

VITA

Carol A. Katowitz

EDUCATION

- 2011 Indiana State University, Terre Haute, IN
Ph.D.; Educational Administration
- 1994 University of Evansville, Evansville, IN
M.A.; Special Education
- 1985 University of Southern Indiana, Evansville, IN
B.S.; Elementary Education
- 1972 Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN
B.S.; Child Development and Family Life

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- 2011-current Ivy Tech Community College, Southwest, Evansville, IN
Schools of Education, Fine Arts and Design, Public and Social Services
Dean
- 2000-2005 Ivy Tech Community College, Southwest, Evansville, IN
Program Chair of Early Childhood Education
- 1992-2000 Ivy Tech Community College, Southwest, Evansville, IN
Adjunct faculty member for Early Childhood Education
- 1992-2000 Evansville Vanderburgh School Corporation, Evansville, IN
Teacher of Students with Learning Disabilities
- 1985-1992 St. Vincent's Child Care Center, Evansville, IN
Program Director

YOU'RE SUPPOSED TO CARE: FACULTY MOTIVATIONS TO INCORPORATE
SERVICE LEARNING INTO COMMUNITY COLLEGE CLASSROOMS

A dissertation

Presented to

The College of Graduate and Professional Studies

Department of Educational Leadership

Indiana State University

Terre Haute, Indiana

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Carol A. Katowitz

December 2011

© Carol A. Katowitz 2011

Keywords: community college faculty, service learning pedagogy

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Committee Chair: Kandace G. Hinton, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Educational Leadership

Indiana State University

Committee Member: Mary Howard Hamilton, Ed.D.

Professor of Educational Leadership

Indiana State University

Committee Member: Dennis L. Dell, Ph.D.

Director of Instructional Technology and Design

Ivy Tech Community College, Southwest

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the motivations that cause some faculty in community colleges to embrace and actively pursue service learning pedagogy in their classrooms. It also identified the catalysts that move faculty to action in implementing this approach to instruction. The qualitative phenomenological case study approach was used to hear the stories of eight faculty members representing different areas of discipline in eight different campus locations in a Midwestern statewide community college system. Four primary themes and two sub-themes were identified through this study. The primary themes were (a) pedagogical connections to previous school experiences and personal and family values, (b) passion and commitment each faculty member had for this approach to instruction, (c) persistence of the faculty participants to use this approach despite the many barriers they faced, and (d) pleasure these faculty members get from watching their students perform in a service learning setting. The identified sub-themes were (a) bottom-up approach to instruction and (b) ability to take risks with instruction.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to acknowledge and thank the late Sister Patricia Finerty, Daughter of Charity, who first modeled service to the Lord and the oppressed to me. I shall never forget her first words to me when she became my supervisor many years ago. She said, “I know a lot, and I will teach you.” I shall be eternally grateful to her for her gentle, loving, faithful teaching and guidance and think she would be proud to see what her pupil has achieved.

Second, I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Kandace Hinton, for her support and guidance through this process. She has the unique ability to pull the best out of her students in an honest and forthright way. I must also recognize Dr. Mary Howard-Hamilton for her loving guidance in the many aspects of leadership and acceptance she shared with our cohort of students. I shall never forget what these two gifted professors have added to my personal and professional growth. The third member of my committee was Dr. Dennis Dell, a dear colleague and friend. His gentle ways and consistent guidance led me through this journey to completion. May God bless you all!!!!

Finally, I cannot neglect to thank my husband, Bob, for his loving support of me through this process. Over our many years of marriage we have learned to lovingly support each other’s passions. I often describe him to others as the one who holds the strings to keep me grounded as I soar through the air like a kite. Thank you, Bob, for allowing me to be the person I was always meant to be. You will always be the only one for me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COMMITTEE MEMBERS	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	ix
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Purpose Statement.....	5
Research Questions.....	6
Significance of the Study.....	6
Personal Story.....	7
Summary.....	9
Literature Review	11
Overview.....	12
Historical Roots of Service Learning Pedagogy.....	16
Emergence of Service Learning Movement in Higher Education.....	18
Theoretical Framework of Service Learning.....	23
Philosophical Foundation for Experiential Learning Theory in Higher Education.....	24

Service Learning Continuum: From Charity to Justice	27
Kohlberg’s Moral Development Theory.....	29
Gilligan’s Theory of Moral Development	31
Kolb’s Cognitive Theory	35
Faculty and Service Learning: What does the research say?	38
Encouragement of Faculty Use of the Service Learning Pedagogy	41
Deterrents to Service Learning Pedagogy.....	43
Positive Outcomes for Faculty Embracing Service Learning Pedagogy	46
Faculty Concerns with Service Learning Pedagogy	50
Service Learning in the Community College.....	51
History of Community Colleges	52
Characteristics of Community College Faculty	566
Pedagogical Challenges in Community Colleges	61
Service Learning in the Community College.....	63
Methodology	68
Qualitative Approach	69
Phenomenology.....	69
Case Study	72
Research Design.....	73
Community College Site Selection.....	73

Participant Selection	73
Data Collection	75
Interview Questions	76
Data Analysis	77
Plan for Study Results.....	79
Consideration for Participants.....	80
Summary	81
Results.....	83
Participants.....	84
Biographical Information.....	86
Doctor C.....	87
Dorothy	90
Julius	92
Sam	96
Elizabeth	100
Bacon	103
Karin	107
Penelope.....	110
Summary.....	115
Analysis and Interpretation	117

Emergent Themes	119
Summary of Themes	134
Sub-themes.....	136
Summary of Sub-themes.....	141
Summary.....	142
Implications, Recommendations and Conclusion	146
Limitations of the Study for Higher Education.....	146
Implications for Higher Education.....	147
Recommendations for Further Research.....	148
Conclusion	151
REFERENCES	154
Appendix A: Consent to Participate in Research Form	164
Appendix B: Interview Protocol	168
Appendix C: Transcriptionist Confidentiality Agreement.....	170

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 *Participant Demographics*.....85

Table 2 *Years of Service, Educational Level, Rank, and Discipline*.....86

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The concept of service learning as a form of experiential learning in college and university classrooms is not new. However, the remarks of President Barack Obama in his “Points of Light” speech at Texas A&M University in 2009 challenged all Americans to volunteer in healthcare centers, energy independence initiatives, and school and community settings to improve the overall state of this nation (Obama, 2009). The purpose of this speech became clear when President Obama sought to stimulate and support service in both K-12 and higher education through the reauthorization and expansion of the bipartisan National and Community Service Act of 1990 enacted on April 21, 2009 (S. 277, 111th. Cong. § 1, 2009). The passage of this service act and the message put forth by the Obama administration makes it very clear that our government officials intend for community college and university students to become involved in their communities. This study addressed the service learning component of civic engagement in higher education. For the purpose of this study, service learning in higher education classrooms was defined as “a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development. Reflection and reciprocity are key components of service learning” (Jacoby, 1996, p. 5).

Jacoby (1996) traced the history of service learning in the academy back to the period of civil unrest this country experienced in the 1960s and 1970s, but this movement was not sustained because it was not rooted in the missions of the institutions of higher learning. The service learning movement resurged with the establishment of Campus Compact in 1985. Campus Compact is “an organization of college and university presidents who have pledged to encourage and support academically based community service at their institutions” (Jacoby, p. 12). According to Honnet and Poulson (1993), in May of 1989 an advisory group of individuals representing 70 organizations devoted to service learning met and authored the first Wingspread Report. This group, sponsored by the Johnson Foundation, developed a report of 10 guiding principles essential to good practice of linking service with academic achievement in higher education. The Wingspread Report challenged members of the academy to return to the principles this nation was founded upon, where citizens actively participated in their communities. But according to Eyler and Giles (1999), the service learning pedagogy was not widely adopted in the academy at that time.

The service learning pedagogy could best be described as one that combines experiences with theory through problem-based learning (Zlotowsky, 1996). The use of this pedagogy in academe has recently been recognized by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in the newly formed Carnegie Civic Engagement classification. This new category was established in 2006 for the purpose of broadening the grouping of community colleges and universities to more clearly reflect the evolution of higher education (Driscoll, 2008). This voluntary classification provided a path for institutions to document their civic engagement. This civic engagement takes many forms and addresses local, regional, state, national, and global

communities “for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity” (Driscoll, p. 39).

This shift in instructional approach creates disequilibrium with many community college and university faculty members whose teaching styles and pedagogical views are firmly grounded in the lecture/test format (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Franco, 2007; Hesser, 1995; Levine, 1994). This study investigated the motivations that cause some community college faculty to embrace and actively pursue service learning pedagogy in their classrooms despite barriers.

Statement of the Problem

Adding an experiential component to students’ educational experiences in community college classrooms presents many obstacles for faculty members. Elwell and Bean (2001) identified the first challenge as effectively incorporating service learning into coursework. The course delivery methods at all institutions of higher learning are based on the idea of academic freedom by giving the professor total control over both content and delivery of coursework. According to Kaplin and Lee (2007), academic freedom is the cornerstone of American higher education. The academic freedom faculty embrace provides the platform for the cognitive dissonance necessary for intellectual growth to occur. Kaplan and Lee defined academic freedom in higher education as “the prerogatives of faculty members and students to pursue research, teaching, and learning without interference from their institutions or the government. These prerogatives may be protected by law or by custom and usage” (p. 671).

Freire (1990), a Brazilian educationalist, emphasized dialogue as an essential component of instruction. He considered pedagogy as a form of praxis that included reflection and action upon the world as essential for learning to occur. He stated, “Reflection—true reflection—leads to action” (p. 52). The service learning pedagogy follows the Frierean philosophy, but

incorporating a service learning component into coursework presents a problem for faculty accustomed to teaching using the lecture/test approach. Freire described this common instructional method as the banking approach to education as one where

education thus becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor. Instead of communicating, the teacher issues communiqués and makes deposits which the students patiently receive, memorize, and repeat. This is the “banking” concept of education, in which the scope of the action allowed to the student extends only as far as receiving, filing and storing the deposits.

(p. 58)

Challenging this approach to education is of paramount importance when considering issues of incorporating service learning into coursework, which requires active dialogue, reflection, and reciprocation. Shifting pedagogical approaches often provides a challenge that is difficult for many faculty members to overcome (Butin, 2006).

Kezar and Rhoads (2001) felt cognitive change must be the cornerstone of service learning but contended that more research was needed in this area to establish a clear linkage to course objectives. These researchers offered many pertinent questions that must be addressed when considering adding a service learning component to coursework. Kezar and Rhoads asked one question with a direct impact on faculty:

Is service learning best understood as a part of the historical mission of higher learning as in fostering social responsibility and citizenship, or in new goals of developing empathy and multicultural understanding, or in traditional academic goals such as critical thinking and writing? (p. 149)

Kezar and Rhoads felt it was essential to understand the undergirding of service learning in the academy to fully embrace this philosophical and instructional approach to instruction.

Numerous studies have been conducted to determine the benefits and difficulties of service learning from an academic standpoint at both two-year and four-year institutions (Erlich & Hollander, 1999; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Franco, 2007; Jacoby, 1996). Duffy (2007) focused his research on two-year institutions and discussed the importance of engaging community college students to form a sense of community as one way to support civic engagement in local communities. This engagement assisted in addressing community needs and provided a valuable link to coursework that enhanced the students' academic learning. Duffy went on to state that quality service learning aided in student retention and provided "a valuable link between students' academic and community lives" (p. 1).

But the fact remains that many faculty do not support this pedagogy (Jacoby, 1996). Investigation into motivations of the faculty who utilize this pedagogy is imperative to understanding how to expand this approach in the academy. Identifying the barriers to this pedagogy is also essential to determine what these faculty members are forced to overcome. The key point this study identifies is why some community college faculty members persevere while others give up their quest to incorporate meaningful service learning into coursework.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to investigate the motivations that caused some faculty in community colleges to embrace and actively pursue service learning pedagogy in their classrooms. An attempt was made to determine common motivations for use of this pedagogy in community college classrooms. An investigation of the historical progression of this

philosophical and pedagogical approach in academe as well as the current state of service learning in community college settings was essential to set the foundation for this study.

Research Questions

This study answers two research questions that identify common motivators of community college faculty members who use the service learning pedagogy.

1. What motivations lead faculty to consider implementing service learning into coursework in community colleges?
2. What catalysts encourage faculty to incorporate service learning into coursework?

Significance of the Study

Much research has been completed in recent years that addresses the usage of service learning pedagogy from the faculty perspective in four-year institutions of higher learning, but limited research could be located on use of this approach by faculty in community college settings. Kezar and Rhoads (2001) addressed the dynamic tensions faculty at four-year institutions experience when balancing this instructional pedagogy with the research and publication components of their positions. Many faculty members at four-year institutions are concerned with the impact of service learning on their promotion and tenure, fearing the time spent on service learning negatively impacted this practice. However, Franco (2007) argued that these concerns were not valid in the community college settings since the focus community college faculty is on instruction as opposed to research.

Patton (2002) supported the use of service learning as a method of doing qualitative research for the purpose of improving both programs and practice. This applied to all institutions of higher education and many K-12 schools. He purported that “the goals, purposes, and methods of service learning are similar to those of naturalistic/qualitative research” (p. 186).

According to Patton, this approach to research “engages individuals in common purposes and similar practices” (p. 186). Therefore, this study adds to the research base of faculty utilization of service learning pedagogy and addresses the motivations and institutional factors that foster or hinder the environment for service learning in community college settings.

Personal Story

My own interest in utilizing a service learning approach to instruction stems from my strong connection with Gilligan’s (1982) ethic of care perspective. My personal connection between giving and serving became apparent to me as I completed the doctoral coursework in leadership in higher education. This connection has deep roots in my ancestral background and is a strong part of who I am as a person both personally and professionally.

The service learning pedagogy was always of interest to me. While I was a full-time community college faculty member, I used this approach occasionally in my classroom and found it very rewarding to my students and myself. As I progressed up the professional ladder to the level of dean and began my coursework toward the doctoral degree, my interest in service learning heightened. This became especially apparent when I studied the ethic of care approach purported by Gilligan and the philosophical approach of Freire (Noddings, 2007), and I realized that this is how I viewed the world. Helping others has always been a part of my life, but I did not realize this approach was typically attributed to women. In my family, the men set the tone for this approach to life.

In my position as dean, I am expected to take a leadership role in the college. Preskill and Brookfield (2009) addressed the strong connection between learning and leading as imperative to creating social change. I would categorize myself as a servant leader who strives to hear the voices of others and is open to new and different ideas. I am not afraid to express

these feelings and concerns in administrative meetings where I give my faculty a voice into the decisions being made at the college.

When I merged the knowledge from the doctoral coursework with my own philosophy of education, it became clear to me that I could advocate for the use of the service learning pedagogy in my own institution. One of the responsibilities I embraced as dean was to move the theory into practice in my own institution through the formation of a service learning committee composed of faculty interested in service learning. It was through this endeavor whereby I became fully aware of how differently I viewed the world. The best word I can use to describe the overall faculty response to this committee was apathetic. However, a small core of faculty shared my passion to serve others and incorporated service into their courses. This gave me hope that I could motivate others to adopt this pedagogy. That spurred my interest in determining why some faculty members accept this pedagogy while other faculty members view this pedagogy as unnecessary, unproductive, and not appropriate for their discipline.

After much thought and prayer, I became aware that this should be the focus of my research. The only approach to determine these motivations I found pertinent to this study was one that allowed me to hear the personal stories of others who share my pedagogical philosophy in hopes of finding common themes that I could use to further service learning at my institution.

Using the community college faculty sample made sense to me because my heart lies in the community college and its large population of nontraditional, underprepared students. Having worked with at-risk and underprivileged children earlier in my professional career has given me the passion necessary to work with the students who flock to community college settings. This research project adds meaningful, qualitative data to the service learning field and

will assist me with the promotion of this pedagogical approach to fellow faculty members at my institution.

While researching the inception of service in the academy, I discovered a quote from Jane Addams (1964) that I found very inspiring in my quest for a doctorate degree and the topic of what motivates many community college faculty to use the service learning pedagogy. It seems appropriate to share that with the reader at this time. She stated:

But we all know that each generation has its own test, the contemporaneous and current standard by which alone it can adequately judge its own moral achievements, and that it may not legitimately use a previous and less vigorous test. The advanced test must indeed include that which has already been attained; but if it includes no more, we shall go forward thinking complacently that we have “arrived” when in reality we have not yet started. (p. 2)

This quotation from the end of the nineteenth century seems congruent with the problems we address today. It is my desire through this study to add to the research in this area in hopes of stimulating others to service.

Summary

The call to civic engagement in higher education is stronger than ever, but the traditions and pedagogical approaches to learning in academe are difficult to change. Kezar (2001) stated that a cultural change in institutions of higher learning often requires a shift of perspective resulting in a deep change in the organization that often happens gradually. This is apparent with the acceptance of the philosophical and pedagogical framework of service learning in many institutions of higher education in the United States today.

Academic freedom has been the cornerstone of higher education permitting professors to choose their instructional methods. Clayton and Ash (2004) described the service learning approach to instruction as counter normative, classifying faculty using this approach as risk takers. Several studies have addressed faculty motivations at four-year institutions, but limited research has been published on this topic in the community college. This study addressed the gap in the literature that identifies what motivations cause community college faculty to use the service learning pedagogy in the face of many challenges.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

The purpose of this study was to investigate the motivations that cause some faculty in community colleges to embrace and actively pursue service learning pedagogy in their classrooms. The use of the service learning pedagogy in higher education classrooms has expanded over the past twenty years in both undergraduate and graduate programs. However, much of the research over the last two decades focused on faculty acceptance of this pedagogy at four-year institutions with scant research being conducted at the community college level.

This chapter provides an in-depth review of the evolution of this pedagogy from a historical, philosophical, and cognitive perspective beginning with Dewey (1933) and moving to Kolb's (1984) theory of experiential learning. Kohlberg (1981) and Gilligan's (1982) theories of moral development are also closely examined through the lens of ethic of justice versus the ethic of care (Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton, & Renn, 2010). Faculty issues with service learning pedagogy in four-year institutions are fully addressed. This chapter ends with the current levels of service learning pedagogy used in community college classrooms. This review provides a foundation for this study that was designed to determine the characteristics and motivations common to the community college faculty who embrace this approach to instruction.

Overview

The rich history of service to the community in the United States has moved from the inception of Hull House, the first American settlement house, in 1899 and its impact on the thinking of Dewey (1938) to the current level of renewed importance addressed in the Wingspread statement of 2003 (Holland, Brukhardt, Percy, & Zimpher, 2004). The Wingspread report challenged the current levels of civic engagement in academe by asking the question, “Is higher education ready to commit to community engagement?” (Holland, et al., 2004, p. 1). Following the sentiments of Dewey (1938), this Wingspread statement challenged institutions of higher education to embrace civic engagement. Holland et al. (2004) maintained

the promise of engagement lies in its potential to rejuvenate the academy, redefine scholarship and involve society in a productive conversation about the role of education in a new century. University-wide, institutionalized and sustained commitment to engagement is a necessity and a priority if American higher education is to continue its global leadership role. Engagement is higher education’s larger purpose. (p. iii)

The historical roots of service run deep in the academy. Philosophically, service learning can be traced to Dewey and his pragmatic approach to education (Eyler & Giles, 1999). This approach focused on the naturalistic process of connecting experiences with the learning process that placed an emphasis on personal reflection on this action.

The philosophical basis to support the pedagogical framework of service learning began with the introduction of Dewey’s pragmatic approach to learning that emerged early in the twentieth century in America (Noddings, 2007). Gutek (1988) described Dewey’s experimental epistemology as “an active social conception of human intelligence, which, while conditioned by societal institutions, could dynamically affect social change” (p. 95). According to Gutek,

Dewey viewed the educational process as one that brought “the immature person into cultural participation by providing the necessary symbolic and linguistic tools needed for group interaction and communication” (p. 99). It was through this transfer of cultural information that students were able to perpetuate their cultural skills, knowledge, and values and become the transmitter of this information to future generations as well as to direct the course of change (Dewey, 1938).

The theoretical foundation of cognitive development found in the service learning pedagogy can be traced back to Kolb’s (1984) theory of experiential learning. This theory expanded Dewey’s pragmatist philosophy by “exploring the implications of an experiential learning theory and experimenting with techniques of learning from experience” (Kolb, 1984, p. ix). Kolb analyzed the theories of Lewin (1951) and Piaget (1973), outlined common themes, and defined the impact of these themes on experiential learning. Kolb’s theory of experiential learning was portrayed in three stages: acquisition, specialization, and integration. According to Kolb, the cognitive experience was at the core of instruction, but one cannot ignore the impact of other dimensions of student and faculty development on the learning process.

Kohlberg (1981) described the need for disequilibrium as an essential component of the learning process. His theory of moral development expanded Piaget’s (1973) research by adding another perspective of moral development for consideration when linking service learning to coursework. Kohlberg focused on the need “to promote the use of reasoning one stage above the thinking exhibited by the individual to enhance development” (Evans et al., 2010, p. 102). Kohlberg’s research was completed on young men and explored the possible dimensions of student and faculty gains from service learning by including the justice perspective that focuses on understanding the rights and rules. Kohlberg’s theory described moral development as a

three-step process beginning with “egoism” and ending with “an understanding of morality as the consistent application of universal principles of justice” (Foos, 1998, p. 14).

Gilligan (1982) expanded Kohlberg’s theory of moral development to include the feminist perspective based on women’s connections with others in a maternal way. Although her research pointed to the different way women develop their moral compasses, her theory was gender-related but not gender-based. Gilligan argued that the care perspective was contextual and “care-based reasoning does not apply abstract principles to generalized situations, but deals with each situation in its concreteness and uniqueness” (Foos, 1998, p. 15). This perspective added the concepts of care and responsibility as a part of the moral compass that is embedded in the personal value system of each individual.

The different voice first identified by Gilligan (1982) has been labeled the ethic of care. Noddings (2003) stated that “an ethic of care arises, I believe, out of our experiences as women, just as the traditional logical approach to ethical problems arises more obviously from masculine experience” (p. 8). Noddings contended that this caring requires an action that involves a situational relationship. She stated,

caring involves stepping out of one’s own personal frame of reference into the others.

When we care, we consider the other’s point of view, his objective needs, and what he expects of us. Our attention, our mental engrossment is on the cared-for, not on ourselves. (p. 24)

Noddings described the implications of this view of the world in education as when teachers meet the ethical moral needs of the students by establishing learning environments that value dialogue, practice, and confirmation.

The philosophical and theoretical foundations supporting service learning led to the development of a new pedagogical approach to instruction established in a grassroots effort that led to the first Wingspread Report of 1989 (Honnet & Paulson, 1993). This report highlighted the United States' founding concepts that were based on active citizenship and participation in community life. This report set forth 10 guiding principles for good practice in establishing service learning in K-12 and higher education programs and coursework. The benefits of incorporating service into the curriculum were also outlined in this report.

Two studies were reviewed that addressed characteristics and motivators in faculty utilizing this pedagogical approach to instruction in four-year institutions. Results of these studies indicated that many faculty members enjoyed the academic freedom service learning provided while others found the positive results of student learning as the strongest motivator to the use of this approach (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Hammond, 1994). However, McKay and Rozee (2004) professed the change in institutional culture was a main motivator to faculty use of the service learning instructional approach.

The fact remains that the professoriate has not wholly embraced the pedagogy of service learning. Kezar and Rhoads (2001) described these concerns as a part of the changing role of the professoriate as dynamic tension resulting from the criticism that occurred in higher education in the 1980s and 1990s when academe had been scrutinized for a "lack of curricular relevance, lack of faculty commitment to teaching, and lack of institutional (and faculty) responsiveness to the larger public good" (p. 150). Butin (2006) maintained that many professors felt this pedagogical approach would be too time consuming and may negatively impact their quest for tenure. Others questioned the fit of this instructional method to their disciplines, especially in the areas of

mathematics and science. Many faculty members struggled with creating proper assessment tools to assess student learning with this method of instruction.

While sharing the concerns of professors at four-year institutions, implementing service learning in community college classrooms presented a series of difficulties not experienced by four-year residential institutions. Kozeracki (2000) avowed that service learning in community colleges presented a challenge for many other reasons. She discussed the demographics of the community college student and the reliance of community colleges on large numbers of adjunct faculty members as obstacles for the implementation of service learning in many community college settings. Kozeracki argued that the institutionalization of service learning into the college mission and culture accompanied by inadequate financial resources provided the biggest barriers at most community colleges. She coupled this with the inadequate levels of professional development provided to faculty members in many community colleges; one can begin to understand why this pedagogy was not readily accepted at many institutions.

However, according to Garcia and Robinson (2005), the results of a study conducted by the American Association of Community Colleges found many community college faculty members successfully utilized this approach to learning in their classrooms for a variety of reasons. They contended that some faculty were motivated by stipends or grants while others used this approach to improve student learning, awareness of social problems, and other intrinsic factors.

Historical Roots of Service Learning Pedagogy

Research on service learning traced its origins back to the inception of the settlement house, Hull House, begun by Addams and Starr in 1889 in Chicago (Addams, 1964). Addams was among the first generation of female college graduates who felt the need to use their

education to improve the “public sphere” (Daynes & Longo, 2004, p. 9). After she completed college at the Seminary of Rockford, she developed her personal philosophy of service. Addams (1964) iterated this philosophy in her book, *Democracy and Social Ethics*, stating that the purpose of schools was to relate learning to the real lives of the pupils in order to help them see their place in the world and their relationship to the rest of society. She felt this could be best accomplished by using the child’s environment as a laboratory for learning. Addams stated, “We constantly hear it said in educational circles that a child learns by doing, and that education must proceed through the eyes and hands to the brain” (pp. 208-209).

Addams’s perspective on education was of great interest to Dewey who visited Hull House in its early days prior to joining the faculty of the University of Chicago. These visits began a lifelong friendship between Addams and Dewey. According to Daynes and Longo (2004), this had a profound impact on Dewey’s view of education. They shared the common vision of addressing the problems of society each from a different perspective. Daynes and Longo (2004) contended that “two of Dewey’s major works of educational philosophy, *The School as Social Centre* and *Democracy and Education*, were heavily influenced by his experiences at Hull House” (Daynes & Longo, 2004, p. 9).

Dewey (1933) approached learning through a perspective similar to that of scientific inquiry where a hypothesis was formed and evaluated by the learner. One strong component of Dewey’s theory of experiential learning focused on the reflective thinking process. The teacher’s role in this process was to guide the learning situations. Dewey viewed reflective thinking as a chain that

involves not simply a sequence of ideas, but a consequence—a consecutive ordering in such a way that each determines the next in its proper outcome, while each outcome in

turn leads back on, or refers to its predecessors. The successive portions of a reflective thought grow out of one another; they do not come in a medley. Each phase is a step from something to something—technically speaking; it is a *term* of thought. Each term leaves a deposit that is utilized in the next term. The string or flow becomes a train or chain. There are in any reflective thought definite units that are linked together so that there is a sustained movement to a common end. (pp. 4-5)

Elwell and Bean (2001) contended that Harry Truman carried Dewey's ideas forward with his unique focus on the purpose of higher education. Truman felt the focus of academe should be to assist all students in acquiring the skills, knowledge, and attitudes to enable them to live "rightfully and willfully in a free society" (Elwell & Bean, 2001, p. 48). Truman advanced an agenda to open institutions of higher learning to the public and not maintain them just for the selected elite members of society.

Emergence of the Service Learning Movement in Higher Education

Jacoby (1996) credited the Civil Rights Movement on college campuses during the 1960s and 1970s as the birth of the service learning movement as a form of experiential learning. However, this movement toward service learning pedagogy was unsustainable because of its lack of organizational structure and institutional support. Jacoby described three pitfalls to sustained service learning programs during this time period. She claimed that the primary reason for the demise of these programs was the failure to integrate the civic engagement philosophy into the mission and goals of the institution. The second pitfall came in the lessons learned by those participating in these activities. Jacoby stated

Those in the community service movement learned several important programmatic lessons about the balance of power and the pitfalls of "helping others" or "doing good."

Paternalism, unequal relationships between the parties involved, and a tendency to focus on charity “doing for” or “helping” others rather than on supporting others to meet their own needs all become gaping pitfalls for program after well-intentioned program. (p. 11)

The final reason Jacoby presented for the failure to sustain service learning movements on college campuses was because professors realized that providing service experiences to students in community settings did not ensure that significant learning or service would result.

According to Jacoby (1996), the actual term *service learning* originated from the work of Sigmon and William Ramsey in 1967 through their work on the Southern Regional Education Board. From this point several different programs such as Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) emerged with a focus on service to communities. Some of these programs still exist while others have vanished. However, according to Jacoby, the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) was formed by fusing several different groups that focused on internships and experiential education.

The creation of organizations such as Campus Compact in 1985 served as a catalyst to create and support academically based community service in higher education in America. This resulted in a dramatic increase in civic engagement activities on college and university campuses across the United States. The Campus Compact organization was comprised of college and university presidents who “pledged to encourage and support academically based community service at their institutions” (Jacoby, 1996, p. 12).

As a result of the tremendous growth in service learning programs in the 1980s in academe, along with the increasing awareness of the importance of fusing service with learning, emphasized the need for the establishment of principles of best practice causing the NSEE to focus on ways to establish guiding principles. This burgeoning need led to the 1989 Wingspread

Conference hosted by the Johnson Foundation. At this conference principles of good practice in combining service and learning were identified (Jacoby, 1996). According to Honnet and Poulson (1993) a small advisory group met in May of 1989 and developed the preamble and guiding principles for the combination of service and learning in academe. This document was a special Wingspread report that outlined the 10 guiding principles for service programs to establish meaningful guidelines. These principles are focused around the needs of the students, recipients, and the community. According to Honnet and Poulson, these benefits were the ability to

- Develop a habit of critical reflection on their experiences, enabling them to learn more through life,
- Increase curiosity level and become motivated to learn,
- Perform better service,
- Strengthen their ethic of social and civic response,
- Feel more committed to addressing the underlying problems behind social issues,
- Understand the problems in a more complex way and can imagine alternative solutions,
- Demonstrate more sensitivity to how decisions are made and how institutional decisions affect people's lives,
- Learn how to work more collaboratively with other people on real problems,
[and]
- Realize that their lives can make a difference. (pp. 2-3)

Other concerns that emerged during this era were based around curricular needs.

According to Honnet and Poulson (1993), the 1989 Wingspread Report focused on three

fundamental issues common to all higher education institutions in the United States. These curricular needs were “taking values seriously, putting student learning first, and creating a nation of learners” (Honnet & Paulson, p. 7). The Wingspread group recommended that “colleges and universities organize and sustain community service programs for large numbers of students” (Jacoby, 1996, p. 14). But the acceptance of these guiding principles was slow to come in higher education.

In 1999, the Campus Compact’s “President’s Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education” was drafted by a distinguished group of scholars from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and members of the President’s Leadership Colloquium Committee in an attempt to encourage more college and university presidents to commit their colleges and universities across the country to “re-examine [their] public purposes and [their] commitments to the democratic ideal” (Erllich & Hollander, 1999, p. 1). Campuses were challenged to become more engaged “through actions and teaching, with its communities” (Erllich & Hollander, 1999, p. 1). These college and university leaders saw their fundamental task was to renew “our role as agents of our democracy” (Erllich & Hollander, 1999, p. 1). These leaders in academe continued,

This country cannot afford to educate a generation that acquires knowledge without ever understanding how that knowledge can benefit society or how to influence democratic decision making. We must teach the skills and values of democracy, creating innumerable opportunities for our students to practice and reap the results of the real, hard work of citizenship. (p. 1)

In this declaration, Erllich and Hollander addressed some of the pressing social needs facing the citizens of our country and pleaded for leaders in higher education to address these issues in

boardrooms and the classrooms. They asked these college and university administrators to join forces to make a conscience difference in the political and educational arenas of this nation. They ended their declaration by asking for “the renewal of our own democratic life and reassertion of social stewardship” (p. 2).

The second Wingspread report of 2003 (Holland et al., 2004) reviewed the current level of progress toward engaged campuses. After finding disappointing results, this report challenged institutions of higher learning to ask the question: “Is higher education ready to commit to community engagement?” (Holland, et al., 2004, p. ii). This report highlighted the barriers many colleges and universities faced when committing to embracing engagement as a part of their institutional missions. The second Wingspread report also informally assessed the current level of engagement in academe by using the results of a 2003 survey conducted by Campus Compact that indicated “four out of five of their member institutions have office support for community service and/or service learning and an impressive 93% have partnerships with one or more P-12 schools” (Holland, et al., 2004, p. 2). This built on the earlier Wingspread report of 1989 and the call to engagement in the Campus Compact’s President’s “Declaration on Civic Responsibility of Higher Education” and indicated that progress was being made in civic engagement in member institutions (Erlich & Hollander, 1999).

However, the second Wingspread report also addressed some of the harsh realities that still faced faculty and administrators in higher education as they moved toward engaged campuses. Committing to civic engagement required integration of the service learning approach to instruction into the mission of the college or university. It also required the local, regional, and global partners to share the overarching framework for meaningful engagement and faculty members to redefine their teaching pedagogy, often shifting from a teacher-directed, top-

down approach to one that is more student-driven and collaborative. All of these lofty goals, when achieved, would result in a change in the culture of the institution (Holland et al., 2004).

But this shift of focus to include service as a mission of academe required a cultural realignment for each college and university. Kezar (2001) described the cultural change in institutions as “a collective and shared phenomenon reflected at different levels through the organizational mission, through individual beliefs, and subconsciously” (p. 51). The change to a culture embracing the service learning pedagogy often required a perspective shift that resulted in a deep change in the organization that often happened slowly.

Theoretical Framework of Service Learning

The philosophical concept of experiential education can be traced back to the early 20th century and the progressive education movement when Dewey postulated that students learn best when they build upon what they already know (Morton & Troppe, 1996). Dewey also recognized that when students understand the purpose of what they are learning, their values are clarified (Eyler & Giles, 1999). Dewey felt learning occurred “through a cycle of action and reflection, not simply through being able to recount what has been learned through reading and lecture” (Eyler & Giles, 1999, pp. 8-9). This approach to learning has been labeled as pragmatism or a practical approach to education (Gutek, 1988).

Noddings (2007) expanded on Dewey’s views on experience and its link to education by stating, “Not only must there be continuity in educative experience, but the experience itself must have meaning for students’ here and now. There must be engagement—interaction between students and the objects of their study” (p. 32). Noddings, like Dewey, believed the new knowledge was based on prior knowledge and guided the inquiry as each new hypothesis was tested and conclusions were drawn.

According to Giles and Eyler (1994), service learning pedagogy was related to Kolb's experiential theory of learning, but it was not initially connected to Dewey's educational and social philosophy that included experience, reflective activity, citizenship, community, and democracy. Initially, service learning was considered as merely a social movement. Giles and Eyler emphasized the importance of developing a body of knowledge on service learning in order to move it toward a sound pedagogical educational practice. They believed that service learning encompassed both a philosophical framework and an approach to the educational process. Giles and Eyler stated, "For Dewey, pedagogy and epistemology were related—his theory of knowledge was related and derived from his notions of citizenship and democracy" (p. 78). They continued by stating,

While there appears to be no evidence that the concept of service learning was part of Dewey's formally stated philosophy of education, his philosophy of experience is central to his early works on pedagogy and his later philosophical works concerning epistemology. (p. 79)

Philosophical Foundation for Experiential Learning Theory in Higher Education

Kolb (1984) deemed Dewey as "undoubtedly, the most influential American educational theorist of the twentieth century" (p. 8). According to Kolb, Dewey felt the quality of the learning experience was based on two different aspects of the experience: agreeableness and effect on later experiences. From this philosophy, he developed the principle of continuity where all current experiences were built on previous ones and the principle of interaction where learning results from the interaction of the student with the environment causing the learning to be situational. Giles and Eyler (1994) stated that Dewey felt reflection was essential for this learning to be solidified. He felt the student must reflect both on the interaction and the

environment in which it occurred. To Dewey the reflection and the action were linked and both were required for learning to occur.

Dewey supporters have embraced his pedagogy that placed an emphasis on progressive education, but others have been critical to its lack of focus on the diverse cultures present in the American society (Gutek, 1988). According to Deans (1999) this has caused some scholars of educational theory to criticize Dewey's approach due to its omission of diversity issues. Dewey's view was one "that prioritized the need for transforming diverse cultures, languages and ideologies into one vision of the social good grounded in White, middle class values" (p. 18). Others have been critical of Dewey's lack of attention to the issues of power and dominance in the American culture.

Deans (1999) contended that another key scholar in the philosophical development of the pedagogy of service was Freire, a self-described radical. Freire's (1990) critical pedagogy also had a dramatic impact on the implementation of service learning in the academy. His ideas were shaped by his third-world context based on his Brazilian heritage. His educational philosophy was derived "on a critical understanding of the dynamics of political power and the dialectical relationship between the word (language or text) and the world (cultural context)" (Deans, 1999, p. 15). Freire's ambitious agenda for change focused on the "political transformation of individuals and society through literacy education, critical reflection, and collective social action" (Deans, 1999, p. 18).

Key to Freire's (1990) philosophy of education was the resistance to what he termed the banking approach to education, where the teacher routinely deposited information and knowledge into the students who were passively engaged in the learning process. Freire viewed knowledge as an active process that involved both dialogue and action that he defined as praxis.

Shor (1992) used such terms as “participatory, situated (in student thought and language), critical, democratic, desocializing, multi-cultural, research-oriented, activist, and affective” (pp. 33-34) to describe Freire’s philosophy of education.

According to Deans (1999), Freire described the role of the critical educator in institutions of higher learning as swimming against the tide. Deans stated that “there is a space, however small, in the practice of education, in the educative system as a subsystem; there is minimum space that we must use to our advantage” (p. 34). It is in this minimum space where there is room for service learning in the Freirian spirit to exist and even thrive under the right conditions.

Deans (1999) compared Freire’s critical pedagogy, with ambitions that were “no less than the political transformation of individuals and society through literacy education, critical reflection, and collective social action” (p. 19), with Dewey’s, who “wants learners to become active participants in the world” (p. 16). Freire (1990) based his critical pedagogy on ideas he shaped using a third world context of the social stratification he experienced in Brazil. He addressed the disparity of the distribution of wealth and the inequities of schooling, viewing it as Eurocentric or centered on the norms of Caucasians of European ancestry. Freire felt the need to transform society in order to eliminate the oppression that existed between the wealthy and the poor and accentuated the need to have meaningful, continuous dialogue between the oppressor and the oppressed.

Although both Dewey and Freire had tremendous impact on the thinking on service learning, Deans (1999) characterized Dewey’s approach as writing for the community while Freire’s approach was described as writing about the community. Both approaches to education provided a strong philosophical and pedagogical framework for service learning from two

differing perspectives. Both theorists supported the importance of experience in the learning process and “the intimate relationship between action, reflection and learning” (Deans, 1999, p. 27). There has been considerable overlap in the theoretical approach of Dewey and Freire to service learning in epistemology and the focus on action followed by reflection. However, the practical approaches to service range from the charity view where the participants help the oppressed of our society through a tangible method to the social justice approach while that seeks to lift the oppressed out of their oppression through social activism.

Service Learning Continuum: From Charity to Justice

When analyzing the philosophical and cognitive roots of service learning, I discovered two different schools of thought on the approaches to service learning as effective pedagogy for instruction that form a continuum with charity on one end, based on the philosophies of Dewey, and justice on the other, based on a Freirian philosophy. The philosophical beliefs of Dewey and Freire have been implemented in a variety of settings with differing approaches to service learning activities. Although each perspective includes the action–reflection step to create the cognitive dissonance necessary for learning to occur, there has been debate surrounding the actual approach to these service learning activities.

Foos (1998) described these approaches as two distinctly different perspectives that form a continuum ranging from acts from a charity perspective on one end to acts from a social justice perspective designed to create social change on the opposite end. Foos described the charity end of this continuum as where students could “get their feet wet and develop a desire to do service” (p. 14). According to Foos, when instructors “encourage students to move away from charity to social activism” (p. 14), they place students at the other end of the continuum, labeling the social justice activities as more mature than the charity-oriented service learning activities. Foos added

that others reject the continuum theory of charity and social justice, preferring to approach them as two distinctly different perspectives.

Marullo and Edwards (2000) criticized the charity approach to service learning when they stated that acts of charity served to reinforce the status quo of society's inequities rather than moving students and recipients toward examining the root causes of such injustices. They reported that critics of the service learning pedagogy argued that the charity approach perpetuated rather than addressed these social injustices. Marullo and Edwards reported: "Institutional elites currently benefiting from the status quo have self-interest in opposing such transformational initiatives and possess considerable resources with which to do so" (p. 10). This appears to support Dewey's views of the great community. Marullo and Edwards maintained that the proper approach to service learning was to develop "the sensitivities and skills needed to become advocates for those in need" (p. 3). They stated that the purpose of service learning from a social justice perspective should be to aid recipients in overcoming isolation and alienation in order to help them become connected and whole. The concluding statements of Marullo and Edwards reiterated the words of Ghandi, a great proponent for social justice. The following quote summarizes their view of service learning pedagogy. "Gandhi taught that it is not enough to do the right thing for the wrong reasons. One's reasons for doing good works must also be good" (Marullo & Edwards, 2000, p. 12). Marullo and Edwards argued that care must be taken by those incorporating this pedagogy into their classrooms to "channel the vast resources of volunteerism toward social change for a more just society" (p. 13).

The social justice perspective to service learning has been grounded in the philosophy of Freire. According to Jacoby (1996), the civil rights movement of the 1960s motivated many college students to become actively engaged in their communities with a focus on social justice

issues. She addressed the goal of active citizenship and participation in the democratic process with this form of experiential activity. Jacoby claimed,

Another shared goal among institutions of higher education is to develop students' appreciation of human differences and commonalities and to teach individuals to live peacefully and productively in communities that value persons of different races, genders, physical and mental abilities, religions, class backgrounds, and sexual orientations. (p. 22)

Jacoby asserted that reciprocity was the factor that created respect in the exchange between student and recipient in the service learning approach. This moved service learning away from the traditional paternalistic approach to service by encouraging students to do things with others rather than for others. This opens the discussion to the moral implications of this pedagogy.

Kohlberg's Moral Development Theory

According to Evans, et al. (2010), Kohlberg's theory of moral development expanded Piaget's research on reasoning in children. This research led Kohlberg to identify a six-stage, hierarchical sequence of moral reasoning based on justice, equality, fairness, and reciprocity that could be further divided into three sublevels. These levels represented the development of justice, where human beings see the value and equality for people and reciprocity in human relations. According to Jacoby (1996), Kohlberg's extensive research, conducted exclusively on young men, found that individuals were able to understand moral reasoning at only one level beyond their current stage. She reported three key implications for service learning educators:

First, it is the complexity of students' moral reasoning that is the focus of moral development, not the specific moral judgments or decisions. Second, because moral development is promoted through dialogue and interchange, service learning educators

should design interactive opportunities such as group discussions to enable students to examine thoughtfully the moral dilemmas raised in their service experience. Finally, service learning educators should design reflection based on the premise that students process moral issues and discussions through their individual cognitive structures and are able to understand complexity of reasoning only one level beyond their own level of moral development. (p. 66)

These implications speak to the pedagogy of service learning and the approach taken by faculty members using this pedagogical approach.

Ethic of Justice. Kohlberg's (1981) research has been credited with the ethic of justice that focuses on general rules and universal moral judgments. Strike (1999) attributed this view of education as one that focuses on equity and sameness. However he linked this view of education back to Dewey when he stated,

Anyone fully acquainted with Dewey's work would know that Dewey wanted an education for each child that would match that child's interests and capabilities. An advocate of justice, using deeper interpretations of Dewey's words, would seek an equity that took account of differences. (p. 13)

This view of moral development fails to consider contextual issues, viewing it as universal and hierarchical.

Gilligan (2003) described the ethic of justice supported by Kohlberg's view of moral development as one that "speaks to the disconnections which are at the roots of violence, violation, and oppression, or the unjust use of unequal power" (p. 159). She called for the reframing of psychology currently based on the patriarchal perspective. Gilligan contended this reframing would "change the conception of the human world; in doing so, it establishes the

ground for a different philosophy, a different political theory, a change in ethics and legal theory” (p. 157). She felt that “theorizing connection as primary and fundamental in human life directs attention to the growing body of supporting evidence which cannot be incorporated within the old perspective” (p. 157).

Gilligan’s Theory of Moral Development

Gilligan (1982) expanded Kohlberg’s (1981) theory by adding a different voice to moral reasoning related to gender. Her psychological theory of women’s moral development focused on the development of women and their differences in approaching relationships. Gilligan challenged the work of Kohlberg, whose research completed solely with young men focused on justice and rights as the context for moral orientation, with individuals evaluating moral dilemmas within this context. Gilligan contended that women’s development of morality centered on care and responsibility as a moral compass because their relationships developed differently than men. She stated,

For boys and men, separation from the mother is essential for the development of masculinity. For girls and women, issues of femininity or feminine identity do not depend on the achievement of separation from the mother or on the achievement of separation. Since masculinity is defined through separation while femininity is defined through attachment, male gender identity is threatened by intimacy while female identity is threatened by separation. (p. 8)

Gilligan’s (1982) theory was developed because she was interested “in women’s relationships to this societal and cultural transformation because the history of this relationship is in danger of being buried” (p. 158). Her theory evolved into three levels of moral development and two transition phases. Each level identified a more intricate relationship between self and

others. Evans et al. (2010) described these stages as *orientation to individual survival, goodness as self-sacrifice, and the morality of nonviolence*. Jacoby (1996) added implications for service learning based on Gilligan's research. Jacoby argued that adding service learning to course content provided the opportunity for students to view how the "underlying moral imperative of care and nonviolence ('do no harm') frequently competes with the moral imperative of rights and justice" (p. 67).

Hatcher (1997) contended that faculty could not ignore the role of moral development in the implementation of a pedagogy that embraced service learning in college classrooms. She linked this back to the philosophy of Dewey and his view of the great society. Hatcher asserted that service learning was congruent with key concepts of Dewey's educational philosophy where, "(a) education must develop individual capacities, (b) education must engage citizens in association with one another, and (c) education must promote humane conditions" (p. 23). She concluded by addressing the challenge of transforming theory into practical application.

Hatcher (1997) addressed the moral dimensions of Dewey's educational philosophy through the lens of undergraduate education. She identified five characteristics of quality undergraduate education that emerge from Dewey's philosophy. These characteristics of good undergraduate education were consistent with the pedagogy of service learning and challenged students to reflect on experiences in the community. Hatcher stated, "Service learning challenges students to reflect on their community service in such a way that the service experience enhances course learning, broadens understanding of the discipline, and clarifies values that can lead to civic responsibility" (p. 27). Hatcher shared her personal experiences with incorporating service learning into under-prepared first year students. She concluded through her research and experiences "that service learning is consistent with the moral

dimensions of education in a democracy. Service learning has multiple outcomes for the public good” (p. 27).

Ethic of Care. Anderson (2004) framed care ethics as an approach that provides an alternative moral voice by focusing on “connections, relationships and affective responses” (p. 1) rooted in Addams’s (1964) view of democracy and social ethics. This care ethic was based on Gilligan’s research on moral development and focused on relationships and contextual judgments as an extension of Kohlberg’s research with young males. Strike (1999) contrasted the ethic of care with the ethic of justice by stating, “An ethic of care, it is said, emphasizes relationships, and contextual judgments, and has a situated self” (p. 23).

Tronto (1998) explored the nature of care and the various perspectives it entails. These perspectives take in both the emotional aspects of care as well as the actual physical activities it involves. She provided a broader understanding of care ethics to include both of these perspectives and developed a broad definition of care ethics. She viewed care ethics as,

a species activity that includes everything that we do to maintain, continue, and repair our “world” so that we can live in it as well as possible. That world includes our bodies, ourselves, and our environment, all of which we seek to interweave in a complex, “life sustaining web.” (p. 16)

Tronto (1998) pointed to the complicated nature of several aspects of care by stating, “Care is fraught with conflict” (p. 17). She also acknowledged care as a form of power relationship where “the caregiver has some kind of ability, knowledge, or resources that the care receiver does not have” (p. 17).

Tronto’s (1998) theory identified four distinct stages of the aspects of care that are linked with a corresponding virtue, as cited by Keller, Nelson, and Wick (2003). Keller et al. provided

a clear explanation of these stages. They described the first stage as the initial recognition that there is a need for some type of care to occur. At this stage, the caregiver both recognizes the need for care and assesses how this need could be met. The virtue attributed to the first stage of care is attentiveness. This stage is followed by the second stage that involves the caregiver taking some type of responsibility for the care of the issue that needs to be addressed. The virtue attributed with the second stage is responsibility. The third stage involves that actual action of providing the needed care. Competence is the virtue that corresponds with this level of care. The final level identified in the care giving process is when the needs of the recipient have been met. The virtue attributed to this stage is responsiveness. However, Tronto (1998) pointed out that each of these phases of care was devalued in our present society because care giving has been attributed to the less powerful in our society.

Keller et al. (2003) examined the use of service learning in a “feminism and families” course to determine if this pedagogy promoted a socially conservative agenda. They criticized the ethic of care by stating “that this approach reflects a feminine behavior of self-sacrificial care for others under oppressive conditions, rather than providing a feminist ethic that will strengthen women’s sense of agency and activism” (p. 40). They asserted that this approach highlights the conservative social agenda that failed to equally respect those who function from the caregiver perspective.

Keller et al. (2003) contended there were three major criticisms of this moral perspective. The first issue dealt with the imbalance of genders embracing this perspective finding it disproportionately tipping toward females. The second major criticism focused on the possibility of students’ viewing those they assisted during their service activities as having individual deficiencies, personal inadequacy, and/or moral weakness. “Thus while actively serving

individuals, students may remain blind to the essentially political problems underlying the situations they are encountering” (Keller, et al. 2003, p. 41). The final criticism of the ethic of care approach to service learning “is the limited exposure to diverse populations may actually strengthen stereotypes and many students’ sense of privilege, rather than encouraging them to examine the intersection of race, gender, and class with power in our society” (Keller, et al., p. 41).

Keller et al. (2003) concluded in their study that the reflective sessions “gave students the opportunity to look more objectively at their service, to step back from the urgent demands placed on them while serving, and to analyze not only *what* was going on, but *why*” (p. 44). The researchers concluded that this experience provided abundant opportunities for their students to connect the theories surrounding the issues of poverty from the classroom to the actual go beyond “the purely personal and immediate situation to raise broader theoretical and political questions about the provision of care in our society” (p. 48).

Kolb’s Cognitive Theory

Morton and Troppe (1996) asserted that service learning theory began with the assumption that experience was the foundation for learning. This form of experiential learning has been rooted in cognitive and developmental psychology, pragmatic philosophy, and democratic theory. This broad theoretical base was a prime reason for the wide range of definitions and value systems that plague this pedagogical approach to instruction. Morton and Troppe addressed this inability to determine a singular definition of service learning as the primary reason that the pedagogy be based on a “set of common assumptions of how people learn” (p. 21). From a sociological perspective, service learning could be “rooted in the formal

and informal systems humans have developed to care for one another” (Morton & Troppe, 1996, p. 21).

The service learning theory was grounded in the assumption that experience was the foundation for learning. This premise linked back to the writings of Addams (1964) and Dewey (1938). Jacoby (1996) introduced the connection of the service learning theory with the theory of experiential learning developed by Kolb. Kolb’s theory was directly based on the legacy of Dewey and Dewey’s view of experience as the foundation for learning. The experiential learning theory in training developed by Lewin (1951), and the experiential component of cognitive development developed by Piaget (1973) also strongly influenced Kolb’s theory of cognitive development. This theory professed that learning consisted of a four-step process: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation.

The root of cognitive development through service learning can be traced back to the experiential learning theory developed by Kolb (1984) where education, work, and personal development were closely linked. As Kolb developed his theory of experiential learning, he focused on Piaget’s studies on cognitive development in children. Piaget’s (1973) theory of cognitive development emerged from naturalistic research focused on how children learn through interactions with their environment. Piaget’s work identified four distinct, hierarchical stages of cognitive growth. Kolb (1984) reiterated Piaget’s belief that, “Intelligence is not an innate internal characteristic of the individual, but arises as a product of the interaction between the person and his or her environment” as quoted in (Kolb, 1984, p. 12). Piaget (1973) viewed action as the key to learning and argued that children proceeded through different levels or stages ending with the ability to think in abstract form during adolescence. Piaget focused on knowledge obtained through assimilation and accommodation where new information is taken

into the brain forcing it to accommodate or redesign the current level of knowledge to include this new segment. Describing how intelligence was formed through experience could best summarize Piaget's theory of cognitive development. This theory saw learning as a continuous holistic process not based on outcomes, but rather on the adaptation to the world.

Kolb's (1984) view of cognitive development was deeply rooted in the works of both Piaget and Lewin. Kolb stated, "Learning is a process whereby knowledge was created through transformation of experience" (p. 38). He expanded Dewey's theory by adding organizational development and modern participative management philosophies purported by Lewin (1951). Kolb contended that four processes must be present in this cycle for learning to occur. These processes are active experimentation in a learning experience free from bias, reflective observation grounded in one's own experiences, theoretical conceptualization causing the formation, and integration of ideas, followed by incorporation of new ideas that are applied to prior learning.

Kolb (1984) found several common themes that were congruent with his theory of cognitive development and the theories he derived from his study of Piaget and Lewin. Taken together, several major premises could be identified. The first of these was that learning could be best described as a process rather than an outcome. Each theorist determined that learning was formed and reformed through experience. Second, this learning was a result of experience and was a continual process. This finding made it the most important job of an educator to instill new ideas while modifying and refining current beliefs. This made it imperative for an educator to introduce new ideas and modify or dispose of old ones. The third concept shared by Piaget, Lewin, and Kolb expanded on the idea of the continual nature of learning as addressing conflicts between "dialectically opposed modes of adaptation to the world" (Kolb, p. 29). Educators

could describe this phenomenon as cognitive dissonance. The fourth common theme stated that learning is a holistic process that involves thinking, feeling, perceiving, and behaving. This learning was initiated through interactions between the individual and the environment. The final major theme described learning as the process of creating knowledge through an epistemological and psychological inquiry. This made it imperative to understand the nature of knowledge to understand the many dimensions of learning (Kolb, 1984).

Jacoby (1996) summarized three major implications of Kolb's experiential learning theory for the service learning pedagogy. Jacoby contended,

First, a course or other experience should be structured to present multiple opportunities continually to enable students to move completely and frequently through the learning cycle. Second, Kolb's model underscores how central and important reflection is to the entire process of learning. Third, in Kolb's model, reflection *follows* direct and concrete experience and *precedes* abstract conceptualization and generalization. (p. 69)

According to Jacoby (1996), a faculty member would design the learning experience to guide the students through this process first by providing readings, lecture, and discussion of the root causes of the social problem. This would set the stage for the service activity that would be followed by the written reflection. The instructor would provide the structure necessary to support the students' connections with the theory in a way that encourages questions and in-depth dialogue.

Faculty and Service Learning: What Does the Research Say?

Today's service learning practitioners must begin with self-awareness and move to align their philosophical approach with one grounded in theory. This process begins with being well-versed in the current research and practice on service learning pedagogy. Jacoby (1996) stressed

the importance of institutional support for such activities to ensure such initiatives fall under a true service learning model and are not merely community service focused on charity.

Jacoby (1996) reiterated Chickering and Gamson's seven principles for quality undergraduate education and stressed how these principles must be mirrored in quality service learning projects. These principles focused on the interactions between faculty and students in an active, cooperative learning process. The importance of prompt instructor feedback and high levels of student engagement were also stressed. This approach to learning accommodates the diversity of student backgrounds and learning styles while placing importance on the pedagogy of service learning with its emphasis on the reflection process. The action-reflection requirements of service learning pedagogy supply the catalyst for discussions about issues facing the faculty, students, and recipients of services provided through service learning.

From Traditional to Service Learning Pedagogy. Cone and Harris (1996) purported that "a genuine service learning pedagogy requires careful thought about how people learn experientially" (p. 32). As previously stated, this pedagogy is grounded in the experiential theory model developed by Kolb (1984). Kolb's four step model was based on Dewey's six step inquiry process described earlier. However, the development of a pedagogy that embraced service learning requires a perspective shift for the instructor from teacher-driven to student-driven learning.

Clayton and Ash (2004) described the pedagogy of service learning as unique, challenging, and transformative. They reported that this "uniqueness can lead to degrees of dissonance, frustration, and uncertainty" (p. 59). However, the confrontation of this cognitive dissonance creates a foundation for change making it a vital component in 21st century education. Clayton and Ash viewed "the task of the educator as helping to empower creative,

expressive, reflective, self-directed learners who are capable of tapping the learning potential of all of their experiences and thus living more effectively in an uncertain world” (p. 60). This challenge makes service learning pedagogy an effective choice in meeting these challenging goals. However, Clayton and Ash addressed this enormous change from the traditional approach to learning and labeled it counter-normative because implementing this pedagogy dramatically shifts “almost every facet of teaching and learning” (p. 60).

This shift in instructional approach often causes stress and anxiety in both instructor and learner who both must view the experience through a different lens than when in classrooms where instructors use the traditional teacher-driven approach. Clayton and Ash (2004) described the shift in pedagogy as dynamic where learning “unfolds as a wave of incoming cognitive dissonance, which instructors ride with students” (p. 60). This wave initially begins with student enthusiasm and moves to an area of uncertainty as students and instructors begin to comprehend this shift in instructional approach. However, according to Clayton and Ash, the results of this shift in approach to instruction creates opportunities beyond those experiences in traditional classroom settings. They affirmed the reflection component of the service learning approach provides the trigger to a new awareness and allows for a critical analysis of the event that created opportunities for open-ended, ambiguous questioning to occur. It is through this dialogue that the student and the instructor often enhance understanding of the meaning of the experience, which allows for deeper levels of learning.

Clayton and Ash (2004) identified several specific strategies to transform the classes they taught from a traditional approach to one that embraced service learning. At the crux of this change was faculty training accompanied by support from other faculty members using this approach to learning. They maintained that instructors “explore the value and limitations of

traditional pedagogies and service learning so that they can incorporate a mix that is appropriate to their objectives” (p. 66). An added benefit to this approach was the ability of the faculty members to better understand their own awareness of themselves and their ability to articulate this to others.

Encouragement of Faculty Use of the Service Learning Pedagogy

Several studies have been conducted that address the effectiveness of service learning pedagogy and ways to encourage faculty to implement a service learning component in their classrooms (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Franco, 2007; Hesser, 1995; Levine, 1994). Levine (1994) addressed several steps needed to get faculty members interested in incorporating community service learning experiences into their coursework. The first of these is the assumption that faculty would initiate this pedagogy without persuasion from a colleague, dean, department chair, or president. The process of incorporating a community service learning project must be supported financially by the institutions and followed by incentives to reward faculty who shift to this pedagogical approach. Couple this with the need to respect this pedagogy and the need to support it with adequate professional development and scholarship opportunities to create a strong foundation for student learning through service learning pedagogy, and the magnitude of this challenge becomes clearer.

Levine (1994) felt it was the faculty’s obligation to prepare students for the harsh realities they may face in the real world setting of service learning. Levine stated, “Instructors must approach service learning with an appropriate critical distance. Instead of preaching the virtues of voluntarism and service, professors must be prepared to show service with all of its warts” (p. 113). Levine believed the pedagogical approach faculty members were urged to pursue should be one that offered a balanced perspective of the activities involved. For faculty members

to embrace the pedagogy of service learning, administrators must be willing to provide adequate opportunities for scholarship and professional development to prepare faculty for this change in course delivery approach. Finally, Levine stressed the importance of adequate recognition and rewards for faculty who pursued this avenue of instruction. This recognition must be systematic and address the appreciation of the college and the community for the importance of their service.

Rooting civic engagement in the mission statements of many colleges and universities occurred during the 1980s. This movement shifted the focus of teaching from instructor-driven to needs-driven (Hesser, 1995). Couple this with the germinal developments that connected educational research with sound teaching and learning practices and the impetus of this new approach was born. Hesser attributed the decade of the 1980s as “a classic example of the social construction of reality and knowledge” (p. 39). Add this with the funding that became available for professional development through the Campus Compact organization and the movement to focus on civic engagement emerged. This movement led to the change in attitudes of many faculty members whose traditional teaching methods began to shift toward the pedagogy of community service learning.

Often the topic of faculty attitudes must be addressed when encouraging seasoned faculty members to change their methods of instruction. Hesser (1995) completed a qualitative research study in an attempt to determine if combining service and learning contributed to desired learning outcomes. He investigated reasons why faculty members moved from skepticism to affirmation of the service learning approach to instruction. Interviews were conducted with 48 faculty members at 16 different institutions across several disciplines. The research results indicated that significant changes had occurred in faculty views of experiential education through

service learning. Many reasons were cited for this change in attitude. First and foremost was the progress that had been made in the theory and practice in the field of experiential education.

This was followed by the emergence of a professional development movement spearheaded by the Campus Compact organization and support from major foundations. According to Hesser, these developments had a profound impact on the expansion of the service learning pedagogy in the academy.

Deterrents to Service Learning Pedagogy

The review of studies addressing limitations and deterrents to the incorporation of service learning fell into five general categories: institutional support, faculty workload issues, promotion/reward issues, outcome measurement, and philosophical differences. Central to these concerns is the institutional support for this approach to instruction. Butin (2006) expressed a common concern as the existence of the appropriate infrastructure to support service learning activities. This includes community partnerships and college financial support.

According to Abes, et al. (2002), the main concern of many faculty members was with level of logistical support for the use of this pedagogical approach at the institutional level with the allocation of adequate resources and/or failure to embed this pedagogy into the college mission and core values. Schäubelt and Statham (2007) addressed the changing nature of scholarship when they spoke to the lack of clearly defined expectations for service activities by college and university deans and department heads. Discussion included the lack of consistency in definitions of what actually constituted service. They asserted that “institutions should focus on forming contextually specific definitions of engaged scholarship, then robust mechanisms/processes for assessing this work that comply with faculty conceptions of scholarship” (p. 29). According to McKay and Rozee (2004), many faculty members were

concerned with the potential for a negative impact on their faculty evaluation. Other issues deterring faculty from implementing a service learning pedagogy are the additional time constraints many faculty face with their instructional and research duties and a lack of its congruence with other scholarly pursuits (McKay & Rozee 2004; Pribbenow, 2005).

Schäubelt and Statham (2007) further stated that, despite the promotion over this form of scholarship over the past 20 years, “little consensus exists around the meaning and value of service as a faculty role” (p. 29). Butin (2006) argued that additional concerns focused on the recognition of college faculty incorporating this approach and the opportunities for them to provide support to other interested faculty. However, the impact of service learning on the tenure process was not viewed as a major deterrent to its implementation (Abes, et al., 2002; Pribbenow, 2005). Other common concerns addressed by these researchers were the shortage of concrete evidence that service learning improves academic outcomes and the ability to link these activities to all academic disciplines. Another issue addressed by McKay and Rozee (2004) was “the concern over ensuring the students received the experiences needed to fulfill course requirements” (p. 29).

Abes, et al. (2002) identified yet another deterrent to service learning as the lack of knowledge and professional development opportunities for faculty on how to effectively use this approach. This makes thorough research essential when utilizing this approach. McKay and Rozee (2004) pointed to technical issues that could underlie successful service learning experiences. Battistoni (2002) summarized a list of barriers to civic engagement in higher education based on his 12 years of experience spanning three different campuses and his work with the Campus Compact organization. He listed the departmental/pedagogical barriers as

- Time resources for implementation; engagement is seen as an “add-on”

- Inequitable workloads, compensation for part-time or pre-tenured faculty, for whom civic engagement is an imposition
- Lack of tangible support, or at the very least, mixed messages from academic leadership
- Hostility/resistance from influential faculty
- Adding to an already-full course; fear of a loss of disciplinary content when doing community-based engagement
- Getting from concrete experience to abstract concepts and theories
- Little or no sense of collective responsibility; courses not seen as “proprietary” by individuals
- Student/faculty ratios that are not conducive to civic engagement
- Reward system, especially promotion or tenure guidelines, not supportive. (p. 52)

Although an avid supporter of incorporation of service learning into coursework, Battistoni (2002) stressed the importance of considering the diversity perspective and its impact in the view of what it means to be a democratic citizen. He maintained that this included looking closely at the skill levels of the students and the connection of these skills to the service learning content and pedagogy. A second important point Battistoni emphasized was that service alone does not automatically lead to an engaged citizenship: only if we construct our courses with the education of democratic citizens (broadly understood) in mind can service learning be one of the vehicles by which we reinvigorate our rapidly deteriorating public life. (p. 55)

These deterrents point to the need for further research in the area of service learning to clearly establish its viability as a usable approach to learning in college and university classrooms.

Positive Outcomes for Faculty Embracing Service Learning Pedagogy

As more faculty members embraced this new pedagogy, common characteristics began to emerge. Hammond (1994) completed a quantitative research study of 250 faculty members across a variety of public and private institutions in Michigan. This study was completed using data collected by a questionnaire that focused on three issues: faculty motivation to use service learning pedagogy, their level of satisfaction with its use, and the intersection between the two. Findings of this study included several dimensions of faculty approaches to service learning. Hammond found that faculty interested in service learning were “driven more by curricular concerns than by personal or co-curricular issues” (p. 27). These faculty members were also motivated by the academic freedom they experienced that allowed them to select this approach to instruction. The sense of meaning and purpose coupled with the positive feedback from students and colleagues contributed to their persistence with this approach to instruction.

Abes et al. (2002) surveyed faculty at 29 diverse institutions of higher learning that were members of the Ohio Campus Compact Organization to determine factors that motivated or deterred them from implementing service learning into their coursework. They found several common significant institutional factors that impacted the use of community service learning by faculty members. The strongest motivator to faculty members who incorporated service learning into coursework was the results of the student learning outcomes. This research finding supported Hammond’s (1994) finding that curricular concerns were the strongest motivator to use of this pedagogy. This finding was also upheld by Bringle, Phillips and Hudson (2004),

when they found that a strong connection to concrete learning outcomes was crucial to faculty implementation of this approach to teaching. A lesser motivator came with the university–community partnerships that were formed with this approach. These findings indicate a strong link between this pedagogy and the student learning outcomes faculty desire.

McKay and Rozee (2004) analyzed 32 structured interviews completed at a large, Southwestern university. Interview questions designed to determine the characteristics of faculty using the service learning approach expanded on the research of Abes et al. (2002) to determine what internal factors prompted faculty to embrace the community service learning pedagogy when institutional support was in place. McKay and Rozee contended that a change in culture underpinned the change in pedagogy. Achieving this cultural change required dedication to civic engagement in the institution's strategic plan. One theme McKay and Rozee identified was the need for this cultural shift to be supported by professional development opportunities geared toward implementation of service learning pedagogy. Strong community partnerships were also found to be a crucial motivating factor for faculty involvement in community service learning activities.

Findings of McKay and Rozee's (2004) study indicated several characteristics common to faculty who adopted the service learning approach. These faculty members were seen as risk-takers motivated to adopt the service learning pedagogy as a person-centered teaching innovation because it blended with their personal beliefs about teaching. McKay and Rozee asserted that professors advocating this approach valued the interpersonal connections among faculty, students, and the community. These professors were willing and even anxious to share and exchange information with other faculty to assist them with course development. As new faculty members came together to discuss this innovation and its usefulness, more began to adopt this

pedagogy, and a shift in college culture began to occur at many levels. McKay and Rozee (2004) addressed faculty opinions about this sector of academe when they stated, “Members come and go, but the process itself is ‘self-sustaining’ and continues to accelerate in its own growth and development as long as the time, energy, and resources to support it are maintained” (p. 30). These faculty members firmly believed that adopting this innovative pedagogy connected strongly with their personal attitudes, beliefs, and values and made it worthy of the risk despite its ambiguity. They adopted this pedagogy even when faced with opposition from colleagues. However, this study concluded that professional development opportunities for faculty were crucial to sustaining this change.

Pribbenow (2005) used an embedded case study approach at an independent Catholic university located in the center of a large, urban Midwestern city. In-depth interviews were conducted with 35 faculty and teaching staff to determine the impact of using the service learning pedagogy on faculty members. He categorized the service learning pedagogy as a counter-normative model. Six themes emerged from Pribbenow’s study. Although this approach to teaching provided many challenges for faculty members, they reported an increased commitment to teaching because of the meaningful engagement service learning provided. This increased connection to teaching also led to a greater connection to other faculty members using this approach. A greater understanding of students that led to deeper faculty–student connections was also reported by the faculty involved in this study. These connections allowed faculty to enhance their knowledge of how students learned and provided them opportunities to understand student learning outcomes from a different perspective. This increased awareness of how students learned led to a reevaluation of “how knowledge is constructed and the role of

authority in the classroom” (Pribbenow, 2005, p. 30). One surprising theme that developed was the improved communication of theoretical concepts. Pribbenow reported,

All faculty members interviewed mentioned increased awareness of community organizations and, in many cases, a better understanding of their needs. For these faculty, this increased awareness allowed them to be more productive in the classroom and more aligned with their students by making available new, relevant examples and contexts for connecting theory to practice. (p. 32)

The final theme that emerged from these interviews was the “greater involvement in a community of teachers and learners” (Pribbenow, 2005, p. 33). While not directly related to pedagogy, this theme had the potential for great impact on the teaching and learning process. This sense of community and collegiality allowed for a decreased sense of isolation and a greater commitment to the institution for the faculty participating in this study.

Gonsalves (2008) conducted a phenomenological qualitative research study that viewed service learning from the faculty perspective at a midsized, doctoral granting university located in the American Southwest. Two interviews were conducted with four different faculty members representing different genders, ages, and disciplines to determine the perspectives of each on the use of service learning in higher education. Gonsalves identified three common themes in these perspectives. The first theme found that using service learning as an instructional approach opened the minds and hearts of the students and faculty. Faculty reported use of this approach because they believed it benefitted students. The second theme connected the service learning opportunities as a vehicle of change. Faculty reported this change both in the students who were given more responsibility for their learning and also in their teaching and research making them feel less compartmentalized. The final theme was that the use of service learning was congruent

with the worldview and personal value system rather than based on a specific philosophical platform. Gonsalves found “the participants valued and emphasized compassion and empathy” (p. 234). She went on to state, “Beyond compassion, the participants believed that engaging with the larger whole, the larger world and contributing to the well being of others leads to personal fulfillment and some hoped the students would discover this.” (p. 235).

There were many examples of positive outcomes reported in the studies discussed in this section. Although there was no decisive overall common theme, the benefit to students and faculty were addressed in each study in a positive way. However, one cannot focus just on the positive attributes of service learning, but the researcher must uncover the drawbacks and problems associated with this pedagogy.

Faculty Concerns with Service Learning Pedagogy

Kezar and Rhoads (2001) described the components of the dynamic tensions of service learning in higher education. They argued that this tension existed in many areas of higher education beginning at the institutional level and filtering down to both the student affairs and academic areas of colleges and universities. Although this research focused on service learning at the institutional level, it also addressed tensions faced by faculty with the association of service learning within the formal curricula, the ramifications of adopting this pedagogy, and the impact of embracing the service learning pedagogy on the promotion and tenure process in four-year institutions. Kezar and Rhoads traced the changing role of faculty response to public criticism of higher education that occurred in the 1980s and 1990s. This criticism charged institutions of higher learning to examine their “lack of curricular relevance, lack of faculty committed to teaching, and lack of institutional (and faculty) responsiveness to the larger public good” (Kezar & Rhoads, 2001, p. 150). This caused service learning activities to rise and

spurred many faculty members to rethink their pedagogical approach to teaching and embrace the service learning approach to learning.

The pedagogical limits of service learning were documented by Butin (2006). He claimed that there was a dichotomy between disciplines labeling some as soft such as liberal arts and health while others were labeled hard such as physics and chemistry. Hard disciplines rated content as cumulative, leaving no room for a service learning component. Butin addressed the issues of the “divergence of teaching methods and assessment procedures” (p. 480) as problematic when 83% of faculty used the lecture as the primary source of instruction. This finding was consistent across disciplines, institutions, and faculty rank. This resulted in antipathy toward the service learning pedagogy in many disciplines. Butin contended, “Thus, irrespective of disciplinary and epistemological differences, the vast majority of faculty in higher education see themselves as embodying the normative (read: non service learning oriented) model of teaching and learning” (p. 481). A familiar refrain was the concern over balancing their professional responsibilities with their concern for the students’ ability to master the course material.

Service Learning in the Community College

Research indicates that service learning pedagogy is not practiced exclusively at four-year institutions. Many community colleges embrace this pedagogy despite their unique differences from four-year institutions in student and faculty demographics. One must consider the niche community colleges fill in academe to fully understand both the commonalities and differences in approaches to service learning by faculty (Cohen & Brawer, 2008).

History of Community Colleges

The idea of expanded educational opportunities for Americans first emerged in the 1940s after the passage of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. Due to the large influx of students entering college as a result of this new legislation, President Truman formed a citizen panel in 1946, the Truman Commission, whose purpose was to examine and define the future role of higher education in the United States. According to Burke (2008), the term *community college* was first coined during the Truman administration and the Commission on Higher Education for American Democracy in 1947. This citizen panel determined that higher education should "aid students in acquiring knowledge, skills and attitudes to enable them to live rightfully and willingly in a free society" (Cohen & Brawer, 2008, pp. 48-49). This view of the purpose of higher education carried the views of Dewey's (1938) great community forward, opened the doors to higher education to the masses, and led to the birth of two-year institutions of higher learning.

During the 1950s and 1960s, two-year institutions were commonly referred to as junior colleges. These institutions were usually branches of private universities, whereas community colleges were most commonly associated with public institutions (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Jones-Kavalier and Flannigan (2008) asserted that junior college doors were often closed to citizens within a community and diverse populations. These issues were not addressed until the junior colleges shifted to community colleges during the 1960s. These institutions "reached out to attract those who were not being served by traditional higher education" (Jones-Kavalier & Flannigan, 2008, p. 33). One of the goals of this commission was to remove the barriers to educational opportunities for students of all ages and socioeconomic levels for "technical and

liberal arts education for personal, professional and social development” (Jones-Kavalier & Flannigan, 2008, p. 4).

According to Cohen and Brawer (2008), community colleges developed in the United States in the second half of the twentieth century as a result of the boom of students entering higher education as a result of the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944. They contended that community colleges were the primary reason that educational opportunities became available to women, ethnic minority, and low-income students. Couple this demand for access with the inception of the Pell grant and the picture of a community college student became clearer. Initially, the community college was seen as a buffer for underprepared students desiring admittance to four-year institutions. Another consideration for the early success of the community college was the need for a ready, trained source of workers to support the burgeoning economy. Cohen and Brawer maintained

that community leaders saw the formation of a college as an avenue to community prestige. Even the notion of a grand scheme to keep the poor people in their place by diverting them to programs leading to low-pay occupational positions has found acceptance, particularly among those who perceive a capitalist conspiracy behind all societal events. (p. 10)

According to Vaughn (2000), the community college combined the characteristics of public high schools, private junior colleges, and four-year colleges and universities to expand the educational opportunities for the American public.

Contemporary community colleges were developed during the 1950s and 1960s with a primary focus of making college accessible to the growing masses of students who entered the higher education system after World War II. Many members of the higher education

community often regarded the community college as a peripheral part of the collegiate system, yet the community colleges played a vital role in increasing the educational attainment of the population of the United States (Pascarella, 1997). Community colleges adhered to an open admission policy and “have enrolled students who are often of modest means that have been hindered by an inadequate education” (Carey, 2004, p. 24). Palmer (1998) maintained that many entering students had academic deficiencies requiring remediation.

Birnbaum (1988) described community college systems as bureaucratic, with most interactions occurring in subunits that were often very specialized rather than with administrators. Birnbaum defined the functions of these types of organizations as those that “are established to efficiently relate organizational programs to the achievement of specified goals” (p. 107). The effect of this type of system was the standardization of activities and processes that made them more predictable and designed for more efficient and effective operation. Organizations structured under a bureaucratic model have many levels of authority that are represented with tall organizational charts and many levels of administration. This hierarchical approach to management makes the community college function in a tightly coupled manner. The relationship between faculty and administrators is determined by the mission of the college and the leadership styles of the top administrators that makes it difficult to differ from the standardized approach to learning.

Levinson (2005) addressed the conundrum facing community colleges that attempted to maintain academic excellence in program delivery but were stifled by the open admission policies. This open admission policy had attracted many first generation and non-traditional students. Many students who entered community colleges were underprepared and faced significant remediation before entering credit bearing courses. Grubb (1999) described the

determination of students needing remediation based on placement tests that sorted students according to scores in reading, writing, and mathematics. Levinson (2005) reported the current trend in higher education was to limit the amount of developmental or remedial education offered at four-year institutions, pushing this responsibility to the community colleges.

Community college students come from diverse backgrounds with differing educational goals that lead to a variety of outcomes. Cohen and Brawer (2008) estimated over six million students were enrolled in community colleges in 2006. They estimated that the majority of students who entered community colleges came from the lower half of their high schools classes both academically and socioeconomically. This student population included a higher percentage of first-time college students and ethnic minorities than those attending four-year institutions.

The Community College Survey of Student Engagement Executive Summary (McCleeny, 2009) concluded that community college students need high levels of student engagement and the feeling of connectedness to keep them motivated and encouraged. This executive summary highlighted the increase in the use of social media and other virtual tools for interaction. As expected, McCleeny reported that “connections in the classroom through interactive instructional approaches appear to increase student engagement” (p. 4). These findings support the research of Karp, Hughes, and O’Gara (2008), based on Tinto’s integration framework on the necessity for community college students to be incorporated into college “by developing connections to individuals, participating in clubs, or engaging in academic activities, are more likely to persist than those who remain on the periphery” (Karp, et al., pp. 2-3). Kuh, Cruse, Shoup, Kinzie, and, Gonyea (2008) also supported McCleeny’s (2009) research finding. Their research focused on the effects of student engagement on grades and persistence. They

concluded, “Student engagement in educationally purposeful activities is positively related to academic outcomes as represented by first-year student grades and by persistence between the first year and second year of college” (p. 455).

The American Association of Community Colleges defined service learning as “instructional methodology [that] integrates community service with academic instruction as it focuses on critical, reflective thinking and social responsibility” (Kozeracki, 2000, p. 55). Kozeracki contended that implementing meaningful service learning opportunities into the community college setting was a natural fit because of the tradition of their involvement in the surrounding communities and their experiences in solving local problems.

Characteristics of Community College Faculty

Community college faculty members have been described as “honored but invisible” (Grubb, 1999, p. 8) in the professoriate of higher education. Teaching at the community college level has often been described as “an isolated and idiosyncratic activity” (Grubb, 1999, p. 27). Many researchers contend that community college faculty are often overlooked in research and frequently do not receive the respect they deserve from the professoriate (Rifkin, 2000; Twombly & Townsend, 2007). One potential reason for the lack of research at the community college level is the lack of focus on research in the community college mission. Twombly and Townsend (2007) contended that

some four-year and university faculty members typically question the quality of the community college courses—and therefore, those who teach them. They tend to hold a general sense of arrogance about the status of two-year college faculty relative to university faculty. (p. 3)

The questions of who community college faculties were and why researchers knew so little about them become important in understanding the phenomenon of service learning. Many in higher education view community college faculty as equivalent to high school teachers because of their comparative lack of autonomy over the nature and extent of their work. Grubb (1999) reported one defining aspect of instructors in the community college setting was their isolation from other faculty. Many were adjunct faculty members who had little contact with the day-to-day operations of the college. He described the source of this isolation as “the lack of any activities that might draw them together around teaching. Opportunities for learning communities and collaborative teaching are rare. Staff development activities are formulaic, contrived, and often do not focus on teaching” (p. 285). Grubb argued that this isolation creates several problems. This isolation creates the absence of a forum to discuss teaching, creates a vacuum, and lowers the status of teaching to almost invisible and inaudible. This prevents the development of a collegial atmosphere where faculty could flourish and makes it imperative for each college to create a central vision that serves to unite faculty rather than enhances the current level of fragmentation.

According to Grubb (1999), the teaching load of full-time instructors were often five classes each meeting for three hours with a typical class size of 25 to 35 students. This gave each faculty member approximately 150 students to establish relationships with and attempt to assess in a meaningful, yet manageable manner. As a result, community college faculty frequently felt overloaded and underappreciated. Grubb described one instructor as feeling fragmented because he was pulled in many directions at once, making it difficult to focus on teaching.

Levinson (2005) addressed the differences in working conditions traditionally found in community college settings, noting the lack of tenure in most institutions and the higher incidence of part-time faculty members. He found that two-year institutions employed 35.3% of faculty full-time compared to 72.6% at colleges and universities. Vaughn (2000) stated several reasons many faculty worked on a part-time basis in the community college. Many part-time faculty members taught only one course per semester and viewed this as a way to fulfill their civic responsibility. These part-time faculty members were able to provide needed expertise and experience allowing for a broader range of specialized classes to be offered in community college settings. Twombly and Townsend (2007) shared that, even though approximately two-thirds of community college faculty members taught part-time, they taught only about one-third of total course offerings.

Demographic data examined by Twombly and Townsend (2007) found that 80% of full-time faculty members were White, with an even division between men and women. This was somewhat surprising given the demographic differences commonly found in community college students. The average age of full-time faculty in community colleges was more difficult to determine, but the 2005-06 salary for a nine-or-ten month contract salary was \$55,380 compared to \$67,909 for faculty working full time in the four-year setting. While Cohen and Brawer (2008) reported the average salary of \$59,960 in suburban colleges and \$46,534 in rural colleges, they maintained that

salaries are about 10% higher in colleges with collective bargaining agreements, but this is more related to median income levels in those states than to the presence or absence of bargaining agreements, as evidenced by comparable salaries in colleges in the same state without union representation. (p. 92)

Grubb (1999) contended that community college faculty members often entered this profession as a second career after working in other settings. Most did not identify community college instruction as their initial career goal. These faculty members come from a variety of sources such as business and industry, K-12 settings, or four-year institutions. This allowed community colleges a great deal of flexibility in hiring. When investigating the level of faculty satisfaction in community colleges, Twombly and Townsend (2007) contended community college faculty were “the most satisfied faculty in academe” (p. 6). One possible reason for this high level of contentment was that community college faculty members have the shortest work week among the professoriate and the lowest amount of salary disparity among genders. Cohen and Brawer (2008) found older faculty members indicated a higher level of satisfaction than the younger instructors. They asserted that older faculty often entered the teaching ranks in community colleges after “retiring from a different type of job, had made a career change, or were teaching in career programs after being affiliated with an occupation” (p. 101).

Vaughn (2000) stated the main theme common in community college faculty was their dedication to the teaching and learning process. The credentialing requirements for most programs in community colleges are a master’s degree in the discipline that contained a minimum of 18 graduate credit hours in the area. Vaughn claimed an increasing portion of community college faculty members hold a doctoral degree. Many community colleges mirror their four-year counterparts with their faculty ranking system. Common ranks include professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor. Formal promotion procedures are a part of the process to increasing level of ranking. While many community colleges grant academic tenure, many do not; those without tenure have a formal procedure for reappointing faculty much like the civil service system.

The primary responsibility for community college faculty members is teaching. However, Vaughn (2000) reported an expansion of faculty responsibilities by adding their commitment to posted office hours (an average of 9.2 hours per week), and sponsorship of clubs, community service projects, newspapers, literary publications, and other extracurricular and civic engagement activities. Rifkin (2000) asserted that community college faculty members spend more time in direct contact with students than any other educational sector. Vaughn (2000) argued that membership in professional organizations and reading professional journals provide the main source of professional development for many community college faculty members. Rifkin (2000) supported this view when he stated that the open access mission of the community college places the responsibility for student success squarely on the shoulders of the faculty.

Cohen and Brawer (2008) asserted that this constant contact with students was often a frustration for many community college faculty members unaccustomed to working with underprepared students. They continued to describe community college faculties as different from instructors in other types of schools. “Most of the faculty members hold a master’s degree or have equivalent experience in the occupations they teach; they are less likely to hold advanced graduate degrees than university professors” (Cohen & Brawer, 2008, p. 84).

In recent years, there have been increases in minorities and women in community college faculties. Cohen and Brawer (2008) reported an increase from 1987, when “9% of the full-time faculty in two-year public colleges were classified as Native Americans, Asians, African Americans, or Hispanics: a proportion that rose to 15% during the 1990s and nearly 20% by 2003” (p. 85). The proportion of women rose from 38% to 48% during this same time period (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Isaac and Boyer (2007) researched the level of job satisfaction of

minority faculty members on community college campuses and found a gap in the literature in this area. Results of their study indicated that rural minority faculty members were more satisfied with their workload than urban minority faculty members, but both groups were dissatisfied with their salary and benefits. However, Isaacs and Boyer addressed the limitations of their study in regards to sample size and cautioned against generalization of the findings.

According to Jones-Kavalier and Flannigan (2008), one future challenge of community college administrators was replacing the aging faculty population in the community college classrooms. Many were hired during the boom of community colleges in the 1970s and 1980s and were soon facing retirement. Rifkin (2000) addressed this issue, stating that at least 80% of community college faculty would be retiring by 2015. Cohen and Brawer (2008) stated community college faculty were aging with the median age rising from just over 40 years to nearly 50 while the modal age rose from 35 to 55 from 1987 through 2006.

Pedagogical Challenges in Community Colleges

According to Grubb (1999), there are several pedagogical challenges facing community college faculty. The movement away from lecture as the main mode of instructional delivery toward a participatory teaching method led to these challenges. This move away from the lecture format toward cooperative learning experiences often motivated students to participate and provided relevance of content to real-life situations. However, Rifkin (2000) identified other challenges faced by community college faculty as they attempted to educate many underprepared and non-traditional students. Heavy teaching loads and underprepared students caused many community college faculty members to rely heavily on lecture-based classes and the use of multiple choice exams rather than those that encouraged the use of higher-level thinking skills.

Another challenge faced by community colleges has been the increase in the use of computer technology in classroom instruction. The quality of such an instructional delivery system could vary widely and leave little room for service learning in course instruction. However, according to Grubb (1999), there are many limitations to this pedagogy. The technological expertise of the instructor must be added to the content expertise. This could often undermine the quality of the learning experience for the students. Rifkin (2000) purported the addition of computer-based instruction and computational software helped community college faculty address the different skill levels and learning styles manifested in the students they served. However, research on the effectiveness of this instructional pedagogy is still sparse.

According to Grubb (1999), learning communities or linked courses were becoming more common in community college settings where a group of students took two or more classes together. This approach to course delivery helped reduce the fragmentation of content between courses. The final challenge community college faculty faced was the need to integrate academic and vocational course content. Grubb professed that today's workers need strong communication and problem-solving skills and the ability to show initiative and use good judgment. One solution to this dilemma is to incorporate more academic content into occupational programs.

Hanson (2006) contended that changes in focus in the community colleges in the 1990s to embrace the learning college concept have limited the focus of community colleges to "goals that are narrowly private and psychological" (p. 128). He attested to the need to shift this focus to the current perspective that includes goals that would be consistent with serving social and public purposes. Hanson maintained,

Because learning is relatively easy to produce and simple to measure, the current

tendency is to focus on the short term and the observable; however, the focus on learning has forced us to sacrifice the goal of preparing citizens to fill long-term social and political roles within our communities. (p. 134)

Hanson (2006) concluded by challenging community colleges to provide students with the same type of education designed to broaden the knowledge of citizenship found in the top levels of higher education. His criticisms of the typical community college and its focus on marketplace education with its “whims of the marketplace, stand opposed to any steps we could take toward improving or maintaining the status of the 2-year college as an honorable, public institution, with firm roots in the social and political fabric of our nation” (p. 136). He stated,

For the sake of our students and American democracy, the time is right for a change in the perspective shaping our norms and our practices. The central focus of our efforts must be education in the broadest sense of the term, such that our actions are consistent with our historical goals and public responsibility. (pp. 136-137)

This statement seems to be congruent with the emergence of the service learning movement in the community colleges.

Service Learning in the Community College

Cohen and Brawer (2008) traced the implementation of service learning in the general education areas in the community college to the 1990s by stating, “Service learning emerged as an attempt to reduce the growing disparity between the liberal arts as portrayed in the disciplines and its original purpose of placing learning in a larger societal context” (p. 372). According to Kozeracki (2000), much of the literature on this topic addressed the processes and procedures of implementing service learning programs in community colleges rather than providing a critical analysis of the topic. The mission of the community college with a tradition of civic engagement

makes service learning a natural fit in this academic setting. Kozeracki contended that community colleges “pioneered the community-service function by offering a range of cultural and recreational activities for their local communities” (pp. 56-57). However, Twombly and Townsend (2007) maintained that while community college faculty members spent an average of 19 hours per week with instruction, they “spend little time engaged in service activities” (p. 6).

Although the mission of the community college supports service learning programs, Kozeracki (2000) pointed to the need for more research in this area to determine how service learning in the community college differs from that occurring in the four-year institutions. This could present a particular challenge given the demographics of the community college student and faculty population.

The Service Learning Clearinghouse hosted by the American Association of Community Colleges and the Campus Compact organization became the major forums supporting service learning initiatives in community college settings. According to Cohen and Brawer (2008), faculty in English and the social sciences were most likely to participate in service learning activities in community college settings. Robinson (2007) presented research ending in 2005 that has shown that students participating in service learning opportunities had a higher graduation rate over a six-year period.

According to Prentice, Robinson, and McPhee (2003), the American Association of Community Colleges developed a guide to organizing service learning programs that emphasized four basic tenets and eight operational components. These four conceptual components were academic integrity, service that met the need, reflection, and civic responsibility in a conceptual category. The operational concerns were faculty support, administrative support, student support, community partnerships, service placement support, evaluation processes, public

relations, and sustainable funding. Prentice, et al. (2003) also pointed out the need to sell the service learning program to the administration and faculty before developing an office of civic engagement.

Prentice, et al. (2003) provided several suggestions from the American Association of Community Colleges for beginning a service learning program. The first suggestion was to start small. They suggested the establishment of an advisory board to oversee the programs as essential to ensure meaningful placements. Prentice et al.(2003) saw no reason to seek new initiatives in the beginning; they felt it was just as effective to connect with existing initiatives. They purported that faculty members should be encouraged, but not forced, to incorporate service learning activities into their coursework.

Achieving institutional support is crucial for successful service learning programs and sustaining the funding for these initiatives is essential for continued success. This includes making presentations to the Board of Trustees to gain support. One suggestion provided by Prentice et al. (2003) was to use a part of the student activity fees to fund these initiatives along with small grants. They suggested networking with other colleges could also serve to spearhead ideas.

The results of an on-line survey conducted by the American Association of Community Colleges indicated that 90% of the colleges responding were interested in service learning but only 72% of colleges actually offered service learning opportunities to their students (Prentice, et al., 2003). However, because the overall response rate was 19%, Prentice et al. (2003) reported the possibility that the sample was not representative of the overall community college institutions. This made it impossible to generalize the conclusions from this survey. But according to Prentice et al. (2003), the results indicated a stronger commitment to service

learning when compared to surveys by the AACCC taken in 1995.

Limitations in the research of use of the service learning pedagogy in community college settings were uncovered in this literature. Most of the research reviewed focused on the statistical information of how many institutions participated in using this approach from a broad sense, but scant research was available on the characteristics of faculty members using this pedagogy. This study will serve to broaden this area of research.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to investigate the motivations that cause some faculty in community colleges to embrace and actively pursue service learning pedagogy in their classrooms. It also examined the catalysts that encourage faculty to incorporate service learning into coursework.

This chapter describes the research methodology and design approach used in this study. The rationale for this particular qualitative approach to this research study is presented. First, the argument is made for the suitability of the qualitative research approach to this study with supporting methodology to provide the justification for the phenomenological research method selection. The design approach to the research is presented to provide the foundation for use of the case study approach in this study. This research design clearly explains the selection process for institutions and faculty, data collection processes and analysis, plans for the results, and considerations for the participants in this study. Attention is given to address the presuppositions and biases of the researcher in an attempt to view the data from a neutral position. Moustakas (1994) described this as *epoche* or *bracketing* where the researcher separates her experiences and biases from her own past experiences and beliefs.

Qualitative Approach

The qualitative approach to research allows for the examination of human experiences in a natural setting. Lincoln and Guba (1985) professed that naturalistic inquiry provided the best approach to discover themes common to the contexts found in the natural environment. Creswell (2007) stated the importance in this approach to qualitative research is to “understand these common experiences in order to develop practices or policies or to develop a deeper understanding about the features of the phenomenon” (p. 60). Merriam (2009) described this approach as discovery oriented with the researcher functioning as the primary source of data collection. This approach uses the inductive process to interpret data and provides for rich description that focuses on meaning and understanding in an attempt to determine the essence of the experiences. This interpretation of the human experiences embraces the cultural and social contexts of each participant. Merriam contended that “qualitative researchers are interested in understanding how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their worlds, and what meaning they attribute to their experiences” (p. 5).

Phenomenology

Phenomenological qualitative research attempts to address both the *what* and the *how* of participants’ lived experience by using a personalized approach to data collection. Moustakas (1994) identified several common principles of phenomenological research. He described the more personalized approach the researcher must use to gather data. Moustakas contended that by using first-person accounts and in-depth interviews, the researcher could search for the essence of the experiences through the identification of common themes. This approach embraced the “wholeness of the experience rather than solely on its objects or parts” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 21). The analysis of the data seeks to join together the internal and external perceptions

derived from the data in an attempt to identify the common premises that leads to the heart of the experiences. Dukes (1984) described the phenomenological approach to research as coming from a double insight where the researcher examines lived experiences from two perspectives:

First, human experience is intelligible—it makes sense—to those who live it, prior to all interpretation and theorizing. Second, the sense or logic of human experience is an inherent structural property of the experience itself, not something constructed by an outside observer. (p. 198)

Phenomenological research seeks to merge a social meaning with something of personal significance to the researcher. As with all research, it is imperative that the researcher seek to eliminate any prejudgments or suppositions in an attempt to view the issue in an unbiased, neutral way.

Moustakas (1994) proposed a continuum of principles key to phenomenological research that addressed these issues. The first principle is epoche or bracketing. Moustakas defined epoche as “a Greek word meaning the refrain from judgment . . . In the Epoche, the everyday understanding, judgments, and knowings are set aside, and the phenomena are revisited” (p. 33). This requires the researcher to temporarily set aside or bracket her own experiences and perceptions when collecting data. The second principle is phenomenological reduction or the description of the phenomena and self through both external and internal means. Merriam (2009) described phenomenological reduction as “the process of continually returning to the essence of the experience to derive the inner structure or meaning in and of itself” (p. 26). This process leads the researcher back to his or her personal experiences through a never-ending process of discovery called horizontalization. Merriam defined horizontalization as

the process of laying out all the data for examination and treating the data as having equal weight; that is, all pieces of data have equal value at the initial data analysis stage. These data are then organized into clusters or themes. (p. 26)

Moustakas's (1994) third crucial principle is called *imaginative variation* where the researcher determines the structural themes common within the research data by viewing it from several different angles. The researcher must find a way to meaningfully organize and analyze the data in an attempt to discover the commonalities and differences. The final step in phenomenological research is the determination of the merged description or essence of the themes identified from the research problem. This is when the final truth is discovered. Creswell (2007) described this stage as when

the researcher then analyzes the data by reducing the information to significant statements or quotes and combines the statements into themes. Following that, the researcher develops a textural description of the experiences of the persons, a structural description of their experiences, and a combination of the textural and structural descriptions to convey an overall essence of the experience. (p. 60)

According to Finlay (2009), this leads the researcher toward the qualitative phenomenological approach that utilizes methods targeted to determine the lived experience through first-person accounts of participants in their own words. From this documentation of lived experiences, the researcher seeks to synthesize the comments collected from different participants in different locations to determine common themes “about the essence of the phenomenon” (Finlay, 2009, p. 10).

During this process, it was imperative to put personal biases aside and listen to the words of the faculty. It was essential not to think too far ahead about the next question and listen

closely to the words of the participant. Clarification of concepts and follow-up questions were important to capture each story with rich details.

Case Study

Using the case study approach in phenomenological qualitative research allowed me to investigate service learning at the community college level by collecting data from several community college faculty members who have incorporated service learning into coursework and determining common themes from the data collected. Merriam (2009) defined the case study as “an in-depth description and analysis of a bounded system” (p. 40). She went on to describe three special features of the case study. The first of these features is the focus on a particular phenomenon. Secondly, the case study provides a thick, rich description that includes as many details as possible. The final feature is the heuristic nature of the data that “can bring about the discovery of new meaning, extend the reader’s experience, or confirm what is known” (Merriam, 2009, p. 44). Merriam contended that knowledge gained through the case study based on a specific sample population approach is more concrete, is more contextual, and is more developed by reader interpretation.

Faculty motivations and steps to the implementation of the pedagogy using a service learning instructional approach can best be discovered through face-to-face conversations and examination of artifacts such as the faculty job description, field notes, service learning activity observations, and course documents, which requires a qualitative research approach. This approach allows the researcher to gain tacit knowledge using a naturalistic, context-specific approach in obtaining data. Qualitative research attempts to discover both the breadth and depth of the topic. Lincoln and Guba (1995) identified four criteria that must be present in qualitative research to provide trustworthiness of the results. These criteria are credibility, transferability,

auditability, and confirmability. These require the researcher to step back and put aside any predetermined outcomes or directions.

According to Kvale and Brinkman (2009), one important aspect of a good interview is to establish a relaxed environment with adequate rapport so the rich stories would emerge from each participant. It was hoped that through this research method I could put aside or bracket my personal feelings and experiences in order to hear the words of the participants and identify common themes that could be used to further the use of service learning in community college classrooms.

Research Design

The design of the study was determined by the research problem and the theoretical framework that supported it. Creswell (1994) described the use of the qualitative phenomenological research study as one that studied the lived experience of a small number of participants using an in-depth, personalized approach to determine commonalities in their lived experiences. This approach provides rich context-driven data from which the essence of the experiences can be extrapolated.

The phenomenological case study research approach best suited the research questions because it provided the best opportunity to discover the nuances of community college faculty members' service learning philosophy, pedagogy, and motivations for its use in their classrooms through their own words. The results of this study provide a deeper understanding of the motivations of faculty members in their implementation of the service learning pedagogy in the community college setting. The qualitative phenomenological case study approach best complemented my personality and interest in hearing the stories of the participants. I generally approach others from the ethic of care perspective and can easily establish rapport with others.

However, I realized I must refrain from sharing my personal feelings and perspectives with participants during the research data collection process and kept the questions consistent with follow-up questions based on participant responses. This methodology allowed the stories of other community college faculty members who routinely use the service learning pedagogy to be heard and common themes to be identified.

Community College Site Selection

The first consideration in this study was to select the campus sites. McMillan and Schumacher (2001) contended that site location must be both suitable and feasible. Therefore, my site collection came from a pool of 14 community college administrative locales representing 23 sites in one Midwestern statewide community college system. Several of these campuses were composed of multiple instructional sites. After Institutional Review Board approval, my initial contact with these institutions was through electronic mail to the chief academic officer of each administrative locale, stating the purpose and data collection procedures for this study and requesting approval for faculty at that location to participate in this study. Upon receiving approval, a follow-up electronic mail was sent to ask for referrals of faculty who embraced and implemented the service learning pedagogy. The goal was to obtain referrals from all of the chief academic officers followed by using the purposeful sampling strategy to locate faculty who were currently using the service learning pedagogy in their approach to instruction through referral from the chief academic officer or the school dean. Twelve chief academic officers readily granted permission for their faculty to participate and two failed to respond.

Participant Selection

The second consideration was to select a pool of possible participants using the purposeful sampling approach (Steinberg, Bringle, & Williams, 2009). The intent of using this

approach was to locate faculty members who routinely use this instructional approach and who were recommended by their academic administration. This technique was used with the selection of eight community college faculty members who were interviewed for this qualitative phenomenological case study. This purposeful approach focused on gathering data from a small sample of cases that were “information rich” (Merriam, 2009, p. 25) where I could conduct an in-depth study designed to gain a deeper understanding of community college faculty who routinely use the pedagogy that includes service learning.

The initial pool of 24 potential participants was derived from recommendations made by the chief academic officers, academic deans, or program chairs at the selected community college sites where permission was acquired. Using a purposeful sampling approach with referrals from the academic leadership at each campus was an attempt to obtain a broad pool of potential participants. I desired a variety of faculty members of all ages representing both genders, length of community college service, faculty ranks, disciplines and ethnic diversity. This approach provided the opportunity to obtain a broad, collective story of service learning pedagogy implementation in the community college setting throughout the entire state.

After reviewing these faculty referrals to determine if they represented the desired characteristics, a grid was created to plot demographic information and discipline area. The grid was then analyzed to identify the broadest representation possible from the 24 names that were submitted, limiting the sample to one faculty member per campus at a total of eight campuses. Initial contact was made with each identified faculty member by electronic mail that clearly outlined the research project and requested his or her participation. This electronic mail was followed with a personal phone call in an attempt to establish rapport, clarify goals, answer questions and to personally ask for support of the research study.

Data Collection

The third consideration was the creation of an interview protocol to use with the selected faculty members. Kvale and Brinkman (2009) described several aspects seen in qualitative interviews. They contended that these interviews must focus on the everyday lived world of the interviewees through their unique perspectives. The interviewer must strive to make this a positive experience for the interviewees and be cognizant of the ambiguities that may arise from the information she is collecting. It is of utmost importance for the interviewer to provide an open, professional, yet personal interview situation and not have predetermined categories and interpretations. Kvale and Brinkman end with the statement that touches the essence of the qualitative interview. They stated, “A well carried out research interview can be a rare and enriching experience for the interviewee, who may obtain new insights into his or her life situation” (p. 28).

After written consent was obtained from each participant, data collection began through the review of faculty job description artifacts to determine service expectations. This was followed by in-depth, semi-structured, face-to-face interviews of all eight faculty members, representing a minimum of eight community college campus sites. These interviews were approximately one and one-half hours in length and took place at the time and location chosen by the participant. This method of data collection provided me the opportunity to observe the body language and other non-verbal communication of the participant that served to enrich the data analysis. Questions were open-ended and participants were allowed to answer in a quiet, non-hurried atmosphere of their choosing. Participants were given pseudonyms of their choice to ensure confidentiality. The procedures for confidentiality set forth by the Institutional Review Board were followed. Each interview was audio taped and the recordings were transcribed

verbatim using the self-selected pseudonyms for each participant. A statement of confidentiality was signed by the transcriber to ensure participant anonymity (see Appendix A).

The semi-structured interview sessions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) were supplemented with the examination of artifacts collected before, during, and after the interviews. After each interview, field notes were completed that were descriptive in nature and included information not directly stated in the interview. Examples include a rich description of the interview environment, demeanor of the participant, relation of service learning to the mission statement, current strategic plan of the college, descriptions of supplemental materials presented by the participant, and casual statements collected informally from colleagues. Copies of the syllabus and any supporting artifacts that included both the course objectives and service learning activity goals with grading rubrics were collected when available.

Interview Questions

According to Kvale and Brinkman (2009), interview questions should be short, simple, and open-ended. The interview session should begin with a concrete question and then gradually move to more abstract areas. With this in mind, the following list of questions that cover three major categories—demographic information, personal teaching philosophy, and institutional support—was developed:

1. How long have you been teaching at the community college level?
2. What professional path did you follow before you began your community college career?
3. Describe yourself as a teacher.
4. What is your pedagogical style?
5. What is your definition of service learning?

6. What led you to implement this pedagogy in the courses you teach?
7. What do you feel are the most rewarding aspects of using service learning in coursework?
8. What are the biggest challenges of your pedagogy?
9. Do you or have you used other pedagogies? If so, how do they compare?
10. How do you assess learning from your courses?
11. How does the institution support (or not) your pedagogy?
12. What type of professional development activities has the college provided you?
13. What professional development activities have you personally participated in?
14. Are there any other aspects of your experiences with service learning not previously addressed that you would like to share? (see Appendix B)

Follow-up questions were asked as needed to clarify answers or to deepen the level of information received. This approach fits with the model established by Kvale and Brinkman (2009), which involves active listening by the researcher. They stated,

The expert interviewer is likewise immersed in the concrete situation and is sensitive and attentive to the situational cues that will allow him or her to go on with the interview in a fruitful way that will help answer each interview question, instead of focusing all attention on the interview guide, on methodological rules of interviewing, or on what question to pose next. (p. 139)

Data Analysis

The results are presented in a manner that includes a rich description with enough detail to provide evidence of how the themes were identified to meet the standards of empirical verifiability. This was accomplished through the initial triangulation of the data collected

through interviews and use of field notes, observations of service learning activities, examination of course artifacts, review of the college mission statement and current strategic plan, and faculty job descriptions. This was an attempt to establish trustworthiness and credibility of the data collected. This approach sought to determine commonalities using multiple indicators from multiple sources. This conversion of the data collected from a variety of sources and locations was evaluated using an empathically neutral approach that sought to understand without judgment where the researcher acted merely as a tool of discovery (Patton, 2002).

The interview audiotapes were transcribed verbatim, returned to the interviewee to member check for accuracy, corrected as per participant suggestions, and printed to provide the opportunity for me to make general notes in the margins, identifying specific topics of discussion and providing a method for preliminary coding. Initial coding was completed using colored note cards with pertinent data from the interviews glued to these note cards. Each participant was assigned a separate color note card to help with identification. The note cards were then divided into three broad categories consisting of demographic information, teaching philosophy and service learning methodology, and institutional support for the service learning pedagogy. Each of these broad categories was divided into subcategories in an attempt to cluster common topics, assist with the initial analysis, and attempt to find common themes. This was congruent with the central steps identified by Creswell (2007) for coding the data. This coding provided the initial step in the reduction of data using segments that were divided into broad categories and assigned titles. These categories were the core elements of the qualitative research and became the themes that determined the essence of this study.

The college mission statement, current strategic plan, and faculty job descriptions were analyzed to determine the level of service (if any) required of each faculty member at each

campus location. This assisted in determining if the use of the service learning pedagogy was internally or externally motivated and provided supportive evidence of data collected in the interview sessions.

Further triangulation of data occurred when course outlines, syllabi, and assignment rubrics of the service learning activities were compared to determine if all four stages of Kolb's (1984) experiential learning theory were addressed. These data provided insight into the approach each faculty member had in using the service learning pedagogy. The data collected from these artifacts were analyzed along with the interview data to aid in the identification of common themes and sub-themes.

The initial results were identified and possible themes were verified and modified as necessary through the use of member checking by soliciting feedback from the study participants. This was necessary to rule out possible misinterpretation of the data. After this was completed, research peers familiar with the qualitative research methodology reviewed the results and provided constructive criticism for me to consider.

These methods of analysis allowed the data to be viewed from a variety of perspectives in an attempt to clarify and validate the results. Merriam (2009) described the use of triangulation as a method to increase the internal validity of the study through the use of multiple methods of data collection. This is essential because it allows for the researcher to view the research question from several different perspectives in an attempt to identify common themes. This method of data analysis also increases the validity and repeatability of the study.

Plan for Study Results

The results of this study provide deeper understanding of the motivations, catalysts, and obstacles community college faculty members experience as they implement service learning

pedagogy into their coursework. The results provide information other community college faculty members could consider as they evaluate the use of this approach to learning into their classrooms. Administrators could use this information to assess their current level of support in the forms of professional development, faculty loading issues, and financial resources for the faculty using this approach in an attempt to remove some of the barriers faculty members routinely encounter. The potential for publication or replication in other community colleges also exists.

Consideration for Participants

As with all research that uses human subjects, ethical issues can arise. Beauchamp and Childress (2001) identified four ethical considerations for such research. The first of these is the need for each participant to have advance knowledge of the purpose of the study along with potential risks and benefits. This was provided to each participant prior to the interview in an electronic mail that verified permission from the chief academic officer and solicited his or her support for the study. When the prospective participant responded favorably to the initial request, a follow-up electronic mail was sent with a thank you with an informed consent document attached for his or her review. Before each interview began, the purpose of the study was discussed and the informed consent with permission to audiotape was signed. This was true for the initial and follow up interviews.

The second key principle of ethics in human subject research was the confidentiality of the identity of the participants and their ability to withdraw from the study at any time (See Appendix A). This was accomplished through the use of a self-selected pseudonym and a confidentiality statement obtained from the transcriber. The right of the participant to withdraw from the study at any time was clearly explained in the informed consent document. The

research documents were coded with the selected pseudonym for each participant. For security purposes, research documents were stored in a locked file cabinet inside a locked office.

The third consideration was with the fairness of the participant selection coupled with the balance of benefit of the study against the risks or costs. The Institutional Review Board evaluated these factors and found these issues to be nonthreatening before granting permission for this study to occur. The use of volunteer participants who were not directly linked to the researcher eliminated bias from this study. Each of these key principles was evaluated during each step of the data collection process.

The final ethical consideration was the requirement of approval of Institutional Review Board of the sponsoring university and the community college administration. This approval for research involving human subjects from the research institution and the community college administration was mandatory before the participant selection could proceed. This approval process was completed before any contact was made with other community college administrators in an attempt to identify participants. Consideration of faculty schedules and responsibilities was given to the participants in an attempt not to be disruptive to their professional responsibilities. This was accomplished in this study by allowing each participant to select the time and location of the interview.

Summary

The qualitative phenomenological case study approach seemed most appropriate for this research study because it attempted to discover the actual lived experiences of community college faculty and their use of the service learning pedagogy. Data collection was completed primarily through in-depth interviews with eight different faculty members representing different campus sites in a statewide community college system. Other data were collected through field

notes, course documents, faculty job descriptions, follow up phone interviews, and face-to-face interviews as needed for clarification to determine common themes. Precautionary measures were in place to protect the confidentiality of each participant and member checking was used to verify themes and conclusions. It is hoped that the results of this study will assist other community college faculty interested in service learning pedagogy to successfully implement it into their classrooms.

CHAPTER 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate the motivations that cause some faculty in community colleges to embrace and actively pursue service learning pedagogy in their classrooms. It also examined the catalysts that encourage faculty to incorporate service learning into coursework. Chapter 4 identifies the participant selection techniques and resulting demographic and professional characteristics of those participating in this study. Each participant brought unique backgrounds, experiences, and approaches to the service learning pedagogy as represented in Tables 1 and 2. The story of each participant is told in the order the participants were interviewed for organizational purposes and to allow the themes to unfold for the reader just as they did for me. This provides rich textural content in their own voices and provides the data from which common themes were identified.

Participants

The eight faculty members, three men and five women, selected to participate in this study came from different regional campus locations in a Midwestern statewide community college system and represented eight different disciplines. These participants represented a breadth of ages from the early 30s to the mid 60s with an average age of approximately 52 years old. Their experiences were broad and seven participants were full-time faculty. One participant was a Black woman who was a full-time staff employee and worked in an adjunct faculty

capacity each semester. The initial data were collected from semi-structured interviews set at the time and location requested by the participant. Four of the interviews were conducted in the faculty member's office, two were conducted in hotel lobbies, one was conducted in a public café, and one was a phone interview due to inclement weather with a follow-up face-to-face interview several weeks later when the weather stabilized.

A multi-stepped process was employed to initially identify participants. The first step in this process was to gain permission from the chief academic officer over each regional campus in this statewide community college system composed of 14 regions and 24 campus locations. This was accomplished through an electronic mail inquiry that outlined the purpose and procedures of this research study along with a copy of the Institutional Research Board approval letter from college central administration. Fourteen chief academic officers were contacted with 12 granting support for their faculty to participate in this research project. Many of these 12 forwarded my initial electronic mail to their academic deans to solicit names of potential participants.

A total of 24 names were obtained through referrals from the chief academic officers or one of their academic deans or program chairs. Four faculty members replied to volunteer for this study upon learning of it from their chief academic officer. One was only willing to complete a survey. The remaining three volunteers were men. Since they represented different disciplines and campus sites, follow-up contact was made by telephone to thank them for volunteering and clarified the purpose and methodology of the study. Each met the research requirements and was included in the pool of potential participants. The remaining five participants were selected from the initial 24 referrals by discipline and campus location to ensure a broad sampling of locations, gender, ethnicity, age, years of service, and disciplines (see Table 1).

Table 1

Participant Demographics

Pseudonym	Sex	Age	Race	Institution
Doctor C	Male	52	White	Millersburg
Dorothy	Female	50s	White	River City
Julius	Male	65	White	Lakeside
Sam	Male	57	White	Porter
Elizabeth	Female	54	Black	Midtown
Bacon	Female	50s	White	Hope
Karin	Female	52	White	Western Valley
Penelope	Female	30s	White	Hill Country

It was difficult to gain the ethnic diversity sought, but there was a wide representation of ages, years of employment in the community college, areas of discipline, faculty rank, and sex; obtaining referrals for faculty of color who utilized the service learning pedagogy was difficult because the vast majority of faculty members in this system are White. One Black woman who worked full-time in a staff position at the college and also taught in an adjunct capacity each semester was interviewed. She had been the project director for a three-year Campus Compact grant designed to increase faculty awareness of service learning pedagogy. Her position as grant administrator gave her a unique perspective into the use of a service learning pedagogy and her work as an adjunct represented a different perspective than full-time faculty members I interviewed. Table 1 provides a visual representation of the participant demographics.

Table 2 provides information on faculty rank, area of study, and years of employment in the community college setting to provide an overview of the diversity of participants represented in this study. It is important for any researcher to seek the broadest representation possible in study participants. These tables represent how this goal was accomplished in this study.

Table 2

Years of Service, Educational Level, Rank, and Discipline

Pseudonym	Years of Service	Educational Level	Academic Rank	Discipline
Doctor C	30	Doctorate	Professor	Accounting and Business
Dorothy	6	Master's	Assistant Professor	Nursing
Julius	34	Master's	Professor	Marketing
Sam	1	Master's	Instructor	Chemistry
Elizabeth	5	Bachelor's	Adjunct Instructor	Event Planning
Bacon	13	Doctorate	Associate Professor	Education
Karin	14	Master's	Associate Professor	Human Services
Penelope	4	Doctorate	Assistant Professor	English

Biographical Information

The biographical information of each participant is presented in the order of the interviews. These interviews spanned two semesters over a four-month period from November 2010 through February 2011 and occurred at different campuses in different settings. Each participant selected the time and place for her or his interview. Four initial interviews were held in participant offices, two in hotel lobbies, one in a café, and one was a telephone interview. The interviews were transcribed in a timely manner and sent to each participant for member checking. Each participant was very gracious in responding to interview requests and promptly returned the revised versions of the original transcripts. Three follow-up interviews were held to clarify and deepen the data with three of the participants.

Doctor C

After a beautiful drive through the southern part of the state to the Millersburg campus, I arrived at Doctor C's office a few minutes early, giving me time to reflect on my surroundings and observe a few students coming and going in this very business-like setting. Doctor C met me with a warm smile and a handshake then invited me into his spacious office. This space was filled with family photos and various mementos that made it very warm and inviting. I will admit to being a little nervous with my first interview, but I established rapport with Doctor C instantaneously.

Doctor C, a 52 year old White man, teaches accounting and business classes in the South Central region of the state. He holds a master's degree in business administration and a doctorate degree in education. He has worked in various capacities in the academic areas including administration at the community college level for nearly 30 years with the last six years spent in the classroom. Doctor C was eager to participate in this study. His electronic mail came on Monday after I sent the request for permission and referrals to the chief academic officer the previous Thursday. His electronic mail stated,

I'll be happy to do whatever I can to help you with your research. I would ask that you send me the definition that you are using for service learning. Service learning seems to mean different things depending upon the groups involved, and that definition can be very broad or very restricted given the group. I just want to make sure we are on the same page.

The definition was sent and the interview was held. It was obvious with his deliberate answers he had spent a considerable amount of time pondering potential questions and formulating his answers.

Doctor C approached his teaching by relating back to his personal philosophy of education. He described his philosophy by stating,

When I look at a class, I first look at the course objectives and what I can do to meet these course objectives. I have to figure out how to make it active, and I have to make it relevant. I think service learning is one of those.

He focused on the importance of the students making connections between the classroom and real life situations. While reflecting on his doctoral coursework, Doctor C shared a part of his personal educational philosophy. He iterated,

After I got out of that [doctoral studies] and decided to go back into the classroom, I began to get involved with the campus engagement committee and began to think about service learning. It's an extension of what I believe we should be doing individually so it fits well with my personal philosophy. But it also fits well with what I feel education should be about. You should have some introspection and reflection so that you can kind of internalize it a bit. It should be active and relevant.

Although this was not the career Doctor C imagined for himself, he has worked in the community college for nearly 30 years. He related a comment from one of his early mentors who told him, "Once you get it [the community college] into your system, you'll never get rid of it." He connected this with the essence of what he looked for when he hired faculty by stating,

And you know, when I was an academic dean you wouldn't come in an interview if I knew you didn't have the credentials for the job. I'd ask you a few questions about what you knew about the aspects of the job, but the thing I was really looking for was did you have the heart to teach, because if you had the heart to teach, the rest would follow.

He expressed a personal belief in the connection between a person's religious foundations on the concept of giving back to the community. Doctor C shared that during his doctoral studies he began to think about his own purpose in life. He stated this philosophy very eloquently during our interview by stating,

I think I kind of came to terms with this year and years ago when I went through a seminar that talked about your purpose in life. I mean really, what is your purpose? What do you live for? What are you looking to achieve? I think we can all talk about retirement, kids . . . but the bottom line is from a very foundational level. I think we are all here to help each other, and I think that what I do in the classroom translates into how I approach this philosophy. I think that if the students are going to walk away from the classroom, I want them to grasp how the learning has been relevant to them. I don't think they can do this if it's not relevant.

Doctor C described his use of the service learning pedagogy as evolutionary, implying that he had not begun his teaching career with this approach. He described his move toward this pedagogy during his doctoral studies when he reflected of his true purpose in life. The result of this personal reflection prompted him to consider how he could make the most impact on students. He called this instructional approach an

extension of what I believe we should be doing individually, so it fits well with my personal philosophy. But it also fits with well with what I think education should be about. It goes back to those terms where you should have some introspective reflection so that you can internalize it a little bit.

Doctor C also reflected on the need for this approach to be active and relevant to the students. He felt the more the students had input into the project, the more they learned from it, but Doctor

C described his dilemma about how to make the learning relevant to the students and still meeting all of the course objectives. He said you have to work hard to make it creative yet practical for the class. “The more specific I can be with the instructions, the easier it is for students to hit the mark, but sometimes this may be a little overkill.”

During my drive home, I reflected on what he had said and what I needed to document further. I had not considered exploring the root source of the motivation to use service learning as an approach to instruction, but Doctor C’s personal quest to determine his purpose in life motivated me to add this question to the remainder of my participant interviews. This proved to be a very rich part of the data collected and provided a rich textural context to the participants’ current use of this approach to instruction.

Dorothy

My second interview was also held in the faculty member’s office. This office was small and had student work stacked in many areas. Dorothy is deeply rooted in her Christian faith as evidenced by her office décor of angels and Bible verses. She was somewhat pensive and soft spoken yet focused and intent with her answers and often took a few moments to think deeply about each question before answering. She described her personal philosophy by saying,

I think as a Christian, that’s part of it . . . we are here to look after others; we are to be of assistance to others. I think as a nurse that is always a part of it as well. And I think just assisting students to see what kind of impact they can have on the community and then they find how the community impacts them as well. Then I just see growth in the students.

Dorothy is a White female nursing instructor in the River City region of this statewide community college system. She is a nationally certified nurse practitioner who has been

teaching at the community college for the last six years. She described herself with a quote from Robert Frost that said, “I am not a teacher, I am an awakener.” She went on to say,

It’s not that I’m pouring something into someone; it’s more like I am helping them see their own potential, giving them the resources to learning, and then showing them where else they can go. And then they will go far beyond me as long as they have those tools to use.

Dorothy attributed her commitment to service to her parents and her faith. She shared that her parents had both grown up in households with negative social issues, but her parents made a conscience choice to break that cycle in their own childrearing. She iterated their commitment to helping others and stated that she and her two siblings were dedicated to giving back to their communities in a variety of ways. Her walk through faith was evidenced by her office décor and in her commitment to her students, family, and community.

Dorothy reported limited or no participation in service learning professional development opportunities provided by the college or individually. She said,

It’s not that I’ve read it and do it, it’s more that I’ve done it and then when I go to the literature, it’s what I am doing. But I had not read anything about service learning before I did it . . . But I’m glad I did it because I think it is so beneficial to the students; it’s so beneficial to the community.

Dorothy viewed this approach to instruction as a perfect way to introduce her nursing students to the health needs of the community. She stated, “As nurses we are often the ones that are asked on where to go and what to do. And so I want to equip my students to know what’s out there.” She stressed the importance of her students knowing what social issues such as

homelessness, sexual abuse, and domestic violence are part of our community's population and felt strongly that her nursing students must be prepared to meet these needs. Dorothy iterated, Nurses need to know how to teach—both to individuals and to patients and families but also to groups. I knew that the Christian Life Center had a program called parenting rewards, which is for at-risk moms and now dads. The at-risk parents come there for resources and are required to attend classes on healthy pregnancy, how to raise kids, and health issues.

She saw this as a perfect fit for her students to give back to the community by providing these training sessions to at-risk parents using funds provided by a Campus Compact grant. This strengthened the students and it also served the community. Although she reported that many of the students dreaded the experience because of the requirement to prepare a lesson with resources and speak in front of a group, none of the students reported disliking the experience. She was proud to report that many of her students came back after this experience and said it was one of the highlights of their nursing training because they now saw themselves as capable.

While reflecting on this interview, I appreciate Dorothy's candor when addressing some of these issues and commend her for trying to address this with her students in a concrete and positive way. Her quiet, thoughtful demeanor was refreshing as was her total commitment to her students and the pertinence of their nursing coursework to what was currently happening in their community.

Julius

The trip to the northern part of the state to the Lakeside campus took place during a snowy, cold December week. The date was selected to coincide with an annual service learning project Julius was completing with two of his business classes. He had invited me to attend and I

was eager to do so. We met initially at this event with the classroom visit and interview being held the following day.

Julius, a 65 year old White man from the Lakeside campus, volunteered to participate in this study. He was a real gentleman with a deep compassion for his students and a strong willingness to help. Julius has used the service learning approach to delivery of coursework for many years in his marketing and management classes and even included it in his on-line courses. He described this approach to instruction by saying, “Service learning is wonderful; no support, but it’s wonderful.” When asked about his educational background, Julius proudly stated, “I attribute some of my success to the community college because I went back to community college. I’m a community college grad.” He went on to explain,

I was pretty much told in high school that I needed to learn a trade. They put me in shop classes because I needed to go out and work with a trade. I wasn’t college material.

After serving three years in the U.S. Army, I went back to the community college and found I could be a halfway decent student just like most of the [college name] students do it. I always like the hands-on type of learning. It’s how I learn best and that kind of carried me. Once I realized that I was not as dumb as my school counselors had told me I was, I went to work and then back to the state university.

Julius currently has a master’s degree in business administration and has worked in the community college setting for 34 years. He invited me to his service learning culminating activity and the debriefing class the next day. I gratefully accepted this invitation. When the students in his class were asked about Julius’s service approach to teaching, they responded, “It’s just who he is.”

Julius traced his roots of service to his personal experiences during high school as a student with a disability. His teachers struggled with seeing the true academic potential in him that was overshadowed by his Tourette's syndrome and attention deficit disorder. It took the disciplined experience and encouragement in the army for Julius to realize that he did have the aptitude and abilities to succeed in the academic world. This early experience had direct impact on his view of the students he taught for over 40 years. This has given him the heart for working with students with disabilities and using a hands-on approach to learning. When one of his students described his compassion for those with disabilities, Julius stated, "Having grown up with one kind of changes your focus a bit." Julius described this approach to teaching as a win-win situation because both the students and the service recipients benefit from this approach. Julius stated this very succinctly by saying,

On the administrative side, everyone talks a good game, but nobody supports the game. There is no release time to do any kind of modified scheduling so that you can do service learning. I try to give alternative pedagogies to the administration, but he [the dean] won't sign the release form. Heaven forbid I have to get a school bus or buy some materials . . . there's about \$50 or \$60 dollars out of my pocket expenses . . . the paperwork process to try to get it approved and the nonsense to go with it.

When asked about his professional development opportunities in service learning pedagogy, Julius, the most experienced participant, reported,

Service learning has been trial and error. I really haven't had professional development with service learning. I've read a couple of things here and there. By the time the college began this initiative, I had been doing it for ten to twelve years. By that time my learning curve was pretty good with some of my trials and tribulations.

My visit with Julius included attending a service learning activity at a local resale shop. He had invited me to attend in his electronic mail agreeing to participate. This first encounter was like watching Santa and his elves serving the community through a great community service learning project. Julius wore a Santa hat and was in the thick of the activity. The event was very organized and students and the attending public were very excited. The room was literally filled with the Christmas spirit. His invitation shared the following information,

On December 8, two of my classes will have the final step in their service learning project for Principles of Retailing and Promotion Management. For the fifth year, the classes will run a non-profit resale shop for the evening (special store hours). The classes prepare all the promotion and all the activities for this event. You are certainly welcome to attend. Holiday shoppers will receive 50%, 75%, or 100% off their total purchase. In addition, the night will be filled with prizes, live music, games, refreshments, and a visit from Santa.

Julius spoke of allowing the students to make decisions by consensus. He used an open forum to plan the activities and brainstormed ways to improve it the next time after the event and was open to all student feedback. One student commented on the politeness of the customers with the resale shop event by saying, "In light of what you read in the paper, it is nice to see this and know our future is in good hands."

Julius best described what happens at the community college level in some programs and classrooms as a "culture of service." He went on to explain how faculty members with the propensity to use the service learning approach seem to find each other and create their own subculture within each college's culture. Perhaps this best described how each of these

participants has embedded this approach into instruction even when this culture was not promoted and nurtured at the institutional level.

Julius has been doing service learning for many years and was very open with both his successes and failures. He shared one specific incident when the activity did not go as planned because it was altered by the agency at the last minute. Several students volunteered to do an outdoor event in the summer. He stated,

You have to be able to think on your feet because no matter what your plans are, they could change. We had the whole booth laid out and everything. We get out there and find we have a little table inside a big tent and that was it. I said okay, what do we do? We had to readjust everything, but seeing the kids get their prizes and knowing that they could adjust the plan made the event fun. It worked out well and we got accolades from the people coming through.

I ran into Julius unexpectedly during a meeting of the academic leadership of this community college system held in the state capital in February 2011. He gave me the same warm reception at this unanticipated encounter as he did during my visit to his campus. It was a real pleasure to work with him during this research study. My life is better because of meeting Julius.

Sam

Perhaps the most endearing participant in this study was Sam. Sam also responded quickly to my query for participants. His response was very simple. He stated, "I have incorporated service learning in my introductory chemistry class. How can I help you? What kind of info would you need?" The interview was quickly set up via electronic mail.

Since I was unfamiliar with that area of the state where the Porter campus was located, Sam helped me locate a motel near his campus and suggested holding the interview in the lobby. As he entered the lobby, it was easy to identify him as my participant because of his college nametag and the big smile on his face. The motel lobby was virtually empty so we sat at a corner table to talk. He was anxious to share his activity with me and for me to visit his classroom the following morning to observe the final student presentations where they discussed their service learning project, which involved testing ground water for oxygen and nitrate levels. Sam had also invited other members of the community college and university partners' science faculty and members from local community organizations interested in this research. His students collected data on the quantity of nitrates in the water in relation to the dissolved oxygen using weather as the variable. It was readily apparent how excited he was about this event.

Sam, a 57 year old White man from Site 2 of the Porter campus, was in his third semester of teaching chemistry in the community college. He holds a master's degree in chemistry and had spent a long career as a chemist in industry before turning to teaching. When asked to describe his teaching style, he described himself as "more of a facilitator than a lecturer." His introduction to service learning in the classroom came through a grant from the National Science Foundation offered through the Learn and Serve America project designed to study the level of nitrates entering a nearby lake from local streams. When asked if there was a problem with using this approach to learning as required by the grant, Sam responded, "I would have done it no matter what because that is the kind of person I am." He felt his own academic history of being a first generation community college graduate gave him a different perspective of students. He stated, "I think I relate to them a little differently . . . I think it's kind of my personality." He felt it was important for students to think about environmental issues and ask questions about the

long-term effects of pollution on our ecosystem. Sam invited me to visit his classroom and observe the students' final project presentation of their service learning activity. It was clear the students learned how to connect the course content with their watershed project. One student described Sam as "an awesome teacher." He was very animated during our interview and passionate about his work with students.

Sam reported never really considering where he developed his commitment to service. He shared that he and his wife of 27 years routinely do community service work. They have also involved their two children in these activities. Sam carried that belief to his daughter. Sam said his daughter often stated, "Grandma always says you've got to give back to the community." This was evident when he shared a story about when he was laid off by the steel mills. Sam stated,

So when I was unemployed, when I lost my job in the steel mill, instead of collecting unemployment, I worked to help. I worked with Work One and helped other steel workers get jobs. I worked with them instead of going on unemployment. I worked part time and taught them how to do Excel, how to do Word, how to do a cover letter and resume, and how to use the mouse.

Sam, a new faculty member, identified his biggest problem as himself because, "I want to do so much, but I don't know how to go about doing it, so I have to learn each step. That's my biggest problem: the learning curve that we have." He tries to make things both interesting and relevant to the topic. One of his zanier demonstrations was to demonstrate the concept of solubility by creating some Harry Potter-type potions using sodium acetate. He created this potion and said a "few Harry Potter words" over it and asked a student to add another particle. The solution immediately froze because it was suddenly supersaturated.

During the month of October, Sam was discussing alcohol and decided to make the lesson pertinent to the Halloween holiday. During a classroom demonstration he added some boric acid to the burning alcohol, which turned the flames green. He actually took this demonstration a step further when a student brought in some donated pumpkins that they turned into green lanterns. This was a very entertaining way to reinforce chemistry concepts and showed me a more playful side of his personality not often seen in college instructors.

When asked the question if he thought his start in the community college was an asset to him because of the differences in the environment in the two year versus the four year institution, Sam beautifully stated,

Yeah, I think so because I think I relate to them [community college students] differently. I work with a lot of science professors that are doctors that went straight through normal school and they expect a certain type of student. And they work really well with these students, don't get me wrong. The students love them, but they expect a different kind of work. We've talked about it; there's nothing wrong with setting the bar. There's nothing wrong with that, but I think I relate to them a little differently.

I was impressed with Sam's willingness to share what he does in the classroom given that he was a novice teacher. It did not seem to bother him that he was at the very beginning of his teaching career after a long, successful career in industry. He really enjoyed working with the students and had a great rapport in the classroom. He did not seem to get rattled as many new teachers do when things do not work correctly, as evidenced when the audio visual equipment did not work initially when the students were setting up their PowerPoint presentations.

Elizabeth

Elizabeth was a referral from an academic dean from the Midtown campus of this community college system because of her commitment to use of the service learning pedagogy in her events planning classes. She had completed a three-year Campus Compact grant designed to jumpstart service learning on her campus by creating a website link and a service learning faculty handbook. She administered this grant while working as a full-time community college staff member in the marketing area who taught in an adjunct capacity. I selected her for my study because of her interest in service learning, her familiarity with this community college system, her ethnicity, her commitment to service learning, and her work in an adjunct capacity each semester.

I learned at our initial face-to-face interview, held in a café near downtown, that Elizabeth, a youthful 54 year old Black woman, had been an adjunct in the event and meeting planning area of hospitality administration for five years in the Midtown region of this community college system. I made field notes immediately after our interview but unfortunately lost the recorder before the interview could be transcribed. Therefore, I redid this interview via telephone a few days later that I was able to transcribe.

Elizabeth described herself as a product of the culture of her youth with “bra burning, peace rallies, civil rights movement, from the feel good music of the Beach Boys and the Beatles to the message music of Bob Dylan, Marvin Gaye and Edwin Starr (War, what is it good for: Absolutely nothing!).” She said her personal motivations have always been to share and improve. She was very warm and dynamic when she spoke, and her enthusiasm was readily apparent both in the face-to-face and telephone interviews. She currently worked as an adjunct because the student population in event planning was too small in this program to warrant a

designated faculty member, but her true desire was to become that full-time faculty member when the opportunity arises. The things that impressed me with Elizabeth were her willingness to go an extra mile to help me. We had difficulty finding common times when we were available for the interviews. When we did connect, her warm smile and firm handshake were very welcoming.

Her own degree path began with an associate's degree from the community college in this study. She pursued her degree in conjunction with a full-time job as an administrative assistant. She continued to work while she studied for her bachelor's degree. She has also received certification in events planning from the Convention Industry Council. Her introduction into Campus Compact was as the administrator of a three-year grant designed to advance the service learning pedagogy on her campus as a part of her full-time staff position. With this grant she oversaw the development of a service learning website link and the development of a service learning handbook created by volunteer faculty and staff members.

When asked about her personal roots of this approach to teaching she referred back to her childhood by saying,

It would go back to my mother because she was always just a very caring soul to help anybody in the neighborhood who was in need. As we got older it just became something that we continued to do, a lot of it through church.

Elizabeth went on to relate this early experience to her work in the classroom with her students.

She shared the students' perspective of service learning by sharing,

I think the students benefit from it. Well, it's mutually beneficial for the people who participate in it and the people who benefit from it outwardly in the community. The students are thrilled about learning outside the textbook and outside the classroom.

Elizabeth described her teaching style as very interactive. She shares her extensive experience in event planning with her students to connect the textbook content to real life situations. It was easy to see her passion for this approach during the interview. Her face lit up and her voice hastened a bit when she discussed her classes and her students. The lilt in her voice was even apparent in our telephone interview.

Elizabeth saw this approach to instruction as a way to provide opportunities for students to lead, express themselves, and be creative. She puts her heart and soul into instruction by being very interactive with her students and sharing her own experiences as an event planner. She became very animated when she talked about the projects she arranged for her students to solidify course content.

Personally she was an active volunteer in a prison ministry in her city that provided transportation for family members to visit their incarcerated loved ones. She also shared that she tried to participate in one big community service activity each year to live her faith in an active way. After the interview, Elizabeth thanked me for the opportunity to share her story and give her a voice in this research project. She was a delight to speak with. Her warmth and passion for this approach to instruction and her compassion for her fellow human beings were almost tangible.

A follow-up face-to-face interview was held a few months later to obtain more data on specific service learning projects and their outcomes. Again Elizabeth was very warm and gracious. She had a student intern with her who also provided some insight into Elizabeth's service learning activities and their contribution to her education. Areas discussed included her service learning successes and those that did not go as planned. It was apparent how passionate

Elizabeth was about this approach to learning. She felt that it is an essential component to her events planning courses to actually participate in the planning and execution of these events.

Bacon

The initial interview with Bacon was scheduled to be face-to-face in her office, but inclement weather forced us to complete the interview via telephone. I had visited Bacon's classroom in the fall of 2010 during a Campus Compact training session held on the Hope campus and was familiar with the child-centered nature of her teaching environment. This classroom is a simulation of an actual preschool classroom, complete with small furniture and learning centers arranged around the perimeter of a college classroom, allowing the students to practice their skills in a developmentally appropriate environment. Student projects were prominently displayed on the bulletin boards surrounding the classroom.

A follow-up face-to-face interview was held a few months later when the weather stabilized and travel was safer. The second interview focused on Bacon's most memorable positive and negative experiences with service learning in her teaching experiences. This more personalized approach to the interview gave me much richer data to analyze because I was able to read her body language and create follow-up questions from her initial answers.

Bacon has been with the community college for 13 years, teaching in the early childhood education program. She is quiet, soft spoken, and very committed to her students and their learning. She entered college as a traditional student right after high school and majored in psychology. She received her master's degree in business administration a few years after her baccalaureate degree. After her own children were grown and she began to teach at the community college, she pursued her doctorate in early childhood education to learn what students face in early childhood settings. She has been the program chair of early childhood

education since the program began in 2002 after spending several years working in various early childhood settings. Bacon has taken this program from its inception to national accreditation by the National Association for the Education of Young Children.

When asked about the source of her commitment to service, Bacon traced her roots of service back to her grandmother and her parents. She shared that they were always helping people in their community by providing food to those who were sick. This was done on a neighborhood basis rather than in the general community. Her family would share unused clothing with needy children. Her personal commitment to service came when she reminisced about her days as a candy striper at the age of 14. She was considering a career in the health care field at that time and used this experience to help guide her way. She shared an early memory that helped shape her commitment to service by saying,

I remember reading a biography of Jane Addams when I was young and how she talked about communities and services as being one way to change the world. Or maybe we can actually go back to JFK because he was the one who really started emphasizing, “Ask what you can do for your country,” right?

She has translated her early experiences into her classroom instruction by saying, “I try to teach my students the same way I would want them to teach young children.” She went on to explain,

I think having lots of experiences and seeing lots of different programs and then, of course, discussing those with different people and then applying the theory to what they see and observe. I guess that’s why it is very important just do that [service learning] so they will transfer what they actually do in the classroom into practice. Because if they don’t have that strong belief, I find that as soon as they find that job somewhere, they’re doing what someone else told them to do.

This belief comes from her deep roots in the early childhood profession. Bacon spent many years working as an early childhood administrator in a variety of settings before entering higher education to begin instructing current and future early childhood teachers.

Bacon spoke about the formation of personal and community relationships through service learning activities. She noticed that the group projects encouraged collaboration and led to bonding between the students that aided in student persistence. She saw one of the biggest rewards of service was that “it helps raise the students’ self-esteem because they know they have given back to the community.” Bacon then asked the students to tie these connections back to professionalism. She showed them how an early childhood professional not only influences the classroom environment but also the community and families.

One particular project served to mold many of her students into early childhood professionals when they worked to plan and implement an early childhood conference. She elaborated on this activity by stating,

I think the most meaningful [service learning activity] to our students was when I first started here, and we revived the local chapter of IAEYC [Indiana Association for the Education of Young Children]. The students helped put on a fall conference. Not only did the students organize and help publicize it, but they also worked at the conference. They helped recruit people to come in and set up booths, they managed the book sale, and some of them presented at the conference. I think that made some of them see themselves as leaders and made them look at early childhood as more than just their little corner of the world. Now a number of students have gone on and now they are assuming leadership roles in different organizations and are participating on different boards.

Bacon spoke of playing a supportive role to students in their learning. It is her practice to link the service learning activities to student application of the learning theories studied in the textbook. Bacon stated,

I think having lots of experiences and seeing lots of different programs and then discussing those with different people is essential to the students' applying the theory from their studies to what they see and observe in the community. I guess that's what I think is very important so that they [the students] learn to transfer what they do in the classroom into practice [in community early childhood classrooms].

Bacon described the difficulty in finding a time for service learning to meet the students' busy schedules and assessing these activities in a fair way to everyone. She is the sole full-time faculty member in this program and is responsible for advising well over 100 students, hiring and training adjunct faculty, implementing curriculum, and selecting textbooks while teaching four sections of classes each semester.

This interview was interesting and very helpful, but the inability to read the participant's body language was a detriment to the depth of the information that was obtained. Rapport is much more easily established in a face-to-face encounter. I was really appreciative of my previous visit to this campus and tour of Bacon's classroom. This made it easier to follow her comments about applying theory to practice.

Because of these inadequacies in the original data collection, a face-to-face interview was held in Bacon's office a few months later that included several follow-up and clarification questions being asked to support and expand the original data collected. I learned that she was a youthful new grandmother who was warm and gracious and eager to help me complete my research project. Her parting words about the legacy she would like to leave for her students

were the importance of creating appropriate spaces for children to thrive, grow, and learn. She stated,

As an early childhood educator, not only are we responsible for the classroom but we are also responsible for the environment that our children grow up in the community and the nation, so a part of what we need to do is advocate for children and take responsibility for the environment in which we live.

Karin

My initial face-to-face interview with Karin came after a large meeting of the academic leadership of this community college system held in the state capital city in February 2011.

Karin, a 52 year old White woman, is currently completing her dissertation to obtain her doctorate degree in counselor education from Indiana State University. She is the program chair of human services at the Western Valley campus and has worked for the college for 14 years. Having been told by her high school counselor that she should just get married and have babies after she graduated, she began her higher education experience when she entered junior college at the age of 31. This experience gave her the self confidence she needed to continue her education.

Karin talked about the interdependent lifestyle she shared with her family growing up. She was raised in a small community, where she still lives, with most of her extended family members. Everyone knew everyone in this type of environment. She stated, "Everything was a shared responsibility because the family was huge, and they all had similar needs." This philosophy was exhibited when everyone came in to help share the bounty of the summer harvest as well as in times of need.

Her personal experiences as a nontraditional college student have given her a unique ability to relate to the students entering the community college setting. Karin is passionate about her students. She shared, “I always tell my students that I’m really not any smarter than you are. I certainly was not born with a silver spoon in my mouth; I’m just too stubborn to quit and that if I can do this, so can you.”

Karin said,

I’m convinced that in order for students to make a change, they have to believe that change is possible, believe that change will benefit them, and believe they deserve to change. Empowerment: It’s all about empowering students. That’s the focus of my teaching is to empower students through education.

Karin prides herself in her commitment to her students. She truly feels that if she provides the right learning environment and support her students need, each one can be successful. She shared that many of them just want to earn the associate degree and go to work in the human services field so they can help others. This often stems from the help they have received through community agencies. She went on to explain her commitment to the students by stating,

I really believe that within each one of us, there is a spark of excellence that can be nurtured into brilliance. I think my job is giving the students the opportunity to be successful and help them to taste that success. Success breeds success and placing them in the community sites gives them the opportunity to see how things work behind the scenes. It gives them the opportunity to connect with people.

She expanded on her belief in service learning during the interview but admitted to having little specific training in this pedagogy. She felt service was “just kind of understood in our profession.” She described her commitment to service learning by saying,

I see service learning as a way for our students to go into the community and broaden their educational experience into the real world. I see this as a way for our students to gain experience but also for us to be a good neighbor in our communities.

She shared that her students often gained employment in these community agencies upon graduation as a result of their service learning experiences. Karin described this as a win-win situation for the students and the community.

Karin was very warm and welcoming during our initial interview and presented a very positive body language with smiles and hugs. At the end of this interview, she stated, “I think we could be good friends because we have so much in common.” I took this as a real indication of who she was as a person since I had never met her before and had limited information about her career and philosophy.

A follow-up face-to-face interview was held several months later in a restaurant near the Western Valley campus. When I entered the designated interview site, Karin welcomed me with a big smile and warm bear hug. She had come to this interview even though her husband had just had back surgery and needed care. We chatted like long-lost friends. She was gracious and animated during our interview that delved into more specific service learning activities and their level of success. Her last words to me before I left for home were, “I feel like I have met a kindred spirit.” This was surprising to me since we had just met through this research project.

Penelope

My final interview was scheduled as a result of a referral from the college's director of student engagement. Penelope represented a different discipline and generation than the other participants and merged service learning with an introduction to poetry class. She was very gracious in accepting my invitation to participate in my research project. This interview occurred in her small office that was tastefully decorated with artwork and contained many books of poetry and family photographs.

Penelope is the youngest of the participants and is a new mother. She completed her doctoral degree in English literature and criticism in modern American poetry and began teaching at the community college level four years ago. She worked first as an adjunct as she completed her studies and then obtained a full-time position. When asked about her childhood roots and service, Penelope responded by saying,

I'm from a very small community, 900 people. We didn't have things like volunteer organizations; we called it being a good neighbor. If anyone was sick or if a family member had died or someone's crops had failed, we made food and took it to the family.

It was never talked about in terms of volunteering or community service, but it was talked about as how you are supposed to be. You're supposed to care about each other.

Her first service learning experience came when she taught a creative writing class at a battered women's shelter in another state. She did this as a part of a non-credit service learning course. Penelope described this experience as life changing for her by stating,

It was different asking a college classroom to trust enough to write a poem about such and such and then walk into a women's shelter with a new group of women each week,

many of them who were there because the state threatened to take their children away if they didn't go and then ask them to trust me enough to write a poem about their lives.

She has taken this experience forward in her current position. As a first-generation college-student, Penelope resonated with the community college student. She described herself as a teacher by saying,

By that, I mean I do not like to be the center of attention. I like my students and their learning to be the center of attention. I like to run discussions and workshops and that sort of thing where students have to take real ownership of their own learning.

She connected with the community college student because she felt in many ways that community college students have been told that their stories do not matter. These feelings stem from the English composition books she used that only use four-year student work as examples. As a result of these feelings, Penelope began her campus' first student literary magazine comprising community college student works. This magazine is required in all English composition classes. Penelope feels this is a way to "validate the students' stories and tells them that they are important."

Penelope stressed several times her commitment to the students and their learning process. Her insight into the community college students came through her very astute comments. She stated,

Many of my students have been silenced in one way or another, whether it's by class or their poor performance in school, or not being prepared for college, or not having educated role models. So, they walk in here completely frightened that they can't do it or don't deserve to do it; it's my job to convince them that they can. A lot of it has to do with not just the touchy feely stuff in words and saying that you can do it, which I also

provide, but it's in the structure and saying, step one, step two, step three; this is what you need to do today . . . and then being there if they have questions.

Penelope reflected on the use of service learning in her classes by discussing the linkages between learning and life. Her member checking response to the interview transcript eloquently expressed her commitment to the service learning pedagogy by stating,

I am passionate about this approach. I think it helps students to learn the material and the concepts in a way that no test or paper can because it forces them to apply their knowledge and not just regurgitate it.

She believes that making associations between classroom learning and real life experiences are pivotal for the students' academic success. She clarified this by stating,

Well, I think that for my students, it helps learning come alive and helps them make that connection between these academic esoteric experiences in the classroom and their lives. It seems to have nothing to do with their real world and real people, and I am providing them with a venue where they are forced to see it in action. That helps them make the connections for themselves: Oh yeah, this doesn't have to be something that I learn and then forget.

Penelope shared common concerns from an administrative level. These concerns included liability and legal issues, insurance problems, plus initiating trust between her students, her community sites, and herself. She stated,

There are things that I never think about when I have to teach: Thinking about legal issues, thinking about transportation issues, thinking about how I am going to help my students translate poetry from academic speech to poetry for nine year olds.

She also reported having difficulty choosing community partners where all of her students could participate. Penelope described this difficulty “because some of them require background checks, drug tests, and TB tests on students . . . I knew I would lose all of my students because this was so invasive.” She went on to say that, “Even though I receive great support from my department and campus administration, there are barriers to this pedagogy that I struggle against: time, energy, revolving community partners/students/venues, etc.” She related the challenges others shared of making the community contacts, completing the necessary paperwork, and setting up transportation before the students can participate.

Penelope afforded me the opportunity to visit her service learning activity at the Boys and Girls Club while her students were working with elementary students in her art-into-poetry workshops. The purpose of this project was for the community college students to work one-on-one with Boys and Girls Club members to generate poems in response to artwork that will be exhibited during the month of April in a local art gallery. The children’s poetry was displayed next to the painting the poem described. In her electronic mail response to my invitation to participate in this study, Penelope stated, “Yes, I am interested. I welcome any opportunity to speak about service learning.” When I observed her first session of the service learning activity, it was obvious that Penelope gets her students actively involved with the project and the children. There was a sense of excitement in the air as her students arrived. She is very feminine and soft spoken with a warm approach to the interview and to her students as evidenced by her warm smile. She exhibited an excellent rapport with her students as she gently calmed their nerves and foreshadowed what was to come when the Boys and Girls Club members arrived. I observed until this activity was well under way. I was really impressed with the intensity of the 12 community college students in their work with the 12 Boys and Girls Club member volunteers.

The children involved in this project were in the upper elementary grades. Penelope acted as a facilitator to this activity by quietly walking around the room and offering the students assistance as needed.

Perhaps Penelope had the most touching story about a service learning activity that did not go as planned. She shared,

Last year we worked with Girls, Inc., but I opted not to work with them this year because we had problems with transportation getting the girls to campus last year. Last year the art gallery was going through some financial difficulties and uncertainties. They almost closed or did close during the time we were supposed to exhibit there. So, we had to move the exhibit to campus, but the girls couldn't make it. We had this huge event to honor the girls and none of them were able to come. It was really heartbreaking. My students and I took their awards to them.

Penelope related another major obstacle she faced with the Girls, Inc. project. She collected art pieces from the community to take to the girls because it allowed the children to see the actual texture and form of the piece. However, she described this approach as frightening, because

four-year-olds around art is just a bad idea because all they want to do is touch it. In fact, on one piece, the frame started coming apart, and it was a nightmare because I was envisioning myself having to buy it myself.

Therefore, Penelope heightened her preparation and searched for another agency to work with this year. She cold-called the Boys and Girls club and found it to be a perfect match. This year the art gallery is supplying the art and Penelope took color photocopies of the art so the children can touch it as much as they want, but the art is still safe.

When asked about her linkages with community agencies and the benefits the students and the community participants received, Penelope stated,

I do find that the students and community (both directly and indirectly) involved in my service learning projects respond very positively. Students have said that they wish every class could be like their service learning class. I have even had some students enroll in my class because they heard about the service learning component and wanted to participate in it. I have had participants from my community partners who have asked if we will repeat the project the next year, and I have been approached by other prospective community partners who have seen the products of our service learning projects and who want to be involved in some way in our future endeavors.

On my long drive home, I had the opportunity to reflect on my interview with Penelope and my observation of her students in their first visit to the Boys and Girls Club. As a trained teacher, I was amazed at how smoothly this initial experience went. The college students and Boys and Girls Club members were very engaged in this project. I attributed this to the advanced preparation Penelope and the club director had spent planning this activity. She made it look very easy because of her calm, quiet approach to the students. Her advanced preparation of having a folder for each community college student with very clear directions made the expectations clear and concrete for the students.

Summary

Although each of these participants had unique reasons for using the service learning pedagogy in his or her instruction, slightly different approaches to its implementation, and different areas of study, they shared a common passion for the use of this approach to instruction. This fervor crossed gender, ethnic, and generational lines with these participants, but their

commitment to the students and the zeal each has in working with the community college students was almost concrete. One of the cornerstones of qualitative research is in hearing the participant's story in his or her own words. Each participant offered a story rich in content that provided a strong structural framework for common themes to emerge. The face-to-face nature of these interviews allowed me to view the positive body language and hear the excitement in their voices that added to the data in a way unavailable in quantitative research. This approach allowed for the emergence of the common themes that pointed to the essence of this study that will be discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 5

Analysis and Interpretation

The purpose of this study was to investigate the motivations that caused some faculty in community colleges to embrace and actively pursue service learning pedagogy in their classrooms. It also sought to determine the catalysts that encouraged faculty to incorporate service learning into coursework. Chapter 4 presented the data collected through in-depth interviews of eight faculty members representing eight different campuses who were committed to the service learning pedagogy. Chapter 5 presents four core themes and the data that support these conclusions. These themes emerged through the use of Moustakas's (1994) four steps of qualitative research analysis. Analysis and synthesis of the interview transcripts, field notes, job descriptions, and course documents provided the basis for the identification of these fundamental themes: (a) pedagogical connections to previous school experiences and personal and family values, (b) passion and commitment each faculty member had for this approach to instruction, (c) persistence of the faculty participants to use this approach despite the many barriers they faced, and (d) pleasure these faculty members get from watching their students perform in a service learning setting. From these four themes, the essence of use of the service learning pedagogy is presented.

Chapter 5 also reveals two sub-themes gleaned from the data using the same coding analysis. The identified sub-themes were (a) bottom-up approach to instruction and (b) ability to

take risks with instruction. Many examples of the data that support these conclusions are presented in this chapter.

After the interviews were completed, faculty job descriptions were reviewed to determine the level of community service expected of each faculty member. The results of this endeavor yielded consistent results at all levels for full-time faculty. According to the Academic Affairs Procedures and Policies Manual (AAPP, 2010) located on the college's website, college and community service is one of the essential functions of a full-time faculty member at any level. These levels were instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor with a structured process for identifying each level. This essential community service function was defined as "the faculty member participates in community service activities on behalf of the college to advance the college's relationships within the service area as appropriate for the department/division" (AAPP, pp. 5-6). This statement reinforces the use of this pedagogy for the participants as a qualifier for meeting this criterion for this study but is also open to many interpretations and other opportunities for faculty to complete this requirement. No job description was located for adjunct faculty members.

Course documents were also examined to determine any common themes. These documents included the course outline and syllabi for 10 different courses taught by the research participants using service learning pedagogy. These courses included five at the 100, or first-year level, and five at the 200, or second-year level. Service learning assignment descriptions and grading rubrics were also provided when available. The findings of the course documents will be discussed further in the theme or sub-theme they represent.

A review of course documents found a wide variance in the points attributed to the service learning component of the classes. The point values ranged from a total of 40 points for

the projects to 120 points. The percentage of the service learning project of the total possible points ranged from 5% to 20% of the total grade, with an average of approximately 10%. Each participant required a written reflection paper linked to the service project with some requiring class presentations.

Emergent Themes

After careful analysis of the semi-structured interviews and artifacts including field notes, job descriptions, and course documents using horizontalization and clustering (Moustakas, 1994), the following four core themes were identified. The first was the connecting of the roots of this pedagogical approach to participants' previous school experiences and personal and family values. The second was the passion and commitment each faculty member had for this approach to instruction. The third was the persistence of the faculty participants to use this approach despite the limited administrative support and other barriers they faced. The final theme was the pleasure these faculty members got from watching their students perform in a service learning setting. This pleasure also included the positive feedback the instructors got both from the students and the community partners.

Pedagogy. The interviews provided rich textural descriptions of participants' stories that indicated that roots to this pedagogy often came from a variety of perspectives but pointed to a general source. Although each participant approached his or her commitment to service in a different way, the common thread of feeling personally responsible to help others permeated these eight interviews. Several of the participants traced the commitment to service back to their family values, previous educational experiences, and personal religious beliefs.

Sam, Bacon, and Penelope were committed to service as a result of their childhood upbringings. Each of them shared stories of how their families routinely helped others in the

community. The common theme with these participants was that helping others was expected of them from a young age. Each has embedded this family value into their instruction of community college students. Sam shared that his daughter had reiterated his mother's words when she said, "Grandma said you've got to give back to the community." Bacon remembers reading a biography about Jane Addams when she was young and how Jane spoke of the importance of "community and service as one way to change the world." Bacon began her community service as a candy striper at the age of 14. Penelope and Bacon both spoke of helping in the community as just what you did. Penelope shared that in her small Kansas community, helping others was just what was expected when others were in need. She stated, "You're supposed to care about each other." Neither of them saw this as community service; they just thought that was the norm for all families.

Julius and Karin traced their roots to previous school experiences when they had been tracked into academic lanes that would lead to careers not requiring college. Each of these participants readily shared this information and how they had overcome this recommendation from their high school counselors to become successful in college and were sensitive to their student needs as a result of this faulty guidance. Karin had been advised by her high school counselor that "I really wasn't college material, and I should just get married and have babies," which is what she did before she entered junior college at the age of 31. Julius had been counseled to "just learn a trade" because he "wasn't college material" due to his Tourette's syndrome and attention deficit disorder. He stated, "Having grown up with one [a disability] kind of changes your focus a bit."

Doctor C honed his philosophy of the importance of giving back to the community as an adult as he searched for his purpose in life during his doctoral work. He had never thought about

what professional legacy he would leave, but his doctoral philosophy class helped him determine his focus. He stated, “I think we are all here to help each other.” His personal educational philosophy views service learning as an extension of “what I feel education should be all about.” He continued by stating, “I’m hoping that you will find that all of us who have been in education for awhile would not be doing what we are doing if we didn’t feel like we were trying to help students on the other side of the podium sitting at that desk.”

Dorothy and Elizabeth traced their commitment to service back to their parents and personal religious beliefs. Elizabeth and her family members are very rooted into their religion and shared that “we all worked in the soup kitchen at our church.” Dorothy stated, “I think that as a Christian, that’s part of it . . . we are all here to look after others; we are to be of assistance to others.”

It soon became obvious that this pedagogical approach was deeply rooted in each of these faculty participants from their own unique experiences in their lives that provided the roots for their moral compass that has been carried forward into this chosen profession and approach to classroom instruction.

This theme connects with the moral development of each participant. The research of Gonsalves (2008) supported this finding in her dissertation conclusions that the university faculty in her study used this pedagogy because “their social consciousness was rooted in their personal/moral/spiritual values” (p. 237). She also concluded that “perspectives like social justice and change are filtered through family values and beliefs and they adapt and use what suits their goals and objectives for their courses” (p. 237).

Whereas Kohlberg (1981) developed a theory of moral development and reasoning based on justice demonstrated by a patriarchal society, his theory was challenged by Gilligan (1982)

who proposed a different approach to moral development, which included listening to the voices of others. Her model includes attention to feelings and concerns about the quality of one's life (Noddings, 2007). Gilligan (2003) described this different approach to moral development as the ethic of care where people dealt with relationships and listened to the voices of others. Tronto (1998) defined this ethic of care as

a species activity that includes everything that we do to maintain, continue, and repair our "world" so that we can live in it as well as possible. That includes our bodies, ourselves, and our environment, all of which seek to interweave in a complex, life-sustaining web.
(p. 16)

Gilligan's ethic of care approach seems more fitting to these research participants' view of the world than Kohlberg's justice view of moral development because the compassion and empathy they showed for the students and their concern for gaining student input into the learning process. The research participants were committed to improving the student learning process by giving them a voice in the projects and attempting to improve the lives of others.

Penelope, a first generation college student, very eloquently expressed the importance of giving the community college students a voice when she discussed the dinner conversation she had with her husband who is a music professor in a renowned music program at a local research university. She said her job was very different from her husband's teaching position because she had to find ways to build her students' self esteem and help them learn to believe in themselves while he had to give his students a more realistic view of their talents and abilities and instill in them the importance of practice and studying. She spoke of her community college students being made to feel that they do not matter, but she was determined to let them know that they do. Penelope shared,

Many of my students have been silenced in one way or another, whether it's by class or their poor performance in school, or not being prepared for college, or not having the role models. So they walk in here completely frightened that they can't do it or they don't deserve to do it and it's my job to convince them that they can.

Perhaps this comes from her own childhood school experiences, but she did not elaborate on them other than to say that she enjoyed school because she felt valued there.

The development of the ethic of care viewpoint stems from the divergence of Gilligan from Kohlberg's theory of moral development and began to emerge during the turbulent times of the 1960s with the Vietnam War and the Civil Rights Movement when the voices of the oppressed began to be heard (Gilligan, 1998). This time in history coincides with the youth of most of the participants and may help explain the root of this approach to their instruction.

Elizabeth referred to this turbulent time in our nation's history when she shared her personal and educational background during her first interview. When discussing the roots to her commitment to service, Elizabeth summarized what many other participants said in different ways. Her statement was an excellent example of a faculty member functioning through the ethic of care. She shared,

My family has always been one that was based on caring for their fellow man. We have always embraced all of our family members and attempted to help those in need. We do not differentiate between those who have been successful and those who have not. The Short family just takes care of them all.

Although Elizabeth's mother has been gone for 10 years, Elizabeth carries on her legacy with her family, her students, and her community. She works full-time for the college in the marketing

area, teaches in an adjunct capacity each semester, and still finds time to personally participate in at least one large community service activity each year.

Passion. Each of the faculty members interviewed was passionate about the value of the service learning approach to instruction and to their students. This message also came through very clearly when Julius and Karin referred to their high school experiences when they were counseled to find an option for their future other than college because they “weren’t college material,” but they both went on to successful academic careers beginning as non-traditional students in two-year colleges.

Julius described his service learning activities as a “win-win” situation because the charities benefit and the students “get more into it and get more out of it.” Field notes taken during a conversation with his students the day after his Winter Wonderland event provided good insight into Julius and his commitment to teaching. They iterated that Julius “lives and breathes service” because “it is a part of who he is.” They shared how much he enjoyed teaching and how seriously he takes service. One student addressed his compassion and his determination to help students with disabilities succeed.

Karin shared, “I believe that within each of us there is a spark of excellence that can be nurtured into brilliance.” Even as a new faculty member, Sam embraced this approach to instruction saying he “would have done it [service learning] anyway because it is who I am as a person.” He went on to describe the “aha moment when the light bulb goes on.” Dorothy and Doctor C each felt it was their moral and ethical obligation to help others and were enthusiastic and eager to share their stories when they were interviewed. This passion for the service learning pedagogy was apparent in their interviews by how excited they were to share their

experiences and the positive body language that was observed through their smiles and verbal excitement I documented in my field notes. Dorothy iterated her teaching philosophy by stating,

Well, there is a quote by Robert Frost that says “I am not a teacher, I am an awakener.”

And I think that is my philosophy of teaching. It’s not that I’m pouring something into someone; it’s more that I am helping them see their own potential, giving them the resources to learn, and then showing them where else they can go.

The participants’ passion for this mode of instruction became apparent as I progressed through the interviews over a seven-month timeframe, especially from the body language and tone of the participants’ answers. The faces of many of them lit up when they began to talk about this approach to instruction. Elizabeth became very animated in her facial expressions and hand motions when discussing her students and their activities. Karin shared, “I think that giving the students an opportunity to be successful helps them taste that success. Success breeds success.”

Although this is hard to measure in a quantitative nature, the qualitative evidence of this theme was very evident in the interview transcripts and field notes taken after each interview. Doctor C was interested in sharing the results with his faculty to encourage more service learning on his campus. Julius described this pedagogy as “wonderful—no support, but it is wonderful.” This passion began to become evident from the very beginning in the purposeful sampling approach I took in locating potential participants that will be discussed in a sub-theme.

The research of McKay and Rozee (2004) supports this finding, stating faculty members who immediately accept a new pedagogy have a positive attitude about innovative methods of instruction and the need to form community and student connections. These faculty members saw the benefits of this pedagogy far outweighing the costs. In her study of faculty perspectives

of service learning in a four-year institution, Gonsalves (2008) found that faculty members were primarily motivated to use this approach because of the positive impact it had on the students and their learning. She concluded that service learning “opens minds and hearts” (p. 170). The faculty members interviewed for her study were passionate about their disciplines and their students and believed that service learning was a “teaching methodology that led to deeper learning” (Gonsalves, 2008, p. 170). These faculty traits also appeared in the interviews of the participants in this study. Sam’s approach to the service learning grant he administered that tested the nitrate levels in ground water concurred with these findings.

Persistence. Faculty committed to service learning faced many barriers in this approach to instruction, but they felt the benefits far outweighed the drawbacks of this approach to instruction. The participants in this study addressed many of these barriers and the reasons they persisted from many viewpoints, but it was obvious that none of them was willing to abandon this approach to instruction because of their deep beliefs in its benefits to students and community partners. The barriers these faculty members faced fell into three main categories: institutional support, professional development opportunities, and curriculum issues.

Issues facing faculty from an institutional standpoint included liability issues, limited administrative support, inadequate financial support, and faculty loading issues. These levels of support varied somewhat between the campuses visited, but it could only be categorized as adequate at the Hill Country campus site. That campus had an office of civic engagement with a director and administrative assistant support. The other locations had added this responsibility to other student services positions, had civic engagement committees, or had no one responsible for assisting faculty in this area at all. Elizabeth described this issue in the Midtown campus as “a lack of cohesiveness leading to programs that were not wide-ranging and lacked financial

support,” but she went on to say that “the institution supported the faculty but it isn’t comprehensive.”

Penelope addressed the major barriers at the Hill Country campus as liability, possible invasion of student privacy, and transportation issues. She highlighted these issues when she stated,

Again, I learned some things last year because I collected art from the community myself last time. I took the actual art pieces to Girls Inc. twice, and I was in charge of transportation and making sure they were safe there, but letting four-year-olds around art is just a bad idea because they all want to touch it. In fact one piece of the frame started coming apart, and it was a nightmare because I was envisioning having to buy it myself. So the legal problems and insurance problems that I was talking about . . . So this time, I’ve worked with the Waldron and they’re supplying the art. I’m taking color photocopies of the art there so they can touch it as much as they want but the art’s still safe.

Julius also discussed these concerns when he shared the difficulties with getting the paperwork in order to complete a service learning project. He iterated, “Heaven forbid we have to get something or get a school bus . . . there’s about fifty or sixty dollars for out-of-pocket expenses. I take it out of my pocket because of all the paperwork process to try to get it approved and all of that nonsense to go with it.” He viewed the biggest barrier as “our local administration, but they talk a good game. Service learning is wonderful . . . no support; but it’s wonderful.”

The additional work and time involved in the use of this pedagogy was also a common concern. Penelope was the only participant who expressed getting off-loaded by one class to develop and deliver a service learning course funded by a Campus Compact grant. She

addressed the importance of this download as essential in getting her started with the service learning pedagogy that she was so deeply committed to use.

Dorothy also saw the additional time required with the service learning pedagogy as problematic. This was the only barrier Dorothy addressed by stating, “It takes time. I’m there with them for over 12 hours, and in this situation I’m there with, because I have different groups come in to teach different classes. I’m there for a full day. But I don’t see any; I haven’t reached any other barriers.”

This need for the examination of the faculty loading of service learning coursework was also addressed by Julius when he stated, “There is no release time to do service learning. You have to do it over and above your office hours and my class hours.” He went on to say, “You have to make time and you have to be willing to put in this extra time. Some faculty just don’t think that is appropriate for them.”

According to the Academic Policies and Procedures (2010) manual located on the college website, the current teaching load for full-time faculty in this statewide community college system was five non-laboratory-based courses per semester for a total of 15 credit hours. According to Penelope, this heavy teaching load caused the faculty to have limited time and energy to pursue this approach.

Curriculum issues were another barrier that was frequently mentioned. Making the project relevant to course objectives and having adequate assessment mechanisms were defined as concerns to many participants. Doctor C addressed this specific topic several different times during the interview while others referred to it in when discussing the fair assessment of the service learning activity. He said, “When I look at a class, I first look at the course objectives

and what can I do to meet those course objectives? And I have to figure out how to make it active. And I have to make it relevant. I think service learning is one of those.”

This conclusion was harmonious with the research findings of Hammond (1994) who found inadequate financial support as a common barrier to incorporating service learning activities into coursework. The issue of the additional time required to teach a course with a service learning component was substantiated by Hammond (1994). His study concluded that the additional time and energy required to use this pedagogy was problematic with 91.5% of the participants responding to his questionnaire. Abes, et al. (2002) expanded on the barriers addressed by Hammond by adding inadequate administrative support, lack of faculty recognition in the reward structure, and low faculty participation to the barriers faculty face in the use of this pedagogy. Abes, et al. (2002) also addressed the logistical issues as problematic.

McKay and Rozee (2004) found that faculty members firmly believed that adopting this innovative pedagogy connected strongly with their personal attitudes, beliefs, and values and made it worthy of the risk despite its ambiguity. They adopted this pedagogy even when faced with opposition from colleagues. However, McKay and Rozee concluded that professional development opportunities for faculty were crucial to sustaining this change toward the use of the service learning pedagogy. These findings were substantiated by Garcia and Robinson (2005) when they found professional development opportunities a crucial component of successful community college service learning programs.

Although the participants in this study faced many obstacles with the use of the service learning pedagogy, none of them was willing to abandon this approach to instruction. The most common barriers faced by these participants was time to plan and implement this instructional approach, lack of adequate institutional support, and limited professional development

opportunities. However, despite these difficulties, these faculty members persisted with this approach to instruction because of their deep beliefs that this approach was best for student learning. Julius summarized this beautifully with his statement, “Service learning is wonderful. No support, but it is wonderful.”

Pleasure. Seeing students make the connections between the classroom and the real world was a strong motivator in the use of this approach to instruction for these participants. Both Sam and Julius addressed the satisfaction they received when they saw a student’s eyes light up with understanding at the moment the course content met real life application. Both Sam and Julius addressed this as the “aha moment,” where textbook information intersected reality. This was affirmed by the students in visits to their classrooms after their service learning events.

The first visit was to Sam’s classroom to observe the students’ classroom presentations of the watershed service learning project. My observations were documented in my field notes. Sam invited several outside visitors from the college, the collaborating university faculty members, and community partners to observe. Sam’s students described him to the community visitors as “awesome.” They went on to state how much they liked the hands-on experience and how they learned to use the equipment correctly. The students were divided into five different groups of three to five students with a total student population of 19 with each group addressing a different area of the service learning project. Although the students were nervous speaking in front of their classmates and other members of the college and community, the student presentations were a great example of student comprehension of the complex watershed issue. The students said, “We liked the hands-on experience and how we learned to use this piece of equipment correctly” and described Sam as “awesome.” They made the connection between the

local streams and the larger aquatic ecosystem in the area. One student expressed support for this project and his hope that Sam would continue it in future sections. This project illustrated a strong connection between this project and research. The students were passionate about the need to continue to address this problem.

During the presentations, Sam stood by the groups in a paternalistic way like a proud new father with body language that indicated his pleasure with the results of this project and his ability to share them with members of the college and community organizations. Sam addressed this as “an opportunity for the students to shine and be proud of their work because they were going to meet some people who may have a full-time job for them later.”

Julius invited me to visit his class the morning after attending the Winter Wonderland event to observe the students as they debriefed the strengths and weaknesses of this activity that I feverishly documented in my field notes. He introduced me to his class of 10 students (two men and eight women) and explained my reason for being there and then left the room so the students could share their personal reflections on the use of service learning in general and the resale shop event in particular. Student comments included Jack’s passion for the students and his love for teaching. They said, “Jack can’t help but share. It is a part of who he is.” His openness and willingness to allow me to participate in these events were heartwarming. His interactive way of instruction and attention to student comments were affirming to his teaching philosophy using experiential learning with a focus on intermingling learning and serving. Julius’s students described him as “passionate about teaching.” They said, “Julius lives and breathes it [service]. It is a part of a lot of his classes. Julius can’t help but share because it is a part of who he is.” The students in the class were very vocal in their praise for Julius and his teaching style. It was as if he unexpectedly opened the flood gates for praise. Even though I had expected just to

observe his classroom, this opportunity provided an unexpected wealth of data. This was a very exciting experience for me to witness because Julius is a very humble man.

Even though we had talked some at the event, our semi-structured interview took place after the classroom observation. During that interview, Julius shared his feeling about the event by saying,

I think the . . . I guess to pick one point is the culmination of the event. Like last night where you see the fruition of their labor is coming to the head and they're seeing that, wow, this actually was worthwhile. And you can see the light bulbs go on at certain times, yeah this was working.

Julius became involved with this community organization several years ago when he taught a marketing class geared toward nonprofit agencies. Two of his students were employees of the resale shop and invited him to participate in their annual event. Julius's Winter Wonderland activity evolved from this course. He formed a lasting relationship with the resale shop director that landed him on their Board of Directors.

This common thread was also evident in the interview with Elizabeth when she became very animated with her speech and her eyes lit up as she spoke of her commitment to service in her events planning classes. She overlapped the service learning happening in the classroom with the satisfaction she received through her own personal service to the community. She shared, "We always receive a thank you note or electronic mail after the events with praise for their efforts and the events. Some even provide letters for the students' portfolios."

Karin contended that she has always had the kind of campus support she needs and appreciation for the positive presence her human services program has in the community. This support came mostly in the form of campus and community recognition of her efforts. Despite

her lack of formal training in the use of the service learning pedagogy, she stated that service was “kind of understood in our profession despite the premium it puts on faculty time.” She was interested in putting a dollar amount on the service her students provided to the community as in-kind donations. She felt this dollar amount would make a strong positive statement to the college administration on the impact of service in the community.

When asked about the most important thing she would like to share about her commitment to service learning, Elizabeth stated, “My commitment to service comes from the desire to share the feelings of accomplishment that comes from a job well done and being a part of those who will take the lead in the future.” Bacon described the collaboration with her community partners by stating, “By working together, we can all make things better.” She also talked about the benefit to the students by making community connections so when they begin to look for a job they already have some avenues to pursue.

Doctor C presented two excellent examples of this with the design technology students recreating a CAD drawing of a hay press located in a chicken house in a small town in the southern part of the state. The state historical society had approached Doctor C to explore the options of documenting the schema of this antique piece of equipment before it was dismantled and reconstructed in a museum. Doctor C approached the design technology students, who measured the hay press and converted this data to a CAD drawing to preserve the exact dimensions of this valuable piece of history. He also spoke about the HVAC students participating in the installation of commercial heating and air conditioning systems at a nearby mall to give the students an internship experience that would supplement their training in residential installation. These activities illustrate the close connection between the learning

activities in the classroom setting and the practical application of these skills in the real world setting.

These statements led to the identification of this core theme. Interacting in a positive way with the community partners was a win-win situation for these faculty members and their students.

These findings are congruent with Hammond's (1994) research that faculty received personal satisfaction from the positive feedback from students, colleagues, and community agencies. The university faculty members participating in this study took the positive feedback as a reflection that their efforts were successful. Other factors that emerged through Hammond's quantitative study were the certainty that the students had "gained professional skills through participation in their course" (Hammond, 1994, p. 25). An additional conclusion from Hammond's study was the strengthened relationship with the community agency that occurred as a result of the service learning activity. Abes, et al. (2002) confirmed Hammond's finding that university faculty members were motivated by "providing university-community partnerships and providing useful service to the communities" (Abes, et al., p. 14). McKay and Rozee (2004) also stated that meeting community partners' needs was a vital part of the service learning pedagogy. The satisfaction of these relationships helped perpetuate this approach to instruction.

Summary of Themes

Four core themes emerged from this study through dialogue and document examination. These themes were (a) pedagogical connections to previous school experiences and personal and family values, (b) passion and commitment each faculty member had for this approach to instruction, (c) persistence of the faculty participants to use this approach despite the many

barriers they faced, and (d) pleasure these faculty members get from watching their students perform in a service learning setting.

The deep commitment each of these faculty members had to this approach to instruction was readily apparent from the passion and enthusiasm each shared during our interview as observed through eagerness to participate, positive body language, and voice intonation. It was obvious that each participant was eager to convey his or her experiences with using service learning in the classroom and hoped to encourage other faculty to try this approach to instruction. These faculty members were not afraid “to show service with all of its warts” (Levine, 1994, p. 113), as evidenced with their willingness to share both their successes and their difficulties with their use of this approach. Some were even excited to read the results of this study and use the findings to encourage other faculty members at their campus sites to consider this approach to instruction.

The personal satisfaction each participant achieved through the use of this approach to learning was evident in his or her responses and the positive body language each presented during the interview. It was evident that each participant enjoyed discussing this topic and sharing his or her perspectives. Their enthusiasm for the use of this approach to instruction permeated their beings and almost “oozed from their pores.” Over and over I heard about the positive feedback they had received from the community and how community partners were beginning to come to them with ideas for student activities.

The commitment to student learning was easily observable in the field observations where the instructors acted as facilitators of learning rather than using the “banking” approach as described by Freire (1990), where instructors deposit information into student brains as they sit passively in classrooms waiting to be taught. During the service learning projects and follow-up

activities observed and documented in the field notes, the research participants let the students do most of the talking driven by open-ended questions posed by the instructor that the students had to ponder before responding. Doctor C shared his view of why we do what we do when he said,

I'm hoping you find with all of us that have been in education for awhile that I can't believe we would not be doing what we're doing if we didn't feel like we were trying to help students on the other side of the podium sitting at that desk.

Sub-themes

Through careful analysis of the data collected in this study, two sub-themes emerged. These sub-themes were (a) bottom-up approach to teaching and (b) the risk-taking these faculty members accepted with this approach to instruction. The sub-themes were determined by analyzing the entire process of participant selection and from filed notes and interview data.

Bottom-up Approach. The first sub-theme identified in this study was the bottom-up approach to instruction used by these faculty members. A review of the course documents revealed that many instructors gave their students a choice of activities or projects. The overriding finding when analyzing the course documents was that most service learning coursework occurred in 200-level classes with the capstone class almost always including a service project. Course documents were provided for ten different classes. These courses represented a variety of disciplines with each requiring at least one service project. These service projects were all completed in on-profit community agencies and ranged from six hours to 20 in length. Each instructor required a written reflection of the activity completed, with many presenting guided responses. A grading rubric was provided for four of these projects with Doctor C providing the greatest detail. He required his students to give examples of leadership they observed, funding source for the organization, and a description of the culture of the

institution. He suggested the students visit the Humane Society, a soup kitchen, or a nursing home. The students were also required to describe their feelings while volunteering for this organization and how they would feel if they had to trade places with its residents. Bacon, Elizabeth, Doctor C, and Karin allowed the students choices in their service learning site, while Julius, Sam, and Dorothy selected the site and the activity for the student. Every participant required a written reflection of the student's experience with Dorothy and Sam requiring classroom presentations of the project.

During our interviews, Bacon, Penelope, Julius, and Karin talked about the importance of giving the student a voice in learning. Julius spoke of making decisions by consensus in his classes. Bacon shared that one of her students had difficulty working with others so she worked with the community partner to develop an individual service learning activity for this student to complete while the remainder of the class worked together to complete another activity at this agency. To insure the student's success, Bacon spent the first day of volunteering with this student to make sure everything went smoothly. The student successfully completed this day and went to spend two extra days helping at this community partner site because she enjoyed the experience so much and felt so useful to the agency. This allowed the entire class to meet the service learning objective in an appropriate way for all.

Dorothy spoke of the satisfaction her students received after completing their service learning activity. Although she reported that many of the students dreaded the experience because of the requirement to prepare a lesson with resources and speak in front of a group, none of the students reported disliking the experience. She was proud to report that many of her students came back after this experience and said it was one of the highlights of their nursing training because they now saw themselves as capable.

This sub-theme was consistent with Dewey's (1938) pragmatic approach to education where instruction was based on previous experience and was an essential part of the learning process. Dewey believed that, to be effective, education must provide a meaningful continuity with previous experience and consist of interaction and engagement between the students and the objects of their study. Kolb (1984) expanded Dewey's theory to include a four-step process approach to experiential experiences that incorporated a reflective thinking step designed to help the student more fully understand the impact of their experiences.

Dewey's (1938) pragmatic approach to instruction postulated that learning occurred through active experimentation and reflective thought that causes individual cognition and social context to intersect. This view of education was supported by Deans (1999) when he stated,

Dewey favors any opportunity through which we can redirect curriculum from lessons that quiz individual accumulation of knowledge to projects that draw on individual talents within collaborative efforts that intervene social settings, whether in classrooms or local communities. (p. 18)

This reflection on learning was congruent with the bottom up approach to instruction emphasized in service learning pedagogy. McKay and Rozee (2004) stated that faculty using this pedagogy were willing to accept the ambiguity involved with how student work could be evaluated using this approach to instruction. According to Deans (1999), Freire's expectations of college curricula were to stimulate curiosity to create knowledge that was collaborative, active, community oriented, and grounded in the culture of the student. This could only be achieved through active participation of the students with the faculty.

Risk-taking. The second sub-theme identified with this study involved the risk these instructors were willing to take with this instructional approach. Despite their commitment to

this approach to instruction, five participants spontaneously shared examples of when the service learning project did not turn out as hoped for a variety of reasons, but these occurrences did not cause them to abandon this pedagogy. Each faculty member found a way to salvage the learning despite the pitfalls each experienced by rethinking the approach for the next time. Julius described this as the ability for the students to problem solve and “think on their feet.”

Sam shared the difficulties he faced with the water testing project. He compared the validity of the results the students reported to those acceptable in industry. Sam reported,

Well, the ones [data results] in house just didn't work right. The method . . . well I didn't have it set . . . I still don't have it the way I would like this method set up. I'm real particular about things. And I explained to them why you have to be this particular. I was teaching them quality control, too, because that is what I did [in industry]. So I was teaching them quality control, but the comparison didn't work. It's not like they weren't learning a method. It just wasn't that good. If I was doing research or if I was working in industry I would have said, nope we've got to do it again.

Julius reported a similar experience when he spoke about a summer project when his students were expected to provide activities for the children attending a festival. He and his students had prepared a table to house these activities in the middle of the festival, but upon arrival they found their space had been limited to the corner of a large tent. He helped his students quickly rethink their activities and how to make sure they reached the children. Julius used this experience to help his students solve unexpected problems to ensure the experience met their desired goals.

Bacon shared an experience when she took her students to a local elementary school to help reassemble a library when two schools merged. Although this activity was planned well in

advance at the request of the school personnel, when the students arrived, the school personnel had no plan on how to utilize these students effectively. The students and instructor stood around for over an hour waiting for direction, which caused frustration with the students, school personnel, and community college instructor. Bacon emphasized the importance of the organization of the activity with the students and the community partner. She shared, “They knew we were coming. They knew how many students we were going to have, but they were just not well organized. I think our students were very frustrated.”

Elizabeth shared a similar problem of lack of organization and planning by the community partner causing some difficulties completing the service learning project. She shared,

The students toured the facility, developed the layout only to arrive at the venue to find the room had not been set and the furniture they had requested was not even available. After a bit of grumbling, they [the students] adjusted their plan and ended up with an awesome room presentation. At the end of the event, our client raved about the set up and the food and the students were beaming.

She described another experience where the students failed to complete the planning process. Elizabeth iterated,

They [the students] failed to develop an agenda for the day of the program and I had to step in to get things on track at the last minute. This was a hard lesson for them, but an opportunity for them to experience the results of poor planning. They were honest in their essays about the event and accurately noted that they had dropped the ball.

Penelope also focused on this aspect several times during her interview with difficulties she experienced with her project with Girls, Inc., last year. The difficulties transporting and

displaying the artwork in a safe manner caused difficulties for Penelope, but she persevered. She was excited about this project, but the culminating activity was unsuccessful due to transportation issues for the participants. However, the students and Penelope found an alternative method of getting the awards to the girls who participated.

Abes, et al. (2002) addressed this risk-taking approach to instruction using the service learning pedagogy as common in first generation faculty “willing to experiment on limited resources with service learning’s possibilities” (p. 6). McKay and Rozee (2004) characterized these faculty members as innovators because of their openness and eagerness to try new ideas. Clayton and Ash (2004) described this approach to instruction as counter normative because “students and instructors alike may fail to take into account how fundamentally different service learning is from traditional teaching and learning strategies” (p. 60).

Summary of Sub-themes

The purpose of this study was to investigate the motivations that caused some faculty in community colleges to embrace and actively pursue service learning pedagogy in their classrooms. It also sought to determine the catalysts that encouraged faculty to incorporate service learning into coursework. The data revealed two sub-themes about the motivations and catalysts for use of the service learning pedagogy.

The first sub-theme identified was the bottom-up approach to instruction that permeated these interviews. These instructors were willing to allow the students to fully participate in the learning experience and have a voice in the activities they would pursue. The participants were not afraid to allow the students’ input into the service learning project. The classroom observations provided ample evidence of this finding. In fact, student input was nurtured and encouraged by these faculty members. Each participant felt strongly that making these

connections between the classroom and real world experience enhanced student learning. These participants were not afraid of allowing the students to provide input into the service learning project but encouraged the students to develop, analyze, and evaluate these activities. In fact, student input was nurtured and encouraged. Each participant felt strongly that making these connections between the classroom and real world experience enhanced student learning and increased the level of comprehension of course content.

The second sub-theme I identified was that these participants were willing to take risks with using a service learning pedagogy. They realized that each service learning activity may not go exactly as planned, but these unanticipated events could be used as a problem solving learning experience. Examples of service learning activities that encountered disappointments and unexpected complications were addressed by Julius, Sam, and Bacon. But Penelope had the most poignant experience during her project with the Girls Incorporated activity when the community participants were unable to attend the culminating award ceremony for the poetry the girls created. Penelope, the students, and the participants were disappointed. Through a problem-solving class session, Penelope and her students varied from their original plan and found a way to get the awards to the girls to honor their work. This unfortunate experience was incorporated into the overall evaluation of the project and adjustments were made for the next year's activities to avoid the pitfalls this class experienced.

Summary

While collecting the data for this study, participants told their stories in their own words identifying the individual root source of their personal commitment to this approach to instruction and student learning. After the triangulation of all the data sources, and the identification of the themes and sub-themes, the true essence of this research study emerged.

Analysis of these four themes and two sub-themes led to the conclusion that the essence of the motivations that inspired these community college faculty members to pursue the service learning pedagogy to instruction came from deep within their souls and touched their individual definitions of the purpose of life. The catalysts to the use of this approach were intrinsic rather than extrinsic with these participants. The support for the institution from a financial, faculty loading, recognition, or professional development standpoint was inadequate to be a catalyst for use of this pedagogy with these participants. They persisted with this approach to instruction in spite of the obstacles and barriers each faced because they felt it was the right thing to do.

Each of these participants came from a different perspective with his or her responses that led to a common conclusion that indicated the importance each of them placed on giving back to the community and leading students to connect with the content to discover the deeper meaning. Another concern of some participants was that the students apply these meanings to persons and circumstances outside the classroom. Sam addressed this directly when he stated, “One of the goals kind of in my mind is that when they [students] go out and hear that we have an oil spill that they can sit down for a second and hear the other side and start asking some questions. What is really important is that they learn to look at the full view.”

Although the motivations of each participant to use this approach were very personal, each participant was guided by his or her own internal moral compass that came from the ethic of care perspective purported by Gilligan (1982). While each participant approached this from a personal perspective, the catalysts to action with the implementation of this approach came from a deep commitment to students’ learning and input into their educational journey. Each participant was warm and open in sharing his or her personal story and perspective on the use of the service learning pedagogy. The voice of each participant came through very clearly through

the iteration of his or her stories during the interviews and was reinforced in the follow-up contacts. It was impossible not to see and hear iterations of the internal moral compass of each participant through such statements as Sam's, "Helping others is just who I am as a person," or Dorothy's, "I think we are all here to help others." Penelope took this a little further when she stated,

We are here to look after others and I am passionate about this approach to learning . . . Many of my students have been silenced in one way or another; whether it's about class or poor performance in school, or not being prepared for college, or not having educated role models. So they walk in here completely frightened that they can't do it or don't deserve to do it; it's my job to convince them they can.

The compassion and empathy for the students and commitment to their success was the common core motivating all participants to action. The lack of institutional support, the discipline area, extra time involved with delivery, the lack of recognition, and the limited professional development opportunities had little impact on the use of this approach by these participants.

These comments and many others led to a review of Kohlberg's (1981) theory of moral development that focused on the moral development of adolescent boys from a paternalistic perspective based on Kantian beliefs. A review of Gilligan's (1982) alternative theory of moral development that focused on a maternalistic point of view followed. She countered Kohlberg's theory to include an alternative moral perspective that included the voices of women in relation to moral reasoning and the development of relationships. Kohlberg's findings were more closely aligned with the justice view of moral development based on rules whereas Gilligan's focus was on the care ethics that highlighted connections, relationships, and responsibility for others.

Gilligan (1982) contended that these moral orientations were gender related but not gender-based and developed during young adulthood when the “identity and intimacy dilemma of conflicting commitment, the relationship between self and other, is exposed” (p. 156).

This linkage with the ethic of care was demonstrated in the findings of this research study and faculty use of the service learning pedagogy in many ways. According to Anderson (2004), Gilligan’s care ethic was “characterized by nurturance [and] placing an emphasis on responsibility to others” (p. 4). Each research participant focused on the importance of the student having input into the learning process and the significance of the reflective process that followed the activity. Penelope actually spoke of giving her students a voice in their educational experience. The service learning approach to instruction was an example of Freire’s (1990) use of dialogue where instructors use a participatory approach to instruction using situations that were “collaborative, active, community related, and grounded in the culture of the student” (Deans, 1999, p. 22). Numerous examples of this dialogue were observed and documented in the field notes in the classes I visited where students were doing presentations to share their findings, debriefing after their Winter Wonderland activity, or preparing to write poetry with students at the Boys and Girls Club.

However, further research into this area is necessary to substantiate the findings of this study. As in all qualitative research, the results cannot be generalized without further research to support or dispute the study’s findings. The naturalistic setting of qualitative research provided an interesting backdrop to the data collection, but the settings and culture of each institution of higher education differs, and assumptions cannot be made that would cross these institutional boundaries.

CHAPTER 6

Implications, Recommendations and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the motivations that caused some faculty in community colleges to embrace and actively pursue service learning pedagogy in their classrooms. Chapter 4 presented the participants' stories told in their own words. Chapter 5 presented the common themes and sub-themes found through the triangulation of the data from interviews, field notes, analysis of course documents, and job descriptions. Four core themes emerged from the analysis of the data: (a) pedagogical connections to previous school experiences and personal and family values, (b) passion and commitment each faculty member had for this approach to instruction, (c) persistence of the faculty participants to use this approach despite the many barriers they faced, and (d) pleasure these faculty members get from watching their students perform in a service learning setting. Chapter 5 also revealed two sub-themes gleaned from the data. The identified sub-themes were (a) bottom-up approach to instruction and (b) ability to take risks with instruction.

Limitations of the Study for Higher Education

The research questions and methodology for this research study provided the framework to guide data collection. However, there are limitations with all research studies because the data collection provides a snapshot of what was happening at one institution and was limited to one narrow timeframe. The same was true with this study of community college faculty who

routinely utilized the service learning pedagogy. Birnbaum (1988) characterized community colleges as large bureaucracies with centralized administrators who made most of the key decisions. These decisions were filtered down to the various campuses through an extensive organization chart designed to facilitate communication and delegate authority which was true in the system represented in this study. Morgan (2006) chose another way to describe this type of bureaucratic organization, calling it a machine that “emphasizes precision, speed, clarity, regularity, reliability, and efficiency achieved through the creation of a fixed division of tasks, hierarchical supervision, and detailed rules and regulations” (p. 17). Both of these definitions provide an accurate portrayal of the community college system used in this study. This bureaucratic approach provides an inherent limitation for other colleges and universities.

Another limitation to this qualitative phenomenological case study was the telephone interviews used to collect data. Although these telephone interviews were followed with face-to-face interviews, the quality of the data collected lacked the depth of those initially done face-to-face. The participants were already familiar with the study and its methodology, which caused a certain lack of spontaneity with their responses.

Implications for Higher Education

There are several implications for higher education based on the findings of this study. Initially, I would suggest this study be replicated, especially at the community college level in another area of the country, to see if any parallels can be drawn between the findings. The community college level seems most appropriate because of the limited research on the use of service learning pedagogy in two-year institutions. The focus on research and tenure issues at the four-year institutions made it difficult to compare study results in two-year institutions that lack these requirements.

The demographics of the community college students often differ from those in large four-year institutions. The community college students are often there to gain job skills for employment, to retrain for new employment, or to transfer to four-year institutions. This gives the community college student body a different complexion than that of the typical four-year university student. Couple this with the academic course level of 100 and 200 level classes offered at the community college level compared to the higher level undergraduate courses found in the four-year setting, and the look of service learning activities can be much different than at the university level. This provided another implication that must be considered when evaluating and comparing the community college and the university use of the service learning pedagogy.

Hopefully, this study has provided some insight into what motivated these participants to engage their students in learning using service learning pedagogy. These faculty members spoke of a subculture naturally developing by faculty who believe in this approach to instruction. This adds an implication for community college administrators to assist with the development and sustainment of this subculture by providing the tools and resources necessary for these faculty to flourish through adequate professional development opportunities, recognition opportunities, adequate financial resources, and faculty loading support.

Recommendations for Further Research

Research studies tackle a very specific component of the chosen topic making it difficult to generalize the findings, but they also open up new questions that require further research. This study was no different. This study could be broadened to include student focus groups to center on the students' perspectives of these faculty members' approach to instruction. The field observations provided some rich textural insight into this topic, but a more formalized approach could be taken in a replication of this study.

The unexpected number of participants who were community college or junior college graduates begs for further study. This study revealed that four of the eight participants were junior or community college graduates and five were first-generation college students. Three entered college several years after high school graduation, making them non-traditional college students. Questions of whether this was an anomaly or a routine part of community college faculty using this pedagogy is worth exploring. A qualitative study could be pursued in this statewide system with all faculty members using this approach and the results compared to this study to verify or dispute its findings.

Perhaps this could account for the ease of participant acquisition. Upon hearing about this study from their academic leadership, Doctor C, Sam, and Julius immediately volunteered to participate. The five women were contacted by electronic mail followed by a personal phone call and shared the same eagerness to participate. This was an unexpected surprise to me. The average age of these participants was approximately 52 years old. Linking this back to Erikson's (Berns, 2010) stages of psychosocial development, these participants fall into the generativity versus self-absorption stage that occurs during middle to late adulthood. Berns (2010) described this stage as when these adults take an interest in guiding and directing the next generation. This was readily evident with the participants in this study. Each shared a deep concern for the students and their learning. It would prove very interesting to conduct a quantitative study to determine what impact age has on the propensity of community college faculty members to utilize this instructional pedagogy.

Another area worth investigating is if the themes would change in community colleges with a mature civic engagement component. According to their website, the statewide system investigated in this study has been a community college system only since 2005. Comparing a

fledgling community college's approach and support for service learning in their classrooms with more established community colleges systems that have used this approach for a decade or more would provide an interesting contrast. This could be approached from many different perspectives, starting at the institutional level with the college mission statements and moving to include institutional levels of support for civic engagement. This could include financial and institutional support, routine professional development opportunities, and the level of acceptance of their faculty members to this approach to instruction.

The numerous articles and books published by the Campus Compact organization provided a rich research base for this study, but not all community colleges are active members of this organization. Many of the participants in this study had not participated in trainings offered by the Campus Compact organization and one had never heard of it. Replicating this study in member community colleges with a long, rich history with the Campus Compact organization may present different results, especially in the areas of professional development and faculty acceptance.

The institutional support for the service learning pedagogy was referenced over and over by these participants as an area of concern or a barrier to this approach to instruction. Currently, institutions categorized by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in the newly formed Carnegie Civic Engagement classification have addressed these issues and provided the support necessary for more faculty members to succeed with this approach, but others need to evaluate current levels of support to encourage and sustain this approach at their institutions. Comparing those community colleges with this designation with those without it would be one measure of the success of this new approach to classification.

Franco's (2007) attests that one out of two community colleges are currently promoting the service learning pedagogy and that some community college faculty are interested in trying new strategies to promote student learning. Community college faculty members need to evaluate their current delivery methods to determine their long-term effectiveness for student learning. Franco stated, "As curriculum it [service learning] can help students develop personal character and learn how to behave as better citizens, eager to participate in a truly democratic and equitable school and community" (p. 3). Research on the successes with student retention and graduation rates of the community colleges promoting this approach would aid those considering implementing this pedagogy.

Conclusion

Franco (2007) pointed out the need for community colleges to focus on the development of sustainable service learning programs that can "democratize higher education, the communities they serve, and the students they educate" (p. 106). This requires faculty at community colleges to try different instructional approaches that are appropriate for students transferring to four-year universities and those seeking vocational/technical education. Clayton and Ash (2004) described the service learning pedagogy as counter-normative because it changed nearly every aspect of teaching both from the instructor delivery to student learning techniques. However, this shift from the instructor-centered pedagogy to a student-centered pedagogy often contradicted the customary methods student have experienced in their early educational experiences. However, Clayton and Ash contended that it was through this cognitive dissonance "where learning unfolds like a wave that both the students and the faculty members ride in unison" (p. 62).

The findings of this study support this counter-normative approach to instruction used by these faculty members. These faculty members have veered from the traditional approach of creating exams to test the mastery level of all students against the same criterion to a more open approach using the reflection process to measure student learning and growth. This was coupled with more traditional assessment methods in each of the courses I reviewed, but these instructors seemed to put more emphasis on the process of learning rather than the products of learning.

The essence of the findings indicated that each of these participants was functioning from his or her internal moral compass ethic of care perspective identified by Gilligan (1982). Much of this ethic of care perspective to moral development was based on the work of Gilligan's two mentors, Erikson and Kohlberg. The tenets of the ethic of care provided a strong foundation for many of the themes identified in this study and have been identified as the essence of the findings. Most participants shared the roots of their philosophy of education from a caring approach from their own previous school and personal experiences.

Julius, one of the research participants, best described what happens at the community college level in some programs and classrooms as a "culture of service." He went on to explain how faculty members with the propensity to use this approach seem to find each other and create their own subculture within each college's collective culture. Perhaps this best described how each of these participants has embedded this approach into instruction even when this culture was not promoted and nurtured at the institutional level. This viewpoint was not addressed by other participants, but it made sense in an overall manner. This view was congruent with Kezar's (2001) views on how to understand and facilitate change in organizations. Kezar contended that the distinct characteristics of academe make creating a change in institutional climate rather challenging.

Prentice, et al. (2003) recommended that “institutions start small and connect with existing initiatives” (p. 53). This statement seemed appropriate for this statewide community college system that is currently striving to meet the educational goals of their communities and citizens of their state. Results of this study indicated some institutional shortcomings that need to be addressed. This institution might want to consider small steps toward institutionalizing support for this approach by providing an avenue for routine, systematic professional development, financial support, and personnel positions to encourage civic engagement and service learning as the norm rather than an exception.

It seems fitting at this point to end this dissertation as it began with the words that Jane Addams (1964) spoke so many years ago:

But we all know that each generation has its own test, the contemporaneous and current standard by which alone it can adequately judge its own moral achievements, and that it may not legitimately use a previous and less vigorous test. The advanced test must indeed include that which has already been attained; but if it includes no more, we shall go forward thinking complacently that we have “arrived” when in reality we have not yet started. (p. 2)

Her words resonated from the very beginning of the research and seem even timelier today at the end of this doctoral journey. Let this research be a tribute to her memory.

References

- Abes, E., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9, 5-17. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0009.101>
- Academic Policies and Procedures Manual. (2010). Chapter 3:1. 3-6. Retrieved from <http://cc.ivytech.edu/>
- Addams, J. (1964). *Democracy and social ethics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Anderson, M. (2004). Jane Addams' democracy and social ethics: Defending care ethics. *Macalester Journal of Philosophy*, 13, 1-6. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/philo/vol13/iss1/2>
- Battistoni, R. (2002). *Civic engagement across the curriculum: A resource book for faculty in all disciplines*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Beauchamp, T., & Childress, J. (2001). *Principles of biomedical ethics*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Berns, R. M. (2010). *Child, family, school and community: Socialization and support*. Wadsworth, CA: Cengage Learning.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bingle, R.G., Phillips, M.A., & Hudson, M. (2004). *The measure of service learning: Research scales to assess student learning*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Burke, K. (2008). *The Truman Commission: International development for colleges*. Retrieved from <http://ccid.kirkwood.cc.ia.us/resourctrumancommission-burke.pdf>
- Butin, D. W. (2006). The limits of service learning in higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 29, 473-498. doi:10.1353/rhe.2006.0025
- Carey, K. (2007). America's best community colleges: Why they're better than some of the "best" four-year universities. *The Washington Monthly*, 39(9), 24- 28. Retrieved from: <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/2007/0709.caseyessay.html>
- Clayton, P., & Ash, S. (2004). Shifts in perspective: Capitalizing on the counter-normative nature of service learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 11, 59-70. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0011.106>
- Cohen, A., & Brawer, F. (2008). *The American community college*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cone, D., & Harris, S. (1996). Service learning practice: Developing a theoretical framework. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 3, 31-43. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0003.104>
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design*. Lincoln, NE: Sage Publications.
- Daynes, G., & Longo, N. V. (2004). Jane Addams and the origins of service learning practice in the United States. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1, 5-13. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0011.101>
- Deans, T. (1999). Service learning in two keys: Paulo Freire's critical pedagogy in relation to John Dewey's pragmatism. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 6, 15-29. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0006.102>
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*. New York, NY: D.C. Heath

- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Collier Books.
- Driscoll, A. (2008). Carnegie's community-engagement classification: Insights and intentions. *Change, 40*, 38-41. doi:10.3200/CHNG40.1.38-41
- Duffy, D. K. (2007). Campus compact, service learning, and community college engagement. In M. Baratian, D. K. Duffy, R. Franco, A. Hendricks, & T. Renner (Eds.), *Service learning course design for community colleges* (pp. 1-4). Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Dukes, S. (1984). Phenomenological methodology in the human sciences. *Journal of Religion and Health, 23*, 197-203. doi:197-203.10.1007/BF00990785
- Elwell, M. D., & Bean, M. S. (2001). Editor's choice: The efficacy of service learning for community college ESL students. *Community College Review, 28*, 47-61.
doi:10.1177/009155210102800403
- Erlich, T., & Hollander, E. (1999). *President's declaration on the civic responsibility of higher education*. Campus Compact: Boston, MA. Retrieved from www.compact.org/resources-for-presidents-declaration-n-the-civic-responsibility-of-higher-education/
- Evans, N.J., Forney, D.S., Guido, F.M., Patton, L.D., & Renn, K.A. (2010). *Student development in college: Theory, research and practice*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Eyler, D. E., & Giles, J. (1999). *Where's the service in service learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Finlay, L. (2009). Debating phenomenological research methods. *Phenomenology and Practice, 3*, 6-25. Retrieved from <http://lindafinlay.co.uk/Debating%20phenomenological%20research%20methods.doc>
- Foos, C. (1998). The "different voice" of service. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 5*, 14-21. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0005.102>

- Franco, R. (2007). The next nexus: Classroom and community, community and world. In M. Baratian, D. K. Duffy, R. Franco, A. Hendricks, & T. Renner (Eds.), *Service learning course design for community colleges* (pp. 103-108). Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Freire, P. (1990). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum Publishing.
- Garcia, R. M., & Robinson, G. (2005). Transcending disciplines, reinforcing curricula: Why faculty teach with service learning. American Association of Community Colleges, #1558.
- Giles, D. E., & Eyler, J. (1994). The theoretical roots of service learning in John Dewey: Toward a theory of service learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1*, 77-85. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0001.109>
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (2003). Hearing the difference: Theorizing connection. *Yearbook of Psychology, 34*, 155-161. Retrieved from http://www.dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/listarticulos?tipo_busqueda=ANUALIDA
- Gonsalves, R. K. (2008). *Service learning from the faculty perspective in higher education: A qualitative study*. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Connecticut. Storrs, Connecticut.
- Grubb, W. N. (1999). *Honored but invisible: An inside look at teaching in community colleges*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gutek, G. L. (1988). *Philosophical and ideological perspectives on education*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hammond, C. (1994). Integrating service and academic study: Faculty motivation and satisfaction in Michigan higher education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1*, 21-28. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0001.102>

- Hanson, C. M. (2006). From learning to education: A new perspective for the community college. *Community College Review*, 34, 128-138. doi:10.1177/00911552106292519
- Hatcher, J. (1997). The moral dimensions of John Dewey's philosophy: Implications for undergraduate education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 4, 22-29. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0004.103>
- Hesser, G. (1995). Faculty assessment of student learning: Outcomes attributed to service learning and evidence of changes in faculty attitudes about experiential education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2, 33-42. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0002.103>
- Holland, B., Brukhardt, M. J., Percy, S. L., & Zimpher, N. (2004). *Calling the question: Is higher education ready to commit to community engagement? A Wingspread statement 2004*. Milwaukee, WI: Milwaukee Idea Office, Retrieved from http://servicelearning.org/filemanager/download/215/calling_the_question.pdf
- Honnet, E. P., & Poulson, S. J. (1993). *Principles of good practice for combining service and learning: A Wingspread special report*. Ann Arbor, MI: Great Lakes Commission, Retrieved from http://www.great-lakes.net/about/pdf/wingspreadreport_web.pdf
- Isaacs, E. P., & Boyer, P. G. (2007). Voices of urban and rural community college minority faculty: Satisfaction and opinions. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 31, 359-369. doi:10.1080/10668920600851639
- Jacoby, B. (1996). *Service learning in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Jones-Kavalier, B., & Flannigan, S. L. (2008). *The hiring game: Reshaping community college practices*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

- Kaplin, W. A., & Lee, B. A., (2007). *The law of higher education* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Karp, M. M., Hughes, K. L., & O'Gara, L. (2008). *An exploration of Tinto's integration framework for community college students*. CCRC Working Paper No. 12. New York, NY: Community College Research Center Teachers College, Columbia University. Retrieved from <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/DefaultFiles/SendFileToPublic.asp?ft=pdf&File>
- Keller, J., Nelson, S., & Wick, R. (2003). Care ethics, service learning, and social change. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 10*, 39-50. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0010.104>
- Kezar, A. J. (2001). *Understanding and facilitating organizational change in the 21st Century*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kezar, A., & Rhoads, R. A. (2001). The dynamic tensions of service learning in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 72*, 148-171. Retrieved from <http://www.servicelearning.org/libraryresource/4109>
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development*. San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row.
- Kozeracki, C. A. (2000). ERIC review: Service learning in the community college. *Community College Review, 27*, 54-70. doi:10.1177/009155210002700405
- Kuh, G.D., Cruse, T.M., Shoup, R., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R.M. (2008) Unmasking the effects of student engagement of first-year college grades and persistence. *Journal of Higher Education, 79*(5), 540-563.

- Kvale, S., & Brinkman, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.
- Levine, M. A. (1994). Seven steps to getting faculty involved in service learning: How a traditional faculty member came to teach a course on "Volunteerism, community, and citizenship". *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1*, 110-114. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0001.114>
- Levinson, D. (2005). *Community colleges: A reference handbook (Contemporary Education Issues)*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO/Greenwood Press.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social sciences: Selected theoretical papers*. New York: Harper & Bros.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Marullo, S., & Edwards, B. (2000). From charity to justice. *American Behavioral Scientist, 43*, 895-910. doi:10.1177/0002764002195540
- McCleeney, K. (2007). *Committing to student engagement: Reflections on CCSSE's first five years*. Austin, TX: Community College Survey of Student Engagement.
- McKay, V. C., & Rozee, P. D. (2004). Characteristics of faculty who adopt community service learning pedagogy. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 10*, 21-33. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0010.202>
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education*. New York, NY: Addison, Wesley, Longman.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Morton, K., & Troppe, M. (1996). From the margin to the mainstream: Campus Compact's project on integrating service with academic study. *Journal of Business Ethics, 15*, 21-32. doi:10.1007/BF00380259
- Mundhenk, R. (2004). Communities of assessment. *Change, 36*, 36-41. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov:80/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?nfpb=true&_
- Noddings, N. (2003). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Noddings, N. (2007). *Philosophy of education*. Cambridge, MA: Westview Press.
- Obama, B. (2009, October 16). Points of light [video file]. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=obama+volunteerism+speech+2009&aq=f
- Palmer, J. (1998). *Fostering student retention and success at the community college*. Washington, DC: Education Commission of the United States.
- Pascarella, E. (1997). It's time we started paying attention to community college students. *About Campus, 1*(6), 14-17. Retrieved from http://www.myacpa/org/ac/ac_indwx.cfm
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Piaget, J. (1973). *To understand is to invent: The future of education*. New York, NY: Grossman.
- Prentice, M., Robinson, G., & McPhee, S. (2003). *Service learning in community colleges: 2003 national survey results*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Preskill, S., & Brookfield, S. D. (2009). *Learning as a form of leading*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pribbenow, D. A. (2005). The impact of service learning pedagogy on faculty teaching and learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 11*, 25-38. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0011.202>

Rifkin, T. (2000). *Public community college faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges. Retrieved from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/newexpeditions/White_Papers/facultywhite.htm

S. 277, 111th. Cong. § 1 (2009). Retrieved from <http://opencongress.org/bill/111-s277-serveamer.htm>

Schäubelt, T., & Statham, A. (2007). Faculty perceptions of service as a mode of scholarship. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 14*, 18-31. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0014.102>

Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Steinberg, K. S., Bringle, R. G., & Williams, M. J. (2009). *Service learning research primer*. Scotts Valley, CA: National Service Learning Clearinghouse.

Strike, K. A. (1999). Justice and caring: Process in college students' moral reasoning and development. In M. Katz, N. Noddings, & K. Strike (Eds), *Justice and caring: The search for common ground in education* (pp. 37-55). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Tronto, J. C. (1998). An ethic of care. *Generations, 22*, 15-20.

Twombly, S., & Townsend, B. K. (2007). *Community college faculty: Overlooked and undervalued*: ASHE Higher Education Report. 32(6).

Vaughn, G. (2000). *The community college story*. Washington, DC: . American Association of Community Colleges.

Zlotkowsky, E. (1996). A new voice at the table? Linking service learning and the academy. *Change*, 28, 20-27. Retrieved from <http://www.servicelearning.org/library/resource/40>

APPENDIX A

Consent to Participate in Research Form

November 5, 2010

*FACULTY MOTIVATIONS TO INCORPORATE SERVICE LEARNING INTO
COMMUNITY COLLEGE CLASSROOMS*

You are being invited to participate in a research study about faculty motivations in use of the service learning pedagogy in community college classrooms. This study is being conducted by Carol Katowitz (Principal Investigator) and Dr. Kandace Hinton (Faculty Sponsor), from the Department of Education, Leadership, Administration, and Foundations at Indiana State University as part of a doctoral dissertation.

You were selected as a possible participant in this study because your Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs or your School Dean identified you as a faculty member who successfully uses service learning in your classroom. The definition of service learning used in this study is:

Service learning is a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development.

Reflection and reciprocity are key components of service learning. (Jacoby, 1996, p. 5)

There are no known risks or costs to you if you decide to participate in this research study. The information you provide will be analyzed and parts of this data will be published in

a doctoral dissertation. If you agree to be part of the research study, you will be asked to participate in one face-to-face interview at the location of your choice. The interview should take about one hour to complete, and will not exceed 90 minutes. I would like to audiotape the interview, transcribe your remarks and return them to you for your review to ensure that our conversation was recorded accurately. The discussion topics will include your use of the service learning pedagogy in your course delivery, institutional challenges to the use of this pedagogy, outcome measurement of student learning, and professional development opportunities that have supported the use of this approach to instruction. This interview may be followed by electronic mails or phone conversations to clarify data. The information collected may not benefit you directly but will provide benefits to faculty who seek to use this pedagogy and community college administrators who seek to support this approach.

The interview portion of this study will be conducted from November 2010 until March 2011. The results of this study will be published, but your identity will be protected through the use of a pseudonym. The digital audio file of your interview will be placed on an external hard drive dedicated to interview data that will be password protected. Study data will be entered on a password protected laptop computer solely dedicated to this study. All data related to this study will be archived for a minimum of three years. The ISU faculty sponsor and members of the Institutional Review Board may ask to inspect these records.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign an Informed Consent Form that addresses confidentiality as a requirement for inclusion in this study. You are free to decline to answer any question you are asked in the interview and can stop your participation in this study at any time.

If you have any questions about the study, please contact Carol Katowitz (Principal Investigator), 1222 North Red Bank Road, Evansville, Indiana, 47720, (812) 422-2224 or (812) 429-9855, or electronic mail me at ckatowit@ivytech.edu_or Dr. Kandace Hinton (Faculty Sponsor), Indiana State University, ELAF Department, Terre Haute, IN 47809, (812) 237-2897, Kandace.hinton@indstate.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject or if you feel you've been placed at risk, you may contact the Indiana State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) by mail at Indiana State University, Office of Sponsored Programs, Terre Haute, IN, 47809, by phone at (812) 237-8217, or by electronic mail at irb@indstate.edu.

By signing this document, you are agreeing to be part of the study. Participating in this research is completely voluntary. Even if you decide to participate now, you may change your mind and stop at any time. You will be given a copy of this document for your records and one copy will be kept with the study records. Be sure that questions you have about the study have been answered and that you understand what you are being asked to do. You may contact the researcher at any time if you have a question or concern about this study.

I agree to participate in the study.

Signature

Date

I agree to be audio taped as part of the study.

Signature

Date

*Carol Katowitz
1222 North Red Bank Road
Evansville, Indiana 47720
(812) 422-2224 or (812) 429-9855*

ckatowit@ivytech.edu

Date of IRB Approval: 10/12/2010

IRB Number: 11-020

Project Expiration Date: 09/13/2011

APPENDIX B

Interview Protocol

Before interview begins

Signed Consent

Permission to tape-record at beginning of tape

Ask if subject has any questions about the study before the interview begins

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the intrinsic motivations that cause some faculty in community colleges to embrace and actively pursue service learning pedagogy in their classrooms. An attempt will be made to determine common inherent motivations for use of this pedagogy in community college classrooms. This will require the investigation of the historical progression of this philosophical and pedagogical approach to instruction in academe as well as the current state of service learning in community college settings.

Research Questions

What intrinsic motivations lead faculty to consider implementing service learning into coursework in community colleges?

What catalysts encourage faculty to incorporate service learning into coursework?

Methodology

Qualitative Phenomenological Case Study Approach-purposeful sampling

Interview Questions (DON'T FORGET TO ASK FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS)

1. How long have you been teaching at the community college level?
2. What professional path did you follow before you began your community college career?
3. Describe yourself as a teacher.

4. What is your pedagogical style?
5. What is your definition of service learning?
6. What led you to implement this pedagogy in the courses you teach?
7. What do you feel are the most rewarding aspects of using service learning in coursework?
8. What are the biggest challenges of your pedagogy?
9. Do you or have you used other pedagogies? If so, how do they compare?
10. How do you assess learning from your courses?
11. How does the institution support (or not) your pedagogy?
12. What type of professional development activities has the college provided you?
13. What professional development activities have you personally participated in?
14. Are there any other aspects of your experiences with service learning not previously addressed that you would like to share?

APPENDIX C

Transcriptionist Confidentiality AgreementCONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT
TRANSCRIPTION SERVICES

I, _____, transcriptionist, agree to maintain full confidentiality in regards to any and all audiotapes (digital recordings) and documentation received from Carol Katowitz, Principal Investigator, related to her doctoral study on Faculty Motivations to Incorporate Service Learning into Community College Classrooms. I understand that the audio files will be hand delivered and placed in my possession in digital form to be transcribed electronically, are not to be transmitted electronically by email over the Internet, and that electronic files and copies are to remain in a secure, safe, and password protected environment. Furthermore, I agree:

1. To hold in strictest confidence the identification of any individual that may be inadvertently revealed during the transcription of audio-taped interviews, or in any associated documents;
2. To not make copies of any audio files or computerized files of the transcribed interview texts, unless specifically requested to do so by Carol Katowitz, Principal Investigator;
3. To store all study-related digital audio files and materials in a safe, secure location as long as they are in my possession;
4. To return all digital files and study-related documents to Carol Katowitz in a complete and timely manner;
5. To delete all electronic files containing study-related documents from my computer hard drive and any back-up devices.

I am aware that I can be held legally liable for any breach of this confidentiality agreement, and for any harm incurred by individuals if I disclose identifiable information contained in the audio files and/or files to which I will have access.

Transcriber's name (printed) _____

Transcriber's signature _____

Date _____

Adapted from: Sample Confidentiality Agreement Transcription Services. Retrieved May 18, 2010 from <http://www.docstoc.com/docs/3279809/SAMPLE-CONFIDENTIALITY-AGREEMENT-FOR-TRANSCRIPTION-SERVICES>