Millennial Generation Faculty:
Why They Engage in Service Learning

James Morgan Lewing

Texas A&M University-Central Texas

Paul Eugene York

Texas A&M University

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this phenomenological qualitative study was to examine the experiences, motivations, and perceptions of millennial generation faculty members who utilize service learning. Eight faculty members were interviewed, and the three themes evident in the findings were: (a) the role of the undergraduate experience, (b) an alignment with intrinsic motivations, and (c) the perception of organizational fit.

  Keywords: service learning, community engagement, generational theory

INTRODUCTION

Service learning within the broader context of community engagement represents one of the largest innovations of the past three decades in higher education (O'Meara, Sandmann, Saltmarsh, & Giles, 2011). Understanding faculty motivations to utilize service learning is critical for institutions that value this form of community engagement and wish to increase faculty involvement in the practice (Bringe, Reeb, Brown, & Ruiz, 2016). Faculty members have reported a plethora of motivations to utilize service learning as a teaching methodology (O'Meara, 2013), and participation has been linked to faculty demographics, life experiences, personal goals, epistemological perspective, and institutional influences (O'Meara, et al., 2011). The purpose of this study is to specifically examine motivations of millennial generation faculty members who utilize service learning. Millennials represent a growing faculty demo-graphic, and the findings from this project may provide an initial understanding of how this generation perceives and utilizes service learning based on institutional and personal variables.

Motivation Factors

The utilization of service learning is more common when faculty members view the practice as supportive of student learning (Abes, Jones, & Jackson, 2002; Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Hammond, 1994; McKay & Rozee, 2004; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009; Parkins, 2008), are personally committed to community engagement (Jaeger & Thorton, 2006), and/or identify as female, individuals of color, or early-career faculty (Astin et al., 2006; O'Meara, 2008; Parkins, 2008). Motivation has been linked to such factors, but Vogelgesang, Denson, and Jayakumar (2010) reported that, despite various personal or demographic influences, perceptions of institutional support in the promotion and tenure process represented the pri-

mary predictor of an engaged faculty member.

Changing Faculty Demographics

Higher education is currently undergoing a major demographic shift as an increasing number of faculty from the millennial generation (born between 1980-1994) begin replacing retiring faculty from earlier generations in patterns similar to other fields (Kilber, Barclay, & Ohmer, 2014; O'Meara, 2013). The population of millennial faculty may currently be small, but they represent a population that holds multiple intrinsic motivators for service-learning involvement (O'Meara, 2013; Vogelgesang et al., 2010). Defining a generation is not a simplistic endeavor; however, Howe and Strauss (2000) provided an explanation through generational, or life cycle, personality definitions. Generation personalities, through this perspective, are defined by the events and trends within their time, and identified four generational archetypes: prophet, nomad, hero, and artist. Howe and Strauss (2000) situated millennials into the hero archetype that is similar to young adults during World War II who were historically civically minded and optimistic. This iteration of the hero generation is described as one of the most unique generations recorded, and the individuals identified within this generation are "beginning to manifest a wide array of positive social habits that older Americans no longer associate with youth, including a new focus on teamwork, achievement, modesty, and good conduct" (p. 12). Additionally, a Pew Research Center (2010) report stated that millennials are more comfortable advocating on their own behalf, have progressive beliefs around society, operate from a more hopeful life perspective, and are more internally defined.

Millennial Generation Traits

Seven traits have been used to define the millennial generation: special, sheltered, confident, team-oriented, conventional, pressured, and achieving (Howe &

Strauss, 2000). The authors claim that this generation has consistently been told that they are special and important for the community. In addition, millennials have also been sheltered from having to confront conflict and are not pushed to resolve conflict on their own. The high levels of confidence exhibited by millennials is, according to Howe and Strauss (2000), partially due to the fact that they are consistently told that their generation has an incredible amount of power and agency. Millennials are also generally team-oriented, focused on egalitarian practices, and interested in community engagement. Furthermore, this generation is conventional, in that they believe in the positive impact that government may have on society.

Millennials in College

In addition to generational characteristics, millennials entered college between the years of approximately 1998 and 2012, which represented a period of renewed civic interest among colleges and universities. This interest was evidenced in significant events, such as the creation of the Campus Compact in 1985, the National and Community Service Act in 1990, the National Service Bill in 2003, Boyer's Scholarship Reconsidered (1990), Eyler and Giles' "Where is the Service in Service-Learning" (1999), and the initial Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in 2006. Therefore, it is feasible to describe millennials as a generation categorized by an affinity for civic engagement and that entered college during a time categorized by a renewed emphasis on civic engagement.

Purpose

While there has been increasing attention focused on the phenomenon of service learning and faculty motivation to utilize the practice in the literature, there is an absence of investigations that specifically address millennial faculty. The purpose of this phenomenological study is to explore motivations of millennial faculty members

who utilize service learning and their perceptions of the practice. The results of this study will provide a mechanism to evaluate similarities between millennial and older generations reported in the existing body of literature as suggested in a recommendation for future research by O'Meara (2013).

Theoretical Framework

This study emphasized the potential interactions between generational characteristics and environmental influences on their development as engaged faculty members. Therefore, Astin's Input-Environment-Output Model (1993) served as the framework for this study, as it supports the perspective that individual, institutional, and environmental influences serve as catalysts when applied to exploring faculty motivations (O'Meara, 2013). Originally developed to explain the manner in which student outcomes are affected by individual characteristics and environmental factors, the IEO Model also provides a "useful tool for conceptualizing all of the potential influences on faculty motivation at different points in a process such as involvement with service-learning" (O'Meara, 2013, p. 221-222). Generational Theory (Strauss & Howe, 1991) provided additional interpretation to the model by specifically contextualizing the individual input element of the IEO model.

METHODOLOGY

Study Design

This study used a phenomenological qualitative research design (Creswell, 2002, 1998) and sought to understand the experiences, motivations, and perspectives of millennial faculty members who utilized service learning. Phenomenology aims to "identify and describe the subjective experiences of respondents" (Schwandt, 2007, p. 226), and the phenomenological qualitative design is recommended when the goals of the research are to understand the meaning of experiences of participants (Creswell, 1998). Specifically, the purpose of this study was to explore the interaction of generational characteristics and institutional environments on millennial faculty members' commitment to service learning. This study was designed with semi-structured interviews and used qualitative procedures of Colbeck and Weaver (2008), which provided a qualitative investigation into the motivation patterns of 12 faculty members engaged in public scholarship.

Participants

The eight participants were all millennial generation (born between 1980 and 1994), full-time faculty members who self-reported using service learning in their teaching. The group consisted of five females and three males from disciplines within art, natural sciences, education, management and leadership, and psychology. Six of the eight participants were at four-year public institutions, and two were faculty members at four-year private institutions.

Purposeful sampling was used in order to identify potential participants with a target sample of five to 10 individuals that met the identified criteria. Participants were initially invited through a mass email to a national civic engagement organization's membership body, and two participants responded. In addition, to increase sample size, recent recipients of young professional awards for service learning and community engagement were identified on a national organization's website and contacted through their university-listed email addresses, yielding three additional participants. Snowball sampling was then used to increase the initial group of participants from five to eight.

Data Collection

Semi-structured interviews were conducted by the two researchers, virtually through Skype or through telephone when virtual connection was unavailable for the participant, and lasted an average of 30 to 45 minutes each. Participants were asked to explain (a) their introduction and current use of service learning, (b) their motivation

to engage in service learning, (c) their perceptions of institutional support of service learning, (d) the prevalence of civic engagement programs and service learning at their undergraduate institutions, and (e) the influence of their undergraduate environment of their development as engaged faculty members. In addition, probing questions were asked in order to prompt clarification and/or elaboration of participant responses.

Data Analysis

Prior to thematic analysis, concepts were set a priori based on the research questions and included the following: (a) motivation patterns, (b) undergraduate experiences, (c) methodology introduction, and (d) perceptions of value. Divergent categories were also allowed to emerge based on participant responses. In order to improve trustworthiness of the study, member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) was used as each interview was recorded, transcribed, and returned to participants for validation. Once validated, transcriptions and analytic memos were initially analyzed through separate cross-case analyses (Eisenhardt, 2002) in order to account for any potential researcher biases. Following separate reviews of the transcriptions and discussion of potential themes, overarching themes were identified through an open coding process. Axial coding was subsequently used to identify specific categories within the concepts identified and to explore how the concepts are or are not related. In addition to the separate analysis, the trustworthiness of the study was further increased through theory triangulation as the findings were contextualized through Generational Theory, the IEO Model, and multiple perspectives of studies on service learning, faculty motivation patterns, and institutional support of community engagement.

FINDINGS

Three specific themes were evident across the interviews: (a) the role of the undergraduate experience, (b) an alignment with intrinsic motivations, and (c) the perception of organizational fit within institutions that value service learning and community engagement.

Undergraduate Experiences: A Key Point of Entry

A key finding from the interviews was that participants encountered one of two very different experiences in regard to the presence of service learning and community engagement during their time as undergraduate students. These experiences, in turn, greatly contributed to the initial perspective of service-leaning implementation within their own teaching. Individuals who attended institutions that provided experiences immersed in service learning and community engagement were motivated by these experiences to become faculty members who engaged the community as well. However, those who reported undergraduate experiences relatively void of service learning and community engagement did not become familiar with the practice until after they became faculty members.

Five of the eight participants described undergraduate experiences that immersed them in service learning through the undergraduate curriculum. When describing their undergraduate institution, one faculty member stated:

> It was a Catholic/Jesuit institution. That religiously affiliated value set was very clearly communicated to us. I remember some of the first in formation I got as an accepted stu dent was 'these are the Service-Learning classes that fill the core requirements in your first year.' My best friend and her husband were in one of those classes; it was just part of the culture, which is what you did, from orientation, all through commencement. It's an obvious thing.

This sentiment was consistent among other participants reporting an undergraduate institution that emphasized engagement. Upon further questioning, these participants

identified these institutional environments as key aspects of their development into engaged faculty members.

> I think if I wasn't involved in the community engagement work I was as an undergraduate... I don't think I would have ended up going to graduate school, specifically trying to get engaged in community-engaged scholarships… It's really been the whole entirety of my work. My research plan when I went into graduate school was to become a community engaged scholar, and [I] studied community engagement and, you know, ultimately try to transition higher education that is kind of the public purpose of the university.

> I was a senior, and in my senior year, and aptly noted that I was spending all of my time in the community doing community service, doing student leadership, running programs to the institution, and was spending little time in the laboratory…. I think maybe it's at the root. We all draw from our own personal experiences. You can't divorce that, for me. For me, that value-based education had come out.

However, three individuals described their institutions as very disengaged. These institutions were very different than the environments described by the other five participants from engaged institutions. One individual, when describing their undergraduate institution, stated, "there were clubs and student service organizations that do more service-oriented type work, but I don't remember anything else that was course-specific." A second faculty member also reported their involvement prior to becoming a faculty member as very minimal.

> I was an undergrad from 2000 to 2004 and I did zero service learning. I did no volunteer work, really, outside of what I did for athletics. I was on the field hockey team, and we did some community work, but nothing really related to my academics. I went to a small private liberal arts college; it just wasn't on our radar.

As a result, these individuals reported very little understanding or motivation to use service learning in their teaching initially. They admitted their courses were very basic and mirrored the course design they encountered as students. It was by accident that they later became involved with service learning.

> I think maybe—unfortunately or fortunately, however you look at it—I fell into it accidentally. I taught for a year at the University X as a visiting professor before I got my tenure-track job. That was my first year of teaching full-time out of grad school, and a colleague of mine was teaching child development with a Service-Learning paradigm, and I had four new class preps, and he just gave me his child development class. He handed the course over with a list of materials to help me with my prep load and it was Service Learning.

> I got started in this back in graduate school with X State and the geography department. They have a service-learning cartography class they ended up doing for a few years. They needed somebody to teach it, and it was kind of a last- minute thing.

> The director of the Experiential Learning Center came up to me and was, like, "given all of the work you're doing with the community partners and your class, you should make this a designated course." So I did that. This is when I really started incorporating projects into my class. This is when I started doing it more intentionally and doing it with conscious thought as opposed to just something that I was doing.

All participants affirmed that their undergraduate experiences affected their

initial development as faculty members. Those that came from engaged campuses became engaged faculty members, and those whose campuses were not engaged began their careers as less engaged faculty members. However, each individual ultimately became involved with service learning through an institutional mechanism, intentional or not. Each of the three faculty from under-engaged undergraduate institutions stated that a service-learning coordinating structure or support system was very important to their continued involvement and growth as engaged faculty members.

A faculty member's overall sense of agency (i.e., confidence and self-efficacy) serves as a key determinant of their involvement in civic engagement initiatives such as service learning (Baez, 2000; Hatcher, 2008; O'Meara, 2013). O'Meara (2013) indicated institutional interventions such as faculty learning communities were potential ways to support faculty agency and improve their confidence in their abilities to make a tangible difference. This was evident as faculty development programs demonstrated a valuable support structure for faculty unfamiliar with service learning due to the nature of their undergraduate experiences. One participant specifically described an intentionally designed fellowship program as key in her sustained success implementing service learning. Each of the faculty members who reported lower levels of engagement as students described some type of institutional support mechanism (i.e., fellowship program, service-learning clearinghouse) as very important to not only their initial involvement, but also their sustained involvement in service learning as faculty members.

However, the individuals from very engaged undergraduate experiences demonstrated levels of agency that clearly originated from their time as students. In addition, these individuals were often more advanced in the descriptions of their own work as they routinely discussed their teaching with aims of social change and reciprocity. Their experiences as undergrad-

uate students related to service learning allowed them to frame how they delivered their service-learning courses as faculty members. Institutional support structures were mentioned in these interviews as well, but more in terms of the university's demonstrated value placed on service learning and other community engagement practices than as an influence or cause for their own involvement in the practice. For these individuals, the largest institutional impetus for becoming an engaged faculty member was participating in service learning as students.

Motivations: Generation Exemplified

Intrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation and improved student learning were the most evident sources of motivation faculty cited in using service learning. Each of the eight cited a deep intrinsic motivation to engage the community through their teaching and referenced their beliefs in the role of higher education within a democracy. The connection between a personal commitment to community engagement and the use of service learning is supported within the current body of literature across demographics (Astin et al., 2006; Jaeger & Thorton, 2006). Furthermore, this intrinsic motivation also aligns with characteristics generally associated with millennials (Howe & Strauss, 2000). Sentiments such as "personal motivation really comes from a place that's thinking above like equity, and justice, power," and "service learning is a way to teach people the importance of giving back to their community in forms of being engaged" were prevalent throughout the interviews. Furthermore, one individual extrapolated an alignment with personal motivation and career purpose: "I just think that higher education has a role in addressing public problems, especially in democracies. Higher education not only has a moral imperative to cultivate dispositions, attitudes around democratic life—I think it's just intrinsic motivation." Personal values of altruism and community orientation positively influence a faculty member's deci-

sion to engage in service learning (Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000; Astin et al., 2006). Faculty participants in this project demonstrated very similar values, and they articulated a clear connection between their value set and their careers.

Improved teaching. Five faculty members described service learning as a supportive model for student learning. However, no evident connection was found between sources of motivation and the manner in which the faculty member was introduced to service learning. The aspect that differentiated the two groups was in how the impact on student learning was described. Individuals with a highly engaged undergraduate experience tended to describe their sources of motivation with a sense that "this is how learning should occur," and those that had a less engaged undergraduate background described service learning by contrasting the strategy to traditional models (i.e., lecturing) and the positive effects of service learning.

Two participants who were highly engaged as undergraduates described their motivations in values-based terminology, articulating a desire to "teach people the importance of giving back to their community in forms of being engaged."

> Personally, to me, it's the most engaging pedagogy. The material really helps you to put theory into practice, to understand complex conducts, to become change agents. I want my students to learn. I want [them] to learn that they're not in a vacuum but in the context of the real world. That's where the Service-Learning part really comes through for me. They are not reading out of a book and trying to relate that to their life; they are actually doing what they have been taught. I think service learning is such a great opportunity to make people be practitioners.

In contrast, two faculty members who were introduced to service learning after becoming faculty described service learning through a comparison to traditional teaching modalities.

> My students were doing a ton of work, and the work was pretty fantastic. I felt really good about the projects we were doing; but at the end of the semester, those projects just kind of sat on my shelf. Or they wrote papers for me, and then the paper was done and that was kind of it. I felt like that was a shame, so one of my biggest motivations was for their work to have more of a meaningful impact. Service-Learning really allows that opportunity.
>
> For the most part, it seems to get the students much more engaged; it gets them working with real world data, real world problems. They come out a lot better in a way than if they were just doing run-of-the-mill labs.

Organizational Fit: The Ideal Employer

Millennials do not question if they are right for the job, but rather if the job is right for them (Caraher, 2014). This concept was evident as participants discussed whether service learning and community engagement would continue to be a major component of their career aspirations moving forward. Each participant stated that service learning would not only be part of their contributions as faculty, but it was an expectation they had for their employing universities. The millennial faculty members described their faculty roles in terms of their engagement, and they believed it was the responsibility of their institutions to support them through promotion and tenure. Stipends and grants were mentioned, but were seen as less essential. One individual left an institution because it was not tenure-track and went to another because it was a tenure-track institution that valued service learning. A second will be leaving their current institution and will be seeking an institution that values service learning. Another participant decided to leave their current institution because their position was not

tenure-track, and is only considering institutions that value service learning in tenure and promotion. When asked if this was a significant aspect of their job search, the participant responded:

> It is definitely very important to me. I'm applying now, and there is one job I really want because of that… Wherever I go, I'm looking for somewhere where faculty are really supportive of that. It's a major factor for me.

Four of the participants interviewed stated that they were happy with their current institutions, and they felt supported as engaged faculty members. One individual clearly asserted that sentiment.

> I chose very intentionally to come to X because there's a huge commitment to civic engagement… So, if you do service-learning or community-based research, that's viewed very favorably in tenure and promotion. And, frankly, I would not have taken a faculty position if the university did not value that work [because] they know that's how, if I were to become a faculty member, how I wanted to exist in academia, as through this work.

However, even the faculty members that feel supported have concerns about the transition between an institution's value in rhetoric and its operation in regard to tenure.

> I can see this younger generation of faculty members who are doing this; however, when I have my conversations with them at conferences and things, we always inevitably talk about whether or not this work that we're doing is going to help or hinder tenure in any way… Even though there's these younger career people that are doing it, a lot of us were still kind of worried about making sure we're making the mark for our research and scholarships standards.

Summary

The millennial faculty members participating in this study demonstrated several characteristics reported in the current body of literature, as they were deeply motivated by an intrinsic commitment to engagement and social change, and they viewed service learning as supportive of student learning. These elements are characteristics of previous research on faculty motivation to use service learning as well as work on millennial generation traits. The effect on student learning was also an evident source of motivation for faculty participants. Furthermore, millennial generation faculty members share similar concerns over institutional value placed on community engagement and service learning to previous generations.

Intrinsic characteristics of motivation were consistent across all eight participants, despite two distinct sets of personal educational experiences. Individuals who encountered undergraduate experiences that were entrenched in service learning and community engagement sought paths that allowed them to grow as engaged faculty members. The traits of activism and engagement often associated with millennials, however, emerged in those who did not experience engaged undergraduate experiences only after they became faculty members who engaged in service learning. An institutional mechanism, intentional (participants enrolling in a service-learning development program) or not (participants being placed as an instructor of a service-learning course with little preparation), was necessary for these faculty members to adopt an unfamiliar teaching methodology, despite intrinsic motivating factors to engage in service learning. In either scenario, the participants held latent motivations supportive of service learning, but an environmental variable was necessary for the manifestation of the motivations to use service learning. Using the Input-Environment-Outcome model, the role of the institution was critical in allowing the personal inputs to become outcomes.

IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Faculty members become involved in service learning in a variety of ways internal and external to the individuals (Bringle, Reeb, Brown, & Ruiz, 2016). The findings from the current study supported both generational research that characterizes millennials as intrinsically motivated to be engaged citizens (Howe & Strauss, 2000), and existing research on faculty motivations to use service learning (O'Meara, 2013). The characteristics and motivations articulated by the individuals interviewed provide early inclinations that millennial faculty members possess attributes that may allow them to serve as early adopters in institutional efforts to advance service learning.

Astin's Input-Environment-Output model served as the theoretical framework for this study as a faculty member's decision to engage in service learning and eventual outcomes (outputs) is influenced by intrinsic characteristics and beliefs (inputs) and extrinsic systems and processes (environment). The model was originally developed to explain the effects of student characteristics and the college environment upon various student outcomes, but the model also provides an appropriate conceptual model for the study of faculty motivations due to an emphasis on values, processes, and outcomes (O'Meara, 2013). Each faculty member demonstrated a process that was congruent with the model as their involvement in service learning and the partnerships developed was influenced by both intrinsic characteristics and environmental factors.

A key finding was the effect the participants' experience as undergraduate students had upon participants' pathways to becoming engaged faculty members. Those who were highly engaged as undergraduate students at universities with a prevalence of service learning and community became very engaged faculty members from the onset of their careers. They also sought out institutions supportive of these efforts. Those who were not engaged at their respective universities began to use service learning inadvertently through environmental interventions. This finding aligns with existing research in which the institution is described as a critical factor in a faculty member's decision to implement service learning (Jaeger & Thorton, 2006; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009; Vogelgesang et al., 2010). Regardless, each individual possessed personal motivations, encountered an environmental signal (as undergraduates or faculty) that engaged them with service learning, and then became engaged with service learning as professionals.

There are several implications of these findings, and the role of the institution in community-based faculty development should not be understated. In order for the intrinsic interests of the participants to manifest in their teaching, the environment needs to be, at least, supportive at the departmental level. The subgroup of participants with engaged undergraduate backgrounds discussed overarching institutional support on service learning and community engagement, but faculty members with undergraduate experiences void of service learning spoke more in terms of departmental support and the presence of pre-existing service-learning courses in which they were placed. Therefore, institutional leaders should view service learning as not only a high-impact practice that supports student learning (Kuh, 2008), but also an intentional platform that supports faculty engagement and development. This concept aligns with the "Next Generation Engagement Project," which emphasizes the development of civic engagement initiatives geared toward the next generation of faculty and students in higher education (Saltmarsh, Zlotkowski, & Horowitz, 2010). A primary element of the program highlights early career faculty as well as their theoretically higher levels of motivation to participate in community-based

43

teaching and scholarship, given their experiences as engaged undergraduate students.

Furthermore, the findings supported a perception of service learning in terms of not only faculty development, but also faculty recruitment and retention. Support was necessary for intrinsic factors to manifest within the participants interviewed, but larger policies—such as the recognition of service learning and community engagement within promotion and tenure decisions—were essential for those faculty to remain with an institution. The state of higher education is currently in flux with large numbers of older faculty set to retire (O'Meara, 2013), and millennials will be needed to fill these voids. Institutions that value community engagement can advertise and promote the resources available to faculty, as values-based work is generally important to this generation (Caher, 2014). The participants identified institutional support as a key component of their ideal institution. Several faculty members discussed their desire to leave their current university or stated that they left their previous university due to a perceived lack of institutional fit, in large part based on perceptions of too little value placed on service learning and community engagement. Faculty members who were engaged as undergraduates also expressed the importance of finding employment with engaged institutions, and they reported having accepted positions at their current institutions largely because of its expressed emphasis on community engagement. Faculty members who were late-adopters after under-engaged undergraduate experiences reported increased levels of overall enjoyment in their teaching in comparison to their earlier models of instruction. They stated that they were more fulfilled and happier in their roles and with their institutions. Service learning, therefore, represents an intentional developmental opportunity for early-career faculty that also supports faculty retention.

Additional research is needed to determine how to best structure developmental opportunities for millennials in regard to service learning and engaged scholarship. The current body of research includes volumes of work investigating college learning environments that best engage general characteristics and preferences of this group (Cavallero, 2013; Howard-Hamilton, Marbley, & Bonner, 2011; Howe & Strauss, 2007; Natali, 2015; Stasio, 2013; Suh & Hargis, 2016). However, little research exists on how these individuals learn as faculty members, especially how their conceptualizations of the practice may be affected by their previous levels of engagement. The faculty members who experienced very engaged student backgrounds described their conceptualization of service learning through a predominantly political perspective, in which emphasis is placed upon addressing systemic issues (Butin, 2010). The faculty members from non-engaged backgrounds, in contrast, described their use of service learning in a more technical conceptualization, in which emphasis is placed upon the structure, implementation, and process of service learning (Butin, 2010). Future research should attempt to investigate how these mitigating factors may present limitations in not only faculty development and understanding, but also their actual delivery of the strategy.

CONCLUSION

The findings from this study depict millennials as a potential demographic of interest for administrators specifically seeking to recruit, develop, and retain engaged faculty members due to their generational characteristics and experiences. Institutions that value service learning and community engagement appear to be at an advantage, as participants in the study described engaged institutions as ideal employers, which provide organizational fit through a congruence of values. Understanding motivations and values will become increasingly important as faculty from previous generations retire, and institutions transition from attempting to appeal to millennials as poten-

tial students to pursuing them as potential employees.

Findings also support the instrumental role of the institution in supporting the development of faculty as engaged practitioners and scholars (Cooper, 2014). Each faculty member interviewed encountered an institutional intervention, either as students or after they joined the faculty, which served as a significant catalyst for their community engagement. However, these interventions were often haphazard or inadvertent. An increased emphasis should be placed on the intentionality of interventions (Chism, Palmer, & Price, 2013).

The implications also extend further into recruiting, maximizing, and retaining faculty. Higher education is in a period of great change (Selingo, 2013), and the manner in which this generation is mentored may have significant effects on multiple aspects of the professoriate and academia in general. Generational Theory suggests a cyclical nature in which the archetypes repeat. Millennials represent the current hero/civic generation, and this archetype consistently demonstrates a strong rise in political power as a dominant generation (Howe & Strauss, 2000). The next generation, by contrast, will likely be a more recessive generation that builds upon the constructs of the previous generation. Therefore, if properly emphasized and supported, the possibilities for community engagement presented by the impending rise in millennial faculty members could be greater than what has been, or will be, witnessed in decades.

REFERENCES

Abes, E. S., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 9*(1).

Antonio, A. L., Astin, H. S., & Cress, C. M. (2000) Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. *The Review of Higher Education, 23*, 373-397.

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college?: Four critical years revisited* (Vol. 1). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Misa, K., Anderson, J., Denson, N., Jayakumar, U., & Yamamura, E. (2006). *Understanding the effects of service-learning: A study of students and faculty.* Los Angeles, CA: University of California, The Higher Education Research Institute.

Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education, 39*, 363-391.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2000). Institutionalization of service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 71*, 273-290.

Bringle, R. G., Reeb, R. N., Brown, M. A., & Ruiz, A. I. (2016). Faculty development for service learning. In R.G. Bringle, R.N. Reeb, A.M. Brown, & A.I. Ruiz (Eds.), *Service learning in psychology: Enhancing undergraduate education for the public good* (pp. 163-174). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/14803-012

Butin, D. W. (2010). *Service-learning in theory and practice: The future of community engagement in higher education.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan. doi:10.1057/9780230106154

Caraher, L. (2014). *Millennials & management: The essential guide to making it work at work.* New York, NY: Bibliomotion, Inc.

Cavallero, J. J. (2013). Engaging millennial students in social justice from initial class meetings to service learning. *New Directions For Teaching & Learning, 2013*(135), 75-80.

Chism, N. V. N., Palmer, M. M., Price, M. F. (2013). Investigating personal development   outcomes in service learning. In P. H. Clayton, R. G. Bringle, & J. A. Hatcher (Eds.), *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment.* Vol 2A. Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Colbeck, C. L., & Weaver, L. D. (2008). Faculty engagement in public scholarship: A motivation   systems theory perspective. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(2), 7-32.

Cooper, J. R. (2014). Ten years in the trenches: Faculty perspectives on sustaining service learning. *Journal of Experiential Education, 37*(4), 415-428.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative* (pp. 146-166). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Santos, F. M. (2002). Knowledge-based view: A new theory of strategy. *Handbook of strategy and management, 1*, 139-164.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hammond, C. (1994). Integrating service and academic study: Faculty motivation and satisfaction in Michigan higher education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1*(1), 21-28.

Hatcher, J. A. (2008). *The public role of professionals: Developing and evaluating the civic-minded professional scale.* (Doctoral Dissertation).

Available from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3331248).

Howard-Hamilton, M. F., Marbley, A. F., & Bonner, F. A. (2011). *Diverse millennial students in college: Implications for faculty and student affairs.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation.* New York: Vintage.

Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2007). *Millennials go to college.* Great Falls, VA: LifeCourse Associates.

Jaeger, A. J., & Thornton, C. H. (2006). Neither honor nor compensation: Faculty and public service. *Educational Policy, 20*(2), 345-366.

Kilber, J., Barclay, A., & Ohmer, D. (2014). Seven tips for managing Generation Y. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice, 15*(4), 80.

Kuh, G. D. (2008). High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter. *Association of American Colleges and Universities.* Washington, DC.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

McKay, V. C., & Rozee, P. D. (2004). Characteristics of faculty who adopt community service learning pedagogy. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 10*(2), 21-33.

Natali, D. J. (2015). Millennial community college student: Understanding their natural use of technology for learning. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A, 76.*

O'Meara, K. (2008). Motivation for faculty community engagement: Learning from exemplars. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(1), 7-30.

O'Meara, K., & Niehaus, E. (2009). Service-learning is...: How faculty explain their practice. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 16*(1), 1-16.

O'Meara, K., Sandmann, L. R., Saltmarsh, J., & Giles Jr., D. E. (2011). Studying the professional lives and work of faculty involved in community engagement. *Innovative Higher Education, 36*(2), 83-96.

O'Meara, K. (2013). Research on faculty motivation for service-learning. In P. H. Clayton, R. G. Bringle, & J. A. Hatcher (Eds.), *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment.* Vol 2A. Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Parkins, L. C. (2008). *Predicting faculty participation in service-learning pedagogy at research institutions* (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3306616)

Saltmarsh, J., Zlotkowski, E., & Horowitz, K. (2010). Students as colleagues in the next generation of civic engagement. In *Presentation at the New England Regional Campus Compact Conference, Burlington, VT.*

Schwandt, T. A. (2007). *The Sage dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Selingo, J. J. (2013). *College (un) bound: The future of higher education and what it means for students*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Stasio, J. R. (2013). Rethinking assessment: Understanding how the millennial generation learns in the college classroom. *Pedagogy and the Human Sciences, 3*(1), 34-51.

Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069.* New York, NY: William Morrow & Company.

Suh, J. K., & Hargis, J. (2016). An interdisciplinary approach to develop key spatial characteristics that satisfy the millennial generation in learning and work environment. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal, 8*(3).

Taylor, P., & Keeter, S. (2010). Millennials: A portrait of generation next. *Pew Internet & American Life Project.* Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.

Vogelgesang, L. J., Denson, N., & Jayakumar, U. M. (2010). What determines faculty-engaged scholarship? *The Review of Higher Education, 33*(4), 437-472.

AUTHOR NOTE

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to James Morgan Lewing .

Texas A&M University-Central Texas, 1001 Leadership Place, Killeen, TX, 76549.

Email: morgan.lewing@tamuct.edu