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ABSTRACT

The purposes of this study were to contribute to what is known about the innovation-decision process, to investigate faculty perceptions of scholarship in relation to teaching, and to explore the role of faculty as learners. The theoretical framework consisted of the diffusion of innovations theory, the concept of the scholarship of teaching and learning, and experiential learning theory. Research questions were derived from the following five stages of Rogers’ (2003) innovation-decision process: knowledge, persuasion, decision, implementation and confirmation. The overarching research question was, “How do early-career faculty come to make innovative pedagogy adoption decisions at a research-intensive university?”

This case study focused on the innovation-decision processes of three, early-career faculty who implemented academic service-learning in a course in their respective disciplines at a research-intensive university. Participants were experts in disciplines broadly described as Design, Family Sciences, and Allied Health.
Specific measures were taken to ensure quality of the study and included the following: revelation of personal biases and subjectivities, triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data, the dynamic incorporation of new data into interview guides, and ethical considerations such as the use of pseudonyms for participant confidentiality. Data were collected using document analysis, monthly group observations, focused life history interviews, ongoing and online reflections during implementation, student surveys, and interviews involving reflection on the meaning of service-learning.

Significant findings that emerged from the data included the following: 1) at the research site, the scholarship of teaching and learning had not yet been fully realized; 2) discrepancies in scholarship created a sense of competing values for early-career faculty participants; 3) the participant innovation-decision process was consistently non-linear and its stages less distinct than expected; and 4) experiential learning played a key role in participant persistence through the stages of the innovation-decision process. Recommendations for institutional practice and further innovation-decision research were made.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Faculty who adopt new ways of teaching and learning at research institutions face a daunting task. They must forge pathways for authentic and meaningful learning experiences while being responsive to institutional expectations for scholarship through research. Early-career faculty must be particularly attentive to scholarship for professional growth through the review, promotion and tenure processes. Unfortunately, the practice of teaching is not always considered scholarly (Boyer, 1991; S. M. Cahn, 2004; Furco, 2001). Faculty development programs within the university can provide a unique haven for interdisciplinary discussion of innovative teaching and learning strategies. However, untenured faculty generally do not participate when there is a perceived professional risk (Caffarella & Zinn, 1999). Those that do participate in faculty development programs are positioned to reconcile beliefs, practices and institutional expectations over time.

Despite varying perspectives on what constitutes scholarship, the values of teaching, service and research tend to define the mission of research institutions and should not be perceived as incompatible with one another (Boening & Miller, 1997; Boyer, 1991). At the research site for this study, a research–intensive university, the integration of teaching and service has become more prominent since a new Office of Service-Learning (OSL) was formed during the academic year 2002-2003 with joint oversight from the Vice President for Public Service and Outreach and the Vice President for Instruction. This unique arrangement is part of the growing popularity of academic service-learning at postsecondary institutions (Armstrong,
Academic service-learning is grounded in Experiential Learning Theory (ELT), the belief that people learn best through real-world experiences. David Kolb (1981) explains his ELT theory using a circular model that depicts a four-stage cycle of learning and related learning styles. In what is often described as the first stage of the cycle, learners have a concrete experience (CE). In this study, a concrete experience of interest is the implementation of service-learning pedagogy. The concrete experience facilitates reflective observation (RO) on what happened and under what circumstances. Reflective observation then leads to abstract conceptualization (AC) when one begins to generalize the experience to abstract situations, applying underlying principles of the experience. During abstract conceptualization participants may or may not be able to verbalize why service-learning works, if that is the perception. In a fourth stage of Kolb’s (1981) experiential learning model, active experimentation (AE), an individual actively experiments with new solutions that address broader problems. If participants implement these new ideas as revised pedagogy, the cycle begins again. At various points in the cycle, participants are expected to be concrete or abstract learners, and active or reflective learners. These two continua occur throughout the CE \xrightarrow{RO} AC \xrightarrow{AE} cycle. In general,
though, participants are expected to gravitate toward a particular way of learning, called a
learning style. The experiential learning process is influenced by one’s characteristics, prior
experiences and present environment (Kolb, 1981).

Most experiential learning theory research involving service-learning (SL) focuses on the
student experience and community outcomes (Tutt, 2001). The faculty member plays a key role
in the relationship of the two but is often overlooked in service-learning studies. In addition to
creating sustainable community partnerships and integrating reflective activities into the course
content, academic service-learning faculty rethink traditional pedagogical methods and often
participate in communities of learning. They may find themselves moving through a cycle of
experiential learning in the process of preparing for and implementing service-learning activities.

At the research site, early-career faculty have emerged as the group most willing to commit to
using academic service-learning by competitively joining the Office of Service-Learning Fellows
program, a faculty professional development opportunity. Those who participate in faculty
development programs for the purpose of implementing new pedagogy are both teachers and
learners (Cranton, 1994).

How do early-career faculty emerge as early adopters of academic service-learning
within a research institution? Rogers (2003) theorizes that people respond to new ideas by
moving through an innovation-decision process where the diffusion of information through
social networks is catalytic. An individual will learn of the new idea and, sensing some
dissonance to be reconciled, moves through these five stages: (1) knowledge, (2) persuasion, (3)
decision, (4) implementation, and (5) confirmation. The stages are influenced by prior
conditions. In the knowledge stage individuals come to know about the innovation, understand
its use and interpret its importance. Participants may be passive or active seekers of knowledge and may be predisposed to certain ideas shared among a particular group of people.

During the persuasion stage information is gathered from various sources and interpreted, and attributes weighed, leading to favorable or unfavorable perceptions about the innovation. In the decision stage, individuals decide to adopt or reject it. If adopted, there is intent to implement the new idea in an authentic environment. Inconsistencies in knowledge, attitudes and practice may emerge during implementation. Adopters continue to make meaning of the innovation over time by confirming its use with peers and sometimes revisiting earlier stages in the innovation-decision process. Confirmation leads to the adoption, discontinuance, rejection or re-invention (modification) of the innovation for future projects.

Participants in this study are three, early-career faculty who work at a research-intensive university in disciplines broadly described as Family Sciences, Design, and Allied Health. Participants competitively joined a new Office of Service-Learning Fellows program, and in their application to the program proposed an anticipated academic service-learning project. The projects were unique and sought to address recognized issues within the respective disciplines. This qualitative study inquired about past experiences and prior conditions, and followed participants through the Fellows faculty development program as they implemented academic service-learning and made decisions about whether or not to adopt the innovative pedagogy long-term. The theoretical framework that informed this study is depicted in Figure 1. This model of the theoretical framework for this study is intended to give context to what occurs with participants as learners in a faculty development program, as innovative teachers who intend to implement academic service-learning, and as individuals who will make long-term decisions about innovative pedagogy adoption.
Early-career faculty at research-intensive institutions must be responsive to scholarly demands for review, promotion and tenure processes. Teaching (Boyer, 1991; S. M. Cahn, 2004; Furco, 2001) and service (Butin, 2006) are not always valued as scholarly activities. Early career faculty must find meaningful ways to connect academic service-learning to what is perceived to be scholarly, in order to be successful. This study examined the innovation-decision process of early-career faculty including how they anticipated implementing academic service-learning (ASL), how it was actually implemented, and how they each made meaning of ASL within the culture of the research institution.

While most service-learning research has focused on the student experience and community outcomes, little has been done to explore faculty as learners (Tutt, 2001). Service-
learning is generally considered a progressive pedagogy (Zlotkowski, 2001a, 2001c) and a radical departure from traditional postsecondary, instructor-led and classroom-based approaches. Not all faculty are prepared to engage in new ways of teaching and learning (Tolleson Knee, 1999; Wilhite & Silver, 2005), and the effective integration of service-learning into a curriculum or into one’s own course may require a transformation in thinking about pedagogy altogether (Butin, 2006). Early-career faculty who join a formal development program aimed at improving teaching through service accept professional risk. To tenured colleagues, participation in the program could be perceived as a distraction to research efforts. One goal of this study was to examine the faculty experience through the lens of experiential learning during the Office of Service-Learning Fellows program, a structured development program. There is a timely opportunity for innovation-decision research given the gap between efforts to institutionalize service-learning at the administrative level and efforts to facilitate its grass-roots adoption among self-selecting faculty across campus.

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study were to contribute to what is known about the innovation-decision process, to investigate faculty perceptions of scholarship in relation to teaching, and to explore the role of faculty as learners. My research questions are:

1. What are the prior conditions and characteristics of faculty who intend to try out academic service-learning (ASL) at this institution?
   a. How do faculty describe prior teaching practices and perceived pedagogical needs?
b. How do faculty perceive their overall innovativeness within their department and within the discipline?

2. How did participants come to know about ASL?
   a. How do participants define pedagogy and service-learning?
   b. What is the perceived value of ASL within the department and within the discipline?

3. How do participants describe the influence, if any, of the OSLF program on favorable or unfavorable attitude formation?

4. Do faculty anticipate implementing ASL and if so, how? If not, why?

5. How is ASL actually implemented?
   a. How do faculty plan and prepare for ASL implementation?
   b. How do participants describe what worked, what did not, and what would be done differently next time?
   c. What are the perceived barriers to the adoption of ASL?
   d. What are the perceived enablers to the adoption of ASL?
   e. Is there a knowledge and practice gap and if so, what is that?

6. How do faculty explain the decision to adopt, reject, discontinue or re-invent ASL for future courses?

The research questions for this study, aligned with the five innovation-decision stages, are listed in Table 1.

Significance of the Study

This case study explores how early-career faculty who intend to implement new pedagogy move through the innovation-decision process over time. The case study is situated at
a research-intensive university where there are limited resources for recognition and reward of innovative teaching strategies. The study is opportunistic in that it takes advantage of the current circumstances unfolding at the institution. Results will contribute to what is known about the innovation-decision process, about perceptions of scholarship at the research-intensive university, and about faculty as learners.

Table 1

*Rogers’ Innovation-Decision Stages and Research Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation-Decision Stages</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior Conditions</td>
<td>1. What are the prior conditions and characteristics of faculty who intend to try out academic service-learning (ASL) at this institution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. How do faculty describe prior teaching practices and perceived pedagogical needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. How do faculty perceive their overall innovativeness within their department and within the discipline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Knowledge – One comes to know about academic service-learning (ASL), understand its use and interpret its importance</td>
<td>2. How did participants come to know about ASL?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. How do participants define pedagogy and service-learning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. What is the perceived value of ASL within the department and within the discipline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Persuasion - Information is gathered, interpreted and attributes are weighed to form favorable or unfavorable attitudes</td>
<td>3. How do participants describe the influence, if any, of the OSLF program on favorable or unfavorable attitude formation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Decision – Decision is made to adopt or reject ASL</td>
<td>4. Do faculty anticipate implementing ASL and if so, how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If not, why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Implementation – ASL tested in authentic environment, re-invented if necessary; KAP-gap can be explored.

5. How is ASL actually implemented?
   a. How do faculty plan and prepare for ASL implementation?
   b. How do participants describe what worked, what did not, and what would be done differently next time?
   c. What are the perceived barriers to the adoption of ASL?
   d. What are the perceived enablers to the adoption of ASL?
   e. Is there a knowledge and practice gap and if so, what is that?

V. Confirmation – Confirmation of innovation-decision for the long-term

6. How do faculty explain the decision to adopt, reject, discontinue or re-invent ASL for future courses?

Limitations of the Study

To study innovations as they occurred in an authentic environment required a sense of urgency and timeliness. This study took place during a specified period of time in order to capture authentic experiences of faculty who implemented academic service-learning. Committee and IRB approvals, participant consent and data collection were processed as anticipated to avoid losing the opportunity. The study was limited to faculty in the Office of Service-Learning Fellows program. It was limited to those faculty in the program who intended to implement academic service-learning during the academic year, and to early-career faculty.

Delimitations of the Study

The case study boundaries were narrowly limited, but delimiters were also necessary to prevent overstepping the bounds of the case. This study did not attempt to address the service-learning student or community partner experience.
Definition of Terms

Academic Service Learning: “…course-based, credit bearing educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs, and reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility” (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996).

Adoption: “decision to make full use of an innovation as the best course of action available” (Rogers, 2003, p. 473).

Diffusion: “process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among the members of a social system” (Rogers, 2003, p. 474).

Formal Professional Development: structured program designed to increase faculty awareness and competence, generally in the context of building or revitalizing scholarship.

Innovation: “an idea, practice, or object that is perceived as new by an individual or other unit of adoption” (Rogers, 2003, p. 475).

Innovation-Decision Process: “The process through which an individual (or other decision-making unit) passes from first knowledge of an innovation to forming an attitude toward the innovation, to a decision to adopt or reject, to implementation and use of the new idea, and to confirmation of this decision” (Rogers, 2003, p. 475).

Pedagogy: intentional design of the teaching and learning experience founded in epistemological or philosophical beliefs.

Re-Invention: “the degree to which an innovation is changed or modified by a user in the process of its adoption and implementation” (Rogers, 2003, p. 476).
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The focus of this study is the innovation-decision process of early-career faculty who intend to implement a new pedagogy of academic service-learning, at a research university. The innovation-decision process was developed by Rogers (2003) who identified five stages of progression, including the following: 1) knowledge, 2) persuasion, 3) decision, 4) implementation, and 5) confirmation. Participants in the study intend to try academic service-learning in a course and are likely to move through a similar process while participating in their faculty development program. Innovation decisions will likely be influenced by faculty development experiences and by factors including but not limited to scholarly expectations in the research-intensive environment. This chapter includes key research summaries and conceptual information intended to situate the faculty innovation-decision process and to bring clarity to the influences of a research-intensive culture. Additionally, Kolb’s (1984) model of experiential learning is discussed as a basis for understanding participants as learners in the service-learning faculty development program. The three topics of literature reviewed in this chapter are the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), Diffusion of Innovations (DoI), and Experiential Learning Theory (ELT).

Strategies for obtaining relevant articles involved scanning electronic journals available through the University of Georgia Libraries website and searching electronic databases in the Social Sciences area of the online GALILEO system and the University of Georgia’s Research
Guide. I used keyword terms and limiters including peer review status of articles and publication dates within the last ten years. Empirical studies, essays, and reports were reviewed and used when relevant and search criteria were expanded as necessary. The references section of many articles was scanned for additional resources. Some articles were reviewed as a result of conversations with leaders in faculty development and service-learning at the research site. Useful texts included but were not limited to Rogers’ (2003) *Diffusion of Innovations*, Kolb’s (1984) *Experiential Learning: Experience As the Source of Learning and Development*, and Boyer’s (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. All useful journal articles were downloaded and related citations were imported into Endnote for use in this document where appropriate.

**Scholarship of Teaching and Learning**

In the tenure and promotion process, research has historically been the dominant form of recognized scholarship (Boyer, 1991; Hackmann, 2007). Often, faculty must overcome institutional values that favor research over quality teaching when hiring, promotion, tenure and retention are at stake. To some, there is “an overemphasis on research and publication as the route to promotion and tenure” (Cross, 1996, p. 403). Many argue that teaching should be taken seriously and viewed as a scholarly activity that directly impacts learning and inspires future academics (Boyer, 1991; S. M. Cahn, 2004; Furco, 2001).

While serving as President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Boyer (1990) published an influential report entitled, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. In the report he called for an end to the debate about whether research or teaching should be valued more in terms of scholarship. Instead, Boyer (1990, p. 16) proposed a
new definition of scholarship involving “discovery” (research), “integration” (synthesis), “application” (solving authentic problems, engaging in reciprocal learning experiences), and “teaching” (transforming knowledge through pedagogy, and learning). He stated that all faculty should be capable of conducting research, should remain connected to disciplinary practice either vicariously through reviews of the literature and publication or by actively participating in the field, and all should be held accountable to high standards of integrity and performance.

Boyer (1990) described the importance of flexibility during the ongoing career of a faculty. He suggested the use of “creativity contracts” (p. 48) to encourage initiative, allow for scholarly freedom, and to enable rewards for creative accomplishments along the way. Boyer (1990) called for faculty to strengthen and rebuild rigorous graduate programs, to engage in civic activity for the purpose of solving modern and authentic problems, and to pursue academic efforts as a “community of scholars” (p. 80) rather than as individuals. Huber and Hutchings (2006) also described the need for “a conceptual space in which communities of educators…meet the challenges of preparing students for personal, professional, and civic life” (p. 26). The nature of higher education can be both individualistic and competitive (Astin, 1993; Kezar, 2005) even though there are issues that might benefit from faculty collaboration (Hein & Miller, 2004; Kezar, 2005; NoAuthor, 2005). Boyer (1990) recognized the individual needs of faculty and the benefit in working together. Likewise, he recognized to the individual strengths of institutions and encouraged institutional “diversity with dignity” (p. 64).

Cross (1996) predicted that the early twenty-first century would bring changes in higher education program assessment and faculty “roles and rewards” (p. 403). She described an emerging shift in thinking in the early 1990’s that was influenced largely by Boyer’s (1990) seminal report, the Higher Education Pew Roundtables, and the Forum on Faculty Roles and
Rewards. Instead of viewing evaluation as an external requirement to be met, many institutions were beginning to value assessment as a means of learning what could be done internally to improve undergraduate education. To improve education would require increased attention to the responsibilities and rewards of faculty teaching. The relationship between improved undergraduate learning and increased attention to the activities and rewards for faculty teaching was both symbiotic and timely.

The result of improved teaching and learning, Cross (1996) contended, would be students who actively and necessarily guided their own learning in a fast-paced and changing world. Faculty would discover and respond to dynamic student learning needs by implementing classroom research (CR). Faculty would, in greater numbers, contribute directly to practice and to a growing body of pedagogical research and literature. Active, self-directed learners, and applied pedagogical researchers suggested greater need for lifelong learning.

To address quality teaching, some institutions implemented the clinical faculty position. Hackmann (2007) affirmed that much remains unknown about the clinical faculty appointment because few research studies in that area have been conducted. He postulated there was a certain level of ambiguity in relation to job responsibilities when he conducted a study of clinical faculty in Educational Leadership departments at research-intensive universities. Hackmann (2007) hoped to learn of any frustrations or conflicts in relation to perceived job boundaries. His qualitative study involved eight clinical, Educational Leadership faculty. Participants came from a mixture of public, private, urban, suburban and rural settings but possessed similar levels of leadership experience. All but one participant earned their degree from the same department in which they were hired.
The participants perceived research and writing as the scholarly aim for tenure-track faculty who, as a result of the related rewards system, tended to be distanced from practice and disconnected from “the field” (Hackmann, 2007, p. 24). Clinical faculty participants felt their role was an important contribution to the academic department because they were able to connect practice to teaching, service, curricular changes and research. However, participants also perceived bias from tenure-track colleagues. One participant overheard a colleague’s comment that Assistant Professors outranked Associate clinical faculty. Another participant felt the institution perceived the Ed.D. as “second-class” (p. 26). While some participants felt powerless, others felt comfortable sharing their perspective and countering criticisms in their departments. In matters extending beyond the departments, the participants generally felt treated inequitably due to their status as clinical faculty.

Faculty development programs can serve as a unifying force for a fragmented university (Watson & Grossman, 1994) and can revitalize scholarship. Effective programs bring tenure-track, clinical, and service faculty together to engage in discussion and reflect on experiences, working against competitive norms. Caffarella and Zinn (1999) identified people and interpersonal relationships; institutional structures; personal considerations and commitments; and intellectual and personal characteristics as factors that both impede and enable faculty professional development. As an example, new faculty may need the support of individuals who consult on teaching matters or the structure of a faculty professional development group offered through the institution, but may be discouraged by colleagues who view these activities as barriers to achieving tenure. Untenured faculty are generally not participants in development programs perceived to create professional risk (Caffarella & Zinn, 1999).
Some faculty decide to participate in formal development programs to keep current with the changes happening around them, and because particular courses may lend themselves to innovative approaches addressed by institutional programs (Cahn, 1999). Incentives such as course reduction, sabbatical, mini-grants, and stipends can motivate faculty to join. Those who decide not to participate often cite a lack of time, support, and effective models as reasons. Sometimes there is a limited perception of the value of teaching, the role of self as teacher and learner, or there is an opposing culture or tradition in place (Boening & Miller, 1997; Boyer, 1991; Brzycki & Dudt, 2005; Camblin & Steger, 2000; Cranton, 1994). In cases where the faculty development program is new, its purpose may be unclear and those who are not selected may feel the program selection criteria is biased (Camblin & Steger, 2000).

Formal professional development efforts are sometimes founded in institutional improvement initiatives aimed at creating significant change (Caffarella & Zinn, 1999). When this happens, programs may be put into place for faculty for the purpose of transforming pedagogical practice. Cranton (1994) states that through critical self-reflection in the context of a professional development program, faculty can transform perceptions and interpretations of the world to make meaningful change. In a qualitative study of pedagogical transformation involving an innovative pedagogy, Major and Palmer (2006) found that with institutional intervention, faculty knowledge about faculty/student roles, discipline and pedagogy changed. When faculty talked about their new knowledge, pedagogical transformation was solidified.

There are many models of formal professional development in higher education. Programs may be optional, required, interdisciplinary or discipline-specific. They may be driven by a large initiative or by a specific need. Faculty development programs can be used to diffuse timely and innovative information and processes (Woodell & Garofoli, 2003). Participants may
be new, tenured or emeritus faculty. Faculty participants may hold academic, clinical, service, administrative or other appointments. Some of the more creative models of faculty professional development involve experiential learning through role play, psychodrama, enrolling faculty in courses they plan to teach, collaborative learning through peer consulting and peer mentoring, self-directed learning through asynchronous communications, and allowing multiple options for development. The overall aim of professional development programs in higher education, though, is to improve learning through increased faculty awareness and competence. Usually the tone is one of building or revitalizing scholarship.

Diffusion of Innovation Theory

Higher education in the United States has endured its share of change over the last several decades. Since 1966, there has been a twenty-seven percent reduction in the number of tenured or tenure-track faculty. Information and instructional technologies have significantly changed the practices of administration, teaching and learning in higher education. There has evolved a fragmentation among departments and across institutions to the degree that some view higher education as unable to respond fully to critical issues that do not discriminate by discipline and that affect the world at-large (Rhodes, 2006).

Change is inevitable, and with it comes a sense of uncertainty and often times risk. In response, individuals reconcile attitudes, beliefs, practices and intentions through a process of decision-making. Rogers (2003) identifies the five stages of the innovation-decision process as 1) knowledge, 2) persuasion, 3) decision, 4) implementation and 5) confirmation. Over the last four decades, Everett Rogers has contributed a significant body of work on the topic of innovation diffusion, including five editions of the book *Diffusion of Innovations* and numerous
other texts, studies and publications on topics of importance to everyone from farmers to health care workers to educators. He defines diffusion as the “process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among the members of a social system” (Rogers, 2003, p. 474). Diffusion is considered a theory that extends beyond disciplinary boundaries and supports common processes that we all encounter. The primary tenets of the theory are concepts of an innovation-decision process, measurable and predictable rates of adoption, reliable characteristics of individual innovativeness, specific roles of individuals in dynamic social networks, organizational innovations and consequences of innovations.

In education, adoption is often facilitated by the belief that the innovation will enhance learning (Butler & Sellbom, 2002). For that reason, faculty development programs can serve a powerful role in the diffusion process by drawing attention to technologies and innovative pedagogies of interest to those who value teaching. Bennett and Bennett (2003) found that faculty development programs that facilitated adoption had successfully identified and demonstrated the innovation in a safe environment and connected it to philosophies of faculty teaching. While both diffusion and adoption processes must be understood to develop an intervention that encourages adoption (Alias & Zainuddin, 2005), most educational studies are concerned with potential adopters and the barriers they encounter.

Ertmer (1999) described two kinds of barriers to teacher technology integration including 1) external, or first-order; and 2) internal, or second order barriers. According to Ertmer (1999), “While many first-order barriers may be eliminated by securing additional resources and providing computer-skills training, confronting second-order barriers requires challenging one's belief systems and the institutionalized routines of one's practice” (p. 48). First-order barriers widely encountered include access, time, training, and support (Ertmer, 1999).
Lack of time and lack of reward were consistently cited as barriers to faculty adoption of innovations (Akir, 2003; Bennett & Bennett, 2003; Ely, 1990). In addition, Bennett and Bennett (2003) found a lack of technical support and lack of empathetic instructional support as reasons why faculty resist adopting instructional technologies in higher education.

Mwaura (2003) investigated influences on the faculty innovation-decision process with regard to web-based instruction. Qualitative methods were used and both faculty and administrators were included in the study. Participants either intended to adopt, had adopted, or had rejected the innovation. Implications were that universities should encourage faculty collaboration and offer more meaningful support, services and incentives.

Akir (2003) investigated the diffusion of information communications technology (ICT) among faculty for the purpose of understanding faculty resistance to adoption. Qualitative methods were used to interview faculty in a variety of departments, and to observe and document conversations with staff at a central teaching and learning office on campus. The sample of faculty participants included junior and senior faculty, some of whom were active users of ICT and others who were not. The study was designed to include data about departmental and other influences on adoption decisions. Findings showed a need for technical and pedagogical training for faculty on the use of ICT, and technical support for ICT infrastructures that effectively bridge the gap in technical knowledge of faculty and support staff. Faculty barriers included time constraints, lack of motivation, and lack of recognition for related efforts in the tenure and promotion process.

Ely (1990) conducted a review of educational technology diffusion literature to identify the conditions that facilitate the adoption of technology by faculty. Faculty who were dissatisfied with the status quo were more likely to adopt than others. Similarly, those who had
time, access to resources, and who had existing skills and knowledge in the area were also inclined to adopt. Other facilitators of adoption included faculty rewards, incentives, and a committed and otherwise effective leadership at the institution. To know if the conditions were equally meaningful in other cultures, Ely (1990) surveyed educational experts in Indonesia, Chile, and Peru. He found that the need for rewards, incentives, and participation varied by country but that the other conditions were consistently important in facilitating implementation.

Surry and Ensminger (2004) developed a quantitative tool designed to measure the degree of importance of each of these conditions. Two years later, in a test of the tool, all conditions were found to be important to the one hundred seventy nine faculty participants. Although the participants were demographically diverse, the availability of resources was overall the most important condition for implementation while commitment and leadership were consistently less important. Other conditions varied by demographic groups represented in the study. The category labeled resources was found to be, on average, the most important adoption condition for k-12 and higher education. Those in business ranked participation highest, while those in the military and government ranked skills as the top condition for effective implementation. Those who were self-employed ranked dissatisfaction with the status quo as the top condition (Surry, Jackson, Porter, & Ensminger, 2006).

Edwards (1990) conducted a study involving only the persuasion stage of the innovation-decision process. The persuasion stage is important in Rogers (2003) model because it represents the period of time when favorable or unfavorable attitudes are formed about an innovation. Edwards (1990) described persuasion in terms of both affect, or emotion, and cognition, or reason. He used a phobia analogy to explain the difference between affective and cognitive persuasion. If one found a snake and was afraid of it without ever having seen a snake
in the past, affective persuasion had occurred. Alternatively, if one saw a snake and reasoned that because it was not a poisonous or aggressive breed, they should not fear it, cognitive persuasion was involved. Rogers (2003) described the persuasion stage in affective terms by stating, “Whereas the mental activity at the knowledge stage was mainly cognitive (or knowing), the main type of thinking at the persuasion stage is affective (or feeling)” (p. 175). He described an individual in the persuasion stage as one who was “psychologically involved” (p. 175) with the innovation, and who relied on interpersonal networks and a variety of messages for persuasion for or against it, rather than relying on empirical evidence.

Edwards (1990) conducted two experiments to determine which means of persuasion – affective or cognitive - was most influential on the adoption decision. He also wanted to know if affective persuasion resulted in greater participant conviction than cognitive persuasion. Results showed that the conditions during attitude formation influenced one’s ability to persist despite “counterattitudinal communications” (p. 211).

When affect precedes cognition in attitude formation, an attitude will be more vulnerable to affective means of persuasion than to cognitive means of persuasion. On the other hand, when cognition precedes affect in attitude formation, an attitude may be equally susceptible to affective and cognitive appeals.

An additional finding from Experiment 2 was that when affective persuasion was dominant during attitude formation, one’s attitude toward the innovation revealed “greater confidence or conviction” (Edwards, 1990, p. 211).

Papazafeiropoulou et. al. (2007) conducted a case study involving policy-makers and potential users of data from a forthcoming NHS Patent Record Service (NCRS). The purpose of the study was to understand perceptions of the implementation process from both perspectives
given an earlier failed attempt at implementation involving these same groups. Over a twenty-five month period, interviews with policy-makers, administrators, and clinicians were held. Questions were related but not limited to perceptions of the innovative and its function, the feasibility of the implementation plan, and implementation progress. Observations of local implementation group meetings and of a board meeting were also conducted. Findings showed that the authoritative innovation adoption decision created a circumstance where leaders were found to be involved in the implementation stage while potential users were still in the knowledge and persuasion stages without sufficient information to move forward. Each person in the system could not actively participate in the decision-making given the large number of individuals involved, so it was assumed that successful implementation would occur if those represented were able to successfully influence potential adopters to implement the service. Given the different perspectives of stakeholders, the researchers confirmed there was an interpretive flexibility with regard to what the technology was, and its function. Future research is planned to better identify all social groups involved, and to know their perceptions in the diffusion process.

Further diffusion research is needed. Wejnert (2002) identified the interactions of developer, adopter and the environment; indirect influences on adoption decisions; and the relationship between adopter characteristics and adoption threshold as important areas for further investigation. Alonge (2005) argued that more studies of the innovation-decision process were needed to inform high-level decisions about the practical barriers to technology integration, and the varied perceptions of potential adopters. Several researchers have called for increased attention to the human-centered aspects of diffusion of innovations where “human dimensions” (p. 592) of the individual are overlooked (Alonge, 2005; Chen, 1998; Surry & Brennan, 1998).
Interpersonal relationships play a prominent role in diffusion and Rogers and Bhowmik (1970) suggested that homophilic and heterophilic relationships between source and sender, an area still weak in the literature, should be explored. Internal and external relationships are both important variables during implementation and further research is needed to determine under what circumstance the benefits of reciprocity in social networks occur (Linton, 2000).

Experiential Learning Theory

In experiential learning theory, an individual seeks out authentic learning opportunities that are personally relevant. They learn in a real-world environment where the experience becomes deeply and personally meaningful. Kolb (1984) developed a cyclical model of experiential learning that is applied to this dissertation study. The model contains four stages of learning that include the following: concrete experience (CE), reflective observation (RO), abstract conceptualization (AC), and active experimentation (AE). Four learning styles are overlaid on this model to resolve tensions between adjacent stages of learning. Learning styles include convergent (AC/AE), divergent (CD/RO), assimilator (AC/RO), and accommodator (CE/AE). The styles represent learner tendencies for problem-solving. Together, the stages of learning and one’s preference or style of learning are important in understanding the role of faculty as learner in this study.

Kolb (1984) derived his experiential learning model from the philosophies and work of Dewey, Lewin, and Piaget. However, Miettinen (2000) suggested that Kolb inaccurately drew on these experts without proper consideration of their work. The result, he claimed, was a collection of ideas presented as an idealistic solution to social problems. Kolb’s motive, Miettinen (2000) stated, was to develop a basis for his learning styles inventory. Miettinen
(2000) distinguished Lewin’s action research from Kolb’s model of experiential learning in several ways. In Kolb’s model, group interaction is more important than the object of interest to the group; individual reflection is used to generate knowledge, instead of the researcher data collection and analysis process; experience is individual rather than collaborative; and the humanistic values of Lewin’s work are not developed in Kolb’s writings (Miettinen, 2000).

According to Miettinen (2000), Dewey’s model of experiential learning begins when habits are interrupted and a problem is created. The problem is defined and conditions analyzed, and a working hypothesis is developed. Kolb’s model lacks the development of a hypothesis that enables learning. It also overlooks Dewey’s phases involving reflective activity (Miettinen, 2000). “To Dewey, experience is not a matter of psychological state, nor anything in the minds of individuals…“the belief in an individual’s capabilities and his individual experience leads us away from the analysis of cultural and social conditions of learning that are essential to any serious enterprise of fostering change and learning in real life” (p. 71).

Fenwick (2000) attempted to broaden the concept of experiential learning by describing different perspectives on cognition. From a constructivist perspective, for example, one might consider reflection an important component for developing the necessary “mental knowledge structures” (p. 4). From a psychoanalytic perspective, an experiential learner would, instead, come to be more self-aware and able to address inner conflicts created by experience. One who takes a situative perspective would reject reflection and psychoanalytic views and instead assume that learning happens outside of the mind and within the bounds of a particular situation in which one participates. From a critical cultural perspective, experiential learning occurs when one examines power relations in society and learns from that experience. From an enactivist’s
perspective, cognition and the environment are considered inseparable and are the mechanism through which learning is enacted (Fenwick, 2000).

Service-learning is grounded in experiential learning theory. Learners engage in civic activity, reflect on the experience in order to learn from it, and become involved in a community-learner relationship that is mutually beneficial. Service-learning goes beyond one-way models of community service that lack student involvement in, and awareness of, the fundamental reasons why the services are necessary (Manley et al., 2006). It goes beyond academic, cultural immersion programs where students may study abroad, for instance, but have no service obligation. Service-learning is considered a radical pedagogy in higher education as it does not follow traditional teaching practices or incorporate traditional measures of student achievement. Service-learning assessments typically examine learner progress in areas like cultural awareness, personal development, and leadership. When faculty implement service-learning in the college classroom, the term *academic service-learning* is used.

Academic service-learning, a movement that began little more than a decade ago, is growing in popularity among postsecondary institutions (Armstrong, 2004; Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Manley et al., 2006; Reed et al., 2005; Vanderhoff, 2005; Zlotkowski, 2001b). It is defined in this paper as “a course-based, credit bearing educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs, and reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility” (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996, p. 222).

Various initiatives targeting higher education have received national and regional support through organizations such as The National Service-Learning Clearinghouse, New England
Resource Center for Higher Education and the Campus Compact. These high-profile groups offer funding, training, conferences, publications, sample policies and practices that support the institutionalization of service-learning (Zlotkowski, 2001b). Effective service-learning programs in higher education are aligned to the institution’s mission, supported at all levels of leadership, cultivate sustainable partnerships with the community, are strengthened through ongoing communities of learners and service activities, and are expanded through faculty development, competitive funding opportunities and other campus programs (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000). Portland State University is one example of an institution that has made civic engagement an explicit part of their mission (Zlotkowski & Williams, 2003).

In spite of initiatives and innovative campus efforts, research institutions have lagged behind other colleges and universities in the institutionalization of service-learning. Furco (2001) describes the dilemma as one where there are disincentives, particularly for non-tenured faculty, to try out innovative pedagogies and pursue activities that are relevant to teaching instead of research. The idea of modifying the curriculum and rethinking pedagogy and outcomes could be enough to discourage the busy, untenured professor. Faculty tend to cite lack of time, energy and support for tenure as reasons for not getting involved in service-learning activities (Rubin, 2001; Speck, 2001).

In 2005, the Campus Compact organization, Tufts, Stanford, Duke, Vanderbilt and a host of other research institutions entered into serious discussions about the role of the research institution in civic engagement. Their perspective, contextualized in this reflective statement, was presented by the collaborative at the Campus Compact’s 20th Anniversary Visioning Summit in 2006:
Auspiciously, there is growing awareness that research universities, with their significant academic and societal influence, world-class faculty, outstanding students, state-of-the-art research facilities, and considerable financial resources, have the credibility and stature needed to help drive institutional and field-wide change more rapidly and in ways that will ensure deeper and longer-lasting commitment to civic engagement among colleges and universities for centuries to come. In particular, because research universities "set the bar" for scholarship across higher education, they are well-positioned to promote and advance new forms of scholarship - those that link the intellectual assets of higher education institutions to solving public problems and issues (Gibson, 2006, p. 1).

There is a critical need for administrators to pursue the engagement of students in civic activity and in expanding the institutional mission (Jacoby, 2006). Much of what is published in the literature about service-learning originated from liberal arts and two-year colleges. Zlotkowski (2001a) argues that even liberal arts institutions that have service as a core part of their mission lack appropriate attention to resources and need to better connect service-learning to other progressive pedagogies, and increase efforts for faculty development and rewards.

Garcia and Robinson (2005) compiled multidisciplinary faculty reflections on teaching with service-learning. Results show evidence of student higher-level thinking about planning, execution and professional responsibility in the content area. Faculty reported that academic service-learning helped balance the teacher-student relationship. It motivated students and faculty alike, was perceived to be rewarding, and served as a flexible model for both qualitative and quantitative student assignments.
Rubin (2001) offers a non-linear model of service-learning course development. Goals should contribute to faculty scholarship and requirements to publish and/or conduct research within the discipline or with regard to pedagogy. Community collaborations should be formed through volunteer agencies where both the faculty and the agency learn about and negotiate the course design as it relates to service-learning. The syllabus should clearly define and explain the context for the collaboration as it relates to course goals, activities and expectations. Specific questions should be used to plan for logistics of orientation, transportation, duration, supervision and facilitation, communication, training, any miscellaneous safety, health or other requirements, and evaluation. Assessment of outcomes should incorporate non-traditional measures of service, values and social responsibility.

Further research on service-learning and its influence on scholarship is needed. Of particular importance are the barriers and facilitators of implementation in teaching, professional development, and both faculty motivation and satisfaction with the experience (Gelmon & Agre-Kippenhan, 2002).

The student experience is a common topic of service-learning research. One notable finding is that cognitive measures typically show no significant difference in those students who do and do not participate in service-learning. Instead, “personal development, citizenship, leadership, altruism, cultural awareness and tolerance, and social or interpersonal development” (Kezar, 2002, p. 16) are useful measures of change in comparative studies. Armstrong (2004) found that immersive experiences were more effective in terms of autonomy and interpersonal relationships than were experiences running parallel to the curriculum or even those that are part of a semester-long course. Ineffective pedagogies were those where the instructor added a service component to an existing course structure without fully integrating the experience into the
learning goals and strategies. Reciprocity among community and learner, and reflection on the experience are key to the service-learning process (Manley et al., 2006; Vanderhoff, 2005; Zlotkowski & Williams, 2003). Armstrong reaffirmed the importance of reciprocity and reflection to the psychosocial development of students (Armstrong, 2004).

Richardson (2006) writes that service-learning as a pedagogical strategy is motivating to students, unlike more traditional strategies where students are struggling to connect classroom knowledge and real-world applications. At the University of Georgia, a survey revealed that student respondents wanted to engage in civic activities but were not asked to do so as part of their course work. Of the three thousand undergraduates surveyed, about one-third responded. The final report from the steering committee called for a campus-wide focus on best practices of service-learning and its effective implementation by faculty (Wilder, 2005). Zlotkowski and Williams (2003) reported a similar case where students at an Oklahoma college petitioned legislatures to demand a more serious inclusion of students in civic engagement. Speck (2001) concedes that some students may object to the requirement to participate in service-learning activities, although he believes that argument carries little weight.

Summary

Research-intensive universities are perceived by some to be fragmented and competitive with few opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration, innovative teaching, or civic engagement. Literature about the scholarship of teaching and learning that emerged in the early 1990’s has facilitated change in higher education. Most notably, attention to quality teaching and to the roles and rewards of faculty has increased. New pedagogies have emerged, and studies of the enablers and barriers to adoption and implementation of new practices have
ensued. An important conclusion drawn from this review of literature is that there is a need to capture the innovation-decision process as it occurs in an authentic, research-intensive context where there are neither incentives nor clear models of service-learning for the participants to follow. The study proposed here seeks to do just that.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study were to contribute to what is known about the innovation-decision process, to investigate faculty perceptions of scholarship in relation to teaching, and to explore the role of faculty as learners. My research questions are:

1. What are the prior conditions and characteristics of faculty who intend to try out academic service-learning (ASL) at this institution?
   a. How do faculty describe prior teaching practices and perceived pedagogical needs?
   b. How do faculty perceive their overall innovativeness within their department and within the discipline?

2. How did participants come to know about ASL?
   a. How do participants define pedagogy and service-learning?
   b. What is the perceived value of ASL within the department and within the discipline?

3. How do participants describe the influence, if any, of the OSLF program on favorable or unfavorable attitude formation?

4. Do faculty anticipate implementing ASL and if so, how? If not, why?
5. How is ASL actually implemented?
   a. How do faculty plan and prepare for ASL implementation?
   b. How do participants describe what worked, what did not, and what would be done
differently next time?
   c. What are the perceived barriers to the adoption of ASL?
   d. What are the perceived enablers to the adoption of ASL?
   e. Is there a knowledge and practice gap and if so, what is that?

6. How do faculty explain the decision to adopt, reject, discontinue or re-invent ASL for
future courses?

Introduction
Merriam (1998) describes a case study as a “unit around which there are boundaries.”
Bounding keeps the number of participants, opportunities for data collection, and distractions to
a minimum. It also enables in-depth description of a particular circumstance or phenomena in
order to increase understanding of the phenomena or improve theory generation. The Office of
Service-Learning Fellows program was used to create boundaries for this multiple-case study.
The Fellows program enabled the study of faculty who were innovators in a university system
most agree bring few rewards for good teaching. Faculty participants intended to try out a new
pedagogy of academic service-learning at a research-intensive university where the dominant
view of scholarship was research. I sought to understand participant innovation-decision
processes using qualitative methods that are appropriate for process innovations (Rogers, 2003).
Research questions for the study were aligned to the stages of the innovation-decision process as
shown in Table 1.
My theoretical perspective for the study was interpretive. Crotty (1998) describes the approach as “an uncritical exploration of cultural meaning” (p. 60). Rather than impose a critical view, my aim was to allow life stories and experiences to emerge, and to search for themes within and across cases. In the data collection process, I conducted multiple phenomenological interviews. The interview strategy, proposed by Seidman (2006), typically involves three, ninety-minute phenomenological interviews. Due to logistical difficulties, however, I resorted to the use of two interviews. The first was a focused life history, and the last was a reflection on the meaning of the experience. I used an alternate strategy of collecting data every-other week via online questionnaires to capture the experience that occurred between the two interview dates. This alternative approach was intended to “meet the intent of the structure” (p. 22) described by Seidman (2006) who readily conceded that “there are no absolutes in the world of interviewing” (p. 22).

Before the first interview, I conducted a document analysis of Fellows program applications. In addition to faculty participant achievements and letters of support, the applications included descriptions of proposed service-learning projects. I used the data to make focused life history interview questions personally relevant. I continued to use incoming data dynamically, to inform the next step in the data collection process for this study.

In addition to document analysis, interviews, and ongoing questionnaires, I observed three monthly Fellows meetings including an overnight retreat. The observations kept me abreast of the kinds of information to which participants were exposed. It informed my thinking about faculty, and provided an additional source of data.

Finally, I conducted a survey of student responses. The survey was simply designed for students to confirm or deny that specific course objectives, proposed by the faculty participant,
were met in the service-learning implementation experience. In some cases, faculty were unable to participate in the student experience to know the result first-hand.

In Table 2, stages of the innovation-decision process and research questions were matched with corresponding, primary data sources discussed in this section. Participant selection, specific data collection methods, data analysis, quality, and ethical considerations of the study are described in detail in this chapter.

Table 2

*Research Questions, Innovation-Decision Stages and Primary Data Sources*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Primary Data Sources</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doc.</td>
<td>Semi-</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>OSLF</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anal.</td>
<td>Structured</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Quest.</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What are the prior conditions and characteristics of faculty who intend to try out academic service-learning (ASL) at this institution?</td>
<td>Prior Cond.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do participants describe the influence, if any, of the OSLF program on favorable or unfavorable attitude formation?</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do faculty anticipate implementing ASL and if so, how? If not, why?</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How is ASL actually implemented?</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How do faculty explain their decision to adopt, reject, discontinue or re-invent service-learning pedagogy for future courses?</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* In Table 2, I = Knowledge, II = Persuasion, III = Decision, IV = Implementation, V = Confirmation.
Participant Selection

The three participants in this study were identified by pseudonym to provide participant confidentiality. Bill D. Green, Jean Anice, and Al Chemy were early-career faculty who had taught five years or fewer as Assistant Professors. Their disciplines were broadly described as Design, Family Science, and Allied Health, respectively. Table 3 shows the participant profile of these individuals who were members of the same Office of Service-Learning Fellows program. Participants intended to implement a course-based project while learning more about service-learning in the context of the interdisciplinary Fellows program.

Table 3

Participant Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Bill D. Green</th>
<th>Jean Anice</th>
<th>Al Chemy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>European American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Expertise</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Family Services</td>
<td>Allied Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Track</th>
<th>Tenure, Graduate Faculty</th>
<th>Tenure, Graduate Faculty</th>
<th>Clinical, Graduate Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Time</td>
<td>9 month</td>
<td>9 month</td>
<td>12 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% Teaching (uncertain)</td>
<td>45% Research</td>
<td>100% Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30% Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those excluded from the study were two remaining Fellows who did not plan to teach using academic service-learning but instead intended to apply their knowledge in areas of service
and administration during a later semester. Faculty who were not in the Fellows program were
excluded because they did not necessarily meet the same Fellows program selection criteria and
would not have the same faculty development persuasion as the three faculty included in the
multiple-case study.

The Fellows program established specific selection criteria for full-time faculty
applicants during the 2006-7 academic year. The reviewers searched for interested faculty who
would support, and benefit from, the Fellows program. Applicants did not have to be advanced
in their knowledge of service-learning but did have to propose a quality service-learning project.
Faculty had to have the potential to significantly impact service-learning at UGA in a positive
way, and had to commit to participate in all sessions and activities including monthly meetings.

Data Collection Methods

This study involved phenomenological interviews. Seidman (2006) proposed a “three-
interview series” for in-depth phenomenological interviewing over time. The first interview of
this study was designed to explore the participant’s focused life history in relation to the topic of
interest. During the second interview, the experience itself was detailed, and in the third,
interviewees reflected on the meaning of the experience. This study deviated from Seidman’s
(2006) model only in that bi-weekly online questionnaires were used instead of the second
interview, to avoid scheduling conflicts with faculty during their service-learning activities.

The general flow of the data collection process was one that began with faculty and
student informed consent and document analysis of Fellows application materials. There was an
initial, ninety-minute life histories interview about how faculty came to know service-learning
and their anticipation for its implementation. This was followed by a series of five, online
questionnaires where participants were asked to detail their implementation experiences. Questions simply asked about what worked, what did not and what could be done differently next time, and included one final question as an opportunity for participants to add any additional information desired.

A student survey was conducted to reinforce what was done during service-learning implementation since faculty, in some instances, could not go with all students as they completed individual or team activities. The survey contained a list of items intended for implementation by the faculty participant, and an open-ended text box for further comment as desired.

I observed monthly Fellows meetings for six months to develop a rapport with participants. After that, when data collection began, I used the observations as an opportunity to stay abreast of topics and issues addressed within the cohort.

Finally, a second, ninety-minute interview was conducted with faculty. This was a reflective interview regarding the meaning of the experience. Follow-up questions were sent in response to all interviews, online questionnaires, student surveys, and Fellows meetings.

All data collection tools were successful in generating responses, in the sense that research questions were addressed. All faculty participants responded to follow-up questions. Bill’s student responded to the student survey and follow-up questions. Thirty-one students in Jean Anice’s course responded to the survey and fifteen also responded to follow-up questions. Twelve students in Al’s course responded to the student survey, half of whom also responded to follow-up questions.

Data collection lasted eleven weeks although it began later than intended due to my ability to obtain approval through the IRB and to defend my prospectus successfully in January 2007. Data collection ended on the last day of April, and minor changes as result of my
prospectus defense were revised and resubmitted to the IRB accordingly. The day my IRB proposal was approved, I obtained informed consent from the faculty participants using the form shown in Appendix A. The data collection model is shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2. The data collection model. The qualitative data collection model is depicted, where orange circles indicate informed consent; yellow diamonds represent semi-structured, phenomenological interviews; green parallelograms show ongoing, reflective questionnaires; and blue rectangles represent observation and note taking at the OSLF monthly meetings.

“Focused Life History” Phenomenological Interview

In February I met with faculty in their offices for a ninety-minute, semi-structured interview at an agreed upon time. The interviews were recorded using a tabletop microphone reserved through the Center for Teaching and Learning. During the interviews, I informed the participants that I would take notes on paper just to remind myself of key points to use as prompts during the interview. Before I left the faculty interview location, I gave participants a copy of the “Participant Reminder of Key Research Events” shown in Appendix B of this
document, and attempted to schedule our next interview time. The first interview was intended to generate data in response to the questions, “What are the prior conditions and characteristics of faculty who intend to try out service-learning at this institution?” and “How do faculty anticipate implementing service-learning pedagogy in their course work?” The focused life histories interview guide for the first interview is shown in Appendix C.

**Monthly OSLF Meeting Participant Observation and Note Taking**

Participant observations during monthly meetings were a primary source of data collected in this study. The observations also helped build rapport with participants and helped me stay abreast of related topics and issues encountered by the group during the semester. I took notes on paper as a reminder of topics, issues and key points to include in online reflection notices to faculty. During the retreat I typed conversations using the computer in real-time and also recorded the audio as possible, for reference.

**Bi-Weekly Online “Details of Experience” Questionnaire**

Every other Friday during the study I sent a standard email reminder, shown in Appendix D, to participants to ask them to share their service-learning experience details online. The “details of experience” questionnaire was made available through Survey Monkey at http://www.surveymonkey.com. I included the full web address for the site in the email so participants could click to access the questionnaire. I also included alternate instructions for how to manually access the questionnaire from the Survey Monkey site. The online questionnaire, shown in Appendix E, was as brief as possible in recognition of limited faculty time. Faculty
were already aware that this activity would require participation every other week and indicated that the time commitment was reasonable.

Participants were asked to complete each questionnaire within three days of receiving the email from me, that is, by the end of the day on Sunday. Participants could then turn their focus to the next two-week period. This activity was intended to respond to the research question, “How is service-learning implemented in this course?” and the question, “How do faculty explain their decision to adopt, reject, discontinue or re-invent service-learning pedagogy for future courses?”

Student Survey

Signed student consent forms indicated the number, names, and email addresses of students who agreed to participate in the study. After the service-learning component of the courses concluded, I emailed students and copied their faculty using the email addresses provided on the student consent form shown in Appendix F. The email message asked students to complete a brief, online survey to explain what happened during the service-learning implementation process. The student survey is shown in Appendix G. I asked for surveys to be completed within five-days. If there were incomplete surveys after five days, I sent one reminder email to the students and copied their faculty. The reminder email is shown in Appendix H. If responses were still not received after those five days, I assumed that non-responding students did not wish to participate. After receiving student responses it was necessary to send a follow-up questionnaire to interpret responses. The return rate of the follow-up was half that of the number of initial respondents. Student survey data were intended to respond to the research question, “How is service-learning implemented in this course?”
“Reflection on the Meaning” Phenomenological Interview

At the end of the semester I conducted a ninety-minute, semi-structured interview with faculty on the negotiated date, and at the negotiated time and location. The reflective interview was recorded using a table-top microphone I reserved from the Center for Teaching and Learning. The interview was phenomenological in nature with reflective, open questions about the service-learning experience and plans to adopt, or not, the service-learning pedagogy for future courses. The interview guide is shown in Appendix I. Questions were refined using the online “experience details” data. These interview data responded to the questions, “How is service-learning implemented in this course?” and, “How do faculty explain their decision to adopt, reject, discontinue or re-invent service-learning pedagogy for future courses?”

Data Analysis

Document Analysis

In the first week of data collection, I analyzed participant OSLF application materials available through the Office of Service-Learning. As I reviewed the data I asked myself, “Do these data relate to the prior conditions and characteristics of faculty who intend to try out service-learning at this institution?” After data reduction, I identified themes and key points to refine my existing focused life history interview questions. The data were intended to respond to my first research question, “What are the prior conditions and characteristics of faculty who intend to try out service-learning at this institution?”
“Focused Life History” Phenomenological Interview Data

Focused life history interview data for each participant was reviewed briefly during the study. Key points were used to construct student survey items to determine whether the anticipated implementation tasks actually occurred.

When data collection was completed, I reduced all focused life history interview data by asking myself the question, “Do these data describe the prior conditions and characteristics of faculty who intend to try out service-learning?” I reviewed the data again, asking myself the question, “Do these data describe how faculty anticipate implementing service-learning pedagogy in their course work?” Data that responded positively to these questions were kept, and from them I developed a partial profile of each participant. The interview data were intended to address my first and second research questions and to inform the statements on the student survey.

Monthly OSLF Meeting Participant Observation/Note Taking

Observation notes were a primary data source in this study. They were also used to help create rapport between myself and participants, and to give context for related topics and issues encountered by the group during the year. No formal analysis was conducted on notes from these meetings, although notes were used to inform individual cases and the cross-case analysis.

Bi-Weekly Online “Details of Experience” Questionnaire and Student Survey

Data from the faculty online reflections and from the student survey were reviewed briefly for key points in March or April, before the final interview took place. These key points responded to the question, “How was service-learning implemented in this course?” I developed
a list of key points for each course in order to refine the “reflection on the meaning” phenomenological interview guide.

**Further Analysis**

At the end of data collection, I transcribed all data and developed three files – one for each participant. Data in each file were compiled chronologically first, to show the process of decision-making as it happened over time. The data were reorganized by research question in each file to check for missing data (LeCompte, 2000). Data not immediately associated with the given research questions were saved and grouped by topics like “scholarship” and “students.” After finding that all research questions had some response, the data in each file were organized chronologically again. I reduced the data, removing extraneous information. I conducted initial coding using process codes on printed transcripts, then transferred the codes to an electronic format. The codes began with gerunds to show action and process (Charmaz, 2006). I printed and cut to separate the process codes, then organized them on the floor using focused coding and a constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). I took a code, compared it to all other codes and began to group data. I generated category names for grouped data and compared codes to the category names. Any data that was better matched elsewhere was moved to a more appropriate category. I defined the categories using full sentences. The definitions helped narrow what was to be kept and removed. I reorganized codes as needed and removed a very small number of codes that did not fit into any category and therefore did not relate to emerging themes. In Inspiration software, I created a file for each participant’s data. In each file, in outline view, I entered category names and corresponding process codes. I used the software to
generate a concept map of individual participant data to show emerging themes within and across cases.

Quality

In this study, I took an interpretive theoretical perspective (Crotty, 1998) to understand the culture of the multi-case study. To support the credibility of the study, I revealed personal biases and developed a subjectivity statement. I used multiple sources of qualitative data and a source of quantitative data for triangulation (Patton, 2002). Member-check was not a part of this study given limited faculty participant time. However, faculty were welcome to provide feedback at any point during the research study to clarify comments made, and they were asked to respond to follow-up questions after each Fellows meeting and each online reflection. Dependability of the data was addressed by allowing the document analysis and online reflections to inform and personalize interview guides during the data collection process.

Building Rapport

I began attending Office of Service-Learning Fellows monthly meetings in August of 2006 to meet and establish a level of rapport with the five Fellows. Gatherings included an August breakfast where I first met faculty participants, followed by more formal meetings in September, October and November. The September meeting was an opportunity for members to become familiar with one another, the program leaders, and with me. We talked about how particular concepts related to our interests and perceptions of service-learning. In October and November, I participated minimally in conversations using my time primarily to observe the discussion and take notes to inform my research design. The topics of discussion at the meetings
were assessment and reflection. I also attended a Christmas breakfast sponsored by the Office of Service-Learning, and a graduation party for one of the Fellows program facilitators where I encountered one of the participants selected for this study who told stories of past experiences. I also encountered another participant off-campus at a community event where we briefly discussed the Fellows program. In addition, I met informally with each of the three participants in their offices to make them aware of my intended methodology and to ask questions about scheduling, and about their backgrounds.

Ethical Considerations Involving Researcher Subjectivities

Before data collection began, the study was approved by the Institutional Review Board and necessary changes were incorporated. Faculty and student participants signed an informed consent document. Interview data were transcribed and analyzed by the researcher, and kept under lock and key. Confidentiality was applied to data received from the online survey system. All data will be destroyed three years after it is fully analyzed. Participant names were replaced with pseudonyms. Specific department names were replaced with a broader identifier of Design, Family Sciences, or Allied Health. Rather than conduct narrative analysis to tell the complete story of each individual, I analyzed narratives which is a distinction drawn by Polkinghorne (1995). By using data in this way, participants became less identifiable.

My personal subjectivities were related to my experiences as a student and as a professional in higher education. During the study, my primary role was student researcher. The Fellows leaders involved me in occasional activities during the year but my preference and inclination was to abstain and withdraw from activities that might interrupt data collection, or influence the activities I observed. The biases outlined in the following section are intended to
highlight my subjectivities and were a result of my reflection on past experience and a bracketing exercise conducted at a recently held qualitative conference.

“Complete Adoption Not Necessary” Bias

In my professional work in higher education I have come to believe that a willingness to explore and learn from new experiences makes the faculty a better professional, whether or not there is complete adoption of the innovation.

“External Influences on Adoption” Bias

Because participants are early-career faculty, I anticipate a number of external factors such as tenure and promotion to influence adoption decisions. This bias is related to past experience at the university, and with faculty development programs that exclude early-career faculty because of the perceived distraction from other forms of necessary scholarship.

“Values and Professional Advancement” Bias

As a doctoral student, I served on a departmental committee and a program committee. Faculty committee members served for the common good but at times had very different perspectives on what that was. The conflict led to discourse about the value of deep-rooted beliefs as they related to various academic programs. I feel that the multidisciplinary faculty in my study will value service-learning to differing degrees. The faculty innovation-decision process may also be influenced by how much service-learning is valued among colleagues in the departments, and in terms of the benefit of service-learning for career advancement.
“Cross-Discipline Consistencies” Bias

The Director of the Carnegie Foundation, Lee Shulman, delivered a speech called *Pedagogies of Uncertainty: Teaching for Understanding, Judgment and Commitment* (see [http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/news/sub.asp?key=51&subkey=2126](http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/news/sub.asp?key=51&subkey=2126)) in which he offered general principles of effective pedagogy across professional fields. I agree with his perspective that there are consistencies in the way that faculty across disciplines think about, and carry-out, teaching and learning activities. My bias stems from years of work in a central teaching and learning group for all disciplines on campus.
CHAPTER IV: WITHIN-CASE ANALYSIS

Introduction

The analysis of data in this case study is documented within individual cases in this chapter, and then across multiple cases in the next. The intent was to develop a rich description of the participant experience during the innovation-decision process.

This study is limited to participants in the Office of Service-Learning Fellows program. Bill D. Green, Jean Anice, and Al Chemy are the participants. As early-career faculty, participants must be responsive to the scholarly demands of the promotion and/or tenure process. The institution has taken bold steps to increase civic engagement on campus, and these faculty have, as a result, decided to implement service-learning into their courses. This study seeks to document their experiences as they unfold.

Data for the cases were obtained through several sources, including: participant application materials; two ninety-minute phenomenological interviews with each participant; three monthly observations of participant Fellows meetings, including an overnight retreat; five online questionnaires made available periodically during the implementation process; and a student survey. The student survey listed faculty participant objectives for the service-learning experience and asked students to confirm or deny which actually happened in the field. Follow-up questions were sent after each data collection period, and the resulting data were also applied to the cases.
This chapter begins with an overview of the Office of Service-Learning Fellows program. Individual cases follow, and are presented in this order: Bill, Jean Anice, and Al. Each case is followed by a summary of findings, and this chapter ends with a concluding paragraph about the results. Participant case study data are organized in this chapter by stages of the innovation-decision process and within those stages, the corresponding research questions. An overview of the innovation-decision stages and research questions was presented in Table 2.

Overview of the Office of Service-Learning Fellows (OSLF) Program

In July of 2005, the Vice President for Instruction and Office of Public Service and Outreach formed the Office of Service-Learning at the research institution of interest in this study. In January of 2006, a new Office of Service Learning (OSL) Fellows faculty cohort was inducted. The first full year of OSL Fellows was in 2006-2007, the year of this study. The multidisciplinary faculty in the study applied to the program and proposed an academic service-learning project. Acceptance was based on the proposal of a quality project and the potential to support, and benefit from, the program. Applicants did not need advanced knowledge of service-learning but did have to demonstrate potential to significantly impact service-learning at the institution. Applicants were also required to commit to all sessions and activities during the academic year, including monthly meetings. Fellows were given a modest stipend in the amount of $2500 to purchase supplies and equipment, and were taken on a two-day retreat near the end of the spring semester to reflect on the year and their work.
Bill D. Green

Prior Conditions

What are the prior conditions and characteristics of faculty who intend to try out academic service-learning (ASL) at this institution?

Bill D. Green was a thirty-five year old Assistant Professor in a design discipline. A graduate, tenure-track faculty, he loosely defined his academic responsibilities during an interview as, “ninety-five or one hundred percent teaching.” Bill perceived a departmental expectation to balance teaching with research but felt that teaching consumed most of his time. Bill reported his normal teaching load as three courses in the fall and two in the spring. This semester, however, he planned to voluntarily teach an extra course to integrate service-learning. He had also begun an independent study that quickly became another additional course to teach, given the large number of students interested. Bill’s course load the semester of teaching with service-learning was four courses. Bill described a daily schedule that involved spending two hours preparing for classes and three hours in the classroom. He stated that each week he devoted several hours to service in support of various community boards. He conducted research when possible but had no formal time set aside for research. Bill taught nine months a year and, in the summer, led an international study abroad experience in Costa Rica.

How do faculty describe prior teaching practices and perceived pedagogical needs?

Bill earned a terminal master’s degree from the institution at which he now works as an Assistant Professor. After he graduated, Bill taught one course per year as an adjunct while also working in business. Three years ago he became an Assistant Professor. Bill described the departmental pedagogy as one that incorporated a studio model where a small number of
students worked independently at tables to construct designs intended to solve applied problems in the community.

There’s very little…formal standing up and lecturing…that goes on in the studio. Most of it is kind of this…guidance…to the student as they pursue discovering the answers…on their own. And again with design…there’s never one right answer.

Bill described his role in Studio courses as project manager, technical and faculty advisor, and mentor. He worked with community clients on difficult issues, and with students, to resolve problems. Bill described “pushing” students to generate and defend meaningful designs for which there is never one, correct solution. He stated that other instructional models, like lecture with question and answer techniques, were applied in the department in support of the Studio experience.

Bill was passionate about applied learning and felt that it was necessary in higher education. He described the value of lectures grounded in real-life experiences by stating that it helped learners “remember it [content] better” by giving it “relevance.” His passion was fueled by his own experience as a child when he struggled to pay attention in classes that offered little hands-on work. In a focused life interview for this study, he conceded that even now he perceives detachment in students who are not involved in service-learning. Bill expects student enthusiasm to be “overwhelming” in response to his proposed academic service-learning idea this semester. His department head, who wrote a letter in support of his application to the Fellows program, indicated that Bill had developed a very promising project that would benefit society for years to come.
How do faculty perceive their overall innovativeness within their department and within the discipline?

Bill described himself as a “risk-taker.” He felt he was more innovative than the average faculty, and elaborated by saying, “I’m new…I have a lot of energy and…I want to discover the best ways to teach and the best ways to get things done.” He strived to improve his teaching by incorporating new projects. While some faculty shared his enthusiasm for change, others did not. Rather than perceiving academic service-learning to be innovative, he felt it had always been a part of his teaching strategy.

Knowledge Stage

How did participants come to know about ASL?

As Bill reflected on his childhood aloud, he determined that his parents helped inform his understanding of academic service-learning. He described his mother, a Biology professor, as working diligently to reinforce book knowledge through real-world experiences. Together, they collected water samples and examined them under microscopes. They explored wetlands and talked about the landscape. He thought it was “fascinating” and that the experiences helped him “learn class work…better.”

When Bill was ready for college, he “intentionally avoided both of [his parents’] fields,” making the conscious decision not to follow in his parents’ footsteps. He recounted his subsequent experiences by indicating, in an interview, that he had earned a bachelor degree in Psychology with a focus on Engineering Psychology, but was disappointed to find the focus on research rather than applied learning. Bill studied Industrial Design in the Studio for a year but was unable to find employment in that field upon graduation. He needed to return to graduate
school and considered several degree programs. Bill recalled the day he made the decision to move into his current discipline. Ironically, it was his father’s discipline.

I was…walking with my Mom through this restored prairie in…Shaumburg, IL, and so it was this…beautiful prairie…a beautiful prairie…an environmental center that had…all kinds of educational stuff in this nicely designed building and my Mom was pointing out all these prairie plants and everything and it was just this beautiful afternoon. And all of a sudden it occurred to me that, a Landscape Architect designed this place. You know, here is an amazing place that I…enjoyed being at, kind of encompasses all my interests of design and science and…art, and it was designed by a Landscape Architect. I was like, well what the heck, Dad was right, so…I applied to graduate school…

Bill now considers the discipline inseparable from service-learning. Although he did not know the term at the time, his definition of service-learning has hardly deviated from the hands-on, applied nature of his early experiences.

How do participants define pedagogy and service-learning?

Bill first became aware of the term pedagogy in his first collaborative teaching experience, and felt the word was “hoyty toyty.” It was not a part of his regular vocabulary. Bill identified the Studio as a common pedagogical approach in his discipline although lecture was also used. He indicated that he had recently begun to participate in charettes with a colleague. Bill described charettes as intense design sessions where faculty and five to fifteen students took a weekend trip to meet with a client and create designs that addressed a particular community need, such as historical preservation.
Bill first became aware of the term *service-learning* between one and two years ago, through a Public Service colleague on campus who forwarded emails, including an open invitation to join the Office of Service-Learning program. Bill explained service-learning as “just getting out of the classroom and…learning by doing.” He felt he had always been a service-learner and worked to recreate that experience for his students. Bill described interjecting bits of volunteerism into his classes years ago, something that he initially described as service-learning after hearing the term. In defining the service-learning now, he feels that accountability and having a community partner whose ideas must be considered, are necessary for service-learning. Journaling and reflection are not critical, but they are valuable and he would like to focus more on that in the future. Bill perceived service-learning to be an active attempt to “broaden student minds and enrich their education.”

**What is the perceived value of ASL within the department and within the discipline?**

Bill described his discipline as a mediator of art and nature. He felt it was concerned with history and philosophy in a qualitative sense, and with physical contact with the soil and Earth. It was inseparable from service-learning.

…the medium that we deal with…living things, plants, um, people, and then the soil, and the Earth…to get our hands on it and to be familiar with it, you…have to be involved in…some sort of service-learning, at least getting outside and actually dealing with those things one-on-one physically as opposed to sitting in a classroom and dealing with symbols and things that represent the things we’re actually going to be dealing with once we get out…that’s the real value.
Bill believed that academic service-learning is of value to both the greater community and to the learner who must overcome real world obstacles for implementation. One widely recognized problem that he intended to address with his project was the “degradation of natural aquatic ecosystems due to impermeable surfaces.” In addition to serving a practical purpose in the community, the project site will become an attractive and easy-to-maintain rain garden for the benefit of the community.

Persuasion Stage

How do participants describe the influence, if any, of the OSLF program on favorable or unfavorable attitude formation?

Bill defined formal, faculty professional development as “continuing education workshops, seminars, etc.” He had not participated in a faculty development program in the past, and it was unclear if he perceived the Fellows program to be a form of professional development. Bill’s motive for joining the Office of Service-Learning Fellows program (OSLF) was to learn how to more fully incorporate service-learning into his instruction. The program justified his use of service-learning as a fully integrated part of his course rather than an extra credit assignment. He felt it legitimized what he was already doing. The most useful thing, Bill believed, was learning how others struggled with, and addressed, issues similar to his. The collegial environment including expert presenters, the formal opportunities for reflection, and the funding received for program participation were most influential during the persuasion stage.

The Fellows program encouraged reflection through journaling, particularly at the retreat. During one reflective activity held outdoors, Bill found it necessary to critique the landscape surrounding the retreat building before writing about his assigned reflection. When reflecting on
the past year and his service-learning work, he decided to develop a five-year professional plan. Bill had used journaling in his summer Costa Rica study abroad experience and planned to incorporate it in his service-learning course this semester for the first time, as a student requirement.

The grant Bill received through the Fellows program proved to be valuable for next semester’s course. He planned to purchase laser surveying equipment, measuring devices, soil moisture sensors, a data logger, and a digital camera for a service-learning installation project.

Decision Stage

Do faculty anticipate implementing ASL and if so, how? If not, why?

In his focused life history, Bill described an experience that transformed his point of view (Mezirow, 2000). He had intentionally avoided his parents’ career paths until that moment, when he suddenly decided to return to graduate school and follow in his father’s footsteps, in a career he perceives now to be inseparable from service-learning. Although Bill did not know the term service-learning at the time, and was not in a teaching position, he became aware of the nature of service-learning through his experience and had developed a favorable attitude toward it. Later, as an Assistant Professor, Bill proposed the implementation of service-learning in a fall semester undergraduate course on his Fellows program application. He changed his mind and decided to implement academic service-learning into a multidisciplinary practicum course this spring semester. His project ideas, reported in an interview and confirmed via follow-up email, were to have a student 1) design a bio-retention area for an elementary school, an idea that he described as relatively innovative given traditional storm water management practices; and 2)
design a demonstration green roof for City Hall. Bill expected the student in this course to
effectively do the following:

- set-up a work plan for success in this class;
- arrange stakeholder meetings;
- participate in a series of meetings with different stakeholders;
- develop a rapport with the stakeholders;
- deliver a mid-term presentation of progress;
- produce a set of design guidelines for designing and installing bio-retention areas on
  public school grounds and green roofs on buildings in downtown Athens;
- address logistics in the design guidelines;
- address aesthetics in the design guidelines;
- incorporate appropriate resources into the design guidelines;
- incorporate curriculum and educational attributes into the design guidelines;
- reflect on the learning experience in a journal periodically throughout the semester;
- complete a final presentation;
- spread the workload evenly throughout the semester; and
- identify future projects that could enhance or complement this product.

Bill’s strategy was to have two semesters of academic service-learning. In the first
semester, a graduate student would create designs, and in the fall, undergraduates would
implement the designs. This semester’s graduate course was co-listed as Ecology and Law and
attracted students from many different majors as an elective course. It was considered a hybrid
studio and practicum course. Bill was one of several instructors for the course and each
instructor supported a very small number of students. In Bill’s case, he had one student. The
student collaborated with community partners for approvals and paperwork necessary to design and plan for implementation of the project sites. Assessment this semester was largely based on having completed the designs and having a supportive client response.

Implementation Stage

How is ASL actually implemented?

Bill’s student worked directly with community partners during the semester, and was primarily self-directed in doing so. Community partners at the elementary school responded by providing valuable resources and a new project idea for the redesign of an existing “granite outcrop garden” in the future.

The student submitted draft copies of her two designs for review and comment by the instructors of the interdisciplinary course, and also presented her design plans to the community partners at the end of the semester. She reported that all anticipated objectives had been completed, and Bill agreed that the projects were successful but felt they could be improved.

During the semester, Bill described in an online questionnaire a “communication breakdown” between he and his student regarding project expectations and deadlines. Their expectations differed and he felt the projects could suffer as a result. Bill lamented, “If anything, I feel like the workload has not been evenly distributed throughout the semester, with too much of the work coming in the last two weeks.” His student indicated that the community partner had “best intentions” but not the “same hard-pushing work ethic needed to get the project done in the [semester] time frame.” Bill intended to implement more interim deadlines in the future. “I feel like these deadlines should be determined by the faculty and student together and 'enforced' by
the faculty.” Bill’s student concurred, on a student survey for this study, that the faculty should play a greater role in controlling the timeline.

I think a more close watch by faculty on what work has been done within a certain timeframe may be appropriate for certain projects AND address the potential for some students to not be on task (and maybe not realize it).

How do faculty plan and prepare for ASL implementation?

Bill reported that he, his student, and community partners were excited about the implementation of academic service-learning this semester. The partners needed assistance while Bill and his student found the projects to be a unique opportunity to make significant improvements for the city. Before the semester, Bill collaborated with the instructor of record for the interdisciplinary course. He arranged potential community projects with leaders, and proposed those projects for students in the class. He negotiated with the student to adopt two projects instead of one, replacing some traditional assignments with the additional project. Planning and preparing for design implementation occurred during the semester and was primarily the student’s responsibility. Bill felt it would be appropriate to arrange client meetings in advance of the next course so that the students would not have to struggle with schedules and related problems, including meeting deadlines within the semester timeframe.

How do participants describe what worked, what did not, and what would be done differently next time?

Bill stated that he and his student communicated via email and in-person during the semester. At a chance meeting one evening, however, the two realized there had been a
miscommunication about expectations and deadlines. In an online questionnaire for this study, Bill wrote, “It will all work out (she is adjusting her focus) but I realize the importance [of] making sure everyone understands the goals up front.” Bill planned to be much more explicit at the beginning of the next semester regarding interim deadlines and intended outcomes, and decided to require ongoing reflection to assess student progress.

Scheduling with the client remained a constant problem due to busy calendars. Bill felt the meetings were beneficial, citing one in which a community partner shared helpful resources and a new project idea.

What are the perceived barriers to the adoption of ASL? What are the perceived enablers to the adoption of ASL?

Bill stated in an interview that he perceived obstacles including city and county ordinances, policies, and client team beliefs as potential challenges to the requirements of a project, particularly when “digging and moving the soil around.” When implementing the rain garden project, he described resistance from the Board of Education in relation to the designs and pending implementation at a local elementary school.

Scheduling was a serious barrier to implementation. Community partners were not on the same semester schedule as the University, and Bill indicated that it took up to four weeks to coordinate schedules to hold a meeting. Delays during the semester were reconciled but to the detriment of the intended, balanced workload.

Bill considered his student’s skill an asset and enabler of the service-learning projects designed for the elementary school and for City Hall.
Is there a knowledge and practice gap and if so, what is that?

Bill indicated that he had gained most of his knowledge about the terms service-learning and academic service-learning as a participant in the Office of Service-Learning Fellows program. He had, in the past, incorporated volunteerism as an extra credit assignment, without knowing what service-learning was. He felt the Fellows program “legitimized” his service work and caused him to integrate service-learning more fully in his courses. Instead of forming new meaning about service-learning, or distinguishing it from earlier practices, Bill felt his previous ideas had been reinforced. Instead of integrating reflection as an assessment strategy, as suggested by leaders of the Fellow program, Bill applied assessment as a way for his student to learn from mistakes.

Confirmation Stage

How do faculty explain the decision to adopt, reject, discontinue or re-invent ASL for future courses?

Bill enjoyed teaching with service-learning and incorporating unique projects with each course. He found the unpredictable nature of service-learning to be “fun” and “exciting,” saying “I couldn’t see myself doing this any other way.” Bill felt his work increased the presence of the University in the community, and gave students real-world experiences they could apply to their careers after graduation. He planned to continue service-learning, evolving his strategy as he went. Ideally, Bill stated, he would implement service-learning into as many classes as possible.

Bill was a tenure-track faculty with no budgeted time for service. To advance professionally, he felt he had to maintain an active research agenda, publish an uncertain number of articles and/or books, and seek out grants. Bill reported no negative consequences for implementing
service-learning but did discover that its departmental support came without funding or helpful curricular changes. He felt his discipline welcomed non-traditional, applied, forms of scholarship but that service-learning alone would not contribute to his career advancement.

In three years Bill hopes to be tenured, and in five he hopes to have balanced his academic responsibilities with private practice. Bill’s ultimate goal, he stated, was to “save the world” through environmental work, teaching others about the environment, and facilitating change. Bill indicated that he was happy at his institution. He described his department as top ranked in the country. All things considered, there was little reason for Bill not to pursue academic service-learning at the university.

Thinking aloud at the end of the final interview for this study, Bill began to mentally construct a five-year plan. He identified a gap in service in his department, found a niche for service-learning that would not duplicate colleague efforts, and talked about building a strong body of service-learning work that would eventually become his job. He expressed an interest in moving to a non-tenure-track position to become a service faculty. By the end of the interview, however, he had decided it would be too risky and instead, chose to remain silent and pursue the tenure-track without worrying about the details of scholarship.

Summary

Bill D. Green came to know the excitement of applied learning through informal and formal experiences early in life. As a young adult, his perspective about a worthy career choice was transformed through a single experience while visiting a prairie designed by a landscape architect. Bill’s identity as a learner, design faculty, and innovative teacher was formed through experience, and through the influence of his parents, colleagues, students, community partners,
and the Office of Service-Learning Fellows program. Bill defined service-learning simply as “just getting out of the classroom and…learning by doing.” As a professional he hoped to find balance between teaching with service-learning, and private practice. He taught more than expected but did so willingly in response to student interest and his own desire to teach with service-learning. While teaching, Bill encountered and overcame barriers to implementation, enthused by the dynamic and unpredictable nature of service-learning.

Bill spent more time teaching than with other scholarly activities. He was rather carefree in terms of thinking about tenure and promotion. He did not have a formal plan for achieving promotion and tenure but realized the need to develop a plan. Bill expressed a desire to increase service-learning involvement over the next five years, to the point of moving out of the tenure track and into a public service faculty position. In doing so, his adoption decision was to continue with service-learning but, at the risk of interrupting his current progress, Bill decided to adopt academic service-learning and to persist in the tenure track.

Jean Anice

Prior Conditions

What are the prior conditions and characteristics of faculty who intend to try out academic service-learning (ASL) at this institution?

Jean is an Assistant Professor who is in her second year at this research institution in a Family Sciences discipline. Her academic appointment is forty-five percent research and thirty-five percent teaching. She is a nine-month graduate faculty with an interest in intergenerational relations. Jean maintains an active and full agenda of teaching, research, service, and manuscript writing.
Although she is not budgeted for service, Jean has chosen to implement academic service-learning in her teaching while simultaneously serving on student, departmental, and college committees, holding leadership roles in the community and in professional organizations, and creating a global service-learning program in Cambodia while tutoring herself in the language of the Khmer. Jean is writing a book proposal, revising a manuscript and developing four new manuscripts, serving as first or second author on four to five conference presentation abstracts that were recently submitted, creating an online course, collecting data for a current study, and creating several research instruments for a new study. She delivers guest lectures and serves on State and National Boards in her field. This is the first semester Jean has had time to have an occasional lunch with her husband, who also works on campus. She thinks it will probably be the last for at least a year given her schedule. On the other hand she has “…been able to carve out [time] about two or three times a week, an hour and a half [to just relax]. I just walk out, ctrl/alt/delete, lock this thing down, out I go and it’s like, this is nice.”

Until her daughter was ready to go to college, Jean Anice had not considered pursuing her own postsecondary education. As a forty-year-old college freshman, she began a twelve-year journey to earning a PhD. As an undergraduate, Jean Anice chose to live with refugee Khmer families and teach the English language, for internship credit. The real-world learning experience challenged her upbringing in rural America:

I grew up in the fifties, sixties, and seventies not thinking much about an advanced degree and even less about refugees or immigrants. I knew that my male relatives and friends stood a good chance of going to fight a war in Vietnam that none of us seemed to understand, with a group of people with whom we could not identify. The languages and
customs of Southeast Asia were not issues of importance to me as I came of age in a small southern farming community.

**How do faculty describe prior teaching practices and perceived pedagogical needs?**

As a graduate student, Jean Anice volunteered to be a mealtime companion in a skilled nursing facility. The experience had a positive, ripple effect on the attitudes of her elder companion and on those who sat near her. Jean Anice described the experience as transformational (Mezirow, 2000).

…it was one of those sort of transformative moments for me and I think it really came when I looked around, and these elderly women in this skilled nursing facility, these elderly women, some of them in wheelchairs some of them almost to the point of being just totally withdrawn had re-engaged just because I had a loud mouth and laughed.

Although she was unaware of the term *service-learning* at the time, Jean Anice realized the meaningful impact one person could have. She decided then, “when I had the authority to tell students what they…should do in a class…I would include this.”

As a graduate student teaching assistant for one semester, Jean Anice drew on her own volunteer experience to have students work with elders in eight nursing homes in the area as an extra credit assignment. An ombudsman trained the students in a one-day workshop and made all the arrangements to place students. Jean Anice coordinated only with the ombudsman. She had her students write loosely structured reflective papers that yielded a range of responses. That strategy changed over time. “…I would put myself in that category of not really getting at the reflections, especially the first semester, trying a little harder second semester. This semester,
very explicit questions…” In addition to learning a great deal from this first teaching experience, Jean Anice received three awards for her work.

When Jean Anice became an Assistant Professor at her current institution, she found that the local ombudsman was unprepared to immediately begin a program of placing students in skilled nursing facilities. Instead of working through ombudsman, she began negotiating directly with local facilities. Jean Anice made initial contact with, and delivered presentations to, local assisted living and retirement communities. For a semester she promoted her service-learning idea to the local Council on Aging. In the Spring, she tried out service-learning as a pilot test for full integration in the Fall. Jean Anice described the challenges of that first experience as an Assistant Professor:

…the hardest part of getting the program launched was I had a syllabus written and so many things happened I was constantly changing the syllabus. So, fortunately that group of students for the most part knew this was the pilot, knew we had to be flexible and were pretty forgiving about this, you know, just throw the syllabus away and rework it as we went through the semester to make it work.

After a year of preliminary arrangements and the pilot test, Jean Anice felt confident in placing all her students in the community. However, with a hundred students that Fall she “panicked” and partnered with another faculty to pair students rather than find individual experiences for them. That was Jean’s first semester in the Office of Service-Learning Fellows program. In that semester, Jean also had to remove a student from the service-learning program after hearing that student’s remarks about an elder’s disfigurement. She was unable to resolve the problem in a student meeting, and decided to give an alternate assignment that might increase
student understanding of the elder’s circumstances. The resolution did not end positively for any involved but did prevent harm to the disabled elder.

Despite trying service-learning as a teaching assistant and pilot-testing it as an Assistant Professor, Jean described herself as having service-learning “ideas but little experience” when she entered the Office of Service-Learning Fellows program. She did, however, express certain beliefs that seemed rooted in prior experience. Jean Anice did not feel community problems could be solved within the time constraints of an academic semester. As a subject matter expert, she felt her role was to find community problems and partners and to match them up with her students rather than having the students make those initial connections. Ultimately, Jean Anice hoped her undergraduates would move from academic service-learning in her courses to active volunteerism in the community later.

How do faculty perceive their overall innovativeness within their department and within the discipline?

Jean Anice cautiously referred to herself as an innovator, noting that she was still relatively new in the department. She was unafraid to try new things and to learn from mistakes and problems along the way. In her area of specialization, the department welcomed new ideas. She perceived herself as first among her colleagues to fully incorporate service-learning into a course, but did not view service-learning and academic service-learning as new concepts. This was partly because her work had always involved “going and doing,” and partly because she found the ideas documented in the literature.

Being innovative had its disadvantages. Jean Anice found little understanding among her colleagues about what she did with service-learning, why it is so intensive, and why she should
persist with the pedagogy despite potential conflicts with other scholarly activities. In terms of academic service-learning, Jean Anice had received words of encouragement and words of caution from colleagues such as, “It doesn’t matter what your teaching is all about as long as you get good teaching scores.” Jean Anice admitted that time spent on academic service-learning detracted from research time and that she “naively” anticipated recovering that time in the summer months. While she was passionate about academic service-learning and strived to be innovative, Jean Anice felt she had to connect teaching to more traditional forms of scholarship at the institution in order to advance professionally. With this strategy, she felt supported by her Department Chair whom she described as having a similar “go and do” philosophy.

Knowledge Stage

How did participants come to know about ASL?

Jean Anice first encountered the term service-learning at a spring conference roundtable session, months before moving to her current institution. She began using the term in searches of the literature, finding most articles in the area of Social Work. More specifically, Jean came to know about the term academic service-learning by searching for articles about “intergenerational engagement, intergenerational interaction…[and] student-elder interaction.”

How do participants define pedagogy and service-learning?

Jean compared her Family Sciences discipline to a laboratory where students first learned the foundation of their field and then went into the laboratory to test what was learned, in action: …whether it’s holding the hand of an elder while she’s crying and telling you about her husband who died twenty years ago or working in a chemistry lab watching something change color when you add some chemical compound…it’s just this…more aha moments
happen in that real situation and then you take that reality and you bring it back and it helps your [text]book to come more alive…

Although Jean was never a student of service-learning, she felt that a more realistic perspective enhanced student learning and helped build a stronger university-community relationship. She wanted her students to know that they could make a difference, and hoped they would see the importance of making the effort.

Jean described *pedagogy* as “…just the methods I use and the way I go about guiding students in this learning process…” She recently labeled her own pedagogical approach as *feminist* after hearing a potential faculty in an interview describe her own pedagogy in that way. Before learning the term, Jean described her approach as a collaborative one with students. For example, if students felt that something was not working and she agreed, they found a new approach. She gave students space to practice and reflect beyond lecture format. Instead of putting students “in an uncomfortable situation” as some hope to do with service-learning, Jean preferred to put students in a situation that they would likely appreciate and move beyond. New to the label *feminist pedagogy*, she concedes, “I’m probably stumbling all over [laughter] feminist pedagogy. But I think that is where…I had to self-label, I would say doggone, I think that’s me!” Jean Anice consistently strived to overcome student fear of individuals who were elderly. Her pedagogy was indicative of a feminist approach described by Shrewsbury (1998) as a practice intended to overcome destructive attitudes through engaged education. Jean’s teaching philosophy had always included a practice of learn, go, and do. She felt *doing* was critical to *learning* and that the two were inseparable. Service-learning lent itself well to her way of thinking.
Jean described service-learning as going out into the community, recognizing a need, and working with students and community partners to help address the problem. The problem should be recognized as such by both the faculty and members of the community. Service-learning involved “‘pushing an agenda’ that was to get students connected academically, socially, and personally to the world.” Early in the semester, Jean did not believe reflection was necessary for an experience to qualify as service-learning, but that it was important for meaningful assessment, and that structured reflection was most informative. At the end of the semester she included reflection in the definition as a necessary part of service-learning; that it must be linked to a body of knowledge; and that it was important for community partners to reflect on the experience, although “they might not want to, you know, sit down and write 3 journals.” Unlike experiential learning that she likened to an extended field trip where students benefited, service-learning generated reciprocity between students and the community.

What is the perceived value of ASL within the department and within the discipline?

Jean Anice intentionally questioned the value of service-learning because of its impact on her other scholarly activities for which she had limited time. While she felt a strong need for it, Jean Anice described her efforts as “an amazing amount of work.” It was so much a part of who she was, that she would continue to pursue it, regardless. Jean Anice chose to look for ways to integrate service-learning into her scholarly activities such as publishing on the topic of pedagogy in addition to intergenerational relations, and conducting relevant research. Having witnessed students’ career goals “transformed,” Jean Anice described the value of service-learning for students in her current course.
…they [students] are learning not just what’s in the textbook about being an elder – being older – the diseases that come along with being older. They’re also learning about how people adapt and how they cope and how different real-life is from the textbook, and sometimes how the textbook tracks real-life.

Persuasion Stage

How do participants describe the influence, if any, of the OSLF program on favorable or unfavorable attitude formation?

As a new faculty, Jean Anice had always known the campus to have an Office of Service-Learning (OSL). In her first week she had lunch with the Office Director to discuss her interests and learn about the opportunities available. Jean Anice joined the Fellows program to brainstorm and learn from others, and she came to value the experts who spoke to the group. She was influenced by one expert to expand her program from a local effort to a global one.

Jean Anice found “amazing” resources through the Fellows program and benefited from the planned opportunities for reflection on her own teaching, particularly during the retreat. During the first reflective exercise of the retreat, her thoughts were racing faster than she could write and sentences became bullets. She described needing more structure to do reflection with her “rather messy personality.” Jean Anice indicated that the exercise made her more carefully consider “vulnerabilities,” and to consider reflecting more on her own professional work.

Fellows program leaders helped refine Jean Anice’s work with students and community partners by giving specific ideas for structuring reflections and creating collages. Jean Anice felt better equipped to organize reflections, and assess student engagement because of the program. The program kept service-learning “at the forefront all of the time.” Through the Fellows
program, Jean Anice received funding and decided to use it to purchase software to help overcome scheduling issues that had become a barrier to implementation. She also planned to buy card paper for the closing ceremonies that could work with her printer.

By actively participating in service-learning groups, Jean received unexpected recognition for her work and for her innovativeness. She appreciated the recognition but recognized a potential risk:

It could hurt. There could be people who don’t like that, who are also in positions of power but that’s okay. That’s okay. If I don’t get P&T [promotion & tenure] because I’m doing something innovative then I shouldn’t be here at all…

Promotion and tenure were topics of discussion on the Fellows retreat. Jean had talked with her department head about changing her budget time to favor service and was told to wait until after tenure to pursue the idea. In the meantime, she strived to maintain two agendas, one that supported academic service-learning and another that supported scholarly activities that met professional expectations. One strategy Jean Anice used to make all of her efforts public was to post her busy schedule on her whiteboard that was prominently displayed on her office wall.

Decision Stage

Do faculty anticipate implementing ASL and if so, how? If not, why?

In her focused life history interview, Jean Anice described a transformational experience (Mezirow, 2000) that occurred while serving as a volunteer in graduate school. Although she did not know the term service-learning at the time, she decided that someday she would teach her students using a similar strategy. This semester, Jean anticipated implementing a mealtime companion program but changed her mind because of the large class size, the need for student
supervision in the field, and a heavy workload as an Assistant Professor. Even if the class size had been smaller this semester she felt she might not have the time needed for supervision given her teaching load. Additionally, Jean Anice needed time to train and prepare students emotionally for working with very frail people in skilled nursing facilities that might portray what it means to be older in a negative way.

Jean Anice decided to implement a more flexible program that required less supervision. Students would still engage with elders in the community but could choose to do that in a number of ways by completing an interest sheet that she created. Some service opportunities would be one-on-one and others, group-related. Students would choose and rank interests and Jean Anice would work to match student interests with the appropriate person and/or activity in the community.

Following are the specific objectives of the course, as dictated by Jean Anice during an interview for this study. The students would be expected to…

- prepare to go and visit with an elderly person(s);
- share general interests with [Jean Anice] using the information sheet;
- rank interests on the information sheet;
- make a minimum of 8 visits with an elder(s) or agency;
- engage with the elder(s) on a personal level;
- spend sufficient time on each visit with the elder(s);
- contribute to the blog after each visit;
- complete the reflective journal;
- use the Friendly Visitors program to generate a term paper topic;
- integrate what was learned from the Friendly Visitor program in the term paper; and
develop a broader understanding of real-life aging.

Should a student-elder conflict or risk arise, Jean intended to pull the student from the program and give an alternate assignment. A past example of an alternate assignment was one that required the student to interview several professionals in the community and present a report.

Implementation Stage

How is ASL actually implemented?

Jean Anice described having between seventy-five and one hundred students in her service-learning class this semester. The students were split into two course sections and could attend during either class time. Both sections used the same syllabus and the same WebCT resources.

Students reported a variety of preconceived notions about the service-learning assignments. One wrote, “I thought it was going to be a depressing experience working with the elderly. I thought it would seem like a chore…It wasn't depressing at all, it changed my view of aging in many ways.” Relief replaced trepidation for many. One student commented, “[I] wasn't looking forward to it too much but after doing it, I loved it!” For a few, the experience was less dramatic, as with this student who responded, “I anticipated to just go and sit and visit with my person…what I expected is what happened.”

Jean Anice described a typical teaching week as providing foundational knowledge to students, and encouraging discussion and questions once a week. The rest of the week she explored an issue with students such as “women and social security.” Jean Anice used PowerPoint, incorporated NPR broadcasts occasionally, and showed a couple of videos during
the semester. She assigned controversies to generate critical thinking, and involved students in a variety of service-learning activities during the course.

For the service-learning component, Jean Anice sent a “photo appointment note” to participating elders as a precaution so that they could identify their student partner at first sight. She expanded student options by adding a pet therapy program to the student interest sheet. One student described their experience participating in the Friendly Visitors and pet therapy programs to earn the required hours:

I thought that the pet program would be my preferred involvement, but I ended up enjoying my personal visits more. We were able to compare our lives and see how things are different now as opposed to then. Furthermore, the interaction led me to understand aging in a different way than a classroom scenario alone would have. I was able to recognize aspects of aging that will affect me in old age and how to prepare. I also received advice that came from the wisdom of an older individual.

To Jean Anice’s dismay, some students chose the pet program to avoid working directly with an older person. Rather than force the issue, she decided that protecting the elder from hurt feelings was far more important than requiring students to visit them one-on-one. Students who did not work with just one elder instead helped many by serving Meals on Wheels and other agencies that help aging adults.

When scheduling with community partners, Jean Anice found the process could take two weeks just to arrange an initial meeting time for individual students and their elders, which made scheduling a “logistical nightmare.” To better manage the logistics of scheduling and matching students to community partners, Jean Anice began searching for software that could be used the next semester. In the meantime she faced an unavoidable delay when a partner suddenly came
under State review and could not arrange a service-learning orientation until three weeks into the program. Only after orientation could students begin visitations and reflections. Jean decided next time to ask the partner to arrange three orientation sessions from which students could choose to attend. While it took a long time to plan with partners that were less involved than others, it took even longer to make alternate arrangements when problems arose.

After orientation, Jean spent time “monitoring the blog, answering questions, assisting with shifts in scheduling, and handling whatever situations arose.” For example, when an elder began using inappropriate language and sharing “past sexual experiences” with a female student with whom he was matched, Jean moved the student to another location. One student in the class noted on the survey, “I did not have any incredibly awkward experiences like I know some of my peers did.” Jean Anice tried to overcome her “cheerleader” attitude to give a realistic orientation to the service experience. Another student wrote, “I didn't experience much at all of the negative stuff we talked about in class.” No students who responded to the survey talked about negative experiences in detail.

When student participants in the study were asked if course objectives were met, almost all responded favorably. The number of favorable responses to the pet program is uncertain. The survey was created before it was implemented, and several survey statements addressed only the Friendly Visitor program.

Students who did not spend the anticipated time with elders gave reasonable responses related to elder health and well-being. One student indicated that they did not always post to the blog because there was no immediate Internet access after leaving the site, and later they sometimes forgot. Not all students prepared before visiting an elder, and those who did not, seemed to take less from the experience than their peers. One student noted, “I didn't really
prepare or feel the need to prepare for anything...I didn't get a lot of information I could use in
the paper from my visits and observations.” In contrast, another commented that the experience
did influence the writing assignment.

I did not prepare to visit with Mrs. Miller. I just went with the flow when I got there. My
time with her was very influential in writing my paper. A large portion of it comes from
my experience with the Friendly Visitor's Program.

Five weeks into the program, Jean asked students to take the lead in preparing closing
ceremonies to honor the elders and formally end the service-learning programs. Community
partners used the opportunity to also thank the students for their work. Ceremonies occurred at
different locations to maximize student and elder participation, and some OSLF funds were used
to print invitations. Students reported that elders were excited about plans for the final
ceremonies, and community partners asked Jean if they could remain partners in the Fall.

For assessment purposes, Jean asked students to reflect on their service-learning
experiences in two ways. She expected them to write in a blog, and to write a very structured,
reflective journal. The latter was an idea she gleaned from the OSLF program. She asked
students to respond to the questions, “What did you learn?” “How did you learn it?” and “Why is
it important?” Jean hoped that reflection would help expose whether students engaged with an
elder “beyond a superficial level.” Several students described engaging with their elder partner
in conversation, through activities in the community facility, and because of regular visits. One
commented, “We had a lot in common and were able to connect with each other easily.”

Jean Anice provided individual feedback to students via WebCT with comments that
ranged from, “This is wonderful,” to specific questions to prompt critical thinking for further
reflection. At the end of each class Jean Anice had students write about what they learned and
what was confusing. She had students write reflective papers three times a semester, and a term paper that integrated all they learned in the course. In terms of traditional testing, course assignments included weekly reading quizzes in WebCT that the technology automatically graded. Questions were derived from a textbook test bank. Because of the many semester activities, Jean Anice felt her course had become rather structured. She hoped students perceived less structure than actually existed in the course.

How do faculty plan and prepare for ASL implementation?

For years, Jean planned and prepared to fully implement a formal academic service experience. She first tried it out as a graduate student and teaching assistant at her former institution. The program was modeled after a volunteer experience she had previously, and was presented as an extra credit assignment. As an Assistant Professor, she spent a year finding and confirming partners in the community. Near the end of that year Jean implemented a pilot test of service-learning. She found herself “constantly changing the syllabus” and eventually decided to “throw the syllabus away and rework it...”

In her second year as an Assistant Professor, Jean joined the Office of Service-Learning Fellows (OSLF) program. At the same time she implemented a full program of service-learning. Due to a large number of students she found herself partnering with another faculty to pair and place students in the community. As the OSLF program progressed that semester, Jean became aware of the term academic service-learning and its application in other disciplines. As a result, she developed more structured reflections for students, more carefully reflected on her own experiences, and planned to implement other new ideas as appropriate.
How do participants describe what worked, what did not, and what would be done differently next time?

Jean Anice found that student journaling, and scheduling with individuals at two facilities, went well. Scheduling conflicts at another center delayed student involvement in service-learning, which delayed the reflections deadline. The human/animal bond program, or pet therapy program, also got a late start. Jean Anice had to temporarily place students elsewhere so that they could earn credit.

Group discussions with students went very well although the blog was not as effective as Jean had hoped. She “would like for the blog to be more like a chat room.” Students did not comment on others’ postings and share ideas as she had hoped. Instead, they tended to use the blog to write facts about what happened on their visit.

In preparing for closing ceremonies, the greatest challenge was having students integrate all content into a single PowerPoint presentation without delay. During one of the events, the technology failed altogether so the students read quotes from the PowerPoint presentation on paper, which opened the conversation with elders, making this glitch an enabler for discussion.

While Jean Anice described student change in a single case, and student survey results showed positive attitudinal change among many students. One student wrote, “I originally did not like older people. Now I do not believe they are all that bad,” and another reported a sentiment shared by several, “My beliefs changed…I learned that they are just like me and that they have thoughts of their own and a whole lifetime of experience that they can share.” Another student became conscious of social justice issues like government control of assets in later life and elderly housing. Nine of the fourteen students who provided qualitative data on a follow-up student survey indicated that they would like to continue to perform some variation of service-
learning in the future, beyond the scope of this class. Two students remarked that they would like to continue but did not know how.

Students submitted ideas for improving the class next time. Several suggested reducing the time commitment each week. For one, transportation was a serious issue. Depending on strangers in the class for a ride to a service-learning site was “awkward” and it seemed unfair to grade on number of visits when transportation was not readily available. Some students felt the experience could have been improved if they had served in a different capacity than what was selected, or available to them at the time.

What are the perceived barriers to the adoption of ASL? What are the perceived enablers to the adoption of ASL?

Semester time constraints and the logistics of scheduling with community partners were perceived barriers to the successful implementation of Jean’s program. The fifteen-week semester schedule followed by the university differed greatly from the ongoing schedule and day-to-day operations of skilled nursing facilities. Scheduling with partners could take weeks. Because several delays were experienced, course deadlines were adjusted and some students participated in an alternate program until their assigned program could begin. Jean Anice considered her full implementation of academic service-learning a success despite delays but clearly described her efforts by stating, “Oh my goodness! I work myself half to death.”

The most significant barrier Jean encountered was a fear of aging and/or disability in some students who chose the pet program instead of the Friendly Visitor program. She perceived a high risk in sending students into the community who found an elder “disgusting or distasteful or repulsive,” even though she spent time early in the semester preparing students.
Instead of pressing the issue, Jean Anice reflected on her own cheerleader attitude and realized she may have overlooked the less-than-positive aspects of the intended student experience.

Jean Anice perceived the blog as a barrier to building community in the course. Students used the tool to post facts about what happened. Few, if any, posts were made in response to other student posts, and many avoided posting negative comments about experiences that might have been perceived as a call for help or new ideas. Jean Anice began to redirect students to post “not just the joy but also the anxiety” of their experiences to the blog.

Growing class size was a barrier to placing students in supervised and meaningful partnerships with the community although Jean Anice did find ways to cope. As enrollment increased, she was asked to consider dropping service-learning from the introductory course. She refused on the grounds that it should be sustained “to keep the goodness of the program,” and that withdrawing would leave the community partners and elders in a lurch.

The greatest enabler for Jean Anice was having a Department Chair familiar with outreach. Aside from cautionary advice about needing to publish her academic service-learning efforts in peer-reviewed journals, he was verbally supportive of her work.

Some aspects of the service-learning experience were both barriers and enablers for Jean. For example, her status as a specialist in the department freed her to be innovative. However, her innovativeness could not be fully understood and appreciated. Likewise, her initial lack of community connections proved to be a barrier to placing students in the community. Over time, though, her growing list of community partners has generated broader interest, making it a strong enabler to student placement and positive experiences.
Is there a knowledge and practice gap and if so, what is that?

Jean described her service-learning practice as “always evolving.” While she had anticipated implementing a mealtime companion program, she implemented the Friendly Visitors program instead. The foundational goals of both programs were met this semester. She added a pet therapy program after the semester had begun and after establishing the initial objectives for students. Thirty-one students responded to a survey about whether or not each objective for this course was met. A large majority of students indicated that all objectives were met. Some of those who dissented gave reasonable explanations as to why the objectives were not fully met in their case, and possibly in the case of others. There were no outstanding gaps in Jean Anice’s knowledge and practice with the implementation of academic service-learning.

Confirmation Stage

How do faculty explain the decision to adopt, reject, discontinue or re-invent ASL for future courses?

Jean viewed her academic service-learning strategy as one way to influence students and community members far beyond those directly involved. Students talked to their peers about the experience, and elders talked to one another and witnessed visits happening with others in their facility. Jean Anice described her service-learning program as transformative (Mezirow, 2000) for students and elders alike:

…they [students] think that aging is disability, decline, death, that there’s no life left in a person once their skin is sagging, their hair is gray and their eyes are cloudy from cataracts. They think that when all of that happens that their life is cloudy and [pause] they, they become awakened, the students just become awakened to this idea that elders
are just as amazing as their classmates and just as interesting, maybe even more so than their classmates, and they, they lose this fear of...I think many of them begin to lose the fear of aging itself but many more of them lose the fear of engaging and interacting with an older person...I have students who have gone onto to graduate school to work with older people...elders talk about...the students about how they have really changed their life and they’ve really brightened their day and so I think in that regard...reaching the elders is also transforming their lives in a strong way.

Jean felt that many students enjoyed the service-learning experience and found it relaxing despite initial concerns that it required an excessive amount of time. Jean’s workload, however, was enormous. The departmental “scuttlebut” had it that “fifteen publications and three grants” were expected for tenure. With that in mind, she struggled not to exceed her required thirty-five percent commitment to teaching. However, she felt that teaching demanded about fifty percent of her time. Competing with her passion for service-learning were research projects and manuscripts, “where I get tenure, this is where I get promotions. Where I get to keep my job. The fact that I am transforming a couple hundred lives a semester is not going to get me promotion and tenure.”

Jean Anice strived to find ways to save time and carry on all activities simultaneously, saying “I am not interested in reducing the service-learning.” Jean’s long-term goals were focused on achieving promotion and tenure through scholarly work that fully incorporated cultural, international, and service-learning issues. Her convictions were reinforced this semester given her course experience and through the Fellows program.
…I’m as I say burning the candle at both ends and have just lit the middle, I’m confident this program is worth keeping. It’s worth keeping. It’s worth sustaining. It’s worth making it an integral part of this course as long as I can possibly keep it there.

Summary

Jean Anice was a non-traditional college student whose views of the world were broadened with her higher education and life experiences. As an undergraduate her career decisions were transformed through the experience of an immersive internship with Cambodian elder. She described a second “transformational” experience in graduate school. During a community volunteer activity she witnessed the impact she had, and knew that someday she would require her students to also volunteer. Jean Anice learned the term service-learning at a conference, and through experience, colleagues, community partners, students and the Office of Service-Learning Fellows program, came to define the term as going into the community, recognizing a legitimate problem, and working with students and community partners to address it. She came to feel that structured reflection was an important part of that.

Jean Anice was ambitious in planning for, implementing, and reflecting on academic service-learning as an Assistant Professor. She spent a year establishing community partnerships, conducted a pilot test of community programs, co-taught a large course that included a service-learning activity, and relied on her experiences to fully implement academic service-learning this semester. Jean Anice spoke of lighting fires, changing lives, and being passionate without knowing why. With a feminist pedagogy she encountered and overcame barriers to implementation, making new plans for next time and expanding her ideas to a global community.

Finding balance between scholarly expectations and service-learning was a challenge. Jean Anice became immersed in research, grant and publication activities. She knew the tenure
“scuttlebutt” and constantly struggled with time commitments. Even so, she refused to compromise her scholarly activities and service-learning programs.

Al Chemy

Prior Conditions

What are the prior conditions and characteristics of faculty who intend to try out academic service-learning (ASL) at this institution?

Al is a thirty-five year old, clinical graduate faculty of Allied Health. He teaches twelve months a year and is in his fifth year in this position. Each week, he works directly with students between ten and twenty hours in the classroom and in the local hospitals. Al’s interests are patient care, and translational research that he describes as, “…how we take the theories and the things we’ve learned in basic science and apply them into real clinical practice.” Al came to value the impact of volunteerism and practice when he worked and lived in a rural community. In keeping with his applied interests, Al plans to incorporate service-learning into an elective course this semester to reach those in the community who most need access to critical health information.

As a college student, Al was never taught with a service-learning strategy. Instead, the typical practice was lecture with three tests a semester, labs in the second and third years, and experience training in the fourth. The curriculum seemed disjointed, requiring science courses and experiences that felt somehow unrelated. Only after entering the workforce did Al fully put the pieces together to understand why certain subjects were important and how they related to the job at-hand.
After completing a doctoral degree in his discipline, Al “was struck by our healthcare systems inability to achieve the outcomes for our patients that could and should be occurring.” To address the issue, he returned to school for six years on a full scholarship to earn a Ph.D. at his current institution. Recruited by his university to teach afterward felt like a good decision because it was a good match for his interests and knowledge, and because he was both loyal to, and proud of, his alma mater.

Al was hired to spend one hundred percent of his time teaching and serving local hospitals. Even so, he maintained a research agenda as long as possible, believing that it would be beneficial during his review for promotion. The review committee would be comprised of tenure-track faculty whose experiences were primarily with research, and not necessarily with teaching and service. Al’s passion became research, and if his teaching load were reduced, he felt could handle both teaching and research expectations indefinitely as a clinical faculty.

Knowing that his teaching load would not be reduced, and that his research might suffer as a result, he once applied for a tenure track position in the department but was not hired. The reason, he was told, was that the department could keep him as a clinical teaching faculty and hire someone new to conduct research. He perceived internal bias and “probably would have never applied” had he known.

Al successfully completed his fifth-year review by the end of this study. The Board of Regents approved a promotion to Associate Professor, a change that promised to bring more stability to his job, and an increase in pay in the next eight months.
How do faculty describe prior teaching practices and perceived pedagogical needs?

Al explained his role in delivering authentic and meaningful instruction by saying, “I cannot learn or apply the material for any student; however I can create situations where the student can find the relevance of knowing the material and knowing how to apply their knowledge...” One way of creating relevance was to take students into the community for on-the-job training, a common practice in his discipline.

Al felt that he should incorporate strategies in his teaching that gave his students and the University positive recognition. He wanted his students to get professional, applied experience that contributed to their own academic competitiveness. Al felt that students needed to participate in conferences and other scholarly activities and gain applied experiences to be competitive among their peers at other institutions.

Al taught students to learn for a life span. He felt that adults had to have a reason to learn, and that traditional students needed to be aware that what they were learning could be applied in the real world. He perceived traditional students who were in the range of eighteen to twenty-two years of age as feeling “upset when things don’t work perfectly” while those who were older, like himself, “realize that everything is goofed up and it’s just a miracle when it does work.” He hoped all his students would learn practical skills and develop a desire to return to their hometowns to make a difference in healthcare services there.

As a student teaching assistant for four years (in the same two labs he teaches now), Al’s pedagogy was one of experience training with lecture and question and answer. In experience training courses, he generally had about thirteen students. Reflection was not a formal part of the course structure although he incorporated it spontaneously to make the most of what might otherwise be perceived as a negative student experience. He described one example where a
student went to a hospital emergency room rather than the pharmacy for her assignment, and said she was ready to work for the next two hours. The ER staff put her to work and she was “freaked out” by the situation. In the end, there was a learning experience but only due to focused reflection on the exposure gained and on learner deficiencies.

In large classes, Al interrupted “the rhythm and the monotony” by incorporating cartoons, cases, questions, and anything to help stimulate students. In contrast, when teaching very small numbers of students in the hospitals, his pedagogy of choice was pimping which he described as putting students “on the spot, in front of all your peers, and you get nailed.”

…we continually pimp them with questions and, you know, get them thinking through the process…they can’t guess at these things…if you don’t know it you need to say you don’t know it and go figure it out really fast – um, where to look it up, how to look it up, what’s going on. Uh, but then if that’s your answer, be confident in your answer.

He described the process as “one of the most humiliating things you’ll ever do” but also as a “great process” because it prevented harm to patients due to arrogance and negligence.

Al tried out a form of academic service-learning one year ago, for one semester, without knowing there was a term for it. He taught an elective, outreach course to eight, hand-picked students who were recognized leaders in the program. The focus of the course was providing community service. There were whole class reflections on what worked and what did not. As a result, the group decided to do more advertising to increase participation, and to concentrate on project management to better pull the many pieces together for their service projects next time. These were the kinds of problems Al faced this semester during implementation.
How do faculty perceive their overall innovativeness within their department and within the discipline?

Al perceived a wide range of innovativeness in his department. He described some colleagues as “people who probably would do more and are more aggressive” than he, and described himself as “extremely traditional with lots of things.” Even so, Al perceived himself as one who took risks and who was resilient:

…if it [a service-learning project] totally screws up and is a complete failure, then I’ll just try something different next year…this is all a gamble, we’re doing the best we can, and if you don’t take a chance you will never succeed.

Service-learning was attractive to him partly because he felt it went beyond the comfort zone to enable things that would never be done otherwise. He perceived his use of it as “somewhat innovative,” because it enhanced the practice of experience training already in place in his department.

Knowledge Stage

How did participants come to know about ASL?

Al came to know the term academic service-learning through the Office of Service-Learning Fellows program this year. During one of the meetings he began to distinguish between experience training and service-learning. “It’s [service-learning] asking that extra question [through reflection]. It’s getting more into…the emotion/feelings processes that they may be going through.”

One year ago, Al had implemented a form of academic service-learning into his course without realizing what it was called. His outreach course was designed to get students into the
community, providing a service to those in need. Reflection was loosely structured as a group activity – a reflection on the process and the logistics of being a service provider.

Al attributed his decision to try out service-learning to two people who were friends and colleagues. One person, Al’s former major professor, was an excellent communicator and teacher who believed in self-reflection. Another influential person had a “just do it attitude” and believed in “stepping out of the comfort zones.” Al was influenced by his own prior experience in serving a niche for patients in a rural part of the state. He and his wife started a pharmacy and provided diabetes awareness information through their church. Al learned that despite not knowing everything, one could still help others in need.

How do participants define pedagogy and service-learning?

Al described pedagogy as “the study of teaching,” a practice that helps engage and show students how to learn. He perceived an evolution in his department with students moving from engagement in didactic/case study courses, to experience training in the field, and now to service-learning. Each change brought them closer to authentic learning experiences critically important for understanding patient care.

As a “coach or mentor,” Al empowered his students to make sense of the real-world experiences. “I cannot learn or apply the material for any student; however I can create situations where the student can find the relevance...” Al’s service-learning course was the most loosely structured of all his previous courses. He felt that flexibility and taking advantage of opportunities and student motivations is key for meaningful service-learning. He encouraged students to go into the community and ask questions of “key contacts” to derive projects from needs in the community:
...just because we in our white, upper-middle class society believe that that may be a problem in the community for the Hispanic population or for, uh, the poor population...is that really what they need is that what they, they perceive that they need?

He gave students the “reins” to initiate projects, work directly with community partners, and to manage service-learning projects throughout the semester. He acted as a guide and colleague to ensure the work gets done, and to incorporate resources that informed and facilitated the process.

**What is the perceived value of ASL within the department and within the discipline?**

Al did not feel that service-learning was valued in terms of “research dollars” in his field. He did, however, feel that he could connect his work to scholarly publications for recognition in his department. In terms of teaching, service-learning caused Al to be more flexible and subjective in his approach. He perceived this as a value to him and to his students who might otherwise never have that experience. For students, too, service-learning was valuable in terms of contextualizing knowledge and in answering important questions about what they do and do not like prior to beginning a career.

...was it really just the preceptor that they didn’t like but they would absolutely love pediatrics otherwise? Or is it that they can’t stand seeing sick children and that crushes their heart, or they want to slap the parents who don’t take care of the kids which I’ve heard from pediatricians coming back that get so frustrated with the system itself that they can’t do more for the kids. You know, where is your area of specialty or do you want to be a generalist? Or, you know, and so I think that the service-learning can really help pull some of that out of there, uh, give more context to what they’re learning.
Al felt that service-learning expanded the basic experiential model applied in some courses, because it required a component of reflection that created a “deeper, richer education.” Through reflective activities, Al became more aware of student misconceptions, attitudes and approaches to problem solving. At the conclusion of the semester, Al described service-learning as a “win-win-win” situation in which the university, community, and student all benefited.

Persuasion Stage

How do participants describe the influence, if any, of the OSLF program on favorable or unfavorable attitude formation?

Al heard about the Office of Service-Learning Fellows (OSLF) program in an email he received from a colleague in continuing education. He felt the program aligned with what he was already doing and, resenting the fact that clinical-track faculty were ineligible for another popular teaching fellowship on campus, he made plans to apply to this one. Al wrote that his primary reasons for joining were to “…learn more; become a better teacher; see how others teach across campus.” He had not participated in a formal, faculty professional development program in the past.

Al had done very little journaling prior to the Fellows program. During the Fellows retreat, he found that before reflecting on “what was really important,” he had to clear his mind of concerns and worries, and then consider what he was trying to do for the long-term. At the retreat, Al openly expressed frustration with the tenure and promotion process and with his course overload.

Al experienced a great sense of support from the people involved in the Fellows program, and witnessed the work of others who took risks and “really push the education” at UGA. He
appreciated seeing others’ successes and challenges and found a great deal of similarity in effort across disciplines. He felt that the program brought awareness, clarification, and deepened his understanding of service-learning. The funding was motivating to him and his students, enabling the purchase of supplies and services for student service-learning projects and professional conference posters.

Decision Stage

Do faculty anticipate implementing ASL and if so, how? If not, why?

As a business owner in a rural community, Al came to believe that service to society was critical and that the impact was more significant than one might expect. While he did not know the term “service-learning” and was not in a position to teach at the time, he came to believe that it was necessary. He continued to volunteer and to incorporate service in his other activities. Last fall, Al anticipated implementing service-learning in a required, experience lab for third-year students. Instead, he changed his plan to implement service-learning in an elective, experiential learning course in the Spring. His students would be at least in their fourth year of college and in their second and third year of the particular degree program in which the course was offered. Al planned for student projects to unfold in four phases, including: 1) developing ideas from literature and Internet searches; 2) gathering and creating materials; 3) negotiating details and implementing projects; and 4) reflecting on the experience and building scholarship as a result. More specifically, he commented that his students were to do the following in this course:

• help guide their own learning in this course;
• make project interests known;
• evaluate a community problem;
• plan, individually or collaboratively, to solve the community problem;
• use a journal or log to help narrow and focus the project idea;
• help write an abstract and create a poster for a project OR write a full term paper;
• attend a class in which a guest lecturer spoke project areas;
• help recruit other students in the program to assist with a project;
• help incorporate existing materials into a project;
• help implement a community project;
• help overcome barriers to a project;
• engage with patients and/or community members one-on-one during project implementation;
• counsel patients and/or community members at a level appropriate for their understanding and needs;
• learn about project management through a community project experience;
• learn from problems and/or mistakes associated with a project;
• revisit, with their group, the scope of the project during the semester;
• revisit, with their group, the project timeline during the semester;
• reflect on guest speaker(s) presentations, journal articles and community project experience;
• plan to submit paper or poster to a state, regional or national meeting; and
• be motivated to solve other community problems.
Implementation Stage

How is ASL actually implemented?

Al implemented service-learning into an elective course that met two hours every Tuesday afternoon. His students had very high grade point averages and were involved in professional organizations beyond just their course work. Students freely chose to enroll in the course and as a result exhibited high motivation to participate. Other than Microsoft Word, Al did not use, or have students use, technology during the semester. He had considered using WebCT but found its application rather “nebulous.”

In the service-learning (SL) course, students carried out community interventions as projects, and were held accountable for their efforts. One student clearly described project activities that support many of Al’s course objectives:

We came up with a topic that we wanted to study (pediatrics) and found a project associated with it. We contacted and brought in a speaker who was an expert in that area. Then we researched and compiled several brochures aimed at parents taking care of their children. We went to two different health fairs and talked to many people about the topic.

Al pushed his students to negotiate and compromise in the scheduling process to fit within the constraints of the academic semester. Al’s referred to them as partners. He asked students to consider their own interests, evaluate community needs, and choose a community problem to address. He shared descriptions of projects that had been done as service to the community the previous year. Although he made suggestions about kinds of projects that might be reasonable to complete in the timeframe, some projects were implemented late in the semester. One student noted that, “…when we did not have a great turn out for the first one there
was not a chance to reschedule and try again.” Six of the eleven students who contributed qualitative data on the student survey commented on low “turn out” at community events.

Al described a variety of student projects with topics that included Medicare Part D, geriatrics, pediatrics, and weight management. Students “amazed” Al with their assertiveness by initiating at least two community partnerships. Al knew of one potential partner, and made a “cold call” to form a second partnership. In the end, he felt that there were two key community partners who would continue to work with him in future service-learning endeavors.

Students initiated a relationship with a medical Spanish class through its instructor, to interpret written text for materials, and to translate presentation information during a Hispanic health fair. By communicating directly with the community partner, students learned that community members would be more trusting of them and their message if the students conducted basic health evaluations of participants first, which they did. The health fair was a success although language barriers did exist.

One student project involved a “brown bag medication review” for older adults in the community. It, too, was a success according to Al’s written reflection:

Student recommendations will save one patient nearly $300/month in her medication costs, another ~$100/month in medication costs and identified several issues with treatment that need to [be] addressed by the primary care physicians.

Students worked in groups during the medication review because the event was not well attended, requiring fewer individual consultations. Given student feedback, Al associated low attendance with poor advertising. Roughly two weeks later, he reported low attendance at a different site due to inclement weather. One student described the set back as a learning experience, stating that:
I have learned from this experience that more emphasis and focus needs to be placed on marketing the events. I also think we can target community centers and other organizations that are already fairly busy and have many patients that can be readily assisted.

Al invited an expert in each project content area to speak to the class. He encouraged his students to draw on existing resources without “recreating the wheel” and to connect their work with professional student organizations to earn service credits there. He asked learners to involve students who were not enrolled in his course, and seventy-five percent of students reported doing so. Al wanted students to realize that doing service-learning did not necessarily end after the project, and that it was important to, in turn, show others what was done, and how, through scholarly work. He explained that building a curriculum vitae through service-learning work did not have to be as rigid as a “placebo controlled trial.”

While the syllabus called for a poster or paper, students commented that the assignment became “more a learning experience than a project,” and “…our final projects/papers were kind of overlooked [due to lack of time in the semester].” Fifty-eight percent of students who completed the research survey indicated that they had helped write an abstract and create a poster or wrote a full term paper. Only thirty-three percent of respondents wrote that they planned to submit their paper or poster to a state, regional or national meeting.

Students were asked to keep a journal to summarize guest lectures and articles shared in class, and to reflect on what was learned and what was difficult. Eighty-three percent of students reported using a journal to narrow or focus the project idea. Without time for focused reflection at the end of the semester, one student commented, “I think every student has the ability to internally reflect on how they think the project went and what they got out of it.”
Al did not feel comfortable grading the journals and had not tried such a subjective measure of assessment in the past. He described his discipline (and its people) as “anal retentive” and that traditionally, the discipline called for things to be “objectively measured.” His struggle was primarily in understanding how to explain to students what was needed in the reflection. He hoped the journal would become more useful with experience.

How do faculty plan and prepare for ASL implementation?

When planning for several community projects, Al worked with a contact at a local church – a pastor who served an area that could likely benefit. The pastor was excited about the pediatrics, healthy foods, and women’s health projects Al proposed, and made several specific suggestions to best meet the community’s needs in those areas. Most surprising was the “point blank” request for birth control training, a request that was far less conservative than the kinds of needs Al had anticipated from the pastor. Al felt it was important that project ideas emerge from current community needs and his planning reflected that. Although he did plan and prepare for his course, he also left it open to student creativity and whatever the community needs might be during the semester. The flexible planning prompted one student to write, “I think the beginning of the semester should include projects that are already planned by the professor so that the students can understand what expectations the community has from them.”

How do participants describe what worked, what did not, and what would be done differently next time?

The beginning of the semester was a very stressful time for Al because he was planning for service-learning while teaching several other classes. He hoped to be more organized with
academic service-learning next time. He credited the success of the course to “releasing the reins and letting them [students] go.” Al felt fortunate to have had busy but highly motivated students, and was uncertain how he would address student apathy (as might occur in a required course) had that emerged in his first attempt with service-learning.

When students had trouble negotiating reasonable project timelines, it worked well to have them work backward from the final deadline to create more feasible plans. The difficulty was having students avoid procrastination and begin to compromise resources and outcomes to complete their projects. Community participation in events was lower than expected, and attributed to poor marketing and inclement weather. When projects occurred late in the semester, there was not enough time to advertise and try again. Al decided that in the future he would limit the number of projects and create more structured guidelines for completion.

Students seemed to benefit from the community and teamwork experiences. One commented, “I knew it was a problem but I did not know that people were in need of it [services] as much as they are.” Another wrote, “Working at this service learning project and the mercy clinic have shown me that multidisciplinary teams are not a novelty – they are necessary.” All six students who responded with qualitative data on the survey wrote that they would continue to provide this type of service in the community after finishing the course.

What are the perceived barriers to the adoption of ASL? What are the perceived enablers to the adoption of ASL?

Al described his learners as second and third year professional students, some of whom where “definitely go-getters.” Those he usually considered “corner wallflowers” took a surprisingly active role in solving authentic problems in the service-learning course. Even
though students were somewhat uncertain about their projects, Al perceived his students to be the greatest enabler of the course’s success. Because of their motivation and ambition, new partners were made and creative projects were implemented. Al attributed a small part of student motivation to the Office of Service-Learning funds that were used to advertise and pay for costs associated with student projects.

Scheduling proved to be a challenge when coordinating community and student schedules. Al’s role was as a “middle-man,” working with students and community members to determine availability. Student schedules were difficult to navigate because they had an eighteen to twenty-one hour-a-semester course load. One student commented that, “the pressures of other classes…were relentless.” Another wrote, “We were going to do a Medicare presentation but couldn’t due to everyone’s schedule.” Because third-year student schedules are more flexible than second-year, Al decided next time to open the course only to third-year students.

In general, Al felt that his service-learning course was “non-traditional,” requiring extensive time for implementation. He found time commitments difficult to reconcile with his heavy teaching load and a faculty shortage he perceived in the department. Al did try to remain flexible and balance his responsibilities throughout the semester, depending largely on students to take initiative. When he had to be out one day, he found unexpected support from colleagues, including the Associate Dean, who offered to teach the class in his absence.

A heavy teaching load and lack of support for Al’s research created the greatest barrier to his continuation with academic service-learning. Al felt misunderstood as a clinical faculty, and unfairly evaluated on the number of grants received and dollars generated rather than teaching. He found it difficult to compare his job to others around the state because of variables like institutional size, number of enrolled students, and lab requirements. He regularly encountered
others who commented that clinical faculty were like adjuncts, and were not required to show scholarship. In reality, Al felt judged by traditional models of review that valued research more than teaching. He felt obliged to publish and maintain a level of scholarly activity but had difficulty balancing that while budgeted for one hundred percent commitment to teaching. His time commitment in the classroom and in service to local hospitals caused Al to miss a professional meeting last semester, and to discontinue a research trial that would lead to a grant application. Overall, Al felt his efforts were not effectively recognized, rewarded, or supported.

Is there a knowledge and practice gap and if so, what is that?

Al’s previous knowledge and experience with teaching involved lecture, case study, experience training and having students work with preceptors in the community for several weeks to gain professional experience. He was used to teaching in the hospitals by “pimping” his students with questions to test their knowledge and encourage critical thinking.

In the Fellows program, Al began to distinguish between what he had known and what he perceived as a much more subjective and a mutually beneficial relationship between students and the community. The Fellows program emphasized reflection as a form of assessment. Al felt reflection was critical to understanding the student perspective, and that that perspective was critical to learning and solving complex problems in the real world.

Although Al’s account of implementation was supported by student data, there were three noticeable discrepancies in what Al seemed to know and do in a broader sense. The first discrepancy in knowing and doing was a lack of change after last year’s service-learning experience. Al had tried service-learning the year prior to this study and found that more and consistent advertising was needed, and that project management should be improved. Both areas
were described as needing to be improved in this course as well. Although greater planning and a stronger faculty role may have helped organize the semester, little was done in that regard. In his defense, Al felt overwhelmed with teaching and other scholarly expectations that extended beyond the scope of this course.

Al knew the responsibilities of his job involved teaching a full load of courses, twelve months a year, and conducting clinical service in the local hospitals. He felt that he was unfairly evaluated on research and grants despite his budgeted assignment. Al attempted to maintain an active research agenda so that he could eventually move into a tenure track position. His plan differed from departmental expectations, and when he was not allowed to move into a tenure track position, he was no longer satisfied in his job.

Finally, there was the irony of leaving his teaching position. Al was passionate about teaching and the hands-on nature of making a direct difference in others’ lives. In his new job he would not have the opportunity to teach, aside from occasional lectures, and instead of working directly in the community as he had enjoyed in the past, he would conduct research in a lab as his full-time responsibility.

Confirmation Stage

How do faculty explain the decision to adopt, reject, discontinue or re-invent ASL for future courses?

Al entered into the semester with a flexible plan, knowing that he had to be “prepared for anything,” and he allowed his course to evolve over time. He was open to change and was heavily influenced by student motivations. He was also influenced by community partner suggestions such as adding basic health assessment services on-site to build patient trust. He was
not an expert in each content area chosen for student projects but did gather the resources needed to support learning in each content area. Al helped students experience real-world situations and apply their knowledge to solve authentic problems.

He “released” his students and found that just as he was willing to put in more effort than usual, so were they. Al talked about “having the reins,” “pulling back the reins” to ensure projects were completed in the semester time frame, “releasing the reins” to allow for student creativity, and how quiet students have “pulled off the reins” to find their passion in service-learning projects.

On the downside, Al perceived “challenges all the way through” the course because he could not be fully prepared, and found a great deal of “busy work” in planning and working with community partners. He expected students to bear the brunt of the busy work by resolving most problems and being accountable. However, he was responsible for guiding all projects and that was a new role for him.

Al never felt completely confident teaching with service-learning during the semester although it was exciting to make a difference, and he felt more confident later than earlier in the semester. He contrasted the free-flowing spirit of service-learning to the “anal retentive” nature of his discipline and the objective nature of scientific testing and research. He was uncertain how best to measure success, and commented late in the semester that “we really weren’t able to do much…at this point,” despite having worked directly with the community to resolve health issues. Al did talk about the positive aspect of simply having the university ask what the community needed rather than expecting the community to go along with ideas generated by the university.
Academic service-learning was a difficult task to balance with scholarly expectations and a full teaching load and clinical service. Al felt pressure to show research productivity for promotion. With time he came to realize his passion for research, and the struggle of being pulled too many directions at once.

In Al’s discipline, there was a “push” for more clinical field experience. However, the approach was “quick” and generally without deep reflection. Al felt that this would continue to be the case, even though more meaningful learning experiences seemed to occur with deep reflection. While service-learning appeared a good strategy, Al was uncertain how other faculty in his department who were “so overwhelmed in opportunities and responsibilities” could possibly implement service-learning into their courses. He felt large projects could be sustained with proper funding and attention from the University, but that once the spotlight faded, the resources may also fade.

Coincidentally, when Al’s teaching obligations began to overshadow his research plans, he was recruited in response to an article about his translational work. Al described the recruiter’s job as totally funded research that impacted millions of lives, and led to articles in respected journals like JAMA and Internal Medicine. Frustrated with the steep course load and lack of support for research and tenure at his institution, Al accepted a Senior Manager position with the company, making this his last semester to teach with service-learning.

I have no ability to do the things that I want to do…when you’re spending your time doing the things that…you’re having to do because you gotta’ do ‘em, and not getting to do the things that you’re passionate about (pause) is where the frustration comes… I’ve got twenty-four publications in my five years… I’ve done the above and beyond to show that I’m worthy to do the tenure track.
Al perceived fifteen publications and two grants to be a typical expectation for tenure. Because of his commitment to teaching, he had no time to obtain grants. Had he moved into a tenure track position, he would have had to start as an Assistant Professor despite scholarly activity in the past. “I’m not going to continue to go seventy hours a week and miss my children growing up, for that…[to] start that clock all over again.”

Al felt the opportunity to experience new things and learn other perspectives in the business world would only make him more marketable in academia later, should he decide to return. He could become an adjunct professor while working in business, teaching for his alma mater at a distance, or by delivering dynamic guest lectures that incorporate case studies not found in textbooks. He hoped to implement a “rotation cycle” where students from his current program could visit his new site for experience training. He would serve as a preceptor or community partner. Al would likely have little opportunity for academic service-learning.

When asked about his five-year plan at the end of the study, Al wanted most to be a good researcher. Ten years ago he would have jumped at any opportunity to advance in the company, but that kind of decision in the future would have to be tempered by family commitments. He would “much prefer to be known as a good father than to be known as a good manager.”

Summary

Al described his discipline as objective and scientific. As a student he was taught using traditional methods that involved lecture and lab. Lecture, case study, pimping and experience training were pedagogical practices in modern day courses in his discipline. When Al learned of academic service-learning through a colleague, he felt it must be a natural extension of experiential training. He had realized years earlier the impact one could have on a community,
and hoped to instill that value in his students. Al came to know about academic service-learning not only through personal experiences, but also through colleagues, students, community partners, and the Office of Service-Learning Fellows program. In the program he began to distinguish academic service-learning from other pedagogical practices, and reflection became central to its definition.

Al described himself as an average innovator among his peers. He took risks, including the venture into academic service-learning this semester. Although projects were successful, he struggled with control and often spoke of “pulling back the reins” and “releasing the reins” to help students get things done. He found it difficult to explain to his students how to reflect in a meaningful way through journaling, and with how to grade the journals. He reported never feeling fully confident with service-learning. Al was resilient and expected his students to demonstrate resilience by overcoming real-world obstacles. To Al, doing service-learning meant taking advantage of opportunities to solve immediate community problems while being flexible enough to overcome barriers.

In addition to teaching challenges, Al perceived challenges of inequity and internal bias in his department. During evaluations he felt grants and research carried more weight than teaching and publications. Al had hoped to move into a tenure-track position but was rejected when he applied, despite many publications and a research agenda. He tried to maintain his research while teaching, but eventually could not do both. Al also perceived bias against clinical faculty who many believed had no scholarly responsibilities. These perceptions led to dissatisfaction and when the opportunity arose, he left the institution. Al’s adoption-decision was to discontinue service-learning, one potential outcome of Rogers’ (2003) innovation-decision process. In reality, Al’s decision was more complicated than simple discontinuance.
Conclusion

This chapter presented data for three early-career faculty who came to know about, and implement, academic service-learning. The participants were unique in their focused life history discussions although each person described a meaningful early experience that predisposed them to the idea of service-learning. As faculty, participants sought to formally integrate service-learning in their teaching and each participant encountered barriers and enablers to implementation. The most common barrier was scheduling with community partners, particularly at the beginning of the semester when participants were eager to get started. Participants in this study wanted to learn more about academic service-learning when they joined the Office of Service-Learning Fellows program. The Fellows program enabled deep reflection on the teaching and learning experience, and facilitated thinking that developed into decisions of long-term adoption or discontinuance of the pedagogy of service-learning. The decision-making process was influenced by scholarly expectations. Individual case studies revealed innovation-decision processes that shared some common themes among participants. Emerging themes will be explored further in the next chapter, a cross-case analysis.
CHAPTER V: CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS

Introduction

Several themes emerged across cases in response to the overarching question, How do early-career faculty come to make innovative pedagogy adoption decisions at a research-intensive university? Participants had unique perspectives on the relationship between teaching and scholarship, and all reported discrepancies in scholarship. Barriers to implementation emerged with some consistency but all persisted in the innovation-decision process, citing informal and formal learning experiences as motivators. Rogers’ (2003) model of the innovation-decision process involves progressive stages of decision-making that include knowledge, persuasion, decision, implementation, and confirmation stages. In this cross-case analysis I will describe the following factors that influenced the innovation-decision process: 1) participant perceptions of the relationship between teaching and scholarship, 2) pervasive discrepancies in scholarship, 3) barriers to implementation, and 4) the role of experiential learning in persistence.

Participant Profile

To situate the cross-case analysis of data, it is useful to note that participants in this study differed in their obligations to the university. Bill was an Assistant Professor in an applied discipline where teaching and the development of products and exhibits were appropriate forms of scholarship. In contrast, Jean Anice was hired to conduct research first and foremost, and then
to teach. Both were tenure-track faculty. Al was a clinical faculty, who was expected to teach fulltime. He worked twelve months a year in classroom and clinical settings. The role of clinical faculty was relatively new and he felt his tenure-track peers valued teaching less than publications and research in his reviews. These three faculty participants were the innovators of interest on this campus. Their unique perspectives, and similarities, shed light on the challenges of institutionalizing pedagogical innovation at the research-intensive university. Table 3 shows the participant profile for this study.

The Perceived Relationship Between Teaching and Scholarship

Participants in this case study perceived a relationship between teaching and scholarship that fundamentally influenced the innovation-decision process. Bill D. Green perceived teaching as scholarship. Jean Anice perceived the need for teaching and scholarship, and Al Chemy perceived a conflict between teaching and scholarship. These unique perspectives contributed to a rich description of innovative faculty as scholars.

Teaching as Scholarship

Bill had taught for many years before coming to this university. As a graduate student, he served as a teaching assistant for two years. He graduated with a terminal master’s degree from the research-intensive university of interest in this study. For six years Bill taught one course a year as an adjunct while working in business. He teaches the same course now, in addition to lecture, studio, and other practicum courses, as a tenure-track faculty.

Teaching was considered scholarly in Bill’s department, and scholarship was generally defined in non-traditional terms. Bill noted that the justification process for tenure had “always
been a big deal in our department…I think the cover letter [for materials sent to the university committee] is really important to set the context of this promotion and tenure that it’s not…phd research faculty.” He likened departmental scholarship to that of a fine arts faculty who would be rewarded for publications for “built works” and “exhibits.” Bill described his discipline as “practice oriented” and commented that he, himself, had just received an award for an exhibit.

Teaching was expected. Bill commented that his department “does have some official FTE [requirement] but whatever it is, it’s just here for show…if you look at our schedule we’re all basically one hundred percent teaching.” He felt expected to teach a minimum of five courses per year, and reported teaching four courses during the one semester of data collection for this study.

As Bill reflected on his teaching, he realized he had incorporated some aspect of service-learning, or “learning by doing,” in all his courses. He considered his teaching and service-learning to be “inseparable.” Bill perceived teaching as a scholarly activity that reflected departmental values and was rewarded. He hoped to connect research and publication to his class projects at some point in the future. At his third-year review he was told everything “is great, just continue what you’re doing, you’re on the right track.”

Teaching and Scholarship

Jean Anice was a teaching assistant for five semesters during her master’s degree program, and had the opportunity to teach her own class as an Instructor for one semester while a graduate student. For two years she has taught at the research site for this study. Jean Anice was hired as an Assistant Professor there to spend forty-five percent of her time on research and thirty percent of her time on teaching during the nine months of her employment each year. Her
commitments were typical of tenure-track faculty at the institution although she struggled to balance her passion for teaching with other responsibilities. She struggled to work less than fifty percent of the time on teaching, lamenting that “the fact that I am transforming a couple hundred lives a semester is not going to get me promotion and tenure.”

Jean Anice hoped to combine service-learning teaching with research but at the moment “only one or two things…come from service-learning and those things that are coming out of service-learning are manuscripts I’m working on.” She described the difficulty further by stating, “it is causing me um a good bit of…angst on trying to make sure it [teaching with service-learning] also fits within the tenure and promotion track.”

She was cautious about how her teaching efforts were perceived by others. Jean Anice kept lists of scholarly activities on a whiteboard in her office to publicly show her efforts, and felt that she needed “to be very careful because…unless I am publishing in peer reviewed journals about that service-learning, no it’s not a scholarly endeavor.” While her department chair reinforced that perception in an earlier evaluation, her colleagues were also quick to warn of potential conflicts between teaching and scholarship:

Be careful. Don’t forget your research. It doesn’t matter what your teaching is all about as long as you get good teaching scores...As long as you get good scores that’s what really matters. Be careful with pushing students too hard because they’re just gonna give you poor scores then.

Teaching with service-learning detracted from Jean Anice’s more meaningful scholarly activities, she stated in an interview. She described the struggle in this way, “because the program takes a lot of brain power it is taking away brain power from manuscript production, grant writing, you know, those sorts of things.” Given the departmental “scuttlebutt,” Jean Anice
perceived fifteen publications and three grants as the expectation for tenure. Even so, she was committed to maintaining her teaching and scholarly agendas in tandem. She was willing to work herself “half to death” and to “burn the candle at both ends.” Jean Anice’s struggle is perhaps best described by Shapiro (2006) who wrote that, “Scholarly contributions to teaching and learning…do not mitigate demands for traditional research productivity” (p. 42).

Teaching Versus Scholarship

For four years, Al served as a teaching assistant during his applied doctoral program, teaching the same two labs he now teaches as a fifth-year, clinical Assistant Professor. He spent the last two years of the same doctoral program working in the hospitals. In his current position, Al spends “ten hours a week…face time and then it’s usually another 10 hours a week with prep and clean up [in the lab].” Al described working with fourth-year students throughout the calendar year, taking them on-site, and doing rotations.

Despite feeling that teaching was a scholarly activity, Al suspected he was evaluated less on teaching than more traditional forms of scholarship like implementing research and obtaining grants. That perspective was reinforced on his application to the Office of Service-Learning Fellows program where his department head described Al as having “scholarship potential,” despite teaching and providing related service one hundred percent of the time, and having twenty-four publications.

The clinical faculty role was relatively new in the department – there were no Full clinical Professors – and Al felt misunderstood. He had heard colleagues on campus unfairly comment that clinical faculty were like adjuncts, and that they had no scholarly. He was excluded from applying to a faculty development program for teaching because he was clinical
and not tenure-track. He described the culture of the university as having “a very low appreciation for teaching, in general,” and in frustration stated that it had been just “another year of getting crapped on. It’s very frustrating…We are the back of the bus community.”

Al perceived the promotion process to be subjective and felt that faculty on the review committee tended to “come back to their traditional models of…how many publications do you have and how many grant dollars do you have coming in?” Al considered himself a “hybrid,” having a PhD and an applied doctoral degree. He had an interest in developing translational research to connect theory and practice. While he tried to maintain a research agenda, publish regularly, and work toward grant opportunities, “teaching became the priority” and he had no time to pursue other activities. Solem and Foote (2006) reported similar experiences with faculty showing “discernible worry” about conflicting scholarly values. Al’s frustration became evident, as he perceived little scholarly opportunity or reward for teaching. He felt that “unfortunately in this position and in this state, currently the way the department is, and the way the college is, I have no ability to do the things that I want to do.” Al left the university at the end of the semester largely due to the perceived conflict between teaching and scholarship, and his role as a clinical faculty.

Discrepancies of Scholarship

As faculty participants talked about scholarship, it became apparent that there were discrepancies in budgeted time for scholarship, perceived expectations for scholarship, and in actual scholarly activity. Each participant responded differently to the challenges of the inconsistencies although a perceived lack of time for scholarship was a consistent theme across cases.
Budgeted Time

The participants in this study were hired under the premise that they would commit a particular percentage of their time to academic efforts. Bill described his budgeted time loosely, and in several ways. His department, he felt, did have some official requirement, “but whatever it is, it’s just here for show…our department doesn’t really focus on that much…[laughing].” He commented that, “we definitely have to do teaching, research and service” but later corrected himself to state that “none of us have any time appointed to service.” His budgeted time for teaching was three courses in the Fall and two in the Spring. When asked for percentages of time budgeted for teaching and research Bill commented, “I think you know, my percentage is probably something like 90/10 or 80/20” on a nine-month contract. Jean Anice’s time was budgeted at forty-five percent research and thirty percent teaching. She had no service requirement, and was on a nine-month contract. In contrast, Al was a clinical faculty whose time was budgeted at one hundred percent teaching and clinical service in the hospitals.

Perceived Expectations

Bill felt that he was expected to teach one hundred percent of the time and to do other scholarly activities in his “free time.” While he tried not to listen to rumors in the department about promotion and tenure expectations, Bill perceived the need to have a peer-reviewed publication or the equivalent, and other minor publications or presentations each year. He had no knowledge of specific numbers of publications or presentations that were expected.

Jean Anice perceived the requirement for tenure to be fifteen publications and three grants. This perception developed from a spontaneous conversation with her former Dean who
proposed those numbers as a goal to attain. There was some perceived flexibility in those numbers as Jean Anice realized individuals might be stronger in some areas than others. Even so, the expectation to do research was great, and she noted that at this institution “You can excel at research or teaching or service but you’d better excel in research.”

Al perceived an expectation to “excel in the three main areas” of teaching, research and service. He felt it necessary to “be good at two out of the three.” However, it did not seem possible given additional expectations to spend twenty to forty percent of his time in “clinical service,” and the remainder of his time in the classroom.

*Scholarly Activity*

In addition to teaching a heavy course load, Bill listed the following kinds of achievements on his vitae: writing, projects, presentations, university committees, community service, professional experience, awards from professional and community organizations, training, teaching, advising. He recently won an award for a project that would be added to his vitae, and has taken a leadership role in several community organizations to support his teaching efforts. Bill planned to conduct scientific research in collaboration with a colleague in the near future, and although he had not applied for a grant other than the Fellows award, he hoped to do so in the future to help fund service-learning activities. While time was set aside each week for teaching and service, research received less attention. Bill fit research into his schedule “wherever.”

Jean Anice maintained an ambitious scholarly agenda. She struggled to keep her teaching activities to fifty percent of her budgeted time, while conducting research, seeking out grants, publishing, and serving on numerous committees and within professional organizations.
Two of her current manuscripts in development relate directly to her teaching with service-learning, and she is “either first author or second author on five abstracts to go to different conferences.” In partnership with a graduate assistant, Jean Anice located existing survey instruments to aid in developing a new, more generic one to enable research of the pet visitor program. She served in various roles on committees for students, the department, the college, the university, and the community. Jean Anice was developing a book proposal, creating an online course, collecting data for a “local research project,” establishing a study abroad program in Cambodia, developing and/or revising five manuscripts, and conducting guest lectures.

Jean Anice had IRB approval to use her student service-learning data for future research. In addition to teaching at the undergraduate level, she hoped to teach graduate courses and to engage more students in research. She intended to seek out grants to help fund her efforts and had established a clear delineation of scholarly efforts in areas of “cross-cultural issues, international issues and service-learning.”

Al spent “between ten and twenty hours a week” teaching and working with students, year-round. He accepted additional courses as needed in the department, and was teaching three courses at the time of this study. He had published twenty-four articles in his five years with the department, and had attempted to maintain an active research agenda until this year.

Barriers To Implementation

The participants in this study described several external barriers to the successful implementation of academic service-learning. Participants had little or no control over these issues that involved scheduling, community partnerships, support, and factors directly related to the teaching and learning process. Important internal barriers, over which participants had more
control, also emerged. To overcome internal barriers would require “challenging one's belief systems and the institutionalized routines of one's practice” (Ertmer, 1999, p. 48). In this section of the cross-case analysis I will describe both types of barriers as factors that directly influenced the innovation-decision process during the implementation stage.

**Scheduling**

Bill described scheduling as a “hassle.” Jean Anice called it a “logistical nightmare;” and Al labeled it “extremely difficult.” These negative perceptions arose from the difficulty participants had in planning for service-learning in the community, on a semester schedule. Bill described it further in this way, “we’ve got this tight timeframe of fifteen weeks to get this project finished and, you know, it might take four weeks to get schedules to coordinate to have an important meeting with someone.” Jean Anice commented that scheduling the very first student-elder meeting could take two weeks. During that time she communicated with community partners for her students, and then dealt with all “last-minute changes.” Jean Anice once spent “a week trying to match four young women in one place because they couldn’t meet at that time and then the residents couldn’t meet at the other time.” A late start due to scheduling problems delayed class deadlines and caused some students to be placed at alternative sites in the semester of this study. Al’s scheduling difficulties were primarily with his students who were in their second and third year with busy academic and extra-curricular schedules. He encouraged his students to negotiate project deadlines keeping in mind there would always be “a compromise between resources and outcomes.”
Community Partnerships

Establishing and sustaining community partnerships was critical to service-learning although it did generate implementation barriers. With limited time for service-learning preparation, Al formed partnerships during the semester in which his course was offered. Poor “turn out,” or participation, at community service-learning events was problematic for student projects designed for one-on-one engagement. Student survey data also reported a lack of community participation. Jean Anice expected one-on-one engagement between all students and community members. She felt it necessary to take a full year to plan her service-learning programs in order to feel comfortable placing her students in the community. Jean Anice described the process of getting started as, “a constant getting to know and getting the word out” in the community.

Even when partnerships were established in advance, other stakeholders created barriers to implementation. For example, Bill found resistance from an influential, indirect partner. Although his elementary school partner was supportive, the Board of Education expressed safety concerns about the development of a rain garden on school property.

Poor communications among collaborators resulted in a variety of barriers. At one service-learning site in the community, there were too few chairs and tables for Al’s health fair; and even with a Spanish language interpreter, there were “language barriers” during the event. In a more serious case, an elder attempted to engage a student of Jean Anice in sexually explicit conversation.
Support

Barriers to implementation also emerged within the university. Despite verbal support for service-learning pedagogy, participant departments did not contribute funds, make curricular changes, or revisit budgeted time for scholarly activities. Bill realized that “if I’m going to do this it has to has to fit” within the class schedule and require “no extra money” for materials. Jean Anice attributed some departmental barriers to increasing class sizes. With a growing number of students to serve, the chair of the undergraduate policies and procedures committee suggested Jean Anice drop service-learning from an introductory course.

Barriers developed through perceived scholarly expectations at the university. Jean Anice and Al felt more heavily evaluated on research and grants than effective teaching. Having been cautioned by colleagues to reduce her teaching efforts and focus on research, Jean Anice decided to publish her service-learning work to maintain scholarship. This created “a good bit of…angst” and she perceived that service-learning “detracted” from her writing of manuscripts and grant proposals in other areas. Jean Anice once commented that at this institution, “You can excel at research or teaching or service but you’d better excel in research.” Time was a significant barrier for she and Al in their efforts to meet scholarly expectations. Al had published twenty-four articles and was near the development of a grant proposal when his department added another course to his load, causing him to set those things aside. Jean Anice found herself “scrambling like a maniac now” to avoid losing the “goodness of the program” later should she have to sacrifice some aspect of her teaching in the promotion and tenure process. Lack of time and lack of reward are often cited as barriers to faculty adoption of innovations, as in this case (Akir, 2003; Bennett & Bennett, 2003; Ely, 1990).
Teaching and Learning

Bill and Al allowed students to set their own deadlines within the semester timeframe, and struggled to keep students from procrastinating. Bill commented, “I am quite sure that I was very specific about the goals early in the semester. I was surprised when the student seemed to have gotten off track.” He and his student had a “communication breakdown” about expectations mid-semester that was discovered in casual conversation outside of class. Al had a similar experience, but in the classroom. He described it in this way:

As we continued to discuss the timeline with little resolution, I kept placing the issue back to the students to give me a commitment. After about 15 minutes of discussion with some intense reactions, the students were able to find a 'better' timeframe realizing that there was no 'best' time to choose. I think the difficulty for the students was how fast the semester moves and a realization that hard choices and compromise has to be made by all.

Jean Anice commented that the barrier of most concern to her involved students. She realized during the semester that some of her students feared elders and possibly found them “disgusting or distasteful or repulsive.” She hoped to avoid harm and chose to give an alternate assignment. The entire experience put Jean Anice in a “very awkward position in the community” and required additional time and effort to resolve.

Teaching with service-learning was time intensive. Jean Anice noted that “it takes a lot of guidance, it takes a lot of ‘here’s what I mean,’ it takes a tremendous amount of feedback on those journals, it takes a tremendous amount of feedback in our small group discussion.” The nature of service-learning was dynamic and unpredictable, as noted by AI who said, “you’re always on your toes and there’s always something you have to be prepared for.”
Jean Anice found the blog to be problematic and wished it were more like a “chat room” where students would reflect and critique rather than simply report isolated facts about their experiences. She wondered if students engaged with their elders “beyond a superficial level.” Al struggled to explain the requirements for reflection and to grade student reflections, commenting that “I am challenging the students but at the same time it’s a challenge to me.” He went on to explain his own difficulty moving from objective to subjective forms of assessment: “I really haven’t felt confident with…what we’re trying to achieve…we know we are doing some good. How much good? We don’t necessarily know, we don’t know the impact of [it].”

Internal barriers also existed. For example, Bill liked to do things himself and wanted “the students to do things the way that I would do them.” He described fighting the urge to “do it myself” in meetings with the clients and students. Jean Anice maintained a “cheerleader attitude” about working with elders. During the semester she realized students were posting positive experiences on the blog and sending her private emails about the negative experiences. She developed a more realistic orientation for students and encouraged them to report both the good and the bad in their blog postings. Al felt service-learning was a non-traditional approach to teaching that seemed to make him and his students feel uncertain about their projects. He was willing to try it but never felt fully confident with it.

The Role of Experiential Learning in Persistence

Experiential learning (Kolb, 1984) served as a catalyst for participant persistence in the innovation-decision process. Two experiences were cited most often in the data. The first was an earlier experience, a prior condition, that predisposed participants to the value of service-learning. The second experience, facilitated by the Office of Service-Learning Fellows program
leaders, put service-learning at the forefront, enabled deep reflection, and caused participants to confirm their adoption decisions.

Prior Conditions

All participants described a past experience as the beginning of coming to know about service-learning. Standing on a beautifully landscaped prairie, Bill suddenly made his career-decision: “here is an amazing place that I…enjoyed being at, kind of encompasses all my interests of design and science and…art, and it was designed by a Landscape Architect. I was like, well what the heck, Dad was right…” As a volunteer who was eating lunch at a skilled nursing facility, Jean Anice knew she would incorporate the experience in her teaching someday. She noted that “these elderly women, some of them in wheelchairs some of them almost to the point of being just totally withdrawn had re-engaged just because I had a loud mouth and laughed.” Jean Anice called the experience “transformational.” As a business owner and one who had recently begun to provide critical health services in a rural community, Al realized quickly that one person could make a difference “if you’re in a small community and there are very limited resources…you can step outside and fill any of the needs in the community and help people get better care.” These experiences predisposed participants to the value of service-learning and facilitated the development of favorable attitudes.

In this study, knowing the practice of service-learning as the participants did was separate from knowing the term service-learning. Although each participant had experienced a form of service-learning and all eventually tried it experimentally in a course, they did so before knowing what it was called. Bill and Al learned of the term service-learning when a colleague forwarded them invitations to join the Office of Service-Learning Fellows program. Jean Anice discovered
it while participating in a round table discussion on the topic, just prior to moving to
the university.

Professional Development

Professional faculty development was defined for the purposes of this study as a
structured program designed to increase awareness and competence while revitalizing
scholarship. Bill joined the Office of Service-Learning Fellows program to learn how to fully
incorporate service-learning into his teaching. Jean Anice hoped to brainstorm and learn from
others in the Fellows program. Al wanted to improve his teaching and to learn more about the
use of service-learning from others at the university. Participants reported that their learning
goals were met and that the program helped strengthen and legitimize current classroom
practices. Funding was motivating and enabled activities that would not be funded in the
departments.

The program addressed teaching as scholarship from a constructivist perspective where
reflection on the teaching and learning process was instrumental for individual meaning making.
In heated discussions of promotion and tenure, a more psychoanalytic perspective was used to
increase self-awareness and resolve inner conflicts involving values and perspective (Fenwick,
2000). Participants in the Fellows program distinguished service-learning terminology from
other concepts and critically considered the value of practices like experience training and study
abroad in relation to service-learning. Through the Fellows program, Jean Anice found
unexpected notoriety for her innovative work. She benefited from the structure of the program
that caused service-learning to stay at the forefront all year. In the program, participants stopped
to reflect on their teaching and on perceptions of scholarship, and eventually made long-term decisions of innovative pedagogy adoption.

Conclusion

Through inductive cross-case analysis I attempted to build abstractions across cases (Merriam, 1998). Although the three participants varied widely in commitment to the university, each was involved in scholarly activity supportive of the promotion and/or tenure process. This involvement in scholarly activity influenced decisions of innovative pedagogy adoption. In two of the three cases, scholarly expectations for research and publications created barriers to service-learning implementation. Both internal and external barriers were found in all cases, as were discrepancies in scholarship. Discrepancies created a sense of frustration and overcommitted. As Davis (2006) noted, “The lack of clarity about what is necessary for success in the academic arena confounds the role overload of pretenured faculty” (p. 146). Participants described two kinds of experiences that facilitated the innovation-decision process. An informal learning experience, considered a prior condition, and a formal professional development program motivated participants to persist despite barriers.
CHAPTER VI: FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study were to contribute to what is known about the innovation-decision process, to investigate faculty perceptions of scholarship in relation to teaching, and to explore the role of faculty as learners. My research questions are:

1. What are the prior conditions and characteristics of faculty who intend to try out academic service-learning (ASL) at this institution?
   a. How do faculty describe prior teaching practices and perceived pedagogical needs?
   b. How do faculty perceive their overall innovativeness within their department and within the discipline?

2. How did participants come to know about ASL?
   a. How do participants define pedagogy and service-learning?
   b. What is the perceived value of ASL within the department and within the discipline?

3. How do participants describe the influence, if any, of the OSLF program on favorable or unfavorable attitude formation?

4. Do faculty anticipate implementing ASL and if so, how? If not, why?
5. How is ASL actually implemented?
   a. How do faculty plan and prepare for ASL implementation?
   b. How do participants describe what worked, what did not, and what would be done differently next time?
   c. What are the perceived barriers to the adoption of ASL?
   d. What are the perceived enablers to the adoption of ASL?
   e. Is there a knowledge and practice gap and if so, what is that?

6. How do faculty explain the decision to adopt, reject, discontinue or re-invent ASL for future courses?

Introduction

In this chapter, findings are discussed in relation to the theoretical framework presented in Chapter I. Significant conclusions that emerged from the data include the following: 1) at the research site, the scholarship of teaching and learning had not yet been fully realized; 2) discrepancies in scholarship created a sense of competing values for early-career faculty participants; 3) the participant innovation-decision process was consistently non-linear and its stages less distinct than Rogers’ (2003) model; and 4) experiential learning played a key role in participant persistence through the stages of the innovation-decision process.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)

In Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate, Boyer (1990) initiated a discussion about what should constitute scholarly teaching and learning. He challenged the dominant view that “to be a scholar is to be a researcher – and publication is the primary
yardstick by which scholarly productivity is measured” (Boyer, 1990, p. 2). Instead, he called for measures of discovery, integration and synthesis of information, the application of knowledge to real-world problems, and quality teaching. His assertions triggered a growing body of literature about the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), a concept that has proven to be rather precarious (Paulsen & Feldman, 2006). In this study, for instance, participants were expected to teach but were not rewarded for their considerable efforts to incorporate service-learning as an authentic and meaningful way to engage students. Instead, Jean Anice and Al described departmental values for research and publications over quality teaching, not unlike the dominant view described by Boyer (1990).

Participants were hired to devote a particular percentage of their time to teaching and other scholarly activities. There was a discrepancy in what participants believed they were hired to do, and what they felt obligated to do for promotion and tenure. Boyer (1990) described this as the “myth and the reality of academic life” (p. 15). Bill was uncertain of his actual commitment but assumed it was similar to his routine of teaching one hundred percent of the time. Jean Anice was hired to conduct research forty-five percent of the time and to teach thirty percent of the time. Al was to teach one hundred percent of the time and provide related service in hospitals in a clinical role.

The reality of academic life was different. In addition to teaching fulltime Bill felt expected to write, conduct research, and provide service. Jean Anice struggled to limit her teaching to fifty or sixty percent during the academic year, roughly twice the time she was expected to spend on teaching. She “naively” intended to make up for lost time on research during the summer. Jean Anice maintained an active agenda that also involved publications, research, and grant writing, and felt it was necessary to do so. Al felt obligated to maintain an
active research agenda and to publish and seek grants while teaching one hundred percent of the
time and serving in local hospitals year-round. All faculty participants reported serving in
professional organizations and providing service either to the local community and/or the
institution. In reality, participants perceived the need to do more than they were budgeted for,
with a significant amount of additional work devoted to traditional forms of scholarship.

Participants did not have an active scholarly agenda that matched budgeted time or
perceived expectations for scholarship. Instead, they struggled to reconcile a passion for service-
learning with the other forms of scholarly activity. Table 4 shows areas of discrepancy that
emerged in the study in relation to scholarship. The participants completed scholarly activities,
but in their own way, and to varying degrees. Boyer (1990) proposed the “creativity contract”
(p. 48) as a way of recognizing and rewarding unique paths of scholarship throughout an
academic career. There was no evidence of this proactive practice in participant departments
although there was evidence that faculty could advance successfully through the review process
despite discrepancies in scholarship. Bill reported successful annual reviews and a successful
third year review; Jean Anice was successful in her annual review; and Al was promoted to
Associate Professor.

Table 4

Discrepancies in Three Dimensions of Scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Discrepancy</th>
<th>Bill D. Green</th>
<th>Jean Anice</th>
<th>Al Chemy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Time for Scholarship</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>TS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Scholarly Expectations</td>
<td>P T S R</td>
<td>P T R G</td>
<td>P T S R G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Activity</td>
<td>P T S</td>
<td>P T S R G</td>
<td>P T S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. In Table 4, T = Teaching, R = Research, S = Service, P = Publications, and G = Grants.*
Discrepancies involving budgeted time for scholarship, scholarly expectations, and scholarly activity created a sense of competing values for participants. They were unclear about what to do specifically for promotion and tenure. The vagueness of what to do was, according to Jean Anice, a feature. It allowed some flexibility during reviews. On the other hand, it seemed to exhaust participants who accepted responsibilities well beyond their budgeted time. She stated matter-of-factly that she was “burning the candle at both ends and…just lit the middle.” The fact that scholarly expectations and budgeted time were not aligned created frustration for Al. He was asked about his research and grant work in reviews even though he was hired to teach one hundred percent of the time. He perceived inequity and bias. Bill knew there were scholarly expectations beyond what he was currently doing. He desired to develop a scholarly agenda of service to match his passion for service-learning and felt he could best do that outside of the demands of the tenure-track.

Summary

The scholarship of teaching and learning was not fully realized at the research-intensive site for this study. Efforts to apply knowledge to authentic community problems, and to enhance learning through innovative pedagogy were not highly valued as scholarly efforts in the review process. Boyer (1990, p. 28) described the phenomena in the following way, almost two decades earlier:

The requirements of tenure and promotion continue to focus heavily on research and on articles published in journals, especially those that are refereed…Good teaching is expected, but it is often inadequately assessed. And the category of ‘service,’ while given token recognition by most colleges, is consistently underrated, too.
Innovation-Decision Process

Rogers (2003) described innovation as “an idea, practice, or object that is perceived as new by an individual or other unit of adoption” (p. 475). At the onset of this study, the institution was involved in a number of innovations or ideas that were new to the university as a whole. Most notably, an office of outreach and an office of instruction joined together to fund a new Office of Service-Learning (OSL). That office, in turn, created new programs including a faculty Fellows program.

Service-learning was an optional innovation because the university did not require faculty to adopt it. However, applicants to the Fellows program were expected to propose a service-learning project to try in a course. The participants in this study entered the Fellows program with an academic service-learning project in mind. During the program, they implemented their projects and eventually made decisions about whether to adopt the pedagogy for the long-term. Competing scholarly values and barriers to implementation influenced the innovation-decision process.

Rogers’ (2003) model of the innovation-decision process is an attempt to explain the stages one experiences when making innovation adoption decisions. The five stages, influenced by prior conditions, are: 1) knowledge, 2) persuasion, 3) decision, 4) implementation, and 5) confirmation. In this study there was evidence that all five stages of the innovation-decision process occurred. However, the stages of the process proved to be less distinct and less linear than the progressive stages shown in Rogers’ (2003) model. Participants described a prior condition, a transformation (Mezirow, 2000), that changed their point of view, made them aware of the nature of service-learning, and instilled a favorable attitude toward it. This predisposition
involved elements of the first two stages of the innovation-decision process, knowledge and persuasion.

Rogers (2003) distinguishes among awareness-knowledge, how-to knowledge, and principles-knowledge. In this study, awareness-knowledge occurred in two stages. Participants first became aware of the practice of service-learning, and then later, the term. When they learned the term it was no longer perceived to represent a new idea. What was innovative to participants was their application of service-learning in the department and on campus. Participants obtained how-to knowledge largely through experience and in the Fellows program where they received how-to tips and information from experts, and discussed enablers and barriers to adoption in a social context. “Principles-knowledge,” described by Rogers (2003) as understanding how an innovation works, was more difficult to find in the data. With regard to student learning, Jean Anice made the statement, “I think that’s how it works – is when they [students] realize it.” She hoped her students would describe their own realizations during reflective activities. Al talked about reflection as a unique aspect of service-learning, something that could “change perceptions and deepen…understanding of what’s there.” Bill spoke often about how important “getting out and doing something” was, a sentiment shared among all participants. All recognized and valued the reciprocity of academic service-learning. At one point Jean Anice conceded, “I’m not sure who helps who here,” when talking about her students and their elder partners. The participants knew service-learning was the right thing to do. As Jean Anice stated simply, “this works.” How it worked was more difficult to determine from the data, but the consensus was that hands-on experience, reflection, and reciprocity with the community were key to creating meaningful learning experiences.
The persuasion stage involves the formation of favorable or unfavorable attitudes about an innovation. The first sign of attitudinal change among participants was during the transformational experiences that altered existing assumptions about service and predisposed participants to the value of service-learning. When participants moved into academia, they tried out service-learning and began to form attitudes and opinions about its use in the classroom. Rogers (2003) identified the following factors that could persuade one in the innovation-decision process: relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability, and observability. Participants perceived a relative advantage of service-learning over traditional pedagogical methods that were less engaging, authentic, and meaningful. Participant interests and beliefs were compatible with the nature of service-learning. Participants were able to try academic service-learning as an extra credit assignment before fully integrating it into their respective courses, and were able to “observe” the results of experts who had gone before them in the Office of Service-Learning Fellows program. The complexity of academic service-learning was an adoption concern. Although greatly valued by the faculty participants, the pedagogy was not supported or rewarded in their departments, and it required significant time to implement - time that was already limited due to competing scholarly expectations.

The decision stage of the innovation-decision process occurred when the participants carried out activities to decide whether to adopt, reject, discontinue or re-invent the pedagogy for the short-term. In the decision stage, participants incorporated service-learning as an extra credit assignment. That experience led to a rethinking of the implementation, and revisions to the next implementation. The tendency for participants was to enter into an iterative loop of decision-making and re-invention of the pedagogy.
Bill and Jean Anice had made the decision to implement and re-invent several times earlier. To them, it was an evolutionary process of change that became an endless cycle of tweaking and implementing the pedagogy again. In the past it was often a trial experience or activity, and just one component of the course objectives. Al had completed the cycle of implementation and re-invention just once before entering the Fellows program. At the decision stage in this study, all participants made the decision to re-invent what had been done in the past and to fully integrate service-learning in a course.

The Office of Service-Learning Fellows program served several purposes. Faculty participants proposed service-learning projects they intended to implement, within their Fellows applications. The program required some level of commitment to try the innovative pedagogy. When participants implemented service-learning, relevant discussions about barriers and successful models ensued. Both external and internal barriers to implementation were experienced (Ertmer, 1999). The program imposed a constructivist perspective by incorporating reflective activities and encouraging reflection as assessment. Program leaders took a psychoanalytic perspective on the retreat when inner conflicts about scholarship were discussed openly (Fenwick, 2000). The program brought closure to the innovation-decision process. It interrupted previous cycles of informal implementation and re-invention, and facilitated more formal processes that led to long-term adoption decisions. The Fellows program kept service-learning at the forefront throughout the year.

The final stage of Rogers’ (2003) innovation-decision process is confirmation. During this stage, an individual makes a long-term decision to adopt, reject, discontinue or re-invent the innovation indefinitely. While all participants were passionate about service-learning and perceived its value for the long-term, it was not clear until the end of the study whether the
participants would feel overwhelmed by logistics or scholarly expectations and, despite all good intentions, forego academic service-learning as a fully integrated part of their courses. The confirmation stage is associated with feelings of dissonance, such as those that emerged during the Fellows program, that trigger a final decision.

In the end, Bill decided to re-invent academic service-learning while secretly hoping to move into a non-tenure, service faculty position. Jean Anice decided to re-invent academic service-learning (ASL) and maintain two agendas – ASL and more traditional scholarly activities like grant writing and research. Al discontinued academic service-learning and left the institution to become a researcher. His decision was not derived solely from his service-learning experience, although he did concede that he was never fully confident with it. Rather, Al’s final decision was largely the result of a reflective process on the efforts and rewards for teaching at the research-intensive university.

Summary

In this study, the five stages of Rogers’ (2003) innovation-decision process were evident. However, faculty participants moved through the stages in a non-linear and less distinct way than represented in Rogers’ model. Some aspects of the knowledge and persuasion stages were apparent in an earlier experience that predisposed participants to the value of service-learning. Participants decided to try out and re-invent service-learning in a cycle of informal experimentation that was interrupted by the Fellows faculty development program. The Fellows program helped bring closure and confirmation to the innovation-decision process.
Experiential Learning

Participants described a meaningful past experience that predisposed them to the value of service-learning. The experience changed their frame of reference, or way of knowing (Kegan, 2000). It transformed Bill’s perspective as he suddenly embraced a career he had intentionally avoided in the past. Jean Anice and Al had separately volunteered in the community before realizing the critical nature of service and the widespread impact one could have. As faculty, participants drew on their individual experiences to design similar learning experiences for their students. The participants personally identified with academic service-learning and wanted students to learn as they had.

To understand participant past experience in relation to pedagogical preference, it is useful to consider learning styles, and cycles of experiential learning that did and did not occur during the study. Kolb’s (1984) model of experiential learning involves the following four stages: concrete experience (CE), reflective observation (RO), abstract conceptualization (AC), and active experimentation (AE). Participant transformational experiences signified the beginning of a learning cycle. The concrete experience created dissonance and caused reflective observation (RO) on what happened. Participants came to a realization about service in the community and then moved to the third stage of the experiential learning model, abstract conceptualization (AC). They considered the underlying principles of the experience and thought the experience could be recreated someday. Only Jean Anice planned to move into academia at the time. She continued the experiential learning cycle by actively experimenting (AE) with the idea of how she could use service specifically in her own teaching someday. Active experimentation continued for all participants when they moved to the university and considered ways that academic service-learning might be implemented in their specific courses.
Bill and Jean Anice completed the experiential learning cycle more than once through trial and error. They implemented changes, reflected, considered abstract situations where the pedagogy might also work, and actively experimented with specific project ideas before implementing academic service-learning again. The two participants, however, approached experiential learning in different ways. Bill tended to be imaginative. On the faculty retreat, for example, he reflected through drawings more than words. He could perceive ideas from different perspectives and enjoyed generating new ideas with others. He appreciated the dynamic and unpredictable nature of service-learning. Kolb (1984) associated those kinds of traits with a divergent learning style, one where individuals demonstrate a preference for concrete experiences and reflective observation in the learning process. Jean Anice had a “go and do” philosophy. She was ready for action and immediate change, always involving herself in new experiences. She valued practice over theory and was continually experimenting with academic service-learning and seeking out others for information. Jean Anice tended to learn best from concrete experiences and active experimentation with new ideas. These traits were most similar to the accommodative learning style proposed by Kolb (1984).

In contrast to Bill and Jean Anice, Al completed the experiential learning cycle just once. He implemented academic service-learning in a course he taught a year ago, reflected on the experience, began to generalize the concept, and actively experimented with ideas for his next implementation during the Fellows program. Despite learning from the experience in the past, he felt overwhelmed with time commitments and was not proactive in implementing change. He encountered the same problems during his second implementation that he had encountered earlier, and did not actively experiment with the idea of service-learning again. Al demonstrated traits of a convergent learner (Kolb, 1984) during the study. He perceived a right and wrong way
to do things and struggled to address the affective and dynamic nature of service-learning in his course. An interpretation of participant preferred learning styles is shown in Table 5. These styles were not determined through formal testing procedures but through an interpretation by the researcher given data collected over time during the study.

The Office of Service-Learning Fellows program helped bridge, for participants, past experience and the implementation of service-learning pedagogy. In the program, individual participant projects were used as a springboard for reflective observation (RO). Experts were invited to share their own projects that, in turn, helped participants grasp the underlying principles of service-learning and begin to generalize experiences in abstract situations, and to actively experiment with new ideas. Jean Anice, for example, began experimenting with global service-learning. The Office of Service-Learning Fellows program also assisted participants in meeting their individual learning objectives.

Table 5

*Participant Learning Styles and Corresponding Experiential Learning Stages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Styles</th>
<th>Bill D. Green</th>
<th>Jean Anice</th>
<th>Al Chemy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convergent - AC / AE</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergent - CE / RO</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation – AC / RO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodative – CE / AE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* In Table 5, AC = abstract conceptualism, AE = active experimentation, CE = concrete experience, and RO = reflective observation.
Summary

Experiential learning played a large role in the participant innovation-decision process. Participant past experience predisposed them to the nature of service-learning and influenced their future pedagogical preferences as faculty. Participants joined a professional development Fellows program that facilitated more formal learning experiences. During the Fellows program, Bill and Jean Anice completed the experiential learning cycle again. Al completed the cycle just one time earlier, and in the second cycle, during the Fellows program, did not actively experiment with new ideas. He felt pressed for time and had difficulty reconciling the affective and dynamic nature of service-learning. Al demonstrated a convergent learning style, making clear distinctions between right and wrong in his professional life and in his course. His learning style differed from Bill and Jean Anice who were better able to handle the dynamic and unpredictable nature of service-learning.

Implications of Findings

Findings of this study imply that scholarship is an important although somewhat elusive factor to be considered in the institutionalization of innovation. In this research-intensive environment, the innovators represented three different kinds of scholars. One participant was a clinical faculty with teaching and service expectations, another was a tenure-track faculty with traditional scholarly expectations, and still another was a tenure-track faculty with non-traditional, applied scholarly expectations. Participants perceived research as the typical form of scholarship on campus but there was not one consistent view of scholarship across the three departments represented. The university has united instruction and outreach departments to increase civic engagement, but the research arm of the university remains distinct. Rice and
Sorcinelli (2005) suggest, and it may hold true in this case, that “Until there is agreement on the primary purpose of the institution and its several divisions, the tenure process will remain muddled” (p. 102).

The findings of this study also imply that there is a symbiotic relationship between experiential learning and the innovation-decision process. Experiential learning initiated the innovation-decision process by generating awareness-knowledge of, and favorable attitudes toward, service-learning. Participants engaged in an experiential learning cycle similar to Kolb’s (1984) model in the decision and implementation stages of the innovation-decision process where the pedagogy was tested and re-invented, sometimes repeatedly. The formal faculty development experience slowed the trial and re-invention process and imposed intentional experiences including structured opportunities for reflection, abstraction, and experimentation. The Fellows program enabled thoughtful confirmation of innovation adoption decisions. Despite internal and external barriers, participants persisted throughout the implementation stage of the innovation-decision process. They cited a passion for service-learning, cultivated by personal experience. Participants who demonstrated a preference for divergent and accommodative learning styles chose to adopt and re-invent service-learning in the confirmation stage. Their learning styles closely matched the dynamic and applied nature of the innovative pedagogy. The participant who discontinued service-learning first stopped actively experimenting with new ideas. After ending the experiential learning cycle, he confirmed a decision to discontinue service-learning.

Recommendations for Practice

In this study, the faculty development program played an important role in the persistence and confirmation of innovation decisions of the faculty participants. These participants proved
to be diverse in discipline, academic appointment, perceptions of scholarship, and in scholarly activity and professional goals. Even within the tenure track, scholarship was perceived in different ways and professional goals varied. Attempts to address diversity in this environment should be made intentional within the program, with the assumption that diversity is the norm. Because experiential learning was influential in the continuation of faculty through the innovation-decision process, steps should also be taken to incorporate concrete experiences and opportunities for reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation with new ideas (Kolb, 1984). Effective programs will value related prior conditions. In this study, the participants had all been predisposed to practices similar to service-learning, like volunteerism. The predisposition motivated participants to try the innovative pedagogy and to make meaning of it within the discipline. Finally, formal faculty development programs must create a non-threatening space for the contemplation of long-term adoption decisions that could be job-sensitive.

If research-intensive universities desire to increase student civic engagement through service-learning, attention must be given to the barriers faculty encounter during implementation. Faculty who adopt academic service-learning tend to struggle with semester time constraints and the centralization of scheduling and negotiation of key orientation and event dates during the semester. Support for establishing, cultivating, and sustaining community partnerships would enable more faculty to try the pedagogy. Innovations that can be tried with ease are more likely to be adopted than those that are initially difficult to implement (Rogers, 2003). Faculty support for establishing, cultivating, and sustaining community partnerships would be job-sensitive.

Central support for establishing, cultivating, and sustaining community partnerships would enable more faculty to try the pedagogy. Innovations that can be tried with ease are more likely to be adopted than those that are initially difficult to implement (Rogers, 2003). Faculty support for establishing, cultivating, and sustaining community partnerships would be job-sensitive.

If research-intensive universities desire to increase student civic engagement through service-learning, attention must be given to the barriers faculty encounter during implementation. Faculty who adopt academic service-learning tend to struggle with semester time constraints and the centralization of scheduling and negotiation of key orientation and event dates during the semester. Support for establishing, cultivating, and sustaining community partnerships would enable more faculty to try the pedagogy. Innovations that can be tried with ease are more likely to be adopted than those that are initially difficult to implement (Rogers, 2003). Faculty support for establishing, cultivating, and sustaining community partnerships would be job-sensitive.

Central support for establishing, cultivating, and sustaining community partnerships would enable more faculty to try the pedagogy. Innovations that can be tried with ease are more likely to be adopted than those that are initially difficult to implement (Rogers, 2003). Faculty support for establishing, cultivating, and sustaining community partnerships would be job-sensitive.
community partner ombudsmen could be useful. Finally, increased alignment of scholarship with service-learning activities should reduce the sense of frustration and competing values participants described in this study. Attempts to join instruction, outreach, and research could establish a scholarly mission for the university that is more representative of contemporary views than is currently the case.

Recommendations for Future Research

This case study was bounded by limitations and delimitations to help define and focus the topic of interest. Findings were not intended to generalize beyond the case but did raise new questions for future research that should extend beyond the borders of this case study. The participants in this study confirmed long-term decisions to adopt or discontinue academic service-learning. A study of the consequences of their adoption decisions is warranted. In about three years, Bill and Jean Anice will go up for tenure. Their experiences along the way could enhance existing findings about the influence of scholarship on long-term pedagogy adoption, about the influence of discrepant aspects of scholarship addressed in this study, and about the sustainability of the innovative pedagogy at this institution.

The case study was developed from the faculty perspective. A more dynamic qualitative study that involves faculty, students, and community members could better explain the innovation-decision process of this “system” when new projects are proposed and implemented. A study of faculty, students, and community members could also help explain, in-depth, the reciprocal nature of service-learning.

A goal of implementing a service-learning initiative at the institution was to increase civic engagement among students. It could be useful to study trends in student civic engagement
on campus, as a consequence of the institutionalization of service-learning. The role of Fellows and the Fellows program in the diffusion of the innovation at the institution could be studied by examining social networks and communication channels to determine the pattern and rate of adoption over time.

In the case study there was a symbiotic relationship between the experiential learning cycle and the innovation-decision process. Experiential learning initiated the innovation-decision process for participants. During the innovation-decision process, participants who completed the experiential learning cycle decided to adopt the innovation long-term. The relationship is likely due to the dual role of service-learning as a form of experiential learning and as an innovative pedagogy at the institution. However, there could be other theoretical connections that might inform practice.

Conclusion

The purposes of this study were to contribute to what is known about the innovation-decision process, to investigate faculty perceptions of scholarship in relation to teaching, and to explore the role of faculty as learners. By looking within and across cases, important themes emerged about unique perspectives of scholarship, discrepancies of scholarship, the innovation-decision process, and the role of experiential learning in persistence through the innovation-decision process. Findings revealed that the scholarship of teaching and learning had not yet been fully realized at this institution, that discrepancies in scholarship were of particular concern and frustration for faculty participants, that participants moved through the innovation-decision process in a non-linear way, and that experiential learning played a key role in faculty persistence through the innovation-decision stages. Findings implied that scholarship was
important to the institutionalization of innovation but remained elusive at the research site, and that there was a symbiotic relationship between experiential learning and the innovation-decision process. Recommendations for practice and for further research were directly related to the findings of this multiple case study.
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APPENDIX A - FACULTY INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I agree to take part in a research study titled Innovative Pedagogy which is being conducted by Michele D. Estes, Educational Psychology and Instructional Technology, University of Georgia, and 706-542-6680 under the direction of Dr. Lloyd Rieber, Educational Psychology and Instructional Technology, University of Georgia, 706-542-3986. My participation is voluntary; I can refuse to participate or stop taking part at any time without giving any reason, and without penalty. I can ask to have information related to me returned to me, removed from the research records, or destroyed.

The purpose of this study is to learn more about faculty who try innovative ways of teaching and learning at a research institution. More specifically, it is intended to generate data about the characteristics of these faculty and their decisions as they try out service-learning during the Spring 2007 semester.

Data collection procedures have been designed to minimize participant time requirements when possible. If I volunteer to take part in this study, I will be asked to do the following things:

- sign the IRB consent form for this study.
- allow the researcher to distribute and collect signed IRB consent forms from my students during class time, requiring an estimated time of 5 minutes.
- allow the researcher to review my OSLF application materials during the semester.
- allow the researcher to take note of my comments at the monthly OSLF meetings.
• participate in two, audio recorded interview sessions in my office with the researcher – one to occur near the beginning and the other near the end of this study. Each interview is planned to last 90 minutes, for a total estimated time of 3 hours participation.

• respond to online questionnaires regarding details of your experience, every other week as prompted by the researcher throughout the Spring 2007 semester. This requires an estimated 15 minutes of time every other week for a total time commitment of 90 minutes during this study.

• participate in data collection procedures from February 2007 through April 2007 or through the Spring 2007 finals period if necessary for this study.

No discomforts or stresses are expected. I understand that I will not benefit directly from this research. However, the data collection process and results may indirectly provide some useful feedback about the teaching and learning process. No financial incentives are included in this study.

The association of a participant to a specific department at the <research site> is possible and could be considered a risk. Only three faculty are participating in this study. However, steps have been taken to assure confidentiality. Participant names will not be used in the study and I have provided the researcher with a broad name (either Allied Health, Design or Family Services) for use when describing my area of employment. No other risks are expected. Internet communications are insecure and there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself. However once the materials are received by the researcher, standard confidentiality procedures will be employed, and audio tapes and/or CDs of recorded interviews will be destroyed within three years after the study is completed.
The researcher will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, and can be reached by telephone at the UGA Center for Teaching and Learning: 706-542-1582.

I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Researcher</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Participant</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please sign both copies. Keep one and return one to the researcher.

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu
APPENDIX B - PARTICIPANT REMINDER OF KEY RESEARCH EVENTS

MONTHLY MEETINGS (2 HRS.) AND ONLINE REFLECTIONS (15 MINS.)

☐ 2/23/07 online reflection (available Fri.-Mon.)
☐ 2/27/07 OSLF monthly meeting (11:30a-1:30p)
☐ 3/09/07 online reflection
☐ 3/27/07 OSLF monthly meeting (11:30a-1:30p)
☐ 3/23/07 reflection
☐ 4/06/07 reflection
☐ 4/19/07-4/20/07 OSLF retreat
☐ 4/20/07 reflection

INITIAL INTERVIEW (90 Minutes)

☐ Date: _______________________
Begin/End Times: _______________ 
Location: ______________________

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW (90 Minutes)

☐ Date: _______________________
Begin/End Times: _______________
Location: _______________________

Michele D. Estes, P. I.
Innovative Pedagogy Research Project
706-542-1582
mestes@uga.edu
1. How do you describe your service-learning project at this point in time?
2. What does the term *service-learning* mean to you?
3. What does the word *pedagogy* mean to you?
4. Think back to a time when you taught a similar course at this university but did not use service-learning. How would you describe your typical pedagogical practice?
5. How would you describe your willingness to try new things in relation to others in your department?
6. From your own perspective, what is the value of service-learning to your field?
7. What do you think will be the advantages and disadvantages of implementing service-learning your course work?
8. What kinds of barriers might you encounter as you implement service-learning this semester?
9. What kinds of things may prove to be helpful as you implement service-learning this semester?
10. Is there anything more you would like to tell me?

Michele D. Estes, P. I.

Innovative Pedagogy Research Project

706-542-1582

mestes@uga.edu
APPENDIX D - FACULTY EMAIL REMINDER TO COMPLETE THE ONLINE BI-WEEKLY
“DETAILS OF EXPERIENCE” QUESTIONNAIRE

Please take an estimated 15 minutes to detail your service-learning experiences at <link>. Using the 15/5 model, your responses should take no more than 15 minutes to write and require no more than 5 minutes for the researcher to read. Your input will be accepted Friday <date> through Sunday <date>. Monday begins a new cycle of experiences. I have attached as a reference, a compilation of your reflections to date.

I also ask that you take five minutes to respond to the following issues that were raised in the OSLF monthly meeting:

Thank you and if you have any questions, please contact me at mestes@uga.edu or 706-542-1582 at your earliest convenience.

Michele D. Estes, P.I.
Innovative Pedagogy Research Project
706-542-1582
mestes@uga.edu
APPENDIX E - ONLINE BI-WEEKLY “DETAILS OF EXPERIENCE” QUESTIONS

FACULTY: Details of the Service-Learning Experience
Faculty Questionnaire

The purpose of this survey is to document your experiences with service-learning this semester. The questionnaire should require only about 15 minutes of your time to complete, and only about 5 minutes of my time to read. Thank you for your participation.

1. In what course are you using service-learning this semester? (Choose one.)
   Course 1 <faculty name>*
   Course 2 <faculty name>*
   Course 3 <faculty name>*
*Note: Actual course prefix and number were removed to protect the confidentiality of the participants.

2. Did you learn about, discuss, plan for, or try out service-learning during the last two weeks?
   Yes   No

   If so, please describe the experience(s).

3. If you tried out service-learning in your course during the last two weeks, please answer the following questions.
   a. What worked as well as, or better than, anticipated?

   b. What did not work as well as anticipated?

   c. What would you do differently next time?

4. What factors most influenced your responses to question 3?

Researcher Contact Information:
Michele D. Estes, P.I.
Innovative Pedagogy Research Project
706-542-1582
mestes@uga.edu
Submit >>
I agree to take part in a research study titled *Innovative Pedagogy* which is being conducted by Michele D. Estes, Educational Psychology and Instructional Technology, University of Georgia, and 706-542-6680 under the direction of Dr. Lloyd Rieber, Educational Psychology and Instructional Technology, University of Georgia, 706-542-3986. My participation is voluntary; I can refuse to participate or stop taking part at any time without giving any reason, and without penalty. I can ask to have information related to me returned to me, removed from the research records, or destroyed.

The purpose of this study is to learn more about faculty who try innovative ways of teaching and learning at a research institution. More specifically, it is intended to generate data about the characteristics of these faculty and their decisions as they try out service-learning during the Spring 2007 semester.

Data collection procedures have been designed to minimize participant time requirements when possible. If I volunteer to take part in this study, I will be asked to do the following things:

- sign the IRB consent form for this study.
- complete a brief, online survey about what happened during the implementation of service-learning activities in my course. My participation will require an estimated 15 minutes of time. The researcher will prompt my participation at the appropriate point during the Spring 2007 semester and will provide instructions for how to access and complete the survey online.
No discomforts or stresses are expected. I understand that I will not benefit directly from this research although the resulting data may indirectly inform faculty about the teaching and learning process. No financial incentives are included in this study.

The association of a participant to a specific <research site> course is possible and could be considered a risk. However, some level of confidentiality is provided. Student names will be removed from corresponding data and replaced with an alias, or fake name. Internet communications are insecure and there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself. However once the materials are received by the researcher, standard confidentiality procedures will be employed. I understand that my decision to participate or not participate will have no affect on my grades or class standing.

The researcher will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, and can be reached by telephone at the UGA Center for Teaching and Learning: 706-542-1582.

I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Researcher</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Participant</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please sign both copies. Keep one and return one to the researcher.

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu
APPENDIX G - STUDENT SURVEY QUESTIONS

STUDENTS: Service-Learning Implementation
Exit this survey >>
Student Survey

This survey is intended to confirm what did and did not happen during service-learning activities in your course.

1. At what email address may the researcher contact you with questions about your responses on this survey?

2. What is your course number? (Choose one.)
   - Course 1 <faculty name>*
   - Course 2 <faculty name>*
   - Course 3 <faculty name>*
*Note: Actual course prefix and number were removed to protect the confidentiality of the participants.

3. Please check “yes” if the activity did occur or “no” if it did not.
   Yes                No
   Statement 1
   Statement 2
   Statement 3
   Statement 4
   Statement 5
   Statement 6

4. Please explain the activities that did and did not occur during your service-learning experience in this class.

Thank you for your participation!

Researcher Contact Information:
Michele D. Estes, P. I.
Innovative Pedagogy Research Project
706-542-1582
mestes@uga.edu
Submit >>
APPENDIX H - STUDENT EMAIL REMINDER TO COMPLETE THE ONLINE SURVEY

Earlier this semester you signed a consent form to participate in the research study titled *Innovative Pedagogy*. Please take 15 minutes to complete the brief, online survey at this location: <link>. The topic of the survey is service-learning in your course – <course number and title>. Responses should be received by <date>. One reminder will be sent via email for those who do not respond by the given date.

The researcher may need to contact you via email at this address for clarification of your response. Beyond that, you have no other obligation in this research study. Your feedback is very important to its success and I look forward to your helpful insights!

Sincerely,

Michele D. Estes, P. I.

*Innovative Pedagogy Research Project*

706-542-1582

mestes@uga.edu
APPENDIX I - “REFLECTIONS ON MEANING” INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. How do you describe your service-learning project at this point in time?

2. How has your project evolved over time?

3. Think back to your implementation of service-learning in your course work this semester. What stands-out most in your mind?
   a. You mentioned…tell me what that was like for you.

4. Think of a time when you experienced challenges. What was that like for you?

5. Think of a time when you felt most confident with service-learning this semester. What was that experience like?

6. How do you feel about service-learning as an ongoing strategy in your courses?

7. Is there anything more you would like to tell me?
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