubleshoot why they were incapable of completing the assessment she developed. This situation implies that Phyllis was dissatisfied with previous assessment methods and required a more varied system. According to her, “I get different measures
from students with service-learning so that’s a motivator for me too that I could actually see what students are learning; ... [if] they able to apply what they are learning; [and] where... they need assistance.” These varying measures refer to Phyllis’s process of tracking her students’ learning. The use of reflection papers and journaling as assessment tools in service-learning allows her to see what the student previously reported as learning progressed through the course. She then compares this information with the examination questions to determine where the student missed the point, thereby failed. Such opportunities for varied assessment contribute to the faculty participants’ use of service-learning pedagogy.

**Student development.** Student development, the third sub-theme under educational discontent describes value added education in which students acquire personal and professional skills in addition to the academic content. Participants reported that they are motivated because service-learning enables them to have significant impacts on students they normally would not have. These faculty members showed a yearning to impact their students beyond just the teaching of the curriculum. Referring to her students, Dawn reported that service-learning “forces them to think on their feet in a way I can’t get them to do... [and to] work together so they build a ... sense of teamwork.” She further noted that students learn to “problem-solve... and ...figure out how to make ...[things] work.” Dawn was also concerned about the need for her students to learn life skills. She noted that “students are going to be [professionals and]... have to figure out what to do with their lives, and one of the things we talk about is how... [to] organize a project and sell a project to somebody.” The only male participant in this study, Joseph, a lecturer in the College of Arts and Sciences, noted that these:
are really good traits … [students will]… end up being the teachers and being the leaders … [and will] go out and try to make a difference. … Students… [involved in service-learning]… are deeply affected and … when they come back with these traits… [, it] …comes in their conversations in their everyday life. … No matter … what occupation or where they find themselves in the future, … [these traits] would be a part of who they are as a person and that would become … an influencing factor on those around them; at least … those attitudes will be… infectious and lead others.

Other faculty members in the study also agreed on the need to build students as professionals to be a motivating factor. Dawn commented that: “we [are]… doing things that… would be helpful for students preparing to be … [professionals:] to know… [the things] we didn’t have exposure to in our college careers or in our internship and … [to give] students a jumpstart.” This previously missing element is the opportunity to effectively combine academic work to practical applications such as in the service-learning model and not just completing internships as "a necessary evil of the program" or graduation requirement. Dawn also mentioned the need to encourage students’ experience, an aspect of student development, as contributive to her motivation for teaching service-learning: “I can give… [students] all my life stories and experiences… [and] the textbook … [but] I think it’s more meaningful for the students if they have the experience themselves.” Faculty participants, thus, desired personal and professional development for their students in addition to academic content learning.

Community engagement. This is the fourth sub-theme under the major theme of educational discontent. This sub-theme refers to the direction interaction of the students with the people in the community, especially the ones related to their studies. This type of educational
discontent was expressed by faculty participants in their desire to facilitate students’ contact with, and understanding of the population they are studying. Lupe, who taught culturally focused classes on ethnic minorities, said: “I was thinking of how [to] … have our students … connect with the population they [are studying] ... to get to know them and to learn not just about them, but from them, [and] with them. Mollie, who taught courses related to the health, wellness, and support of older populations, described that the goals of such contact is for the students to have “a better understanding of the population, [and]... a better awareness of themselves.” Lupe additionally noted that: “to see that the students and the people in the community… [learn] from each other… [and] are happy and grateful … increases my motivation. [This] …gives me the feeling, [that] … I am doing the right thing [and] it is worth the trouble.” These faculty members expressed a desire for their students to engage with the community as contributive to their motivation for teaching service-learning courses.

A related aspect of community engagement is civic participation. This focuses on encouraging students to be more aware and directly involved in community activities. Lupe stated that she wanted her students to “become active in, committed to, and connected with the community.” According to Joseph, a lecturer in the College of Arts and Sciences, “It’s very rewarding … [to] see the students interacting with the community… and the way they learn through this interaction, [and] contribute to the community. … The community helps them understand something [and is]… included in the learning process.” Joseph’s classes involve culture and art-based projects with ethnic minorities and persons of low socioeconomic backgrounds. Civic participation also makes students aware of societal problems and global issues. For example, students in a service-learning course taught by Meg, an instructor in the College of Arts and Sciences, did a project where they assisted the county’s “domestic violence
officer… to inform middle school students of domestic teen-dating violence.” Similarly, Phyllis “wanted [her] students to learn … what programs and services are available for older adults and how they could develop evidence based program services that responded to the specific need of the older adult population,” which was the goal of the course. For Meg, students’ engagement in the community was “really striking because… one of [her] students knew [a domestic violence] victim [and]… had seen [this person] … in their town.” All these faculty members reiterated the need for a community – student connection, participation, and engagement as a deficiency that was being addressed by being involved in service-learning. The fulfillment of such needs contributed to the faculty members’ motivation.

According to Joseph, it is important for students to be “more self-aware, aware of global issues, and of the other; that they can get out and see outside of themselves, … see other people’s side of it, be more empathetic, and transform that into some form of action.” He reported that these qualities are fulfilled by service-learning and thus contributes to his motivation to teach such courses. These students, as part of their service-learning courses, are immersed for a defined period of time in cultures and living conditions different from their own. Joseph further emphasized that “the value of the service-learning… is that… students are enlightened by it, they become more aware of how they fit in the world, they become less self-centered and certainly more open.” In terms of applied learning, student development, varied assessment, and community engagement, participants expressed educational discontent in their current teaching and learning methods and reported service-learning to be fulfilling these needs. The next theme related to the intrinsic motivation of faculty members engaged in service-learning at this university is described in the following section.
Relationship, Collaboration, and Communal Support

This is the second of the four major themes that emerged as a response to the first research question of what contributes to faculty’s intrinsic motivation to teach service-learning. Relationship, collaboration, and communal support describes the various individual and group interactions faculty members had that contributed to their motivation for teaching service-learning courses. Relationship and collaboration involved direct and indirect connections made for the purpose of service-learning while communal support includes benefits derived and influence exerted from the various forms of group relations, including the faculty learning community, collegial network, campus community, and the surrounding community. These interactions were either personally or professionally motivated. Some of these include developing new relationships as well as the influence of previously formed relationships. Participants in this study reported valuing opportunities in academia that encourage faculty and community collaborative interaction and described how the use of service-learning influenced such connections. Two sub-themes, faculty relationships and community relationships, are described next.

Faculty relationships. This sub-theme refers to the service-learning related interactions faculty members have with one another. Faculty reported various influences of their colleagues on intrinsic motivation for teaching a service-learning course. These include influences on motivation outside of, prior to, and after joining the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community. Either directly through a mentor faculty, peer faculty, or within the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community, these faculty members influenced, created, and made use of relationship networks for service-learning collaboration and support. According to Dawn, an instructor in the College of Health and Human Services, it was a senior faculty member “very
active in service-learning… [that told her]… service-learning will be a good experience for [her]… and the [department] as well.” Dawn further noted that this mentor faculty, who “was the only one teaching service-learning courses [in the department] at the time, [was] … an awesome resource [for her].” Karen, a professor in the College of Arts and Sciences, was “friends with somebody in the service-learning office [and had]… been listening to them talk about the importance of service-learning and thus decided to give it a try.” Phyllis, an associate professor in the College of Arts and Sciences, was motivated to join the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community and teach a service-learning course because she “wanted to be with ... peers to see what they were doing.” These participants were motivated by established relationships and a desire to create community. Karen mentioned that involvement in service-learning affords opportunities to make connections with different faculty members that they may not have been able to. She notes that: “the interesting thing about being in the faculty learning community was there was faculty from all different disciplines in there.”

A major aspect of faculty relationships, collaboration, and support that contributed to the motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning is the efforts of the Office of Service-Learning at the university. Karen reported that “the faculty learning community and the serving-learning office… [was very] supportive.” Every faculty member who participated in this study echoed this thought in different ways. The relationship with the service-learning office and the faculty learning community was explored in terms of resources provided, workshops conducted, visibility of faculty members, and expertise of the office director. Meg stated that having the Office of Service-Learning that supports students and faculty involved contributes to her motivation. She noted that the office has many “students who are interns in the civic action leadership program, [that do] … a lot of work to make service-learning happen on campus, and
of course the funding that [the faculty learning community] … provides is really instrumental.”

For Lupe, an assistant professor in the College of Arts and Sciences, her first contact with service-learning was through “a workshop the director of the Office of Service-Learning gave.”

All the participants recognized their interaction with the Office of Service-Learning’s director as contributing to their motivation for teaching a service-learning course. The director facilitated the faculty learning community. Phyllis expressed that the director “is fantastic.” She was also “so pleased to see that [the university]… was recognizing the importance of service-learning.” Similarly, Joseph, an instructor in the College of Arts and Sciences, mentioned that he was motivated by “the work … the director does [in]… getting [service-learning] a more prominent place in the university.” Learning about this pedagogy, and valuable discussions on logistics, risk management, and assessment are other resources gained by faculty through their interactions with the Office of Service-Learning and the faculty learning community. These relationship benefits were contributive to their motivations for teaching service-learning. As reported by Meg:

[It]…was really very helpful … participating in the service-learning faculty learning community … It gave me a space and support [for]… how I was going to do the class and … motivated me because I had to present to the community …what I was thinking of doing… [and] gave me a deadline… I was able to hear what other people were doing and if I had questions, I had support… so I really think that was a critical piece of the puzzle … having the office of service-learning … and [the Teaching and Learning Support Center] supporting the faculty.
In describing the experience of the learning community, Lupe reported that faculty members discussed their course development progress and got feedback from the learning community. Such feedback was only possible because of the relationship, interaction, and existence of the participants in the faculty learning community. Also, according to Lupe, “the coaching of the learning community, … workshops, and lectures organized … [helped her] develop… [the] course, … create the syllabus, … assignments, … assessment tools, and evaluations…. [and] to be in the partnership.” Other resources from the faculty learning community include “how to create … learning goals, learning objectives, and strategies that match. … Several service-learning courses… created in other universities … [were also discussed to see] what their weakness were, what their strengths were, and how …[that] could [be used at a mid-western public university].” Readings and discussions on topics such as partnership building and best practices were also part of the benefits of associating with the faculty learning community.

Additionally, the need for a shared experience contributed to the motivation of faculty members that joined the learning community. According to Phyllis, members shared their “struggles, …successes, …thoughts, … [and] information, and … sometimes it was like group counseling… [for them]. For the faculty members, being part of the faculty learning community was a driving force created by being committed to the group. Meg stated that “once I had signed on, I had committed myself to doing a number of things; like I will give a talk, … so knowing that I had that kind of accountability, [and] responsibility motivated me.” Peer support received from the faculty learning community also contributed to faculty members’ motivation to teach service-learning courses. These included feedback and critique meetings, peer praise, and emotional and social support through the course development and implementation process.
Community relationships. This is the second sub-theme under the major theme of relationship, collaboration, and communal support as contributing to the motivation of faculty members who teach service-learning courses. Community relationships describe the various forms of interaction faculty members have with entities within the surrounding environment of the university. Such interaction allowed faculty members to reach out and develop relationships with the community, thus contributing to participants’ motivation to teach service-learning courses. Building networks and partnerships, connecting the university to the community, and servicing personal connections to the community partner, exemplify this reciprocal relationship and support. Karen noted that teaching service-learning courses is “a reciprocal relationship with the community… where [the] students are learning something … [and the community partner is]… also gaining something.” Echoing similar thoughts, Meg expressed that “there is a lot of reciprocity in the relationship and that is part of what makes it sustainable.” The reciprocity from community relationships contributed to sustaining faculty participants’ intrinsic motivation to teach service-learning courses. As expressed by Phyllis, the faculty, students, and community all benefit from the relationship. In her words, “the students benefit more, the community benefits more, I had more fun [as well,] so it’s mutually beneficial for me, my students, the community, [and] the community partner—I think all of us benefit.” This reciprocity is also related to building partnerships with the community. According to Dawn, there is “a reciprocal relationship [where they] … are helping the students make connections … [to] the community [and help the community] … to have a relationship with the university.” Community partners that faculty members worked with for their projects include K-12 schools, other educational institutions and after-school programs, health services establishments, culturally-focused organizations, and legal protection and social services organizations.
With personal connections, Meg spoke of a situation where “the former assistant director of the [department] was the cousin of the [community partner, thus a] … [relationship] connection” that contributed to this faculty’s member’s motivation. Similarly, participants who were already connected with the community saw service-learning as an opportunity to make use of those relationships.” In addition to teaching classes in the university, Dawn conducts educational seminars and workshops for working professionals in her field, therefore has a large network of people and professionals in the community. As stated by her, “It sounds like I’m bragging but I like to think I’m pretty well connected [with people in the community related to my discipline]; … So, you know, for me, I have the community connections, I know the people, … and it’s easy for me to do.” Overall, both faculty and community relationships were instrumental to faculty member’s intrinsic motivation for teaching service-learning courses at their university. Two more themes that contributed to the intrinsic motivation of the faculty participants are described in the next section.

**Goodness**

This is the third major theme that emerged in response to the first research question on factors that contribute to faculty members’ intrinsic motivation for teaching service-learning courses. Goodness refers to the tendency and belief in performing kind acts as a service to other people. Contrasted with altruism, goodness in this context is concerned with kindness to others and not necessarily opposed to reciprocal benefits. Altruism, however, involves selfless acts to others. Goodness beliefs contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning. Participants who reflected this attribute reported it as a personal philosophy, as part of the teaching profession, or as part of their service to the community. Regarding personal philosophy, participants who believed in doing good to others noted this as a motivating factor to
their motivation for being engaged in service-learning. Joseph noted that doing good is “something that I’ve been doing … [for many years] … as part of who I am as a person.” Speaking about service to others, Dawn reported that “for me, it just makes sense.” These faculty members believed in including the act of doing good as a service to others in all their endeavors. For Phyllis, “it has always been part of my philosophy… prior to coming to [a mid-western public university]… and almost every class, I had some service-learning component in it.” She effectively captured the essence of this theme in the following statement:

I hate to be so simplistic... but that’s the right thing to do. It’s the right thing to do; to share with others, share our learning, our compassion, ourselves, and ... I mean ideally as human beings we would all provide service to others; … That’s just my philosophy in life.

Teaching was also mentioned as contributive to the need to do good and provide service to others. Joseph noted, “Teaching is … a profession that involves service to others in a sense; … [teachers] help other people.” Another dimension of doing good is in cases where faculty members are motivated to help their students with similar issues to the efforts of the community partner. For example, Meg expressed that “a lot of students … have experienced domestic violence … maybe witnessing it with their parents or … [have] been victims… in teen-dating relationships; … so [it is]… important [that they are informed]… about something that could directly affect them… [and how to do] something about it.” Meg facilitated a service-learning project where her students collaborated with an organization that provides services for domestic violence victims and advocates against domestic violence in society.

An important part of the service-learning pedagogy is the service provided to the community. This aspect of the pedagogy resonates with participants in this study who believed in
doing good, which was a motivator for them. According to two female associate professors in the College of Health and Human services, “the community obviously benefits from the service component” (Phyllis) and “some of these agencies… [are] very excited to get assistance” (Mollie). Phyllis and Mollie partnered with health services organizations, including those for development and disability services and care for older adult populations. Meg, an instructor in the College of Arts and Sciences, stated that for her:

Intrinsic motivation was really wanting to help … my [community] partner because … [they were] trying to solve a serious community problem and I thought that it would be a good thing to do. … I felt motivated because … [this] was really a grassroots organization and it seemed like… it would feel worthwhile for me and the students to help this organization [, which provided services for domestic violence victims].

For Karen, her project motivation was inspired from a need to help as well as her thoughts that she could do it. According to her: “I did a project with the local teen center. … They are always looking for after-school programming so we offered to come in… [because] I thought it would be a fairly easy thing to do.” Phyllis reported previously benefiting from service-learning; therefore, her efforts to reciprocate was contributive as her motivation for teaching the course. In terms of goodness, it was her way of giving back. Phyllis’s experiences included being part of a service-learning course as an undergraduate and previously being a community partner prior to taking up a faculty appointment:

I was often the site supervisor of students completing their master’s in social work at [a neighboring mid-western university]… so there I was …on the flip side; I
was the community partner working with students. … So in essence, I’ve been…
a community partner, [and] I’ve also been the instructor… but then one of the
most important courses I ever took as an undergraduate which got me into this
whole field is basically a service-learning course.”

Goodness is borne from wanting to show kindness to other people, and these faculty
members were motivated to incorporate service-learning in their teaching as a
medium of reaching out to others. The final major theme that contributed to faculty
members’ intrinsic motivation to teach service-learning courses is described in the
next section.

**Gratification and Advancement**

This is the fourth major theme that emerged as contributive to the motivation of faculty
members who teach service-learning courses. Gratification and advancement refers to the
personal benefits that faculty participants received from being involved in service-learning,
including the personal satisfaction and fulfillment derived from teaching a service-learning
course. There are three sub-themes under this main theme, including: (a) social satisfaction and
fulfillment, (b) department and administrative support, and (c) personal advancement.

**Social satisfaction and fulfillment.** Social satisfaction and fulfillment refers to the
pleasures faculty members derive in relation to other people as a result of their involvement in
service-learning. For those who reported this sub-theme, teaching such courses is more fun,
keeps them happy about helping other people, and makes them satisfied that other people are
noticing their efforts. Joseph related “that my life and the happiness that I get in life all sort of
evolve around ... service... and I sort of include teaching in that too.” He also disclosed his
membership in a group that believes in serving others. As a self-help group for personal recovery
from previous health, social, and emotional impairment, Joseph said they have a common understanding that “when we do things for other people, that our problems becomes less significant; so it’s more of an altruistic—or narcissistic thing than it is altruistic, I mean I feel better about myself if I’m doing things for other people.”

With regard to having fun, Karen reported that “we had a good time … [working at the teen center], the kids really enjoyed it, [and requested that we come back for]… their next year’s activities; … so we did have an impact on them which felt good.” Speaking on gratification, Karen continued by saying: “I guess … most people like to work on approval … and I think there is some recognition through service-learning. … One of them I got … [when the state’s] arts council posted our project with the teen center on their website as a community connection piece.” She reiterated being happy with the recognition: “I like seeing things like that; knowing that people are watching and noticing things what you do.”

Other faculty members also reported that service-learning enhances their teaching, is a lot of fun to teach, and keeps their job interesting. Phyllis stated that she “had more fun.” Similarly, Dawn noted that “I guess it just helps to bring… [academics] to life for everybody, and makes it more interesting, and more fun, and more people oriented.” Karen said she liked the challenges that came with teaching a service-learning course. For her, this made her more inventive and was viewed as an advantage.

I know people often think once you are a full professor, you don’t have anything to work for … but … I love teaching and it’s really about that. … I’ve been teaching now for 23 years … [so] I get bored… [and] always looking for something new. … Service-learning is a way that kind of keeps things fresh because it’s never the same. We always have a different [community] partner …
[and] always do things differently… My profession is one that requires a lot of problem solving—I think that’s why I like it because we are always trying to figure out what’s going wrong or how to do things differently and better and I think service-learning kind of fits into that same sort of mold of problem-solving. So it keeps me on my toes, I know that … I can’t get too comfortable.

Karen’s service-learning courses involve art-based projects and they have worked with various community partners both within a school system and for after-school programs.

Another form of gratification faculty members get from using this pedagogy is that it allows for both a greater opportunity to learn from their students and for positive feedback of their impact on the student. Both benefits contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty members who teach service-learning courses. Participants reported being continually encouraged by how much students were impacted by service-learning. According to Karen, students report being glad that they were involved in a service-learning course and did a project. Such feedback contributes to her motivation for teaching service-learning courses. For Phyllis, reading “students’ evaluations, or … their reflection papers … continues to be on-going motivation.” Dawn noted that the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community has “sessions where students have attended and that has been really helpful … [to hear] students’ perspective like: ‘Is this worthwhile to you?’ ‘Is it a meaningful experience for you?’… [and] it is nice to hear from students that it is meaningful.” She reported that many of her students email and call her about a year after graduation, while on their first job, to confirm that knowledge and skills gained from service-learning were relevant in their workplace. Lupe expressed that there are cases where some students complain about the projects but usually only about “two or three … in a class of 15 or 18, where most of the students say, ‘Wow, I really learned something; or these hands-on
experience taught me a lot; or the interaction with the community made a big difference.””

Overall, the faculty participants mainly reported gaining satisfaction from their use of service-learning.

**Department and administrative support.** The second sub-theme under gratification and advancement, which is department and administrative support reflects the gratification faculty members enjoy when they are supported by their departments/school heads and teach service-learning within an enabling environment. Some participants stated that they felt more motivated to teach service-learning courses when their departmental head or school director was in support of this pedagogy. According to Karen, “the director was very interested in service-learning and … excited when I joined the faculty learning community and offered a class with service-learning; so that kind of support… feels a little special.” The fact that application to the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community at the university requires the signatures of departmental heads, school directors, and college deans is also a motivation for some faculty members. According to Dawn:

> [Having the] department chair and the dean of the college … sign consent … was that they … support … [and] have some level of faith in me to carry out my mission. … It’s a nice affirmation that … they believe in me and … in what I’m trying to do with the course and … believe … I’m taking it in the right directions.

The presence of an enabling environment also contributes to faculty motivations for engaging in service-learning. Mollie “was able to make use of … [her] master’s level graduate assistant, … [for] logistical support.” Lupe, on the other hand, “had a course release during the time [she] developed the course … [and noted that her] … chair was very supportive and understanding [to have given her] … that course release.” Participants also received financial assistance through
the Office of Service-Learning and the Teaching and Learning Support Center to facilitate the development and implementation of the courses.

Professional advancement. Professional development is the third sub-theme under the main theme of gratification and advancement, which contributes to faculty members’ motivation for teaching service-learning. This sub-theme refers to the professionally related benefits that faculty members receive from teaching service-learning courses. Whether specifically to enhance their teaching, research, and service or just to learn about this pedagogy, participants reported professional advantages from their engagement in service-learning. Phyllis described that her teaching, personal service, and research are all enhanced through service-learning. She further stated that she “wanted to learn more about service-learning …, how [the university] was going to be recognizing it…, and how it connected to the whole concept of scholarship of engagement because that was going on at the same time.” For Lupe, she wanted “to learn more about this pedagogy… and how it worked and learn about… specific examples of other courses that have been developed, about the challenges, and … [other] things [that] are involved.” In terms of research, Phyllis reported that the community partner, which served older adult populations “had a need …that happened to be … [her] research area, so of course that piqued … [her] interest.” She additionally noted that as part of the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community, all faculty members “develop … courses with the service-learning component … [and talk] about the importance of maintaining … [a] research focus and how … [to] turn… [their] service-learning project into a publishable article. Reporting her success, she said a service-learning article she wrote has “been cited as one of the top 25 articles in that journal …, [got] press releases, [and she]… was invited to [a government] meeting on [the research topic and study].” According to this participant, this success “was a totally unexpected result … [that came from]
knowing [through service-learning] how to take service, teaching, and research, and truly integrate the three of them.” Such professional advancement contributes to the motivation of faculty members’ involvement in service-learning.

Also in terms of professional advancement, some participants related a similarity between their field and the practice of service-learning, thus making it a necessary advancement. It made sense for faculty members in service-oriented professions to incorporate the pedagogy because their discipline involved service to people and the community in various forms. Dawn stated, “For us in the helping professions, it seems a natural progression. We want to teach you to help people, we want to teach you this empathy, [and] we want to teach you this advocacy.” Similarly, Mollie posited “even though I didn’t know very much about it, … we’re in a service field already so it seemed natural… [and] I wanted to learn more about it.” Phyllis, however, stated that despite being in the College of Health and Human Services, she believes that service-learning is relevant to all disciplines:

It is my opinion that any discipline can have a service-learning component in their classes. It’ll be really hard for me to not argue. ... I mean I would not argue but I would debate with anyone from any discipline who would say “you know, we can’t provide service or have a service-learning component in this course.”

Also related to professional disciplines, Meg noted that service-learning is popular in her field nationally and has a history of developing and teaching service-learning courses. She reported to have “attended sessions at national conferences on the topic of service-learning, [and thus]... just been interested in it.” For her, joining the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community was “finally an opportunity to really… do it.”
Social satisfaction and fulfillment, department and administrative support, and personal advancement were all reportedly important to faculty members’ intrinsic motivation for engaging in service-learning. Overall, the emergent themes in this section were reported to contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty participants in this study, including educational discontent; relationship, collaboration, and communal support; goodness; and gratification and advancement. The following section applies the theoretical framework to analyze the reported ways faculty members are engaged in service-learning.

**Modeling Human Agency in Promoting Service-Learning**

The next group of findings addresses the second and third research questions of the study by presenting ways in which faculty members actualized their involvement in service-learning, promoted the pedagogy, and modeled human agency at a mid-western public university. The conceptual framework of this study is human agency, a key concept in Albert Bandura’s social cognitive theory (1999, 2001, 2006). This concept posits that as an agent of change, a person exerts influence over his or her environment. In promoting service-learning, faculty members are directly and indirectly exerting influences on their environment. These activities include making presentations to various people about service-learning, proposing the pedagogy to other faculty members who agreed to do it, helping other faculty see benefits of service-learning and, as an administrator, removing barriers that prevent faculty members from successfully implementing service-learning. There are three main ways in which human agency can be carried out, which also form the categories by which these results were analyzed: (a) personal agency, (b) proxy agency, and (c) collective agency.

**Personal Agency**

This kind of agency refers to the actions directly taken by the individual. The decision of
faculty members to join the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community, a self-selected
group, reflects personal agency. One of the faculty members exhibited this in a report of specific
actions taken:

I think just by doing … [service-learning], I’m advancing it because I become an
example… I have a lab guide that I started and I think mine was one of the first ones
so when I did that a lot of people were interested in doing it as well... so that’s my
way … of advancing service-learning (Meg, Instructor, College of Arts and
Sciences).

The ways in which faculty participants modeled this agency include developing and
teaching a course, partnering with external organizations, doing presentations, building internal
networks, publicizing service-learning, and carrying out support and sustainability efforts.
Faculty members actualize their involvement in service-learning by developing and teaching a
service-learning course, which includes getting students out to the community to do projects such
as educational, arts, cultural, and health based initiatives. Meg expressed that members of the
faculty learning community are required “to design and develop a course and [in] …the second
year [carry out]… the actual implementation of the course.” In addition, she noted “faculty
members become partners with organizations and agencies in the community… [and may have]
more than one partner.” Faculty members also make presentations as part of the Service-
Learning Faculty Learning Community and in other forums. In the faculty learning community,
these presentations are of courses that have been developed so they can receive feedback on it as
well as share information and ideas with other faculty members. These efforts advance service-
learning by peer-shared information, thus facilitating each other’s service-learning efforts. Other
presentation outlets for faculty members include the Teaching and Learning Support Center,
faculty members’ academic departments, graduate level classes, and disciplinary-focused national conferences. Phyllis spoke of cases where other faculty members have done public poster presentations and that she had “been asked to be a panel member to present [service-learning]… to other faculty on campus.” Karen talked about this pedagogy to her graduate students.

Faculty members are also involved in the promotion of service-learning by taking part in development sessions for interested faculty, advocating this pedagogy in their primary department, and discussing possibilities with other faculty. Mollie stated that:

As an administrator, another part … is promoting service-learning … [among] my faculty. ... I discussed the possibility [with another faculty member] and the person was open to teaching… a service-learning course. … I was able to keep… [service-learning] alive in the department and… [this professor] also was very interested and committed to it and now… is… in the [faculty] learning community. … I feel like service-learning is one of my goals and obviously that takes some time, not every faculty member is open to it. I have open discussions with people who have not been interested, and I haven’t yet decided… exactly the best way to deal with that, other than to try to work with the most open folks in the beginning and then slowly create some change that way.

Three other faculty members noted trying to talk their colleagues into teaching service-learning courses. They do this by telling the other faculty members the kind of support available and share course ideas and projects with them. One of these participants, Phyllis, expressed that: “I hope I am a strong enough advocate for service-learning across campus … I know I have encouraged another faculty member in our department to … apply and she’s been accepted to
faculty learning community for service-learning.” Her main ways of publicizing service-learning to other faculty members is by "being a role-model, a mentor, and encouraging other faculty to become involved.” Joseph, a lecturer in the College of Arts and Sciences, noted that “I talk to everybody I can about it. … I promote it to students. I have colleagues that I meet with regularly… and … we would talk about our next service-learning [project].” Such discussions with colleagues include how to manage funding and logistics for such projects when they do not have full resources provided by the university.

Still in terms of personal agency, some faculty members have actively promoted service-learning while others have only done so indirectly as a result of using the pedagogy. Lupe referred to herself as “just being someone who uses this pedagogy to teach.” She, however, noted that by teaching a service-learning course, she “added a new course to the curriculum [of her department and the]… chair and the dean are very happy with that.” Joseph reported that just by doing service-learning and being a role model for the pedagogy inspired his school director to promote it.

Stated below are statements from participants who take active steps to promote service-learning. Mollie expressed that:

Beyond my department… It’s just more sort of peer to peer kind of way [like] if someone had asked me about it, or … even been willing to participate in [this research]… study… is supporting [service-learning] in a way. … In my … [department] where I actually have decision-making… What I’d like to do is to get the majority of the faculty to vote and say that service-learning is an appropriate pedagogy which is worth some extra effort. I would give … [faculty] work load hours extra and … will tell the dean that… I will give … some of the money that’s
available from this service-learning … [for faculty to be] able to do this, you know, 
incentivize them, [and] get people to see why it’s beneficial.

This faculty member further described her role in the advancement of service-learning as
removing barriers to involvement.

I see my role as to help … [other faculty and the department] see why … [service-
learning] could benefit us… and remove barriers to making it happen. … This could
be financial barriers, … logistical barriers, … or time barriers… There can [also] be
… attitudinal barriers… [, which is] the harder one … [and] I haven’t completely
decided [on how to go about it.] … The way to get there I think is to get the faculty to
decide that’s something that’s important for us and to put some resources there.

In the case of Phyllis, she reported “working one-on-one with… [another] faculty member
who added service-learning in two of her courses … and … is now currently in one of the faculty
learning communities.” Describing the ways she has been working with the other faculty
member, this associate professor further reported that:

I encouraged her to join… [and have] sat with her on numerous occasions … [to
help] develop her course…  Any faculty on campus who is interested in including a
service-learning component in their class, I’ve been willing to speak to. I come to
their classes, … I’m … available, … and then whenever I speak to the community
about our program, I always talk about service-learning in our courses. … I’ve
presented on service-learning at national conferences.

Six of the seven participants in the study described some direct ways in which they have
promoted service-learning. Dawn sees herself as a referral for other faculty members who are
considering teaching service-learning courses but worried about finding a community partner.
She helps them make connections with community agencies whose efforts are related to the faculty members’ course or subject area therefore serving as their consultant. Finally under personal agency are actions taken towards the support and sustainability of service-learning practice. Faculty members conduct and publish service-learning research as well as provide tangible support for other faculty members to ensure continuity of the practice of this pedagogy. In specific departments, faculty members produced service-learning lab-guides, workbooks, and manuals for their discipline such that other interested faculty members could have access to it. This includes Meg, an instructor in the College of Arts and Sciences and Phyllis, an associate professor in the College of Health and Human Services who both made such efforts in the department.

**Proxy Agency**

Proxy agency is another way human agency is carried out, and the second theme addressing how faculty members model agency when promoting service-learning. This form of agency is evident when an individual acts through another person or system that is believed to be more potent and will have more effect on the desired cause. Faculty members who model proxy agency in their promotion of service-learning do so by using students as spokespersons, talking to departmental heads and deans about service-learning, and building partnerships with community partners. Sometimes when people have questions during public presentations, faculty members ask students to speak. According to Karen, this is “because often times … [students] are better at it. … They have the energy and excitement about [their service project]... and people like to hear the students’ experience probably more than … [the professor] talking about why [she]… wanted to do [service-learning]. This professor further noted that the course has been taught a few times that “there are enough of those students around that have talked to other
students and now students are starting to say...[they]... heard ...[it] was really fun, ...[and] the word is out.”

Besides the proxy agency of using students as spokespersons for service-learning, faculty members have to rely on their department, school, university administration, and other entities to take action where they cannot. Meg, an instructor in the College of Arts and Sciences, noted that because she was not a “tenure track faculty member, [decisions have]... to come from the administration of the program and [she thinks]... the [program] director is supportive of [service-learning].” In the case of Joseph, a lecturer in the College of Arts and Sciences, he sought support for service-learning through “monthly meetings with... [the] dean.. [and by making] ... great connections with ...civic leaders in the community... and people who are running... [non-governmental organizations]... and grassroots types of projects that are all about service.” This lecturer reported that he made video documentaries of service projects embarked upon that were circulated and has been seen by the senior administration at the university.

Speaking of other ways in which efforts are made to promote service-learning, Dawn reported that sometimes it involves calling community partners to share project ideas and to ask for financial and logistical support, where possible. In addition, Mollie expressed that faculty members may sometimes “get the partners to come into the classroom” to give lectures and talk about their organization and project opportunities.

Collective Agency

Collective agency is the third sub-theme that explains how faculty members model human agency in how they promote service-learning. This form of agency is carried out when faculty members combine the efforts of one another for the advancement of service-learning or with that of the students and working organizations to make a change in the community. Two sub-themes
are presented under collective agency, namely within-institution impact and external community change.

**Within-institution impact.** This sub-theme references the networks faculty members build and access within the university that facilitates and support their involvement in service-learning. Such networks include the already established faculty learning community and occasional meetings with other faculty engaged in service-learning to brainstorm possibilities. The establishment of the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community by itself is a medium of collective agency. Faculty members engaged in service-learning gather in this forum to facilitate learning about, developing, and teaching service-learning courses. Carrying out such activities together gives the faculty members group visibility, which makes more people aware of this pedagogy, and in turn fosters the growth of service-learning. Some of these organized activities, as reported by Phyllis, include “the teaching and learning fairs … when … all the faculty who are involved in creating strong learning environments, …[including] service-learning … get together and … share the projects [they are] …involved [in]… and [give information about] the service-learning courses that … [they] are teaching.” She further noted that these fairs provide an opportunity for “individuals who come to the conference … [to] see what other people are doing … and then if someone contacts me from another department saying … ‘how did you do that?’ … then you just share.” Speaking on how such efforts have impacted the growth of service-learning at a mid-western public university, Phyllis observed that “the learning community started out being a group of probably no more than 10 of us I think …, but then we have extended out from that.”

Karen also mentioned how such efforts have contributed to “the growth of the faculty learning community: year after year they have new people coming in… [and] … it is becoming
more well known among faculty so people are starting to think about how they might do it.”
Some participants reported being involved in service-learning as a result of similar efforts done by previous members of the faculty learning community. According to Lupe, she “saw the call for participation, … became aware of it, … thought about service-learning and [believed it]… could be beneficial to [her] field. Mollie also noted that she “saw [some information about service-learning ] and it triggered a thought in … [her] mind. … [She believes that] … for people to think about service-learning, … [it is important] … to keep it in front of people’s attention.” Lupe shared similar thoughts with her belief that “if service-learning as a pedagogy got more recognition, university wide, some more people would get motivated to do … [it].” Participants, therefore, collectively seek support for service-learning within the institution.

External community change. This sub-theme is the second way by which faculty members model collective agency. External community change describes the ways in which faculty members form partnerships to positively impact their institution’s surrounding environment and society. Faculty participants have students in their service-learning courses do projects that are not merely assignments, but such that contribute to society. Such projects are ones mentioned about domestic violence awareness, cultural orientation, health services, development and disability support, educational assistance, and other projects where students go into the community to make a positive contribution. According to Meg, students are “not just writing term papers … [but they] write something that would have an impact somehow.” Relating some of the previous assignments, Meg mentioned that her students wrote papers ”arguing a position … [on] four bills on the … [state] senate and house that deal with domestic violence; … whether or not they thought the bill was a good, … or would be helpful to victims of domestic violence.” Another project of her students involved making advertisement “brochures and fliers [for the
community partner … so that was another way they could actually write for the real world.” On a similar note, Karen stated that “the university puts on a community partner fair … every year … [where faculty members talk] … to people about possibly doing projects with their organizations. Such efforts demonstrate the combined efforts of faculty members with their students, community partner, and institution to impact society. Participants in this study appeared to model all three modes of agency, which are personal agency, proxy agency, and collective agency. The next section matches the reported characteristics of change agents with the activities of faculty members engaged in service-learning at the university.

**Characteristics of Change Agents**

As a final aspect of this study, faculty members were asked to describe the characteristics of a change agent. Participants described different attributes they considered crucial for anyone to influence change or make a difference in his or her environment. Meg, an instructor in the College of Arts and Sciences, noted that a change agent must be present at the grassroots level to see the problem clearly and be aware of what is going on. This attribute involves being situated in the community such as to identify the needs of the people and be able to decipher a solution. In addition, she stated that a change agent must be able to work with a good team and make appropriate connections. Using the example of her community partner, Meg stated that her community partner has a good managerial board and very good relationships with the police, domestic violence officer, and other social agencies involved in domestic violence victims’ protection and the offenders’ prosecution. According to her, it is important to have a great team and the required networks to facilitate change. Karen, a full professor in the College of Arts and Sciences, describes the usefulness of such networks. These connections create a link to the community and the world at large. In some cases, these networks are online or social based such
as when Karen’s students would connect to an art-based social networking site for project resources. Furthermore, Meg expressed that a change agent must have a personal connection with problem and issues from victim’s perspective and be able to connect to the population and community. The family of Meg’s community partner had previously experienced a severe case of domestic violence thus their whole family was committed to the cause. Such direct connectedness encourages a higher level of engagement.

To effect a change, a person must also be knowledgeable, experienced, and skilled. Such persons should possess a record of past successes and be informed about possible risks and how to manage them. Dawn, an instructor in the College of Health and Human Services, illustrated a possible example that could involve a health service provider, the students, and the university in a service-learning project. In this situation, there has to be clear communication on commitment levels, expected outcomes, and risk management in case there was a breach of service or undesirable outcomes. Phyllis, an associate professor in the College of Arts and Sciences, noted that flexibility is quite important. This flexibility includes the medium of message delivery and partnership with other stakeholders. Karen stressed that a change agent must be able to motivate and empower the people. The community must realize, through the change agent, that they are part of the change, therefore provide reciprocal commitment to the person and cause. Such a leader must also possess a sense of organization, of goals, and of strategy. The people should receive clear directions from the leader on their roles and level of commitment. A change agent must be able to inspire and encourage community members to participate, make people feel needed, value their opinions, listen to them, and take their input where relevant. A change-motivated person facilitates the people’s acquisition of technical skills and how they can apply them.
To influence change, one has to be a problem solver, be interested in seeing what may happen, possess an inner strength, and believe that one can make a difference. Dawn, an instructor in the College of Health and Human Services, stated that financial resources are also required to manage the logistics that accompanies change efforts. Such logistics includes setting up an office where required and covering administrative costs. Dawn also stressed the need to ascertain the sustainability of a change effort before embarking on it. The motivation for change should not merely be for novelty but a commitment to excellence. Such commitment should reflect the leader’s boldness, confidence, and risk-taking acumen. A change agent must be an excellent role model and an effective communicator. According to Meg, such persons must be able to speak eloquently in various forums and make people aware of societal problems as systemic and cultural. Finally, taking action is a desired attribute in a change agent. It is not enough to possess potential without using it to implement change. Acquired knowledge and skills by persons interested in change has to be turned into action.

Based on the above-described characteristics, service-learning faculty members are viewed as change agents in their efforts to contributing to the community through students’ service projects. According to Karen, “I never really think about myself as a change agent but more of a problem solver; ... I’m more interested in just seeing what might happen. ... I guess a little bit of a change agent. Phyllis, however, emphasized that:

Unless you are seen as being knowledgeable, it would be very difficult to create change. You have to have … good [and]… successful examples if you’re going to change other individual’s opinions; … so … [knowledge], experience, previous successes. … You wouldn’t change anyone by forcing it – so being flexible in delivering the message.
Meg stressed the need to see situations clearly and having the appropriate networks to facilitate change efforts. She stated that:

[Something]… so powerful … is … the people who are at the grassroots and … see the problem clearly … and then say okay this is not working, we have to do something. … It’s just really seeing clearly, …[the] problems and finding solutions to them. … Also the whole idea of having this organization that is a clearinghouse.

This clearinghouse described by Meg refers to the efforts of the community partner where all stake-holders in the prosecution of domestic violence offenders and service personnel in the support of domestic violence victims have representatives brought together for easier accessibility. Speaking about the organization she works with, Meg mentioned that the partner “has a good [managerial] board… [and] has become … the mover and shaker of the organization because of her personal involvement. … [It] … is important … [to work]… with other agencies [in the field].” Describing more attributes of change agents, Karen noted that:

Flexibility is … [needed] because you have no idea of where you are going if you’re trying to create change. … Strong leadership skills [is another requirement because] you have to be able to … motivate people to do something. … I’m always surprised when I can get students to do this because they drag their feet and they think they can’t. … It maybe comes back to that sense of empowering the people that you’re trying to help to make the change so that they feel like they are making change too. And I guess the change has to be good or it’s not worth making. It has to be worthwhile. [and] … I think a sense of organization is [also] important because somebody… [has] to delegate things… [and] make things happen. … [Furthermore,] a sense of what… you’re trying to achieve, a fairly
clear sense of goals [set out], and the way to go about those goals. ... [In addition,]
some inner strength [is required] because they will always be people that will say
no along the way; sometimes yourself ... [and] believing that you really can [is
essential].

Knowledge, commitment, basic skills, and judicious use of resources were other
characteristics that were generated by the faculty participants. Using the teaching of a service-
learning course as an example of a change effort, Dawn stated the following:

If ... someone wanted me to begin teaching a service-learning course, ...[and] it
hadn’t being my idea, [I would]… be looking for tools. ... If I did not know what
service-learning was or what was expected, …[I would] be looking for those
resources… [like]… what’s involved, what’s the commitment, [and]… expected
outcomes. … If I was new to the area, I’ll be looking for … what [has been]…
done in the past… [and the]… goal to expand it for the future. What are the
community resources … [and] what’s the outside world like? … Do they want the
university involved or do they want us to stay in our ivory tower? … Do they see
our students as more of a burden than a help and ... is service-learning the new
buzz word today, and…tomorrow [will]… be something else?

Dawn further emphasized that it is important “to have the flexibility of being able to
work with other entities; … to be connected… but at the same time… be distant …[for] risk
management.” She noted that it was important to “maintain that close relationship and also be
able to distant ourselves if we need to?” Overall, Mollie summarized a change agent as
“somebody who is a risk taker, …who is not satisfied with the status quo, and … who likes or
engages with new things as part of how they get through the day… [and] as a commitment to excellence."

This chapter presented the study’s research findings. Four major themes (educational discontent; relationship, collaboration, and communal support; goodness; and gratification and advancement) contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning. Various ways in which the participants model forms of agency—personal agency, proxy agency, and collective agency—were also described. The next chapter discusses these research findings and offers suggestions for service-learning practice and research.
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter connects current service-learning literature to the study findings, analyzes the results based on the conceptual framework, and offers suggestions for future research. The purpose of this study is to explore the factors that contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning and how they promote such learning in a mid-western public university. Human Agency, a core concept of social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1996; 2001; 2006) is the conceptual framework for the study; this posits that as an agent of change, one exerts influence over one’s environment. Seven faculty members from the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community who had previously taught or were currently teaching service-learning courses at a mid-western public university were interviewed. These interviews were face-to-face, semi-structured, and one hour long. The findings from the qualitative analysis of the research data are discussed below based on the research purpose and the conceptual framework. Four main themes emerged as the factors that contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning: (1) educational discontent, (2) relationship, collaboration, and communal support, (3) goodness, and (4) gratification and advancement. In addition, the ways faculty members promote service-learning is discussed under the various forms of human agency, namely personal agency, proxy agency, and collective agency. Subsequently, faculty members are viewed as change agents based on their described characteristics of change agents.

Factors that Contribute to Intrinsic Motivation

Abes, Jackson, and Jones (2002) describe intrinsic motivation as a salient factor for faculty engaged in service-learning. Such motivation, however, does not exist independently. Intrinsic motivation is a derivative of one’s sense of self (Ryan & Deci, 2000); therefore, intrinsic motivation is reflective of self-efficacy. People are prone to embark on actions they
believe they can do and set goals to realize a conceived outcome. The research findings expose the underlying factors that contribute to the faculty participants’ intrinsic motivation to teach a service-learning course. These factors include ones that contribute to the initial development of intrinsic motivation and the ones that sustain such motivation. Intrinsic motivation needs to be present for continuity of embarked actions (Bandura, 1986); thus, factors that both develop and sustain such motivation are both essential. This research shows the relationship between intrinsic motivation and external social rewards. According to Deci (1972), intrinsic motivation is not without external rewards. Furthermore, Bandura (1986) posits that external rewards and positive feedback received from engaging in an activity increases intrinsic motivation and interest in the activity. Some of the emergent themes in this study appear externally motivated, thereby revealing the interactivity of intrinsic motivation and external influences. This situation is explained by Bandura’s (1986) assertion that external social rewards can build, sustain, and increase intrinsic motivation. Essentially, factors that contribute to intrinsic motivation can be both internal and external. Additionally, due to their interactive effect, external rewards can serve as a marker for intrinsic motivation.

**Educational discontent.** The first of four major themes, faculty members in the study showed various forms of dissatisfaction with their current teaching and learning method. This educational discontent emerged either as an existent gap the participants thought needed filled, or through their awareness of a way to enhance their current practice. Therefore, joining the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community and teaching a service-learning course catered to their pedagogical demands. These needs, which include applied learning, student development, varied assessment, and community engagement, are related to why service-learning was introduced in higher education. Applied learning is the need to connect theory to
practice. Varied assessment is to have multiple evaluative measures for student learning. Student development is the acquisition of personal and professional skills by students in addition to the learned academic content. Community engagement is the connection and commitment of students to the surrounding communities by applying classroom knowledge to real-life scenarios of service.

According to Leeds (1999), a prevalent dissatisfaction of society with the U.S. higher education system is the foundation for service-learning. The intrinsic motivation of participants in the study was spurred by the educational discontent expressed during the interviews. Bringle and Hatcher’s (1995), in their definition of service-learning, already communicated the purpose of this pedagogy as such. Service-learning allows students to earn academic credit by undertaking a service project that responds to community needs and to reflect on this activity to “gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility” (p. 112). All participants in the study resonated with the academic benefits of service-learning for their students. In addition to learning the academic content, faculty members wanted their students to acquire personal and professional traits. This aspect resonates with the goals of higher education as a whole. As stated by Berdahl and McConnell (1994), student development and learning are part of the goals of U.S. higher education and institutions are increasingly being pressured to show evidence for such. In using service-learning, faculty members at this university are responding to some of the pressures on higher education itself. Such personal and professional traits are described in the research of Eyler, Giles, and Braxton (1997) as the impact of service-learning programs on students. Students develop a belief in their ability to be connected, effective, and make change agents in the community. Faculty participants in the study desired the development of such traits
for their students. These attributes were described as very beneficial for students’ personal and professional lives. Students are impacted by these characters and are able to positively influence the people around them. Specifically, one participant reported that her students contacted her about a year or more after graduation to emphasize the value of some of the traits they developed from being in the service-learning course. Such attributes were not apparent to the student at the time of taking the course but later became evident when manifested in their workplace. Some of these traits include positive collegial interactions with their co-workers and effective application of classroom knowledge in the workplace. This participant reported forwarding the email from her students to her department heads as a validation of good work done, especially when the course evaluation did not reflect such learning outcomes. Longitudinal studies could show such gains, considering that some of the desired traits only manifested in the workplace rather than immediately after taking the course.

In terms of community engagement, university and college students are members of society, thus, they are actors and contributors to the development of society. Faculty participants expressed a need for their students to connect with the community. Such connection confirms what is reported in previous literature as benefits of service-learning (Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997; Pribbenow, 2005). Service-learning addresses community needs while educating young people. According to Bringle and Hatcher (1996), service-learning differs from volunteering because students are not merely rewarded for performing service. Students earn credit by participating in the organized service activities tailored to specific community needs and effectively tied to their course of study. Incorporating reflection components through discussion, writings, and presentations emphasizes the curriculum. One of the participants really emphasized this aspect of service-learning. According to this faculty member, she advised students who are
merely interested in volunteering to seek other alternatives. The students were informed that for service-learning, academic work which connects their interest in helping the community is required and not the mere offering of service. Another aspect of community engagement was making sure the students had direct contact with the population they were studying. Rather than just reading about these communities, service-learning allows students, especially from the dominant cultures, to learn from, with, and in these communities. Such communities include ethnic minorities, older adults, and people with lower socioeconomic status. Engaging students from the dominant culture with other groups in the community may also be likened to reducing the class separation between the University and community. Colleges and universities are reported to pride themselves in scholastic endeavors and act disconnected from their surrounding communities. In addition, previous university-community partnerships have focused on higher education institutions providing expertise for the community rather than stimulating a collaborative and reciprocal interaction. This may also be historically traced to higher education in the United States, which had reportedly always been for the societal privileged.

This theme of educational discontent reveals that faculty members are motivated to engage in service-learning to facilitate applied learning, student development, and community engagement. Such discontent, however, raises questions about the climate of higher education. According to Lynton (1995), higher education plays a special role in producing advanced knowledge and better-equipping graduates that can discern and respond to societal problems; such roles are reported to be fulfilled by service-learning. What then can make more people embrace service-learning?

According to Bandura (1998), self-efficacy influences people’s decision to act. Perceived self-efficacy describes a person’s belief about his or her potential to make an impact. It involves
people’s perception about their abilities to make a desired level of impact on their life’s circumstances. Faculty members in the study did not only verbalize educational discontent, but they also acted on it. Taking steps to join the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community, a self-selected group, and teaching a service-learning course demonstrates the participants’ belief in their ability to make an impact. The desire to fill pedagogical vacuums attracted the participants to service-learning, and their motivation to take on the extra required work reflects perceived self-efficacy. As stated by Cameron and Pierce (2002), self-motivation developed through the assessment of one’s capability leads to personal agency of action. People are prone to embark on actions they believe they can do and set goals to realize a conceived outcome. Such people tend to welcome more challenging tasks as growth opportunities rather than threats. Intrinsic motivation is a derivative of one’s sense of self (Ryan & Deci, 2000); therefore, intrinsic motivation is reflective of self-efficacy.

**Relationship, collaboration, and communal support.** Relationship, collaboration, and communal support contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning. The second of four major themes that emerged in the study, two sub-themes of faculty relationships and community relationships are reported here. As a social practice, relationship, collaboration, and communal support can be classified as external social rewards described by Bandura (1986) as important to intrinsic motivation. External social rewards are required to develop as well as to sustain and increase intrinsic motivation. In terms of faculty relationships, participants influence and encourage one another, as well as seek to associate with other faculty members as a result of using this pedagogy. Such relationships are manifested through participants’ individual interactions with other faculty members and their membership in the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community. According to a participant, interaction with a
faculty member already using this pedagogy led to her decision to join the faculty learning community and teach a service-learning course. Another faculty member stated that the faculty learning community created a space of support and equipped her with the required tools to teach the course. Faculty relationships are important, therefore, to the intrinsic motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning. Previous literature (Furco 2001; O'Byrne, 2001) posits that service-learning is a viable way for faculty collaboration across programs and departments. Such collaborations facilitate relationships of mutual interaction and benefit. Faculty members contribute to each other’s motivation to teach a service-learning course through information sharing, discussions, and strategizing with one another. Such contributions were expressed either in mentor-mentee relationships or by peer associations. Participants expressed the value of such relationships in their comments. A participant was motivated by friendship with a faculty member in the learning community who always talked about the pedagogy. Another participant just wanted to be with her faculty peers and be involved in what they were doing. These participants reported that relationships were important to their motivation for joining the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community and teaching such courses. Membership in the faculty learning community emerged as the crux of the faculty relationships. Participants noted this as a great opportunity to associate with other faculty members and encourage one another through the process. As described by one participant, some of their meetings were similar to group counseling sessions because they could share struggles and successes together and offer support to one another.

The knowledge and expertise of the director of the Office of Service-Learning was also reported as a benefit derived from the faculty relationships. Abes, Jackson, and Jones (2002) report that encouragement from other faculty members, including those from within and outside
the same department, is a motivator for faculty already engaged in service-learning. The Office of Service-Learning at a mid-western public university gives room for such support and encourages faculty relationships through the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community. Pribbenow (2005) posits that there is great value in having supportive and connected communities for faculty engaged in service-learning. These serve as encouragement and motivation for faculty members to be involved in service-learning. Community relationships also contributed to the intrinsic motivation of faculty members at the mid-western public university to engage in service-learning. Participants wanted to build networks and partnerships to connect the university to the community and to foster reciprocal relationship and support. Abes, Jackson, and Jones (2002) also report that community members are strong motivators for faculty engagement in service-learning. Faculty members established new relationships as well as harnessed previous relationships as a motivation to teach service-learning courses. This is consistent with previous literature that service-learning fosters a positive relationship with community partners. In many cases, faculty members reported having great satisfaction in connecting and collaborating with their community partners (Driscoll, 2000). Faculty members also felt more connected to other faculty members and the university institution (Pribbenow, 2005).

**Goodness.** Goodness is reflected in service to the community and forms the third major theme that contributes to the intrinsic motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning. Faculty members who reflected this theme were motivated to give back to the community through teaching service-learning courses. Goodness, however, is one of the controversial issues associated with service-learning in U.S. higher education. There is a dichotomy in academia on the role of goodness. This is because Democrats are believed to be more concerned about service
to the community, which also happens to be a key component of the service-learning pedagogy. According to Butin (2006), service-learning promotes pluralism, social justice, and the common good, which does not resonate as much with political conservatives. These principles are believed to lean towards liberal ideologies and democratic affiliations, which is not representative of conservative Republican views. Lynton (1995), however, posits that there is a need for academic institutions to respond to societal needs and reestablish their commitments to society. Although partisan affiliations were not inquired of participants in this study, faculty members who teach service-learning courses were not solely motivated by goodness. Students’ learning was the most salient factor for these faculty members’ motivation, and community service only acted as a medium.

This emphasis on academic learning is also what distinguishes the pedagogy from being solely the offering of service, which is typical of volunteerism. According to Bringle and Hatcher (1996), service-learning differs from volunteering because students are not merely rewarded for performing service. Students earn credit by participating in organized service activities that are effectively connected to their course of study and purposefully tailored to specific community needs. Service-learning emphasizes the curriculum by incorporating reflection components through discussion, writings, and presentations. Furthermore, Bringle (1997) notes that faculty members presently engaged in service-learning are more interested in the concrete learning outcomes of the pedagogy rather than the mainly idealistic, risk-taking, and visionary characteristics of the earlier adopters. Therefore, one cannot solely consider goodness as a motivating factor for faculty engagement in service-learning without being cognizant of the curricular motivation attached to such.

**Gratification and advancement.** This fourth major theme describes personal benefits
faculty participants receive that contribute to their motivation for service-learning. Such benefits include social satisfaction and fulfillment, department and administrative support, and personal advancement. Compared with goodness that revolves around service to the community, using this pedagogy creates a reciprocal condition that benefits the faculty members. Participants reported that teaching service-learning courses was more fun, made them happy helping other people, and gave them satisfaction that other people were noticing their efforts. Some faculty members received departmental, institutional, state-wide, and national recognition for their use of service-learning. Previous researchers already reported such factors in faculty motivation. According to Banerjee and Hausafus (2007), consistent encouragement from college deans, departmental chairs, and other university administrators increases the motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning. Abes, Jackson, and Jones (2002) also reported that department heads and other faculty are a strong motivating factor in recruiting other faculty members for service-learning. Such need for gratification is explained in the literature on intrinsic motivation.

Deci and Ryan (2001) posit that many social-contextual factors such as competence, autonomy, and performance feedback are essential to the development of intrinsic motivation. An individual is more intrinsically motivated when given a choice, the opportunity for self-direction, and acknowledgement of their feelings (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Therefore, faculty participants, although they may be intrinsically motivated, still required external rewards as well. Deci (1972) notes that intrinsic motivation does not negate the need for external rewards, it only reveals that external rewards are insufficient to keep a person motivated. This position is as reinforced by Bandura, (1986) who stated that external social rewards can build motivation at the onset before intrinsic effects are manifested. However, if intrinsic motivation is not developed, actions are discontinued at the removal of the external rewards, whereas, when
intrinsic motivation is present, external rewards increase or sustain the actions. Social learning theory also posits that parts of personal agency emanate from outside influences (Cameron & Pierce, 2002). In addition, external rewards and positive feedback received from engaging in an activity builds self-efficacy. Although perceived self-efficacy can motivate action, rewards and feedback affirm such prior belief in the ability to make an impact. Faculty members who teach service-learning courses, therefore, require external social rewards to initiate, as well as to sustain their intrinsic motivation to use the pedagogy.

To a large extent, faculty members who teach service-learning courses at a mid-western public university conform to what is already reported in previous literature on motivation for using this pedagogy. Faculty members integrate service-learning in their curriculum to contribute to their communities and to make a positive change through their disciplinary expertise and resources (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Driscoll, 2000). However, curricular concerns outweigh personal or extracurricular factors in faculty motivation for service-learning (Hammond, 1994). According to Pribbenow (2005), service-learning as a pedagogy is effective and embellishes academic disciplines. Faculty members are more engaged in teaching and feel empowered from course learning outcomes because their students develop a sense of self-efficacy and satisfaction. Faculty members also gain new insight, understand the students’ learning processes better, and are able to assess learning more effectively. It is, however, unclear if faculty members will embrace newer developments in teaching and learning if such innovations appear to meet their educational discontent goals, without catering for goodness, gratification and advancement, and relationship, collaboration, and communal support. Longitudinal studies are also required to see how many years faculty members continue to use this pedagogy following their initial adoption of it.
Human Agency and Promotion of Service-Learning by Faculty Members

As an interpretive study, the theoretical framework for analysis was determined a priori. According to Merriam (2002), interpretive methodology is a combination of both symbolic interaction and phenomenology and is often framed around a related theory. Phenomenology examines the significance of meaning and interpretation in participants’ experiences while symbolic interaction emphasizes “symbols and the interpretive process that undergird interactions as fundamental for understanding human behavior” (Patton, 2002, p. 112). Human agency, the theoretical framework for this study, describes the dual interaction of people and their social contexts. As a change agent, a person influences and responds to his or her environment (Bandura, 1999). Three modes are described in human agency, namely personal agency, proxy agency, and collective agency, which were used to analyze how faculty members directly and indirectly exert influences on their environment in their actualization of service-learning involvement. Personal agency refers to actions taken directly by an individual, proxy agency refers to the use of a representative to mediate action, and collective agency describes the process of group action. All three modes of agency are founded in the belief that desirable results can be achieved, which is also known as efficacy. The study shows that in promoting service-learning at a mid-western public university, faculty members influence the institution for the positive growth of service-learning. Such influence is carried out directly through personal action and indirectly through the use of groups and other individuals.

Personal agency. According to Bandura (2001), influencing a situation requires determining the purpose of the decision, taking steps towards realizing it, and responding to the outcome. An agent is any such person who decides the intent of a decision and its expected outcome prior to taking the required action. Being a self-selected group, the decision of faculty
members to join the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community reflects personal agency. It indicates the belief in their ability to make an impact on teaching and learning at a mid-western public university and the action they took to realize such impact. This belief was exhibited when faculty participants discussed possibilities of teaching a service-learning course with their colleagues who were not yet involved and encouraged these other faculty members to join. Faculty members also promote service-learning by doing presentations in various forums on course development and sharing the insight gained as part of the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community. Other ways in which faculty participants modeled this agency included partnering with external organizations, building internal networks, and creating a reference document for interested faculty in their discipline. Such efforts in promoting service-learning further reflects personal agency. Efficacy is a mechanism of personal agency, thus it was necessary for potential faculty members interested in service-learning to believe in their abilities to make an impact as well. According to Bandura (1998), personal efficacy can be developed through one’s record of success, seeing other people’s success as a model, encouragement from other people that one has what it takes, and inferences from physical and emotional perceptions of one’s abilities. To promote service-learning means to develop efficacy of non-service-learning faculty members for the purpose of service-learning. By promoting service-learning at a mid-western public university, these participants exhibited self-efficacy and facilitated the development of such in their colleagues. They do this by telling the other faculty members the kind of support available for service-learning at the mid-western public university and sharing course ideas and projects with them. Participants also served as referrals for other faculty members who were considering teaching service-learning courses by helping them find a community partner. In addition, faculty members that use this pedagogy take part in
development sessions for interested faculty and advocate this pedagogy in their primary department. A participant who is an administrator noted removing factors that could inhibit involvement in service-learning for her faculty members. All such efforts carried out by these faculty participants model personal agency.

*Proxy agency.* Also reflective of efficacy, faculty members exploit other mediums they consider potent for the promotion of service-learning. According to Bandura (2001), proxy agency is founded upon the belief in the effectiveness of others intervening. In cases where people cannot directly control the social and institutional situations that affect them, they turn to proxy agency. Individuals can also resort to proxy agency when they do not want to carry the responsibility of the required action. Being socially driven, faculty members rely on others who have the ability, means, power, and influence to facilitate situations for the promotion of service-learning. Such channels include students in service-learning classes, other colleagues using the pedagogy, and people in administration. Faculty participants noted using students as spokespersons, brainstorming possibilities with other faculty members, and meeting regularly with departmental heads and school deans to seek support for service-learning. Faculty members reported using students as spokespersons during presentations because people often want to hear the report of students who experienced the learning rather than the faculty member who developed the course. Students’ reports on their experience also serve as feedback and validation of the effectiveness of such courses. Brainstorming possibilities with other faculty members arose when participants needed ideas for particular course development. Such brainstorming was also important when University administration did not provide funding for required projects. Faculty members’ meetings with heads and administrators were often to acquaint the
administration on course progress and success, as well as to state needs and solicit support. All such efforts are classified under proxy agency.

Proxy agency is also modeled in community partnerships for the growth of service-learning at a mid-western public university. Faculty members are sometimes able to access financial and logistical support from civic leaders and grassroots organizations in the community to facilitate service-learning. Participants also reported inviting community partners as guest speakers to the classrooms to give lectures about their organization and project opportunities. Such actions exemplify the use of proxy agency even when an individual has direct control. As stated by Bandura (2001), people may still resort to proxy agency in situations where they do not have all the resources to take action, believe another person is better, or simply do not want the responsibility of direct control. Rather than presenting this information to students by themselves, faculty participants preferred bringing in the speakers to address their students. Proxy agency is therefore an important mechanism through which faculty members promote service-learning at the mid-western public university.

Collective agency. The third way participants promote service-learning, namely collective agency, is exhibited when faculty members combine their efforts with that of other entities for the advancement of this pedagogy. These entities are other colleagues involved in service-learning, students in their classrooms, and organizations they are working with to make a change in the community. Bandura (1997) posits that collective agency relies on the shared belief in the combined strength of a group to achieve desired outcomes. This belief, founded in collective efficacy, is expressed through within-institution impacts and external community change. Faculty members build and access networks such as the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community and occasional meetings with other faculty engaged in service-learning to facilitate
and support their involvement in service-learning. Such networks allow faculty members engaged in service-learning to facilitate learning about, development of, and teaching of service-learning courses.

Collective agency enables groups to work together to achieve what could not be done individually. According to Bandura (1999), collective agency operates "through shared beliefs of efficacy, pooled understandings, group aspirations and incentive systems, and collective action" (p. 33). Activities done through the faculty learning community give the faculty members group visibility, which makes more people aware of this pedagogy, and in turn fosters the growth of service-learning. Participants noted that the learning community, which started with a few faculty members, continues to grow based on their group promotion of service-learning at the mid-western public university. Bandura (2001) notes that for this kind of agency, collective efficacy is not merely the aggregate of the personal efficacy of individual members but a rising characteristic developed from the group’s dynamic interaction. This attribute develops from the joint actions and beliefs of the individual members. Through presentations done at fairs organized by the Teaching and Learning Support Center and support given to one another in the learning community, faculty members harness collective agency for the promotion of service-learning at their university.

External community change is another way faculty members modeled collective agency. Through partnership with organizations in the community and efforts of their students’ service projects, participants mediate group change that positively impacts their institution’s surrounding environment. Such change is carried out through their students’ assignments which contribute to various aspects of society. These areas include domestic violence awareness, cultural orientation, health services, development and disability support, and educational assistance. Such efforts are
consistent with the position of Bandura (2001) on group efforts. According to him, group attainment includes “the product of the shared intentions, knowledge, and skills of its members” as well as the “interactive, coordinated, and synergistic dynamics of their transactions” (p. 14).

The combined efforts of faculty members with their students, community partner, and institution positively impact society. This impact is borne out of collective efficacy, which is the power of people’s combined efforts to achieve results. Furthermore, Bandura (2001) notes that a strong perceived collective efficacy provides greater motivation, higher aspirations, and increased determination when faced with challenges. It also boosts morale and resistance to distress and results in greater achievements. Therefore, the group efforts of faculty members in promoting service-learning at their university aligns with collective agency.

**Faculty Members as Change Agents in Society**

One of the main reasons I went into this research study is my interest in the factors that motivate people to action. I wanted to know how a leader encourages a group of people or community to take action for a unified purpose. Faculty members teaching service-learning courses appealed to me as leaders for change because they were implementing a pedagogy that was not yet widely used across the institution. Using service-learning also came with numerous challenges, including seeking community partnerships and managing logistics, which are characteristic barriers to initiating change. Therefore, as a final part of this research, faculty participants were asked to describe attributes of a change agent. These attributes described by the faculty members turned out to be a reflection of the required efforts to teach a service-learning course. Participants are, therefore, theorized as change agents in their institution.

One participant noted that a change agent must be present at the grassroots level to see the problem clearly and to be aware of what is going on. This attribute involves being situated in the
community to identify the needs of the people and to be able to decipher a solution. As faculty members in an institution of higher education, participants in the study exhibited this attribute. They are present in the academic community and aware of events in their surroundings. In addition, they are directly connected with the problem through their involvement in teaching and research, which forms the core of academia. A participant also stated that a change agent must be able to work with a good team and make appropriate connections. Faculty members who teach service-learning courses are part of the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community at the mid-western public university. As a team with a common interest, participants share related information and support one another in their efforts to use this pedagogy. They also make connections with other entities, including students, institutional administration, and community partners to further their goal of service-learning practice. Such characteristics resonate with the assertion that it is important to have a great team and the required networks to facilitate change. Another faculty member emphasized the usefulness of such networks as a connection between the faculty members to the community they are trying to influence for change. The participants noted that a change agent should have a personal connection with the problem at hand. As faculty members, their professional responsibilities include teaching, thus, they are directly connected to any innovation or challenges with teaching and learning within the institution. Therefore, as faculty members teaching service-learning courses, participants have a first-hand connection and experience of implementing this pedagogy.

Another characteristic of a change agent described by faculty participants in the study is that such persons must be knowledgeable, experienced, and skilled. A leader for change should possess a record of past successes and be informed about possible risks and how to manage them. One participant emphasized that there has to be clear communication on commitment
levels, expected outcomes, and risk management to prevent a breach of service or undesirable outcomes. As part of the faculty learning communities, participants spend the first year equipping themselves with knowledge and skills required to implement this pedagogy. They are acquainted with multiple readings on the subject and attend workshops and discussions to facilitate their development of the course. Such activities further corresponded with the faculty members’ description of a change agent. Another participant noted the importance of flexibility in message delivery and partnership with other stakeholders and stressed that a change agent must be able to motivate and empower the people. As faculty members who teach service-learning courses, participants have to work with both students and community partners to get them involved in the process. This procedure involves making the community realize that they are part of the change, thereby providing reciprocal commitment to the leader and cause. Participants make their students part of the change through the service projects they complete. The community benefited from these projects and the community partners were also engaged by being involved.

A change agent must also possess a sense of organization, of goals, and of strategy. The people should receive clear directions from the leader on their roles and level of commitment. Prior to teaching a service-learning course, faculty members spend a lot of time developing the curriculum and procedure to implement it. At the beginning of the course, both the community partner and the students are informed of expectations and their level of involvement. Such information culminates into action throughout the semester in which the course is taught. By using this pedagogy in teaching the course, faculty members continually align with the described characteristics of change agents. Participants also described a leader for change as someone who must be able to inspire and encourage community members to participate, make people feel
needed, value their opinions, listen to them, and take their input where relevant. Additionally, a change-motivated person facilitates people’s acquisition of technical skills and how they can apply them. Students’ learning remains one of the top motivators for faculty members engaged in service-learning. Faculty members in this study reported that they wanted their students to connect theory to practice, develop personal and professional skills, and become active, engaged, and connected to the community. By offering feedback through the learning process, participants are able to monitor their students’ learning and keep them encouraged. Such attributes additionally position faculty members’ who teach service-learning courses as change agents.

Furthermore, participants noted that to influence change, one has to be a problem solver, be interested in seeing what may happen, possess an inner strength, and believe that one can make a difference. This study demonstrates that by teaching service-learning courses, faculty members exhibit self-efficacy which is the belief in their ability to achieve results. Faculty participants in this study had an educational discontent of pedagogical gaps and took steps to solve the problem by getting involved in service-learning. Financial resources required to manage the logistics that accompany change efforts are provided through grants from the Office of Service-Learning and the Teaching and Learning Support Center to facilitate the development of service-learning courses. Participants also stressed the need to ascertain the sustainability of a change effort before embarking on it, which is carried out by faculty members’ promotion of service-learning to other faculty members and providing the required support to facilitate their colleague’s involvement. Such support includes the development of discipline-specific service-learning workbooks and manuals for interested faculty. Service-learning advancement is also facilitated through the various ways participants modeled human agency. Additionally, the motivation for change should not merely be for novelty but a commitment to excellence. Such commitment
should reflect the leader’s boldness, confidence, and risk-taking acumen. A change agent must be an excellent role model and an effective communicator. Faculty members that teach service-learning courses exhibit these characteristics in their struggles and successes with service-learning. The implementation of courses is often challenging, but through dedication, readjustment, and focus, participants are able to teach their courses throughout the semester. Finally, taking action is required of change agents. Potential has to be transformed into action to implement change. Faculty members utilized the acquired knowledge and skills from the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community by teaching the courses. Based on the described characteristics and the aligned efforts of participants, service-learning faculty members are viewed as change agents for teaching such courses in their institution and contributing to the community through their students’ service projects.

**Recommendations for the Mid-western Public University**

Human agency embodies the requirements for advancement in a given situation. First it depicts the influence one could have on his/her environment and further expatiates the various modes in which such influences could be carried out. Human agency is an important factor for the promotion of service-learning. Through personal, proxy, and collective agency, faculty members can influence the growth and development of service-learning at their university. For rapid results, however, more faculty members have to be active and intentional about such promotion. This study reveals that some of the faculty members speak with other people about service-learning only when asked and do not actively promote service-learning. According to Bandura (2001), to be an agent is to intentionally influence one's functioning and the course of environmental events. For agency to exist, there has to be purpose, action, and response. Bandura (1999) states that "human agency operates generatively and proactively on social systems, not
just reactively" (p. 24). To influence a situation one has to determine the purpose of the decision, take steps toward realizing it, and respond to the outcome. Efforts in promoting service-learning can be used to foster the institutionalization of service-learning at this mid-western public university. Multiple research studies (Furco 2001, 2002a; O’Byrne, 2001) emphasize the importance of faculty members in the advancement and institutionalization of service-learning. The extent to which service-learning is institutionalized on any campus depends on faculty responsibility and administrative support. Such responsibility and support can be facilitated through proactive human agency. Because faculty members teach academic courses, as well as some serving in administrative roles such as deans and school directors, a substantial amount of faculty members who support and promote service-learning can accelerate its institutionalization. Such acceleration requires purposive action by faculty members to promote the pedagogy with the different modes of human agency. The root of human agency, however, is in perceived efficacy, and faculty members need to believe in their ability to make an impact as a motivation for action.

Additionally, various factors have been described that contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty members engaged in service-learning. These factors, however, show interactivity with external social rewards. Promoting service-learning advancement on a university campus requires reinforcers for its growth. This finding confirms the position of Abes, Jackson, and Jones (2002) that it is unlikely that non-service-learning faculty members would embrace the pedagogy without required support. Such support lies in the importance of proxy agency. “Agency embodies the endowments, belief systems, self-regulatory capabilities and distributed structures and functions through which personal influence is exercised, rather than residing as a discrete entity in a particular place" (Bandura, 2001, p. 2). The measure of influence an
individual or group could exert on an environment is dependent on the structures and functions of those who hold the power in that environment. According to one of the participants, more faculty members will be prone to embrace service-learning when the senior administration of an institution openly supports the pedagogy. It is also important that faculty members forward information to their heads about students who contact these faculty after graduation to express the benefits of their service-learning class. Such information should also be made available to the Office of Service-Learning and the Teaching and Learning Support Center. Dissemination of this information emphasizes the value of the pedagogy and positions it for more acceptance. It also gives departments an opportunity to follow-up or conduct longitudinal studies required for a holistic evaluation of service-learning. Proxy agency also encompasses the engagement of University administrators who are able to provide the required funding and logistical support for the pedagogy. These administrators can determine the policies that promote service-learning use and implementation. Either individually by faculty members who also hold administrative roles, or by other faculty members who actively reach out to those who are able to exercise influence, the advancement and institutionalization of service-learning requires the support of institutional authorities.

**Conclusion**

This study explored the factors that contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning and how they promote such learning at a mid-western public university. The findings contribute to the body of literature on faculty members and service-learning advancement in the context of a mid-western public university and advance the knowledge by viewing service-learning faculty as change agents. It also offers a utilitarian value to the Office of Service-Learning at the mid-western public university, as there has not been such
a study on this subject carried out at this site to date. Results of this study reveal four major themes that contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty members that teach service-learning courses: (1) educational discontent; (2) relationship, collaboration, and communal support; (3) goodness; and (4) gratification and advancement. Ways the faculty members promoted service-learning at a mid-western public university were analyzed with the categories of human agency, the conceptual framework for this study. These categories included personal agency, proxy agency, and collective agency.

Despite its acclaimed benefits, service-learning still struggles for full acceptance as a teaching and learning method in U.S. higher education (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Butin, 2006; Furco, 2002a; Holland, 2000). As a curricular practice, faculty participation through commitment, adoption, and engagement is significant to the advancement of service-learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 1997). Educational discontent emerged to be the most salient factor that contributes to faculty members’ motivation to teach service-learning courses. This educational discontent developed either as an existent gap the participants thought needed filled, or through their awareness of a way to enhance their current practice. Participants, as a result of self-efficacy, joined the Service-learning Faculty Learning Community at a mid-western public university to enable them to teach a service-learning course and to cater to their pedagogical demands. Self-efficacy is the participants’ belief in their ability to make an impact, and the pedagogical gaps were applied learning, student development, and community engagement. These demands are related to why service-learning was introduced in higher education, which is dissatisfaction with current teaching and learning practices.

Relationship, collaboration, and communal support formed the second major theme that contributed to the intrinsic motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning. This theme is
explored through faculty relationships and community relationships. Participants influence and encourage one another, as well as seek to associate with other faculty members as a result of using this pedagogy. This is expressed through mentor-mentee relationships, by peer associations, and by membership in the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community. Faculty members contribute to each other’s motivation to teach a service-learning course through information sharing, discussions, and strategizing with one another. Community relationships describe the various forms of interaction faculty members have with entities within the surrounding environment of the university. Such interaction allowed faculty members to reach out and develop relationships with the community, thus contributing to participants’ motivation to teach service-learning courses. Goodness, the tendency and belief in doing good as a service to other people, emerged as the third factor contributing to faculty members’ intrinsic motivation for teaching service-learning. Participants with this attribute reported it either as a personal philosophy, as part of the teaching profession, or as part of their service to the community. The fourth major theme, gratification and advancement, which contribute to the motivation of faculty members to teach service-learning courses, refers to the personal benefits that faculty participants received from being involved in service-learning. These benefits included social satisfaction and fulfillment, department and administrative support, and personal advancement.

In terms of human agency, faculty members promote service-learning through individual efforts, enlisting the intervening of others, and using collecting action. These activities include teaching a service-learning course, making presentations to people about service-learning, proposing the pedagogy to other faculty members who agreed to do it, helping other faculty see benefits of service-learning and, as an administrator, removing barriers that prevent faculty members from successfully implementing service-learning. Faculty participants also described
characteristics of change agents which formed a lens that reflected their activities in teaching service-learning courses; therefore, the study participants are change agents themselves. Some of these characteristics include being present in the community, knowledgeable, flexible, bold, communicative, and action-oriented.

**Suggestions for Further Study**

It was beyond the scope of this study to follow-up on how many years after initial adoption faculty members continue to teach service-learning courses. Thus, this necessitates a longitudinal research study. Although educational discontent emerged as the most uniform factor that contributing to participants’ motivation to teach a service-learning course, it is unclear if faculty members will readily embrace innovative pedagogies that do not cater for the other reported motivating factors. It is suggested that this issue be explored by inquiring about the teaching requirements emphasized in graduate school training for faculty members in relation to the other professional responsibilities they assume. Finally, because this qualitative interpretive study focused solely on data collected from interviews, a case study with multiple sources of data, including service-learning class observations and teaching documents could provide a deeper perspective on the intrinsic motivation of faculty members engaged in service-learning initiatives.
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Dear Faculty,

Your contact was obtained through the Office of Service-Learning of a U.S. mid-western public university as a present and/or past member of their Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community who has taught and/or currently teaches a service-learning course at a U.S. mid-western public university. I am inviting you to participate in a research study for my master’s thesis to fulfill my graduate degree requirements. The topic for my research is “Intrinsic Motivation and Human Agency of Faculty Engaged in Service-Learning: A Qualitative Interpretive Study of a U.S. Mid-Western Public University.” The purpose of the research is to explore the factors that contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning and how they promote such learning. My advisor is Dr. Patricia K. Kubow, Professor and Director of the Center for International Comparative Education (ICE) in the School of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Policy at Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio.

I hope that you will participate in this study. Those who are interested in the study will complete a demographic form, sign the informed consent form and return both documents to the researcher. Only a sub-set of those interested in the study will be selected as participants by the researcher from the pool of returned demographic forms and informed consent forms, and contacted for interviews. The selection criterion is a diverse pool of faculty members spread across the different factors presented in the demographic form, including different colleges/schools/departments affiliations, faculty position, number of years teaching at a U.S. mid-western public university, number of years teaching service-learning courses at a U.S. mid-western public university, number of service-learning courses taught at a U.S. mid-western public university, and whether currently teaching service-learning courses this semester – Spring 2011. Please refer to the attached demographic form and informed consent form for more information, including questions on participant expectations, confidentiality, and risks and benefits, and contact me by email if you have any questions. I will respond by email or phone call to answer your questions.

Following answering of all questions and/or if you do not have any (other) questions, kindly confirm your interest in the study by returning your completed demographic form, and signed informed consent form to me through email attachment, campus mail, or contact me by email to come and pick-up the documents. I’ll follow up only with selected participants to confirm a meeting time and date for the interview. On the day of the interview, I will provide participants with a physical hard copy of the informed consent forms which includes my signature. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Oluwadamilare Adeyeri
Graduate Assistant-Research
Educational Foundations and Inquiry/MACIE
Room 550, Education Building, Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
419-372-7274; oadeyer@bgsu.edu
APPENDIX D: PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHIC FORM

The following information is being obtained in relation to my Master’s thesis research titled “Intrinsic Motivation and Human Agency of Faculty Engaged in Service-Learning: A Qualitative Interpretive Study of a U.S. Mid-western Public University.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/ Ethnicity:</td>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Position:</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest degree obtained:</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year degree was obtained:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College:</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Health and Human Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>Musical Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Campus</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education and Human Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/School:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years teaching at a U.S. Mid-western Public University:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years teaching Service-Learning Courses at a U.S. Mid-western Public University:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Descriptor(s)/Credit Hrs of Service-Learning Courses taught at a U.S. Mid-western Public University (e.g. CSP 6800/(3) Credits):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title(s) of Service-Learning Course(s) taught at a U.S. Mid-western Public University:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you currently teaching any of the above courses this semester:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your time.
APPENDIX E: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Introduction to Study:

I am Oluwadamilare Adeyeri, a graduate student of the Master of Arts in Cross-cultural and International Education program, and my advisor is Dr. Patricia K. Kubow, Professor and Director of the Center for International Comparative Education (ICE) in the School of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Policy at Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH. This research study is for my master’s thesis to fulfill my graduate degree requirements and my topic is “Intrinsic Motivation and Human Agency of Faculty Engaged in Service-Learning: A Qualitative Interpretive Study of a U.S. Mid-western Public University.” The purpose of the research is to explore the factors that contribute to the intrinsic motivation of faculty engaged in service-learning and how they promote such learning. You are being asked to participate in this study because a U.S. mid-western public university’s Office of Service-Learning identified you as a present and/or past member of their Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community who have taught and/or currently teach a service-learning course.

Expectation of Participant(s):

Those who are interested in the study will complete a demographic form, sign this informed consent form and return both documents to the researcher. Only a sub-set of those interested in the study will be selected as participants by the researcher from the pool of returned demographic forms and informed consent forms, and contacted for interviews. The selection criterion is a diverse pool of faculty members spread across the different factors presented in the demographic form, including different colleges/schools/departments affiliations, faculty position, number of years teaching at a U.S. mid-western public university, number of years teaching service-learning courses at a U.S. mid-western public university, number of service-learning courses taught at a U.S. mid-western public university, and whether currently teaching service-learning courses this semester – Spring 2011.

The expectation of participants selected for the study will be to take part in a one hour-long semi-structured face-to-face interview; and a subsequent 30minutes - one hour session to clarify questions that may have arisen from the researcher’s analysis of the interviews to ensure accuracy of data and for member checking. Interviews will be at a location you choose for your convenience purposes. Field notes would be taken and with your permission, the interviews would be recorded digitally with a voice recorder and transcribed. You may decline to be recorded, and you may have the recorder turned off at any time during the interview.

Your participation is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw at any time. You may decide to skip questions or discontinue participation at any time without penalty. Deciding to participate or not will have no bearing on your relationship with the Office of Service-Learning, or your position and standing at a U.S. mid-western public university.

Confidentiality:

Any information in the interview that can be identified with you will remain confidential and every effort will be made in the write-up of this study to maintain confidentiality. Pseudonyms will be used throughout the manuscript. The actual name of a U.S. mid-western public university
will not be used in the report of research findings. Consent forms will be stored in a locked file cabinet. Transcribed interviews and audio recordings will be stored on my password-protected computer. Only my advisor and I will have access to the data as required for guidance and instruction through the study. The Office of Service-Learning at a U.S. mid-western public university has only provided a list of members in their Faculty Service-Learning Community who have taught and/or currently teach service-learning courses. The list of final participants, consent forms, field notes, and recorded and transcribed interviews will not be shared with the Office of Service-Learning at a U.S. mid-western public university. Only analyzed result findings written in the final thesis version will be made available to the Office of Service-Learning at a U.S. mid-western public university and other required parties, including the Bowling Green State University’s graduate college to fulfill the researcher's master's degree requirements. All associated data with this study including written transcriptions and audio recordings will be deleted and destroyed after 5 years of the study’s completion. The length of time in keeping the data is to make provisions for the researcher to refer to the data for possible conference presentations, research publications, and doctoral studies.

**Risks and Benefits:**

There are no direct benefits to you as a participant, such as a monetary awards, or raffle, etc.; however, there are indirect benefits. Because service-learning engagement is an ongoing issue in many U.S. universities and colleges and you would have contributed to its knowledge base by being part of this study. The interview questions may also cause a reflection of your personal motivations for service-learning if not done previously; thereby, facilitating a possibly better understanding of your service-learning teaching experiences. The Office of Service-Learning at a U.S. mid-western public university will also benefit from this research as there has not been a previous qualitative research on the office's activities. The final thesis results' finding will aid their understanding of faculty motivations; thereby, giving an insight to more ways to cater for faculty needs through their Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community and other faculty-centered activities. On a broader scale, this study is of great benefit to other practitioners and researchers in the service-learning field as it begins to fill the void of the knowledge and understanding of faculty motivations for service-learning engagement. This study will also benefit higher education administrators in policy making, both at a U.S. mid-western public university and other universities, as it will illuminate the factors affecting the motivations of faculty members' engagement in service-learning.

I do not anticipate any risks to you participating in this study other than those encountered in day-to-day life. These may include risk to individuals who honestly express their opinions in any given setting. Because the “Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community” is a small and self-selected group, individuals might be identifiable from reported projects and/or research results; however the intent is not to connect data to specific names. Steps to maintain confidentiality are as stated above.

**Contact Information:**

If you have any questions about this research, you could contact me: Oluwadamilare Adeyeri, Graduate-Research Assistant, Educational Foundations & Inquiry/MACIE, Room 550 Education Building, oadeyer@bgsu.edu, 4193727274, or my advisor – Dr Patricia. K. Kubow, Professor
and Director, The Center for International Comparative Education (ICE), School of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Policy, Room 562, Education Building, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio. Email: pkubow@bgsu.edu, Phone: 419-372-7380, Fax: 419-372-8448. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Review Board at 419-372-7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu, if you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research.

Thank you for your time.

I have been informed of the purposes, procedures, risks and benefits of this study. I have had the opportunity to have all my questions answered and I have been informed that my participation is completely voluntary. I agree to participate in this research. A copy of this consent form will be provided to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Signature</th>
<th>Name (in Print)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher’s Signature</td>
<td>Name (in Print)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Thesis Title: Intrinsic Motivation and Human Agency of Faculty Engaged in Service-Learning: A Qualitative Interpretive Study of a U.S. Mid-western Public University

**Introduction:** My name is Oluwadamilare Adeyeri, and I am conducting this study for my masters’ thesis. The purpose of the research is to explore the factors that contribute to the intrinsic motivations of faculty engaged in service-learning and how they promote such learning. As a faculty member who has been through the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community and taught/currently teach service-learning courses at a mid-western public university, your perspectives are invaluable. I am conducting this one hour long semi-structured face-to-face interview to inquire about your understanding of service learning, how you have been involved in such learning, and your perceptions on service learning in relation to human agency. Your participation in this interview is completely voluntary, and you may choose to not answer any of the questions I pose today. There are no right or wrong answers. I am most interested in hearing about your experiences, your perspectives, your beliefs, and your stories. I will read aloud the contents of the informed consent form to you and allow you opportunities to ask any (other) questions before we begin. It contains information about this study, steps taken to protect confidentiality, and other relevant information.

- (Read aloud consent form)

Before I countersign the informed consent form, do you have any (other) questions?

- (countersign two physical hard copies of the informed consent form and give one to participant)
- (Turn on the voice recorder)

I also seek permission to digitally record the interviews. Do you have any objections to this interview not being recorded?

- (leave recorder on or turn off as determined by participant response and proceed with interview)

**Interview Questions:**

1. **Background: Service-Learning**
   a. What is Service-Learning?
   b. Kindly describe your experiences with service-learning so far?
   c. Why did you choose to join the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Community at a mid-western public university?
   d. What could contribute to your continuing and/or discontinuing teaching a service-learning course at a mid-western public university?

2. **Motivations for Service-Learning**
   a. What are your motivations for teaching service-learning courses at a mid-western public university?
   b. What factors contribute to your motivations for teaching service-learning at a mid-western public university?
c. Describe your experiences with the Service-Learning Faculty Learning Communities at a mid-western public university.

d. In what ways have these experiences contributed or not contributed to your motivations for teaching service-learning at a mid-western public university?

e. What forms of support are available to you to facilitate your teaching of service-learning courses at a mid-western public university?

f. How does this support contribute or not contribute to your motivations to teach service-learning courses at a mid-western public university?

3. Human Agency for Service-Learning at a U.S. Mid-western Public University Campus

a) As a faculty who has taught/is teaching a service-learning course, what is your perceived role in the advancement of service-learning at a mid-western public university?

b) In what ways have you taken action (if at all) to influence the advancement of service-learning at a mid-western public university?

i) What contributed to your decision to take the above actions?

ii) If no action has been taken, what could contribute to your decision to take an action to influence the advancement of service-learning at a mid-western public university?

c) Describe a situation (if at all) in which you have seen other people take action to influence the advancement of service-learning at a mid-western public university.

d) How did the observed action affect or not affect your own actions to influence the advancement of service-learning at a mid-western public university?

e) What characteristics or attributes do you associate with being a change agent/able to effect change in a given situation?

f) How may the above characteristics in a change agent/leader for change move (or not) move you to action?

g) Please share anything else related to the previous questions, interview, and/or study that you consider important or would like me to know.

Thank the participants for their cooperation and participation in the interview. Assure them of the confidentiality of the responses as stated.