The Impact of Service-Learning Pedagogy on Faculty Teaching and Learning

Dean A. Pribbenow
Edgewood College

While there has been a steady increase in the understanding of how service-learning affects students, there remains a dearth of research on how using service-learning pedagogy impacts faculty. In this research study six themes emerged that illuminate how using this innovative pedagogy shaped and influenced faculty members' understandings of, and approaches to, teaching and learning.

An abiding belief exists among innovators, researchers, and many others that faculty participation and commitment is critical to implementing and institutionalizing innovative forms of curricula and pedagogy (Bringle, Games, & Malloy, 1999; Checkoway, 2001; Fairweather, 1996; Finkelstein, Seal, & Schuster, 1998; Hall, 1991; Kuh, Schuh, & Whitt, 1991; Lee, 1967). Because of its direct connection to the curriculum and the teaching and learning process, service-learning is one such innovation that requires direct faculty involvement and support. Yet when called upon to implement innovations such as service-learning, many faculty are challenged by the knowledge, skills, support, or motivation needed to engage in this change (Bok, 1988). Moreover, these innovations often confront traditional pedagogical approaches.

To be sure, the primary measure of any effective pedagogy should be its impact on student learning. Although much has been learned about the impact of service-learning on students and student learning (Astin & Sax, 1998; Bringle et al., 1999; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Kendrick, 1996; Myers-Lipton, 1996; Rhoads, 1997; Rhoads & Howard, 1998; Schneider, 2000), there remains a dearth of studies exploring how participating in service-learning impacts faculty. Indeed, despite the obvious importance of faculty participation in service-learning pedagogy, scant research exists to inform understanding how implementation of this approach affects faculty teaching and learning. Driscoll (2000) noted that most of the existing research on service-learning and faculty has focused on how best to prepare faculty to teach using this approach. Moreover, she points out: "Studies of the impact of service-learning on faculty is a fertile research area with the potential to uncover more possibilities than we anticipate at this time" (p. 38). A better understanding of this concept sheds light on the role of service-learning as a strategy for creating and supporting conditions conducive to faculty growth and learning and for improving the quality of undergraduate education and the teaching and learning enterprise (Rice, 1996).

Does use of pedagogical innovations significantly change how faculty teach and learn? The purpose of this study was to describe and interpret how the implementation of service-learning pedagogy affects faculty.[1] Advancing understanding of the meanings and behaviors that faculty associate with using service-learning pedagogy most directly contributes to knowledge and understanding of the impact on faculty instructional approaches, which is the particular category of findings I report here.

What We Know about Impact on Faculty

Despite what is known about the positive effects of service-learning, its implementation and sustainability face significant barriers, including institutional culture and a lack of faculty involvement and preparation (Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Rubin, 1996; Ward, 1996, 1998). But while these barriers exist, many faculty on campuses across the country do implement service-learning, and much can be learned from them.

Are faculty who implement service-learning affected? Beyond informal data gathering or anecdotal reports, limited research is available on how engaging in service-learning pedagogy affects faculty. Heuristic models and scant research suggest that faculty and their teaching can be affected in various ways, including reconceptualizing classroom norms and roles, enhancing their understanding of student and community needs, and in some cases, expanding opportunities for their scholarship.

For example, some believe faculty are challenged to rethink their traditional pedagogical approaches. Howard (1998) compares a traditional pedagogic model—individualistic, teacher-centered, based on

information dissemination—with a counternormative pedagogy required by service-learning—a synergistic classroom, one in which the responsibility for teaching and learning is shared by students and instructors. This counternormative model "requires that the instructor and the students *travel together* [italics in original] on a journey to remake the classroom" (p. 25) by resocializing themselves around a new set of roles, relationships, and norms.

Similarly, Zlotkowski (1998) posits that the faculty experience with service-learning includes more than just learning a new set of techniques; it challenges faculty to understand the context of service-learning within their discipline, acknowledge their role in developing values such as ethical responsibility and leadership, and see the community as a co-teacher. For service-learning to be successful, Zlotkowski believes faculty must challenge themselves to rethink their pedagogy in light of these dimensions. Indeed, he states that "service-learning packs a whole wardrobe of theoretical and epistemological challenges to the status quo" (p. 82) that faculty must confront. Both Howard and Zlotkowski draw attention to the challenge for faculty and illuminate the potential ways that faculty may be affected by using service-learning.

Despite the existence of these heuristic tools, few studies have considered the experience of faculty or explored whether engaging in service-learning pedagogy significantly affects their teaching and learning approaches or philosophies. In a qualitative study of faculty participation in a service-learning development seminar, Stanton (1994) learned that successful design and implementation of a service-learning course is affected by intrinsic motivation, prior knowledge of learning theory, perception of institutional value on teaching, and faculty role. Hammond (1994) surveyed 250 faculty in Michigan and concluded that faculty who become involved in service-learning are motivated by curricular concerns more than personal or extra-curricular concerns. In addition, she found that faculty were most satisfied with an enhanced sense of meaning associated with their involvement and by their freedom to choose service-learning, and they were least satisfied with how much time was required to implement service-learning and with the "interface between service-learning and scholarly pursuits" (p. 27). Others have considered the factors that encourage and deter faculty from using service-learning (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Mundy, 2003). These studies show that faculty are challenged by institutional barriers and time commitments, but those who use service-learning may find their experience relevant and meaningful.

Most germane to this study is the work of Driscoll et al. (1998), who used a case study approach to predict and develop impact variables, indicators of each variable, and suggested measurement instruments to gather data on the impact of service-learning. Variables included awareness of community, professional development, scholarship, teaching philosophy and methods, and commitment to community-based teaching. The value of this model is its identification of a wide range of potential effects on faculty; its limitations include its lack of depth in telling the stories of faculty affected by service-learning, its small sample size, and the fact that only faculty who were currently implementing service-learning were studied. Driscoll (2000) observed that these "case studies were initial explorations of the process of assessing service-learning courses, but they also yielded faculty impact variables to be addressed in continuing research efforts" (p. 36). Indeed, I agree with Driscoll's (2000) call for research in this area: "Not only do the beginning insights from these case studies leave much to be studied, but this aspect of the research agenda has the potential to influence most of the other agenda items, including faculty motivation, support, and satisfactions" (p. 38).

Research Methods and Design

My approach to understanding faculty experiences was guided by an interpretivist perspective, with the "goal of understanding the complex world of lived experience from the point of view of those who live it" (Schwandt, 1994, p. 118). Thus, this study was anchored in a qualitative approach focusing on trying to make sense of faculty members' experience by interpreting the meaning that they make from utilizing this pedagogy (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994).

For this study, I utilized an embedded single case study design, an approach that is particularly effective in exploratory studies (Yin, 2003). I conducted my research at one institution with an established service-learning program, which allowed me a logical point of access to the institution and a critical mass of faculty with experience in service-learning pedagogy. Middletown University (MU)[2] is a Catholic independent university (Doctoral-I/ Research Extensive) located in the center of a large, urban Midwestern city. It has an undergraduate enrollment of 7,500 students, most of whom are age 18-24. While MU has always articulated undergraduate teaching and an ethic of service as important values and priorities, there is increasing emphasis on raising the institution's research profile, a point made both by the faculty and administrators. Indeed, one associate professor half-jokingly shared with me that at MU the breakdown of expected faculty work "is 40% research, 40% teaching and 40% service."

The service-learning program at MU officially

began in the early 1990s with 10 service-learning courses and has grown to 40-50 service-learning courses each semester. More than 60 faculty have taught using service-learning, and approximately 800 students participate in the program each semester. Service-learning program activities include course selection, faculty support, placement selection, student placement, student preparation, and student monitoring and assistance.

Data collection continued for 11-months. The primary data source for this study was semi-structured interviews with 35 faculty and teaching staff (hereafter "faculty")—selected from a list of 61 service-learning faculty—who had implemented or were in the process of implementing service-learning in a credit-bearing academic course at MU. The range of service-learning experience for these faculty was wide, from those who were implementing service-learning for the first time to those with eight or more years of experience using this teaching approach. Those who were using it for the first time were interviewed at the beginning and end of the semester. I purposefully sampled faculty seeking a diverse group based on four guiding criteria (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992): (a) those who were currently implementing or who had implemented service-learning in their classrooms within the last three semesters; (b) department and discipline; (c) academic rank; and (d) gender.[3] In addition to 35 faculty interviewees, I also interviewed three administrators who provided unique perspectives on the campus, service-learning program, and perceived impact on faculty.

Interviews with all participants were audio-taped and transcribed for the purpose of capturing all of the participants' comments and noting specific questions and follow-up questions. Other data sources included service-learning syllabi, course materials, institutional documents, and limited participant observation.

Glesne and Peskin (1992) note that the process of analyzing qualitative data "is a continuing process that should begin just as soon as your research begins. It follows, then, that interviewing is not simply devoted to data acquisition. It is also a time to consider relationships, salience, meanings, and explanations" (p. 81). Consonant with qualitative methods, I utilized the constant comparative method, which emphasizes the continuous interplay between analysis and collection (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1994). The use of coding strategies served as the primary method for analyzing transcripts, field notes, and documents. Data were collected and analyzed, resulting in the development of hundreds of codes. These codes were sorted and further analyzed, leading to the emergence of categories about how implementation of service-learning pedagogy affected faculty. To assist in the coding and analyzing of data, I used the software application Atlas/ti®, which supported the development of a database and assisted in the process of identifying patterns and themes.

As a way of reflecting on the emerging themes, I employed memo writing (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992) to develop my emerging interpretations, and member checks to determine the accuracy of my analysis (Ferguson, Ferguson, & Jones, 1988). For example, as ideas and themes emerged, I used subsequent interviews with faculty and discussions with administrators to check for accuracy. A significant audit trail and triangulation was utilized in two ways to increase the trustworthiness of my findings (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992; Janesick, 2000). First, participants included faculty with no experience using service-learning pedagogy ("new faculty"), those with varying experience levels, and administrators who had working knowledge of the service-learning program. Second, although the primary data source for this study was interviews, I also included syllabi, faculty reflection and writing, institutional documents, field notes, and limited observation to broaden understanding of how faculty were being affected.

Despite these efforts to ensure trustworthiness, this study has at least two limitations. It trades breadth for depth in that the research was conducted at one institution over a limited period of time. In addition, findings are based primarily on data gathered directly from faculty and does not include student interviews or other evaluative data.

Findings

In this study I identified six themes that describe the impact of service-learning on how faculty teach and learn. To be sure, not every faculty member interviewed addressed all six themes as they reflected on their experience and the influence of service-learning on them. More broadly, these themes portray—in some cases with many of the faculty and other times fewer—my interpretation of their voices describing the ways in which using service-learning pedagogy shaped and influenced their understandings of, and approaches to, teaching and learning.

In broad strokes, service-learning pedagogy led many faculty to more meaningful engagement in, and commitment to, teaching. In addition, it was common to hear faculty describe an enhanced understanding of students, which often led to deeper student-faculty connections. Faculty indicated that these connections allowed them to better understand students as individuals and learners. Not all but some faculty noted that this increased understanding

fostered a better sense of students' learning styles and methods for demonstrating learning. An enhanced commitment to teaching and greater understanding of students compelled nearly all the faculty in this study to continue using service-learning pedagogy. But, interestingly, increased understanding did not always translate to action or a significant change in pedagogy. Still, for a few faculty, their new knowledge of students and community-based experiences led to changes in classroom pedagogical practices—including more use of constructive teaching and learning approaches, and improved communication of theoretical concepts through the availability of community-based examples. Notably, nearly all the faculty in this study acknowledged their association with the service-learning program and use of service-learning pedagogy led to a greater sense of connection to other faculty and the institution. The significance of this finding increases considering that a greater sense of connection keeps faculty involved and increases the likelihood that using service-learning pedagogy will lead to positive effects associated with the use of this teaching and learning approach.

In the remainder of this section, I describe each of the six themes that explain how service-learning pedagogy affected the teaching and learning of faculty in this study. In addition to my interpretations of their stories, I have integrated faculty voices to add depth and meaning to these themes.

More Meaningful Engagement in and Commitment to Teaching

Many faculty I interviewed spoke of the engaging and rewarding nature of service-learning. While previous studies have demonstrated how participation in service-learning enhances student learning by engaging them in their learning experiences, the findings from this study suggest faculty who use service-learning pedagogy can be affected in similar ways. Anne (Education), who used service-learning a number of times, described how she became empowered through service-learning: "I guess what I would say is that it's always new, which is another form of talking about empowerment."

A sense of excitement and engagement, common among experienced service-learning faculty, was particularly evident with nearly all the new service-learning faculty. Randy (Spanish) described his "surprise and gratification" with students' reactions "I have seen students learn in new ways, ways that are meaningful to them and inspire confidence in their necessarily imperfect abilities…I continue to find the student reaction to be a source of surprise and gratification."

Recognizing the sense of self-efficacy that service-learning fostered with students led to a sense of satisfaction for most faculty and, in turn, enhanced their own engagement in teaching. Ellen (Nursing) said seeing her students energized by the community-based experience renewed her own energy level: "I had detected these energies that I didn't think I had again. I was renewed by their enthusiasm."

For some faculty, heightened engagement in and commitment to teaching came from recognizing that service-learning was a very effective pedagogical approach and brought their discipline "alive." John, an experienced service-learning faculty member in Philosophy, told me that he "learned that even in a discipline like Philosophy, the [service-learning] students can make connections that they probably couldn't make in a classroom setting." Jean (English), a professor and admitted skeptic, noted that "there's a deeper commitment to the issue. ...And there was much more of an intense need to try to understand the academic question[s]."

Altogether, the apparent increase in students' sense of self-efficacy, greater depth of learning, and range of meaningful disciplinary expressions led many faculty to describe service-learning as an effective pedagogical approach.

To be sure, the effort required to implement a service-learning course was identified as a potential barrier—Tim admitted that "it's a hell of a lot more work, let alone the reading part, but also the preparation and the implementation"—but the satisfaction gained by having a successful teaching experience appeared worth the effort. One of Tim's colleagues captured this sentiment: "Oh well, it's a lot of work. It's a whole lot of work but it's really worth it. This experience, and I told my students this, it was the most rewarding teaching experience to date for me."

Deeper Connections and Relationships with Students as Learners and Individuals

By design, service-learning pedagogy depends on a relatively seamless link in which students' experiences from the community are brought into the classroom, and content and learning in the classroom are applied in the community. As research has demonstrated, this can be a rich and powerful experience for students (Eyler & Giles, 1999). According to the faculty in this study, as students came to make sense of their experiences and the learning that occurred inside and outside the classroom, faculty, in turn, gained new insights into cognitive, emotional, and social dimensions of students' development.

For many faculty, using service-learning pedagogy led to deeper connections and relationships with students as learners and, more holistically, as individuals, beyond just intellectual acumen. In

many cases, increased awareness of and respect for students developed as a result of service-learning, leading to these enhanced connections. These connections are of particular interest when considering that research on student learning outcomes has consistently shown that increased student-faculty interaction positively affects student learning (Astin, 1993; Kuh et al., 1991; Pascarella, 1980; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

It follows, then, that positive student-faculty relationships also can affect faculty. Through the process of implementing service-learning, faculty in this study described coming to see students as whole persons. Simply put, you "get to know them better…it draws them out," said Linda (Anthropology). Kevin (Philosophy) described a similar perspective: "It gives me a real, more vivid picture of the whole range of student education experiences and gives me a sharper idea, a vision of the student as a whole person, both emotional and social needs." By understanding more about their students, faculty felt connected to their students and better able to relate to them.

Heightened respect for students was a key element in deeper faculty-student interactions and relationships. A sense of respect for his students was evident in Harold's (Philosophy) description of his students: "I guess maybe the main thing I learned is that students can really make some sometimes good, sometimes brilliant applications and insights as to the meaning of the issues and theories that we studied."

For a few faculty, seeing more of their students also encouraged the faculty to reveal more of themselves. Upon reflection, Michael, an experienced service-learning faculty member said how this affects him:

> I think I gained deeper respect for the students because I see more of them. When they do their [writings] on service-learning, they can't help but reveal more about themselves than a typical research paper would because they're talking about their relationships with people. So that in a sense opens them up to me as more complete human beings. And so I can respond in class with more of my commitment. . . . It encourages me, though, it encourages me to be a more complete human being in class, to kind of be myself more rather than just in the role of teacher.

Michael's comments indicate a type of reciprocity and trust in the teacher-student relationship. By being more open, Michael had more meaningful interactions with his students, which in turn had a positive impact on the quality of his teaching and learning experiences.

Indeed, most faculty interviewed held a common belief that implementing service-learning in the classroom provided them with new, more human perspectives of their students that led to a greater sense of engagement with them. Brenda (Sociology) described it as having an "avenue to reflect with them." This connectedness was also reflected in a greater sensitivity to students' needs and higher quality interactions with students.

Unlike with more traditional pedagogical approaches, by placing students in community-based settings and then connecting that experience back to learning goals through journaling, class discussions, and other reflection strategies, faculty gained new understandings of students. This knowledge led to greater respect for students and sensitivity to their needs and sometimes faculty members' willingness to share more of themselves. More importantly, this understanding of students often led to deeper connections and relationships between faculty and students. As one faculty member described it, "it's like having a picture of their soul."

Enhanced Knowledge of Student Learning Processes and Outcomes

In addition to learning more about their students both as learners and individuals, implementing service-learning provided a window for faculty into students' learning processes and their achievement of class learning goals, a third theme. In some cases, because service-learning increased the level of interaction between faculty and students, faculty were able to assess more effectively what students were learning. In other cases, increased awareness or interaction provided faculty with a deeper understanding of how students construct knowledge and experience the course—knowledge that engaged the faculty in their students' learning and opened them up to learning from their students.

Understanding students' learning processes. As one faculty member stated, service-learning is "a whole other sense of learning…They learn differently." One of the effects faculty consistently described was that implementing service-learning made them more aware of how students were learning in and experiencing the course.

Deeper awareness often developed from the need to pay close attention to the service-learning experiences in which students were engaged. Tim (History) indicated he regularly inquires into his students' activities so that he can intercede if necessary. A number of faculty shared the following perspective: "The thing we find is that you really have to interact with students quite frequently. ....If you're going to have success at all, you do have to try and keep in touch." By paying attention to students and increasing the level of interaction with them, these faculty felt they could enhance their students' theo-

retical and practical learning.

Wendy (Communication) talked about how service-learning increased her knowledge of how different students learn in different ways:

> It's just interesting to see how different venues bring out different strengths in people and some people are good in some ways and others are good in other ways. It's very graphic because some people who may have—like this one guy in my class last semester, I don't think he contributed one single word. I don't think he ever said anything in class. He talked to me outside of class but I don't think he ever spoke in a class discussion. And he was just fabulous in the [service-learning] project. I mean, he took a real leadership role…And so I've learned to suspend judgment a little bit and try to offer students a lot of opportunities to show me what their strengths are.

A number of faculty in this study enhanced their knowledge of how students experience their course and, more specifically, how different learning styles affect students' ability to comprehend course content. For some faculty, enhanced knowledge of students' learning process was a new insight; for others, service-learning moved them further on the path toward developing more active, student-centered classrooms. After listening to one faculty member describe his increased interaction with his service-learning students, I summarized, "It sounds like it brings you closer to their learning experience in a number of ways," to which he agreed, "Actually, it does that, yeah. I do feel as though I'm participating in that experience."

Understanding students' learning outcomes. In addition to learning about "how" students learn, another significant theme that emerged from my interviews with faculty was that implementing service-learning provided opportunities for faculty to better understand and assess "what" their students were learning in the course. One of the earlier interviews with Russell, an English professor and experienced service-learning faculty member, revealed the potential for this effect when he stated, "I know now much better what my students are taking away from these courses. I know what kind of impact it has in the way that I didn't know before. And I know that it is having a permanent effect."

In some cases faculty, such as Randy (Spanish) said using service-learning made assessing student learning easier than with traditional courses:

> Assessing learning was easier. In the journals I can elicit specific information on what and how students learned. . . . I can also see students' skills developing, as they experience a boost in confidence when they actually use Spanish for something outside the classroom, something other than answering my questions and writing exams.

Several faculty were impressed with the quality and depth of thought students often demonstrated. This learning was demonstrated through classroom discussions and oral presentations, but the most common method for assessing student learning was journal writing. Jay (Sociology), an experienced service-learning faculty member, used journals to assess students' learning and found them valuable:

> Reading the journals was, I suppose, the most rewarding thing. I think they were all different …Somebody did an excellent job of integrating their experiences with what went on with class. Some people did an excellent job of being personally present and at least observing subtleties and thinking about them in a sociological way. Somebody just spent the whole time describing almost the way a brochure would what the program was like.

The range of writing in the journals allowed Jay to more accurately assess his students' experience and the degree to which they could articulate course concepts within the context of their service-learning experiences.

In Neil's (Spanish) case, where his students were in the Hispanic community interacting with native speakers, it was students' service-learning experiences that provided him with something to assess: "But even if they don't get a lot of input from native speakers, they do get an experience that they can talk about in class. And so they have something to say." This was an important point: participating in meaningful community-based experiences provided students with a real experience, allowing them to become more fully engaged in classroom discussions-a practice that gave faculty an opportunity to assess students' learning.

What impact did these opportunities to assess students' learning have on faculty? For Russell, the English professor who indicated that now he knew much better what his students were taking away from his course, it had a significant effect. When probed as to what the knowledge of student learning did for him, he replied: "It gives me confidence. Maybe it's changed me in that way. That I believe in what I'm doing in the class in a way I didn't before."

Increased Use of Constructivist Teaching and Learning Approaches

Deeper awareness of how students learn challenged faculty to rethink how knowledge is constructed and the role of authority in the classroom. Indeed, Baxter Magolda (1999) has called for a con-

structivist-developmental pedagogy that connects "teaching to students' ways of making meaning in order to create the conditions to promote growth to more complex meaning-making" (p. 23). Foundational principles of this pedagogy include validating students as knowers, situating learning in students' own experience, and defining learning as mutually constructing meaning. Among many of the faculty I interviewed, implementing service-learning pedagogy cultivated an awareness of the need for approaches that advance these principles.

For example, Michael (Theology) explained that using service-learning helped him to understand that "lecturing is maybe the least effective method of pedagogy, especially for greater student participation and initiative." Although his inclination to student-centered learning had long been an interest, he "didn't know how. I didn't know how I could [do that]" until he began using service-learning.

While using service-learning pedagogy opened up faculty to new ways of constructing knowledge and learning opportunities, it also confronted faculty members' abiding epistemological beliefs. A number of faculty described their challenges with this aspect of service-learning pedagogy, which was often reflected in faculty members' traditional reliance on text as the sole information source, anxiety over "covering" the syllabus, and a tendency toward using lecture as a primary pedagogy-despite service-learning's experiential-based philosophy. One faculty member's comments captured the opinions of many other service-learning faculty:

> In practice, I'm afraid the student who is learning in experiential [service-learning] terms always gets shoved a little bit aside, because-you can tell I was trained 30 years ago—the syllabus and the text still dominate my vision and the body of the material to be covered.. . . . So, I mean, this wore on my mind between the tyranny of the syllabus and the energy of the students and their experience and interaction. And I really don't give enough space to that last one.

Despite the "tyranny of the syllabus," a number of faculty indicated that using service-learning fostered greater respect for direct, out-of-class experience. Many described observing the knowledge gained from service-learning was "powerful" and allowed students to be more active classroom participants. Ned (Philosophy) described the impact it had on him: "It changes my emphasis, such that I have a lot more respect for direct experience than just bookish learning."

The value of experience in constructing knowledge was sometimes reflected in faculty views on authority and classroom roles. One faculty member acknowledged he had come to see "that students are sometimes the authority," and Brenda (Sociology) indicated that it caused her to rethink how she views students: "I would say that service-learning has caused me to treat the student as more of an 'expert.' When I didn't [use service-learning], I brought in speakers from the community. . . . Now I use students more often." Similarly, Wendy (Communication) said: "When we do the [service-learning] project it does require a little bit of giving up, on my part, of control or coverage." But only a few faculty were as comfortable as Ned with these changes: "I never get threatened if a class gets way behind schedule as you go along, because that's a good sign."

Faculty members' awareness of how experience contributes to knowledge construction and shared authority led, in a few cases, to changed classroom activities, content, or format. These changes included selecting new texts that would address issues germane to the project, eliminating certain activities to enable focus on discussing students' experiences, and utilizing peer learning techniques. More often, faculty demonstrated their commitment to student-centered classrooms through slight changes in their syllabi and creating class time for service-learning students to discuss and reflect upon their experiences. Other faculty set aside regular time for talking with students about their experiences.

One of the more common illustrations of faculty members' increased use of constructivist approaches was evident in their use of peer learning strategies designed to allow students to learn from one another. In Carl's (History) case, creating in-class opportunities to learn from students who were in the community interacting with families on welfare challenged pre-conceived notions held by some non-service-learning students. Because of this benefit, Carl committed himself to continuing to use a form of constructivist pedagogy such as peer learning.

Despite their enhanced knowledge of how students learn and the need to have students play a more prominent role in shaping their learning, a number of the faculty admitted that they needed to improve in the area of integrating student's experiences into classroom activities and discussion. In some cases it seemed faculty struggled because they felt they lacked the skills to do so effectively. Ellen's (Nursing) comments provide insight into this:

> [We] talked about building in an in-class opportunity to discuss it more. I hadn't really, I think partly because I was unsure about service-learning, where it was going, what people were getting out of it, I was not too skilled even to spend the amount of time in class talk-

> ing about it. . . . I'm just not sure what my role would be in that particular instance.

Ellen knew integrating students' experiences into the classroom was important, but struggled to do so at all or in ways that she thought were most effective, a fairly common expression from these faculty. The struggle itself, however, was evidence that she was moving toward using more constructivist approaches such as guided discussion or peer learning methods.

Finally, increase in the use of, and commitment to using, constructivist teaching approaches such as service-learning was captured in a single question that several faculty members asked themselves: "Anytime I'm thinking about a course or syllabus, I'll give some thought to, 'Is there any way I could incorporate service-learning as a component?'" That they ask this question demonstrates recognition that service-learning represents a different way to think about how they teach, how students learn, and how knowledge is constructed.

Improved Communication of Theoretical Concepts

Through this study I came to understand that faculty awareness of the community—although it was an awareness often gained vicariously through their students—had pedagogical implications. Indeed, nearly all faculty interviewed mentioned increased awareness of community organizations and, in many cases, 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 and practice. This new knowledge rarely came from first-hand, ongoing participation in the community; rather, faculty gained it from students, through evaluation forms and periodic calls to agencies, and for some, a bus tour (organized by the Service-Learning Program) of the community sites at which their students might be placed. Even without a significant amount of time—if at all—spent in the community, many faculty described an enhanced understanding of the Middletown community.

Caroline (English) indicated using service-learning had "shown me a deeper sense, a more complex sense of [the community]," though like their students, faculty sometimes had to overcome assumptions about community agencies. When they did, their awareness of community-based organizations and the challenges of their work increased significantly. Randy (Spanish) said he "learned first of all about the existence of some of these agencies, what they do, how they're organized, and what the people in them—who avail themselves of their services—are like."

Martha described how she was able to make concepts clear in her "Abnormal Psychology" course because she knew her students would have experiences that provided them with insights into a diverse groups of individuals. Rebecca pointed out the benefit of these examples in a literature course:

> It was working with meta-narrative and meta-textual elements of telling a story that they were hearing out in the community and how that is incorporated into the literature. So it became a theoretical tool: By examining what you were hearing and examining the text, were you able to come up with something?

Faculty from a number of disciplines welcomed the availability of a growing resource of examples to further explain issues. Others, especially the new service-learning faculty, spoke with excitement about relevant practical cases that could inform theory. Randy (Spanish) cited a specific example from one of his students who was conducting interviews in the community: "One of the interviews dealt with family celebrations and food to some extent, and I heard people talk about stuff I hadn't experienced myself. . . . That was news to me." Ellen (Nursing) described her intentions to use what she learned from students:

> I certainly will use a lot of their examples in class. . . . I will remember the pieces of it that had particular meaning for me, and I'll be able to use that in other contexts and other settings to make a point in class or in future classes. So what they're learning, seeing the world through their eyes will be able to enrich my own teaching.

Ellen's awareness of students' community-based stories and ability to weave them into her teaching enhanced her effectiveness as a teacher in her service-learning classroom discussion, and it also had the potential to enhance instruction in non-service-learning courses.

Faculty members' understanding of the community and students' community experiences can be especially powerful when complemented by student insights. A faculty member from Social Work, a discipline in which myriad examples already exist, spoke of the benefit of these new understandings:

> What's fun is when I'll be talking about theory and then in one of the classes, the students will say, "Yeah, you said that the client would be resistant," or "You said they would be a scapegoat, and I went to my service-learning and participated in a group, and they actually did what you said they did theoretically." So, in the academic classes it just makes our concepts become so much more alive.

Deborah, an experienced and introspective service-learning faculty member, offered her perspective on the powerful dynamic that can occur in the classroom when a faculty member, with knowledge of the community and the experiences that students are engaged in, creates opportunities for students to actively participate in their learning:

> As far as the classroom goes, I guess the biggest distinction is when you have a service-learning semester, you're drawing on a fund of experiences that the students have or are getting and so you can count on that. Where as normally I would be hypothetically drawing on what I hope is students' experiences, I can be sure that there are students right now having experiences that are raising questions for them and so then I can draw on those.

Greater Involvement in a Community of Teachers and Learners

Nearly everyone I interviewed indicated that service-learning—and the accompanying opportunities for professional development in this area—had introduced them to other faculty who shared a common cause for improving undergraduate education. While this theme does not directly relate to the specific topic of pedagogy, it has broad implications for teaching and learning. Many faculty spoke with passion about these interactions, which were often organized around service-learning workshops or luncheons but sometimes involved less formal encounters. The sense of community and collegiality created from these interactions connected faculty to each other, enhanced their commitment to the institution, and assisted some in overcoming isolation. These three effects gave faculty a sense of greater involvement in a community of teachers and learners.

First, interacting with other faculty and staff, particularly those outside their department, was of significant value to many faculty. Nancy noted:

> Everybody gets so busy and so focused on your discipline that we don't do a whole lot of interdisciplinary things. And so, it's one of the rare experiences that you—I got to talk to people in foreign languages! To talk with faculty in other disciplines on a common interest: faculty building.

On occasion, experience with service-learning led to service-learning faculty connecting with non-service-learning faculty. One faculty member pointed out to me that "people will just drop by and say, 'Hey, can I see your syllabus, how do you do this service thing? I want to try this.'"

I learned that in most cases these connections were not made with faculty in their own departments, which Sally (Theology) described as a "missed opportunity." A number of faculty in her department were doing service-learning, but rarely talked with each other about it because they were so busy.

Faculty members' understandings of their interactions and connections with other service-learning faculty were at least two-dimensional: relational and learning-oriented. It was evident that many faculty appreciated and benefited from the social aspects of sharing a common interest with colleagues they might not normally meet. Ned (Philosophy) noted that "this is one of the ways, running the workshops, that's helped me get to know quite a few people." Another faculty member reflected back on her first year using service-learning:

> And that was a shock to me the first year that here were all these people and I never saw them unless they happened to teach on the same day…Service-learning—the workshops, luncheons, and things that go along with all that—provide a kind of transcendence, an avenue, to be cozy for a little bit.

Kevin (Philosophy) clarified that renewal did not occur only because of implementing an innovative pedagogy. "The renewal has come by way of getting in contact with [other] teachers and introducing [service-learning] to them." Christine's (Social Work) opinion was that it was "a breath of fresh air" because it connected her to a "cohort of people who really are interested in students, the community, and have an enthusiasm and kind of a synergy that lends excitement." The relational dimension of service-learning "faculty building" enlarged faculty members' circles of encounters and relationships with other faculty. In turn, this allowed them to know and be known by more people on campus, creating a greater sense of community and belonging.

In addition to a relational dimension, service-learning faculty connections provided opportunities to increase one's pedagogical knowledge and confidence—a learning-oriented dimension. Russell (English) said he learned that service-learning "works very differently in different kinds of classes, and that it's always interesting to hear about how philosophers are doing it, how theologians do it." Organized discussions provided a venue for discussing and reflecting upon different pedagogical strategies and faculty roles, "because it wasn't just how can we implement service-learning, but how can we, in general, teach better," noted another faculty member.

As faculty from the Spanish Department indicated, learning-oriented interactions with other faculty

colleagues appeared especially important for first-time users of service-learning. New service-learning faculty indicated how connecting with other experienced service-learning faculty through the workshop provided them with specific examples of how to deal with student and community issues as they arose.

Second, in addition to connecting faculty to each other, utilizing service-learning fostered, among some faculty, a sense of commitment and connection to the institution and its purposes. In some cases, faculty expressed respect for the institution and a sense of pride with being connected to it. In other cases, involvement in service-learning allowed a number of faculty to feel like active members of the university community. One faculty member described feeling that she was not "giving to the university as much as I should be giving to them. And, I think that that's why I really want to do service-learning."

Another faculty member shared: "I think it's simply for me a great, wonderful way that Middletown is able to express something about its identity that I can connect in within the classroom. It enables me to bring to life some of the banner words we like to hang on the street."

And Martha's (Psychology) comments further illustrated this point:

> I feel better about being here, than I did for a long time, because I think in a small way, by making these opportunities available for students, ... I'm doing something that I think is really worthwhile...It gives me a sense of purpose and . . . makes me feel better about being at Middletown.

Third, as a result of feeling more connected to other faculty and to the institution, some faculty were able to overcome the isolation that accompanies much of faculty work (Rice, 1996). Perhaps the most powerful story about isolation was told by a new assistant professor that confessed that, because of isolation and hostility within her department, she was prepared to leave the university, until she discovered her service-learning colleagues:

> By the end of my first year I was considering that I should look for something else and I was pretty depressed. I mean, the department had so many political problems. And then I went to this [service-learning] workshop where people from other disciplines were there and it was so nice to transcend those departmental problems and to see people work inter-disciplinary, collaborating, all talking about how we can teach better. . . . And that three-day workshop really helped me to stay, because I was ready to go.

The importance of creating opportunities to bring faculty together around important efforts like service-learning should not be underestimated.

Discussion

As discussed earlier, few studies have explored how implementing service-learning pedagogy affects faculty. This gap in the literature has been identified by a number of leading researchers in service-learning (Bringle, Hatcher, & Games, 1997; Driscoll, 2000; Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon, & Kerrigan, 1996; Gelmon, Holland, Driscoll, Spring, & Kerrigan, 2001; Giles & Eyler, 1998; Rhoads & Howard, 1998; Stanton, 1994; Zlotkowski, 1998). This study begins to fill this gap.

The findings from Hammond's (1994) research most relevant to this study concern faculty members' satisfaction and dissatisfaction with using service-learning. She found that faculty were most satisfied with autonomy and control (i.e., they freely chose to use it), the purpose and meaning associated with using service-learning, and the level of positive feedback they received; faculty were dissatisfied with the time commitment and the logistical requirements of using this approach. The outcomes of this study confirm some of these findings. A sense that, by implementing service-learning, they were doing important and meaningful work was evident among faculty. Reflected in faculty members' meaningful engagement in and commitment to teaching, among other themes, were comments indicating that faculty found meaning in enhancing student learning and providing a service to the community. In addition, deeper relationships with students and enhanced knowledge of learning processes and outcomes detail how faculty received student feedback, and increased connections to other faculty using service-learning provided feedback and support. Although faculty in this study admitted being challenged by the time and logistical requirements of service-learning, few dwelled on or indicated high levels of dissatisfaction because of these factors.

The work of Driscoll, Gelmon, and their colleagues (Driscoll et al., 1998; Driscoll et al., 1996; Gelmon et al., 2001) aligns most directly with this study. Although documenting service-learning's effect on faculty was one aspect of their work, their primary aim was developing a comprehensive model—impact variables, indicators, and measures—for assessing the impact of service-learning on four major stakeholders: students, faculty, community, and institution.

My findings affirm their variables as legitimate areas to explore the impact of service-learning pedagogy on faculty. Moreover, the results of this study extend their work and enrich what is known about faculty impact in at least four important

ways. First, my findings offer the opportunity to consider additional impact variables (such as "reflective practice," "involvement in community of teachers and learners," "expanded faculty roles," and "quality of relationships with students") or to reconsider those previously identified. Second, I have added to the list of potential indicators of impact. For example, under the variable "philosophy of teaching/learning" it is important to consider additional indicators such as "broadened student perspectives" or "knowledge of student learning styles;" under the variable "teaching methods," indicators such as "use of reflection strategies" or "use of peer learning" should be considered.

Third, my findings offer salient examples—in the voice of the faculty—of how these factors, indicators, and experiences find expression and the nuances of faculty experiences. Giving voice to these faculty makes more real their excitement, satisfaction, and struggles and opens a window into the myriad ways that faculty can be affected by using this innovative teaching approach. Simple cause-effect relationships fail to capture adequately how faculty change. For example, the indicator "faculty/student interaction" took on richness when faculty described their deeper connections and relationships with students as both learners and individuals. By adding depth and breadth to the potential areas of impact, I have illuminated how faculty in this study interpreted and made meaning of using service-learning pedagogy. Finally, my findings call attention to the systemic nature of pedagogical innovations such as service-learning—all the players active in the innovation can be affected by their involvement. In the case of most innovative pedagogies, this includes students and faculty; in service-learning, the community and institution are recognized as additional key players.

Implications for Practice and Research

This study has implications for those who participate in, coordinate, and support innovative pedagogy in higher education. In addition, it may be of interest to those who care about university engagement with communities and improving undergraduate education. My focus on faculty will matter to those committed to better understanding and supporting faculty—one of higher education's most important resources.

This study revealed that faculty connections and opportunities to reflect on their teaching with others in a community of teaching and learning were both outcomes of their use of service-learning and factors that contributed significantly to shaping and deepening their experience. A sense of connection between faculty and students was certainly evident in this research. But community also refers to how faculty learn from one another. Palmer (1998) asks, "Could teachers gather around the great thing called 'teaching and learning?' . . . We need to learn how to do so, for such a gathering is one of the few means we have to become better teachers" (p. 141). For the service-learning faculty in this study, opportunities to talk about good teaching occurred but in varying degrees of depth and meaningfulness.

Based on my observations, I assert a strong need exists for a broader and more comprehensive approach to service-learning faculty development, an approach that encourages faculty reflection and growth within the context of a community or communities of teachers and learners. Many have indicated the importance of providing faculty development opportunities while others have suggested curricula for guiding faculty preparation for using service-learning. (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995; Morton, 1996; Rice, 1996). In most cases, however, faculty development in general and service-learning faculty development in particular have focused on preparation: what knowledge and skills do faculty need to possess and what aspects of their course must they reconsider to implement service-learning. This approach assumes that faculty will gain everything they need to know before the course is implemented that will allow them to be successful. Common sense indicates that this is often not the case.

Indeed, faculty development does not begin and end with the preparation stage. It begins with preparation, continues through implementation, and includes evaluation that cycles around to further preparation. To this extent, it mirrors the major components of students' service-learning experiences: preparation, meaningful action, reflection, and evaluation. To approach faculty development in this ways leads us to Zlotkowski's (1998) point—service-learning pedagogy *is* faculty development. In this sense, reliance on Kolb's Experiential Learning Model (1984) model—a model oft-cited in developing students' service-learning experience—is equally applicable for faculty. An approach to faculty learning must be developmental, accepting them with the skills, knowledge, and perspectives they bring and allowing them to grow in the directions they choose.

Creating supportive and connected communities has noteworthy implications for those who direct or coordinate programs that facilitate faculty implementation of service-learning pedagogy. What level of support will these programs provide to faculty? On one hand, when these programs assume a significant level of responsibility for service-learning processes (e.g., designing service-learning experiences, building community relationships, facilitating

orientation, reflection, and evaluation activities), there typically will be greater willingness on the part of faculty to participate and, consequently, more service-learning opportunities for students. On the other hand, when programs provide this higher level of support, faculty may not be as likely to fully engage in the activities and reflection necessary to contribute to faculty learning or systemic change in teaching, learning, and faculty work. Striking this balance will continue to be an abiding challenge.

This study begins to expand understanding by proffering themes of the impact of using service-learning on faculty teaching and learning. Still, an array of gaps remain in this area that further research and lines of inquiry could address to add breadth and depth to what is known about faculty members' experiences with innovation.

First, this study was limited by a focus on faculty at one independent, religiously-affiliated institution of higher education. Future research should explore faculty experiences using service-learning at a range of other institutional types—public, private, 4-year, and 2-year—to learn more about how faculty are affected within different institutional contexts. Further investigation should attempt to heighten understanding about how new and experienced service-learning faculty are affected in similar and different ways. Cross-institutional analyses of these findings could lead to a more comprehensive theory that would inform developing programs and processes to support faculty participation in service-learning pedagogy.

Second, future research should seek to determine the factors that shape how faculty are affected by using service-learning pedagogy. Although this was not the primary emphasis of this study, I have suggested that evidence of faculty reflection on their experience seems to affect changes in their knowledge and understanding. Other factors to be explored might include the type of service-learning course and experience or whether service-learning within a course is required or optional. In addition, research is needed to learn more about how institutional and disciplinary differences shape how service-learning affects faculty and their work.

Notes

[1] This article is based on findings from my dissertation (Pribbenow, D. A. (2002). *Exploring the impact of innovative pedagogy on faculty work: The case of service learning.* Unpublished Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison). My findings covered an array of dimensions of faculty work. In this article, I focus on those most reflective of the impact of service-learning pedagogy on faculty teaching and learning.

[2] Middletown University is a pseudonym for the research site. To ensure the confidentiality of the study participants, I have chosen to use pseudonyms for the institution and participants.

[3] Of the 35 faculty I interviewed, 3 were lecturers, 10 were assistant professors, 16 were associate professors, and 6 were full professors; 19 were women; 8 were first-time users. Disciplines/departments included Anthropology, Chemistry, Communication, Economics, Education, English, French, History, Management, Nursing, Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, Social Work, Sociology, and Theology.

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), 5-17.

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

Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development*, *39*(3), 251-263.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (1999). *Creating contexts for learning and self-authorship: Constructive-developmental pedagogy.* Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bok, D. (1988, April 27, 1988). Universities have an obligation to help students learn how to lead ethical, fulfilling lives. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. B4.

Bowen, H. R., & Schuster, J. H. (1986). *American professors: A national resource imperiled*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bringle, R. G., Games, R., & Malloy, R. E. A. (1999). *College and universities as citizens*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1995). A service-learning curriculum for faculty. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *2*, 112-122.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., & Games, R. (1997). Engaging and supporting faculty in service learning. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, *2*(1), 43-51.

Checkoway, B. (2001). Renewing the civic mission of the American research university. *Journal of Higher Education*, *72*(2), 125-147.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1-17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Driscoll, A. (2000). Studying faculty and service-learning: Directions for inquiry and development. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*: Strategic Directions for Service-Learning Research [Special issue], 35-41.

Driscoll, A., Gelmon, S., Holland, B., Kerrigan, S., Spring, A., Grosvold, K., et al. (1998). *Assessing the impact of service learning: A workbook of strategies and methods* (2nd ed.). Portland, OR: Portland State University, Center for Academic Excellence.

Driscoll, A., Holland, B., Gelmon, S., & Kerrigan, S. (1996). An assessment model for service-learning: Comprehensive cases studies of impact on faculty, students, community, and institution. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3,* 66-71.

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

Fairweather, J. S. (1996). *Faculty work and public trust: Restoring the value of teaching and public service in American academic life*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Ferguson, P. M., Ferguson, D. L., & Jones, D. (1988). Generations of hope: Parental perspectives on the transitions of their children with severe retardation from school to adult life. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 13*(3), 177-187.

Finkelstein, M. J., Seal, R. K., & Schuster, J. H. (1998). *The new academic generation: A profession in transformation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gelmon, S. B., Holland, B. A., Driscoll, A., Spring, A., & Kerrigan, S. (2001). *Assessing service-learning and civic engagement: Principles and techniques*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Giles, D. E., Jr, & Eyler, J. (1998). A service learning research agenda for the next five years. In R. A. Rhoads & J. P. F. Howard (Eds.), *Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection* (pp. 65-72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Hall, J. W. (1991). *Access through innovation: New colleges for new students*. New York: Macmillan Publishing.

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.

Howard, J. P. F. (1998). Academic service learning: A counternormative pedagogy. In R. A. Rhoads & J. P. F. Howard (Eds.), *Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection* (pp. 21-30). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Janesick, V. J. (2000). The choreography of qualitative research design: Minuets, improvisations, and crystallization. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed., pp. 379-399). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Kendrick, J. R., Jr. (1996). Outcomes of service-learning in an introduction to sociology course. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3,* 72-81.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kuh, G., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (1991). *Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and development outside the classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lee, C. B. T. (Ed.). (1967). *Improving college teaching*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Morton, K. (1996). Issues related to integrating service-learning into the curriculum. In B. Jacoby & Associates (Eds.), *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 276-296). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mundy, M. E. (2003). *Faculty engagement in service-learning: Individual & organizational factors at distinct institutional types*. Unpublished Dissertation, Vanderbilt University, Nashville.

Myers-Lipton, S. J. (1996). Effect of a comprehensive service-learning program on college students' level of modern racism. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3,* 44-54.

Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E. T. (1980). Student-faculty informal contact and college outcomes. *Review of Educational Research, 50*(4), 545-595.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rhoads, R. A. (1997). *Community service and higher learning: Explorations of the caring self*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Rhoads, R. A., & Howard, J. P. F. (Eds.). (1998). *Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection* (Vol. 73). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rice, R. E. (1996). *Making a place for the new American scholar*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Rubin, S. (1996). Institutionalizing service-learning. In B. Jacoby & Associates (Eds.), *Service-Learning in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 297-316). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schneider, C. G. (2000). Educational missions and civic responsibility: Toward the engaged academy. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education* (pp. 98-123). Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.

Schwandt, T. A. (1994). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 118-137). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stanton, T. K. (1994). The experience of faculty participants in an instructional development seminar on service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1*(1), 7-20.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 273-285). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ward, K. (1996). Service-learning and student volunteerism: Reflections on institutional commitment. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3*, 55-65.

Ward, K. (1998). Addressing academic culture: Service learning, organizations, and faculty work. In R. A. Rhoads & J. P. F. Howard (Eds.), *Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection* (pp. 73-80). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed. Vol. 5). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Zlotkowski, E. (1998). A service learning approach to faculty development. In R. A. Rhoads & J. P. F. Howard (Eds.), *Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection* (pp. 81-89). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Author

DEAN A. PRIBBENOW is assistant professor of Education at Edgewood College, where he teaches in and directs the Human Issues Studies Program. This program coordinates interdisciplinary teaching and learning experiences designed to advance the liberal arts as fundamental to the world of citizenship, work, and public life. He was founding director of the Institute for Service Learning at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and a member of the planning team that formed the Wisconsin Campus Compact. Pribbenow has been active in presenting and writing on service-learning and civic engagement. He holds a Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, an M.S. in Counselor Education from the University of Wisconsin Whitewater, and a B.A. in English from Luther College.