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ABSTRACT

This qualitative study investigated factors that facilitate and hinder service-learning implementation for novice and veteran teachers. It also investigated a service-learning course designed to teach the theory behind service learning and give pre-service and in-service teachers an experience working with it. The investigation focused specifically on how the course influenced implementation of service learning in elementary and middle school classrooms. Case studies of three novice teachers and three veteran teachers were conducted and a cross case analysis was conducted within and across the groups. The primary source of data collection occurred through interviews and the secondary sources included artifacts and a questionnaire.

Findings from the study indicate that there are many factors that facilitate implementation of service learning as well as hinder it for novice and veteran teachers. Findings also indicate that novice and veteran teachers have differing needs when it comes to learning about and implementing service learning. Because of their limited knowledge and experience with teaching, novice teachers need more direct instruction on implementation than veteran teachers. When attempting to implement service learning, novice teachers are often overwhelmed by the
demands of being a beginning teacher, while veteran teachers are more able to focus on atypical pedagogical strategies and make them successful in their classroom.

An investigation of the service-learning course revealed four points to consider when organizing a course that offers students an opportunity to participate in a project of their choice. The most influential factor contributing to a program’s success is the course instructor. A course instructor must have knowledge of, enthusiasm for, and a belief in service learning. A second consideration focused on individualizing the course according to the interests of the students by establishing a democratic classroom. Third, students benefit from working in an atmosphere that is positive where they feel support and guidance while conducting their service-learning project. A final consideration revealed the benefit of students implementing their service-learning project into a classroom setting with a group of students.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the last 10 years the field of service learning has essentially exploded. As a result, numerous publications touting the benefits of service learning have been published (e.g., Duckenfield & Swanson, 1992; National Middle School Association, 2003; Pate, Thompson, & Keyes, 2001). Corporations (e.g., The Corporation for National Service), organizations (e.g., Learn and Serve America), commissions (e.g. National Commission on Service Learning, 2002), and networks (e.g., Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development/Experiential Learning Network) are now dedicated to the field of service learning. Federal, state, and foundation dollars are set aside each year to fund programs cultivating service learning (e.g., Learn and Serve America; W. K. Kellogg Foundation). During the past decade, research about service learning has also increased (e.g., Billig, 2000; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Johnson & Notah, 1999; Melchior, 1999; Stephens, 1995).

What is service learning? Service learning can be considered as both a philosophy and a methodology. As a philosophy, service learning is grounded upon the framework of experiential learning, a notion stemming from the works of Dewey (1927). This notion makes the claim that it is through experience that children learn best. As a methodology, service learning encourages students to apply newly acquired skills as they serve within the community. Through reflection, students derive meaning from their experiences and come to understand the impact they have on the community and themselves, often leading to an increased sense of social responsibility and caring for others.
With so much attention being placed on service learning and its beneficial outcomes, it might be expected to be more prominent in classrooms across America. While service learning is thriving in some classrooms, in others it is not. Billig and Furco (2002) state that although there has been a substantial increase in the use of service learning in the past decade, it is still only implemented in approximately a third of K-12 schools. They add that in spite of the growth of service learning over the past decade “it continues to remain a fragile reform that is highly dependent upon individuals to be sustained . . . [and] runs the risk of becoming the ‘fad of the day’ unless certain factors are in place to sustain and institutionalize practice over time” (p. 245). Classroom teachers, both novice and veteran, are the individuals most responsible in schools for implementing and sustaining service learning.

Pressure for higher test scores continues to inundate public schooling, often squelching the implementation of alternative teaching practices (Academy for Educational Development, 2002). This emphasis on test performance often encourages rote memorization of facts when what is really needed is for students to acquire the skills of independent thinking and reasoning, as well as a love for learning (Brooks & Brooks, 1993). Carter (1997) summarized the current situation well by suggesting that “our vision of the kinds of schools we want often collides with the daily tasks of surviving in the schools we have inherited” (p. 69). Increased emphasis on testing is one factor affecting service-learning implementation in classrooms, but are there others? What is happening in public school classrooms that facilitates and hinders service-learning implementation?

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to understand novice and veteran teachers’ perceptions of factors that facilitate and hinder implementation of service learning in their classrooms. In
addition, this research will examine how a university course contributes to service-learning implementation in both novice and veteran teachers’ classrooms. This study seeks to answer the following questions:

• What are novice and veteran teachers’ perceptions of factors that facilitate service-learning implementation in their classrooms?

• What are novice and veteran teachers’ perceptions of factors that hinder service-learning implementation in their classrooms?

• How does a professional development opportunity in the form of a university course contribute to service-learning implementation in novice and veteran teachers’ classrooms?

Significance of the Study

Research in the area of factors that facilitate and hinder service learning is minimal. While there have been a few studies addressing factors that facilitate and hinder service learning, there have been no studies specifically examining novice and veteran teachers’ perceptions of such factors. Research examining the effects of professional development, such as university-level service-learning courses, is also limited. This study addresses both of these gaps in the literature.

This study is significant in several ways. First, it provides information about factors that facilitate and hinder service-learning implementation in classrooms. With a deeper understanding of these factors, teachers, researchers, administrators, and community members can work together to assure that certain components are in place to organize successful service-learning initiatives and sustain them over time. Second, this study differentiates between novice teachers’ and veteran teachers’ perceptions about service learning. This distinction is important
because both groups have characteristics unique to their situation that may play a role in service-learning implementation. Third, this study addresses the importance of professional development focusing on service learning.

Critical Terms Defined

For the purpose of establishing a common understanding of the terminology in this dissertation, a list of definitions has been included below. These definitions are derived from readings I have done and from my own personal experience in service learning.

C Service learning is a philosophy and methodology involving the application of academic skills to solving real-life problems in the community (Pate, 1999).

C A novice teacher is a certified teacher who has 1 or 2 years of teaching experience.

C A veteran teacher is a certified teacher with more than 2 years of teaching experience. In this study the number of years of experience of the veteran teachers ranged from 7 to 33 years.

C Perception, in this study, refers to the point of view of the participants regarding service-learning implementation.

C Factors refer to the items that the participants suggested had an influence, whether facilitating or hindering, on service-learning implementation in their classrooms.

C Facilitate refers to factors that make implementing service learning easier according to the perceptions of the participants.

C Hinder means to interfere with the progress of something.

C Implementation refers to the act of applying a theory or idea in a practical setting.

C Professional development refers to an education experience through which professionals attempt to learn about and develop additional knowledge and skills in their field.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This literature review is divided into three sections. The first section introduces service learning as a philosophy and methodology, provides a rationale for service learning, and reviews research studies on service learning. The second section is a review of research on factors that facilitate and hinder service-learning implementation. The third section addresses studies about professional development, in particular, those focusing on service learning as a university course.

Service Learning

Definitions of service learning are not in shortage and differ considerably among those who embrace it. In 1990, Kendall catalogued 147 definitions of service learning, reflecting the interest in service learning at that time. Interest in service learning has grown considerably since then (Schine, 1997). Now, over a decade later, definitions continue to surface, most of which share a certain amount of agreement about the basic framework and purpose of service learning. As Schine points out, service learning can be categorized in two ways: service learning as a philosophy of education and service learning as an instructional methodology.

*Service Learning as a Philosophy*

Many of the theoretical underpinnings of service learning as we know it today can be traced to Johann Pestalozzi (1746 - 1827), a Swiss educator and researcher, who stressed the importance of children learning through their senses and in concrete situations. He resisted the belief that students should get “the right answer” and encouraged the process of work coupled
with education as the means for students arriving at their own understandings. He also believed in getting students actively involved in learning through the balance of “hands, heart, and head” and felt that to focus on just one was dangerous (McEachron, 2001). Pestalozzi was concerned with social justice and was committed to working with those who suffered within society. He promoted reflection as a way to make sense of experiences, another important component of service learning. He believed that education was central to the amelioration of social conditions (http://www.infed.org/thinkers/et-pest.html).

Although many of the theoretical underpinnings of service learning clearly align with Pestalozzi, most researchers trace the roots of service learning to Dewey’s (1927) philosophy that the interaction of knowledge with experience is the key to effective learning (Giles, 1991; Harkavy & Benson, 1998; Seigel & Rockwood, 1993). Dewey’s philosophy maintained that school was the context in which children could actively learn about democracy as a social process. He called for moving beyond the traditional method of accumulating knowledge through rote memorization to a curriculum that expanded the experiences of children by relating knowledge to immediate social needs (Dewey, 1927). Dewey’s work came to be known as the educational philosophy of “progressivism.” This philosophy purports that knowledge must continually be redefined and rediscovered to keep up with surrounding changes (McEachron, 2001). In the progressivist classroom students become problem solvers and the teacher’s role is to serve as a facilitator, creating opportunities for students to develop their problem-solving abilities. The objective of education grew into an effort to take students beyond classroom skills and guide them into practical experiences in the community (Hepburn, 1997). Thus, service learning aligns with philosophies of both Pestalozzi and Dewey because, as noted by Morton and Troppe (1996), service-learning theory “begins with the assumption that experience is the
foundation for learning; and various forms of community service are employed as the experiential basis for learning” (p. 21).

From the works of Dewey came the model of experiential learning developed by Kolb and Fry (1975). Experiential learning involves a direct opportunity to acquire and apply knowledge, skills, and feelings in an immediate and relevant setting (Borzak, 1981). According to this model, there are four stages involved in experiential learning. In stage 1, the learner is involved in a concrete experience. In stage 2, the learner experiences a new situation through observations, feelings, and reactions and adds to or adjusts his or her schema. Stage 3 involves forming abstract concepts and generalizations to fit a pattern that makes sense to the learner. Finally, stage 4 requires transferring the learning to other settings and situations (www.infed.org/biblio/b-explrn.htm). The philosophy of service learning and experiential learning mesh in many ways.

In summary, service learning is a philosophy of teaching that does more than cover concepts. “Service learning works because it is based on one simple principle: you don’t learn the basics by memorizing the basics, but by doing projects in which you utilize the basics” (Berson, 1994, p. 17). As Cleary and Benson (1998) state, “If the theories of education are true, then education is better when processes are active rather than passive, student-centered rather than instructor-centered, and concrete versus abstract. Service learning clearly combines these considerations” (p. 125).

Service Learning as a Methodology

In an attempt to define service learning as an instructional methodology, detailing what it is not can be very insightful. It is important to note that service learning is not interchangeable with community service or volunteerism (Witmer & Anderson, 1994) and it is not compensatory
service assigned as a punishment by the courts or school administrators. Service learning should not be an add-on, but a way of working with an existing curriculum tied to academic objectives. It is not one-sided, benefitting only the students or only the community, and it is not a quantitative experience where students log a certain number of hours in order to graduate (Fiske, 2002). Ideally, service learning should not be solely teacher directed, instead, it should encourage students’ voices throughout the entire process. In this manner the teacher simply acts as a facilitator of knowledge (Andrus, 1996). As McPherson and Nebgen (1991) state, “The teacher, rather than simply being the provider of information and the evaluator of competence, is the creator of environments where students learn by doing, working with others, and reflecting on their experiences” (p. 331).

More specifically, *The Alliance for Service Learning in Education Reform* (1993), defines what service learning is as follows:

The term “service learning” refers to a method:

C under which students learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service experiences that meet actual community needs that are coordinated in collaboration with the school and community;

C that is integrated into the students’ academic curriculum and provides structured time for a student to think, talk, or write about what the student did and saw during the actual service activity;

C that provides students with opportunities to use newly acquired skills and knowledge in real-life situations in their own communities; and
that enhances what is taught in school by extending student learning beyond the classroom and into the community and helps to foster the development of a sense of caring for others. (p. 71)

Some of the essential components that surface in this definition and others found in the literature can be detailed by organizing them into categories of before, during, and after the service experience. Before the service begins there must be a great deal of learning about the service to be performed. The service experience is thoughtfully organized in collaboration with the school and the community and addresses both parties’ needs so as to be mutually beneficial. Throughout the process, student voice is encouraged and the role of the teacher becomes that of a facilitator. Research (e.g., Meyers, 1999) suggests that when students are actively involved in service learning, such as selecting and implementing a service-learning project, and when they are able to make the connection between the project and something that is significant in their lives, they are more likely to become motivated and engaged in the learning process.

During the service experience, students are actively engaged in an opportunity to incorporate and apply their academic learning in a practical real-life setting. Structured reflection becomes an important part of their activities as they evaluate their experience through deliberate thought.

After the service experience, reflection continues to be a vital ingredient for success. Evaluation is also a part of service learning and should be conducted along with reflection throughout as an informative instrument for directing the experience. At this time students are also encouraged to apply what they have learned to other settings as a way of cementing their learning. Finally, students are invited to celebrate what they have accomplished (Alliance for
Service Learning in Education Reform, 1993; Commission for National and Community Service, 1993).

Rationale for Service Learning

With many effective teaching methods already available, why would teachers be interested in adding service learning to their teaching repertoire? To answer this question, it is important to recognize the purposes of education, the needs of the students, and the most effective approaches for meeting such needs. If educational purposes consist of covering numerous concepts with subsequent testing, then current teaching practices may sufficiently address the goals of education. However, among educators, the current sentiment of educational purposes goes well beyond the shallow practice of covering concepts. There is also a general conviction among the public, teacher-educators, researchers, and politicians that students need more from their schooling experiences (Brooks & Brooks, 1993).

Considering student needs can be used as a way of justifying which methods are used in the classroom. Slavin (2000) gives teachers who consider the needs of students and subsequently foster their abilities to solve real, complex problems the title of “intentional teachers” (p. 284). These teachers respond to students’ needs by considering the most effective approaches for meeting their needs. They make sure that school provides students more than lectures and workbook exercises. Intentional teachers provide opportunities for students to build their own knowledge while working with others to discover important ideas and attack challenging issues.

Many teachers who implement service learning have witnessed the success of others involved with it and wish to make it an important element in their own pedagogical practice (Wade, 1997). Some teachers are motivated by financial stipends and others by the public recognition that often accompanies service-learning experiences (Toole, 2002). It may be that
teachers participate in service learning because they feel pressure from the administration or colleagues. Some teachers recognize a positive connection between the service-learning experience and their students’ academic development. Kinsley (1997) suggests that teachers who implement service learning do so because it automatically motivates their students and helps them as teachers relate more positively to their students.

Furthermore, many educators have expressed the importance of preparing their students to be life-long learners, prepared to face the world outside of the walls of the classroom (Biemer, 1993; Willis, 1993). Research (e.g., Blyth, Saito, & Berkas, 1997; Cairn, 1999) suggests that when students are actively engaged in the processes involved in service learning, and when they make the connection between a service-learning project and something that is significant in their lives, they are likely to meet many educational needs by becoming motivated and engaged in the learning process.

Motivation is another factor contributing to the rationale for using service learning as a teaching method. Motivating students is important because our country is faced with an achievement problem that is not due to a drop in the intellectual capacity of our children (Steinberg, 2001). Steinberg believes it results from a decline in children’s interest in education. In other words, it is a problem with apathetic attitudes and low effort, not ability. Why are students apathetic? When Vispoel and Austin (1995) asked students to share the reason they failed in different school tasks, lack of interest was rated first on the list. Obviously, if teachers want to build on children’s schema and abilities, they have to pay attention to what interests them. As a method of educating, service learning gets students actively involved both physically and mentally by engaging them in student-centered motivational activities (Cleary, 1998). Such involvement creates an emotional connection (Meyers, 1999) and therefore higher interest.
Service learning also gives students the opportunity to take ownership in the curriculum. Eisner (1982) stated that when students feel their voice matters enough to create avenues of learning, they will be more prepared and feel more empowered to transfer this understanding to other areas of their lives.

In 2002, the Academy For Educational Development conducted a survey that assessed public attitudes towards education (available at www.learningindeed.com). The Academy reports that 89% of respondents believe that improving public education is a very high priority and almost half (49%) believe it should be the highest priority. Good teachers and researchers are continually striving for ways to improve education. And politicians, who often use education as a means of getting the ear of the American people, highlight educational reform as a method of building their political stature. The question is, who or what has the biggest impact on educational reform in American schools? Many teachers are already referring to Bush’s “No Child Left Behind Act” as the “No Child Left Untested Act.” Is testing really the answer? Are teachers incorporating the correct methods? Are researchers researching the things that really matter? And is the public appropriately involved? The answer clearly lies in uniting efforts from across each domain. There are many places in the nation where schools, community, politicians, and researchers have united to make service learning a powerful force in school reform (Hornbeck, 2000; Lewis, 1991; Mittlefehldt, 1997; Obert, 1995). It is through such efforts that service learning will eventually make a difference in the lives of students and the communities within which they live.

Service-Learning Research

Research, both quantitative and qualitative, suggests that when service learning is successfully implemented in the classroom there are positive outcomes for students, teachers,
schools, and the community. The most salient student outcomes of service learning are in the areas of students’ academic, personal, and civic development. In the area of academic development, studies show that students involved in service learning complete their school work accurately more often than they did before their experience (Dean & Murdock, 1992; Melchior, 1997; O’Bannon, 1999), and get higher test scores and have higher grade point averages than those who did not participate in a service-learning experience (Astin & Sax, 1996; Billig, 2000; Donahue, 1999; Scales, Blyth, Berkas, & Kielsmeier, 2000). Conrad and Hedin (1991) also found that through service learning students participated in more higher-level thinking activities than their peers, which contributed to increased motivation. Zeldin and Tarlov (1997) suggest that service-learning activities contribute to the development of problem-solving skills, which may contribute to the decrease Yates and Youniss (1996) and Follman and Muldoon (1997) found in the number of students who received discipline referrals during their involvement with service learning.

Looking at the research on the personal development of students who participate in service learning, Fiske (2002) reports that students feel connected with a group and consequently less alienated than before their experiences. Carver (1997) echos this view by claiming that students who have participated in service-learning activities have more of a sense of belonging and develop greater social competence than students who are not involved. Not only do students have the potential to learn about career opportunities, they also gain experience by becoming authorities in their specific area of service and are more respected by their peers after participating in a service-learning opportunity (Gibson-Carter, 1995). Conrad and Hedin (1989) report that students gain personally through service learning because it both reinforces and challenges their values and beliefs and places them in a setting of taking responsibility.
Newmann and Rutter (1986) suggest that students involved in service learning communicate better because they are more likely to initiate conversations with others. Consequently, better communication skills contribute to increased self-esteem and sense of personal efficacy as they take risks and explore new roles and interests.

Many researchers also agree that students develop a sense of civic responsibility through service-learning experiences (Berkas, 1997; Lisman, 1995; Melchior, 1999; Sax & Astin, 1996). Not only do they increase their knowledge of the community as they strive to meet its needs, service-learning experiences contribute to a deeper commitment towards the community. Fiske (2002) and Hamilton and Fenzel (1987) report that students who participate in service learning develop better attitudes in general than their peers who have not participated. This may be because service learning fosters a spirit of caring and lifetime service (Anderson, 1991).

Perhaps the most important voice to listen to concerning the service-learning experience is that of the students involved. In a nationwide survey of 4,000 students participated in service-learning experiences, 75% reported that they learned more in the service-learning class than in their other classes (Conrad & Hedin, 1991). Conrad and Hedin discovered that when students expressed that they learned more by participating in service learning, they were talking about the “significance” of the experience. For example, students were asking fundamental questions such as “Who am I? Where am I going? Is there any point to it all?” (p. 749) rather than questions like, “What will my grade be?”

Beyond the positive outcomes for students, a wide array of positive outcomes also results for the teacher, school, and community when participating in service learning. Bowers-Sipe (2001) suggests that teachers benefit through opportunities for collaboration and research while working with students who are motivated and have fewer behavioral problems. She shares that
schools and communities, while infusing the creativity and enthusiasm of youth, also benefit from the opportunity to collaborate with each other. Communities receive direct aid from the school and students subsequently become more invested in their communities. The report of the National Commission on Service Learning (2002) suggests that not only do teachers and students become more cohesive, students feel more connected to their school and the same feeling of connection also occurs between the school and the community. Not only is the community the direct recipient of the service, community members report a positive change in their perceptions of young people as well (Fiske, 2002).

In summary, many benefits surface as a result of service learning. Beyond the benefit of increased citizenship skills, students grow academically and personally. Students are not the only ones who experience positive outcomes as a result of service learning. Teachers, schools, and the community can also benefit from being involved in such a program.

Factors that Facilitate and Hinder Service-Learning Implementation

Factors That Facilitate Service-Learning Implementation

There are many factors that may contribute to the implementation of service learning, factors such as teaching experience, teacher knowledge, and experience with service learning. In a study of 271 middle-level schools, Seitsinger and Felner (2000) examined attributes of teachers who implemented service-learning practices in their teaching. Through surveys and interviews they found that teachers who are inclined to implement service learning are often those with more teaching experience. Their study does not look in detail at the reasons novice teachers shy away from service learning, nor does it investigate why some veteran teachers do not implement it. Novice teachers might be so overwhelmed with the day-to-day survival of being in a classroom that service learning remains an ideal to be incorporated in the future. However,
Wade, Anderson, Yarbrough, Erickson, and Kromer (1999) found that some novice teachers are successful at implementing service learning despite the fact that they are busy and often unsupported. Veteran teachers, on the other hand, may not have the energy to keep up with the latest school-reform efforts and may feel that what they are doing is working so why bother with yet another fad. Their idealism may have been tempered by the reality of educational demands.

To understand the impact of teaching experience on service-learning implementation, it is helpful to recognize the process involved in the evolution from a novice to an veteran teacher. The first year is often spent muddling through as new teachers attempt to incorporate the practices that were modeled for them in the student teaching experience (Berliner, 1988). Next they become followers, making some changes in their practices until gradually they start taking more control over what they do and become independent (Bullough & Baughman, 1993). Next, novice teachers move to mastery or experimentation where they begin to develop a style of their own. After many years they arrive at a professional stage where they are totally in control of their own work. Thus, the status of a teacher in regards to his or her experience will make a significant difference in the perception a teacher has on service learning.

The knowledge a teacher has about service learning is another factor in his or her perception of what it is all about and the value it carries in regards to implementation (Seitsinger & Felner, 2000). Although research (e.g., Cohen, 2002; Goodlad, 2002) clearly indicates that educational reform is most successful when conducted over a period of time, many teachers are being trained in short-term professional development workshops that rarely last beyond a few hours or days. Shumer (1997a) recommends that an understanding of service learning will come from staff development that allows for instructional conversations. These conversations, which take place in conjunction with implementing service learning, are about instructional change and
take place in the context of work and in the spirit of continual improvement. Through such conversations teachers become reflective practitioners who identify problems and address them together as professionals. Concentrating on long-term efforts with service learning as a means of educational reform is a process of learning and acting that will not happen quickly, but will pay off in the long run.

Experience with community service and service learning on a personal level are also factors that determine a teacher’s likelihood for implementing service learning. Many teachers have had personal experiences with community service (service in the community with minimal reflection and no specific attempt to link to academics) because of family and church experiences, as a routine part of their elementary or secondary educational experiences, or in their preservice-teacher training programs. These teachers often understand the overall potential of service learning and wish to foster similar types of enthusiasm and learning in their students (Wade, 1997). In a study of 84 teachers (67 elementary and 17 secondary), Wade found that teachers who were motivated to get involved in service learning were those who felt it important to instill a sense of caring, social responsibility, and self-esteem in their students. Often the more personal experience teachers have with service learning the more likely they are to recognize that caring, social responsibility, and self-esteem are often outcomes of service learning. For example, in a teacher education graduate’s view of service learning, Magelssen (1997) shares that her past experiences of learning through service were rewarding and motivated her to implement it into her own classroom.

In addition to teaching experience, teacher knowledge, and personal experience, there are additional factors that facilitate the successful implementation of service learning. Feeling a sense of support from the administration is one motivator (Shumer, 1997b). Other factors include
sufficient funding and in-service training. Schine (1997) suggests that service-learning programs are more successful if the philosophical goals, practical needs, and anticipated pitfalls are outlined for the particular school or district before beginning the service-learning activity. Goals should identify clear benchmarks against which to measure success. Schine also suggests enlisting the support of the school community, including the administration, staff, and parents.

Wade (1997) believes that educators must tap into funds, students’ interests, and curriculum resources. The school district can facilitate the process by providing a support system such as service-learning coordinators, teacher mentors, and peer consultants to assist.

Toole (2002) approaches service-learning implementation more intrinsically by suggesting that if teachers are going to focus their educational efforts on promoting service learning they must first pay attention to people and the social conditions in which they work. When teachers are working in a condition where they respect each other and have strong relationships of trust, they are working in conditions with a high degree of social trust. Social trust is a key element because “service learning and civil society are involved in a cycle of circular causality. Each needs the other. Service learning cannot only help produce a civil society, but its implementation relies on its existence to happen” (p. 78).

Kinsley (1997) outlines seven suggestions to facilitate the implementation process. First, those who are involved must clearly understand that service learning is not an “add-on” but another way to teach. Second, principals must be involved by understanding service learning and making it a part of the school improvement plan. Third, teachers and principals alike must feel the support of the school district. Fourth, school districts can show support by providing funding for the needed implementation. Fifth, schools must work together to promote positive relationships. Sixth, issues such as scheduling, transportation, professional development,
curriculum integration, student assessment, and program evaluation need to be examined by all who are involved with the program. Finally, the community and school must work together to provide sites for teaching, learning, and service. These suggestions can be implemented during in-service training.

In conclusion, according to this review of the literature there are at least nine factors that facilitate service-learning implementation. These include teaching experience, teacher knowledge of service learning, experience with service learning, support system, resources, in-service training professional development, experience with community service, match with personal and school philosophical goals, and social trust.

Factors That Hinder Service-Learning Implementation

Teachers’ descriptions of their experiences with service learning reveal that it is both rewarding and problematic (Wade, 1997). On one hand, teachers feel a great deal of satisfaction because of the benefits that become salient as students experience service learning. On the other hand, there are many challenges with planning, time, community contacts, and funding.

Although research on factors that hinder service-learning implementation is limited, there are three studies that have specifically investigated such factors. Greenberg, Domitrovich, Graczyk, and Zins (2001) examined the barriers to implementation in the initial stages as well as when the process advances. The initial breakdown occurred due to a lack of awareness about service learning or possibly a lack of commitment. Further in the process of implementation they found that inadequate support systems, specifically in terms of insufficient planning and training, were obstacles to success. Also, they found a lack of supervision, poor communication, and lack of technical assistance to address ongoing needs or problems.
Wade, Anderson, Yarbrough, Erickson, and Kromer (1999) focused their efforts on investigating the experiences of 30 K-12 teachers who had previously received instruction on service learning. By interviewing these teachers the researchers found that factors hindering the implementation of service learning included limited classroom time, teachers feeling overwhelmed, lack of planning time, lack of funding, and lack of principal support. The researchers suggest that teachers will be more apt to implement service learning if they “participate in varied high-quality service learning experiences” and if they “are provided with support for implementing service learning in the schools” (p. 683).

Toole (2002) studied the relationships among adults in the school as the main attribute supporting school improvement or program implementation. Specifically, he investigated issues of social trust among faculty in seven schools to determine its relationship with service-learning implementation. Toole examined social trust among teachers involved in service learning by looking at six different areas involved in the implementation process: purpose, structure, learning, leadership, political, and cultural. He found that social trust issues appeared throughout all areas. For example, some teachers wondered what the real purpose was for implementing service learning. Was it honest and benevolent? In the area of structure, there were problems with teachers leaving the school to perform the service, students missing other classes, and lack of communication about what was going on with service learning. In the area of learning, trust issues arose about whether teachers would share their understanding of service learning with others or try to keep it private. Leadership was another area with trust issues. Teachers and principals did not always have the same philosophy of service learning and questions arose as to whether teachers are involved in making meaningful decisions about programs so they feel ownership. Political issues are another area containing a breakdown of trust. Questions such as
“is the distribution of resources such as money and professional opportunities equitable?”, and “how are grant moneys managed?” are questions that need to be addressed. Problems with social trust in the area of culture appear when teachers are unwilling to plan together and conduct joint work.

Toole (2002) also investigated how social trust influences the ability of schools to implement service learning. He found that in schools with a high degree of trust among teachers, the purposes of service learning were seen as authentic and leaders were appreciated rather than despised. Schools seemed to work together to improve and contribute to service-learning implementation. Toole suggests that if teachers or schools are going to create professional-learning communities that promote a civil society, they must pay attention to people and the social conditions in which they work, and social trust is a key element. He continues to explain that service learning and a civil society need each other. Service learning can help produce a civil society and service learning relies on a civil society to happen.

Other problems mentioned in the literature as factors hindering the implementation of service learning can be separated into two categories: issues concerning the service-learning program and issues concerning the person implementing it. The service-learning program is not one that easily aligns with the day-to-day events of most classrooms, which presents a problem when considering the procedures for carrying out service learning (Carter, 1997; Scales & Koppelman, 1997; Wade, 1997). With shrinking budgets, relatively few resources are available and those that are available are not easily accessible (Carter, 1997; Scales & Koppelman, 1997). Many teachers feel that the school already places too many demands on them (Schine, 1997) and the curriculum is already overcrowded with insufficient time for planning (Billig, 2000; Carter, 1997; Scales & Koppelman, 1997; Wade, 1997). The fact that there are relatively few tangible
incentives is just one more reason why teachers are unmotivated to implement service learning (Billig, 2000). Kendall (1986) suggests that service-learning implementation is a difficult process because it reaches to the heart of an educational organization. For example, it affects the school’s mission, curriculum, quality, administrative structure, and budget, as well as faculty expectations.

The second consideration, the person implementing service learning, is also of extreme importance. One of the most important characteristics of a successful service-learning program is a teacher who is committed to its success (Billig, 2000). Without commitment the program will deteriorate into nothing more than a memory of something once tried. Another problem mentioned in research is that of limited staff training (Billig, 2000; Zeldin & Tarlov, 1997). Without sufficient training, teachers are often left confused about what defines service learning (Zeldin & Tarlov, 1997) and with unanswered questions about its implementation (Sheckley & Keeton, 1997). They may see it as an “add-on” to the curriculum rather than something that complements it (Schine, 1997; Zeldin & Tarlov, 1997). They might not recognize that service learning is extremely difficult to implement because it requires collaboration between and among youth, teacher, and community and asks implementors to strengthen such relationships (Toole, 2002). Often times such relationships are with others who hold conflicting opinions about appropriate ways of teaching and learning, which creates a lower level of support for the person attempting to implement service learning (Billig, 2000; Carter, 1997; Scales & Koppelmann, 1997). With so many factors playing into successful implementation it is understandable why it must be handled with care.

In conclusion, according to this review of the literature there are at least eight factors that may hinder service-learning implementation. These include: time, making contacts with the
community, teacher knowledge of service learning, support systems, insufficient planning and training, lack of social trust, resources, and few tangible incentives.

Professional-Development Opportunities in Service Learning

As service learning continues to evolve into a powerful means of education, a wide variety of professional-development opportunities have surfaced for educators interested in implementing it into their schools and classrooms. One approach to professional development regarding service learning is through teacher-education programs in colleges or universities.

Service-learning programs appear in teacher-education programs in a variety of ways. For example, Wade et al. (1999) share information about a program where students receive instruction in service learning in conjunction with another course, such as social studies, and are then required to carry out a service-learning project as part of the course. Another model of implementing service learning in a teacher-education program is through a course that stands on its own. In this model, students are given instruction on the service-learning philosophy and methodology and then carry out a service-learning project in conjunction with their learning. Projects can be completed as a class, in groups, or individually, and may be selected by the professor or by the students. However, when students are given the opportunity to choose the project it creates a situation where they take ownership in it, an important element to success.

Cleary and Benson (1998) also view higher education as a site for service-learning professional development. They offer five models of service learning in programs of higher education:

C Independent or study group - The student is involved in an individual service experience related to a discipline or topic area. The student meets regularly with a professor to
discuss the service and reflect on its connection to the topic area. A group of students may be involved in a regular group study to discuss the service.

C Consulting - In a consulting design, the entire class of students participates in a community project by bringing technical expertise to a community need or problem. This service may be rendered to one or more agencies or to an entire community.

C Partnership - In a partnership model, there is an ongoing relationship between the department or faculty and the community agency or school where students are involved in service.

C 100% Individual Placement - All students in a course are required to individually fulfill a service-learning component for course completion. Students select service sites from a menu of placements and complete service hours and assignments designed to facilitate learning.

C Optional Placement - Similar to the 100% placement except the service-learning option is in lieu of another course requirement, such as a research paper. Students choose which activity they will pursue to fulfill the course requirement. (p. 127)

Wade and Eland (1995) examined preservice teachers’ commitment to service learning and found that it may be enhanced by the combination of three factors. First, pre-service teachers should be provided with opportunities to develop a personal commitment to service learning by actively being involved in it. Second, pre-service teachers must learn how to go about implementing service learning in the classroom. This can happen through practicum experiences in schools that are enthusiastically involved in service-learning activities. Finally, teacher educators should structure the course in a way that offers students the opportunity to plan units and lessons incorporating service learning, reflect on their service-learning experiences, and
discuss the difficulties of using service learning in their future teaching. There is no question that
developing such a comprehensive approach to service learning in teacher education programs
takes time and effort on the part of teacher educators (Cleary & Benson, 1998) but the payoff for
teachers, and eventually for their students makes the effort worth while.

Another means of professional development for service learning is through in-service
training or staff development. The *National Information Center for Service Learning* (1998)
proposes that staff development is one of the most effective ways to help teachers infuse service
learning into the curriculum. The *National Information Center for Service Learning* suggests
releasing teachers during the day to spend time with other teachers who are involved in service
learning. Through this type of interaction it is hopeful that support networks will develop and
contribute to the success of service-learning programs. The *National Information Center* also
recommends that teacher training be carried out through 3- and 4-day workshops as opposed to
shorter sessions because training over a longer period of time is more likely to prepare
participants for implementing service learning. In the Hudson Public School District (Degelman,
1999), teachers and administrators have worked together to create a school-wide service-learning
program. Their program began with a commitment by all to integrate it into each grade level and
make it a basic part of each student’s education. With such a commitment, teachers were
prepared to participate in professional development experiences throughout the year. The
training was conducted through monthly coordination meetings to build consistency across
schools and grade levels. It also ensured time for reflection and encouraged the expansion of
service-learning projects. Teachers and administrators learned to write and use mini-grants to
support new initiatives and these endeavors were directed by a team of teachers known as the
CSL (community service learning) Leadership Team.
In conclusion, this review of the professional-development literature suggests ideas for both pre-service and in-service training. For pre-service training, service-learning programs can be organized in many different ways. For example, students may receive training in conjunction with another course or they may be involved in a service-learning course that stands on its own. In-service training, on the other hand, has to be organized around teachers’ schedules. Consequently, offering training during a time when teachers can be released is one of the best ways to accommodate teachers. Regardless of the way pre-service or in-service teachers are trained, research suggest there are three factors that influence teachers’ commitment to service learning. First, teachers should be personally involved in service learning while learning about it. Second, they should be given explicit instructions on how to make it work. Finally, the service-learning course should be structured in a way where teachers have the opportunity to plan units that incorporate service learning, reflect on their experiences, and do so in an environment where they can discuss the difficulties that surface.

Summary

Through this review of the literature, it was determined that at least two gaps exist in the research related to this study. First, while there is some current literature about facilitating factors and hindering factors, to this date no study has specifically addressed the perceptions of novice teachers and veteran teachers. Such an investigation is important because it will inform teachers and teacher educators about the differing needs of each group. This study will examine the experiences of six teachers, three with 1 to 2 years teaching experience (novice) and three with more than 2 years experience (veteran), concerning factors that facilitate and hinder service-learning implementation in their classrooms. Second, little research has been conducted in the area of how a professional development opportunity in the form of a university course
contributes to service-learning implementation. No studies to date have been conducted specifically examining novice and veteran teachers’ implementation of service learning as a result of such an experience. Each teacher in this study has knowledge about and experience with service learning, both in her classroom and as a result of professional development in the form of a university course. This study seeks to address both gaps in the literature.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine the perspectives of novice and veteran teachers regarding factors that facilitate and hinder implementation of service learning. This chapter describes the methods involved in conducting the study and the process for selecting participants. The means of collecting and analyzing the data for the study are also discussed, including considerations regarding the role of the researcher.

Case Study Research

The research method used to gather, interpret, and analyze data for this study was case study. Case studies can be represented by three differing paradigms. According to Merriam (2001) “the single most defining characteristic of case-study research lies in delimiting the object of study, the case” (p. 27). It is by “fencing in” the topic you wish to study that you can see the case as a “single entity” and then aim to uncover the meaningful components that constitute the phenomenon. Yin’s (1994) paradigm, on the other hand, is that case studies can be a methodological process of conducting research, whereas Wolcott (1994) proposes that case studies can be the end product of an investigation.

For guidance needed to manage all phases of research, this study aligned with each of the paradigms mentioned above. It aligned with the methods outlined by Merriam (2001) because the cases were chosen, described, and analyzed based on specific characteristics unique to each bounded case. It aligned with Yin (1994) because it was the chosen research method designed to
answer the questions set forth in this study. And finally, it aligned with Wolcott because there was an end product for each case examined.

After exploration of each case and explanation of the findings, the question then becomes, “now what?” Merriam (2001) suggests that information gathered from case-study research can be useful in directly influencing policy, practice, and future research. Merriam (2001) believes that a case-study research can be used to explain why an innovation worked or failed to work. Case-study research examines a specific instance but illuminates a general problem and can suggest what to do or not do in a similar setting. Using case-study research I attempted to explore and explain factors contributing to and hindering service-learning implementation and offer suggestions that could influence future practices of teachers and researchers.

Merriam (2001) believes that case-study research is also appropriate when the intentions of the researcher are to explore a phenomenon in its context, discover insight about the phenomenon rather than testing a hypothesis, and holistically describe and explain it. My study harmonizes with Merriam’s beliefs because, first, I explored the phenomenon of teachers implementing service learning. Second, I discovered insights about service-learning implementation based on teachers’ vocalizing their experiences rather than simply having them fill out a survey or questionnaire. This provided an opportunity to probe for further information and clarification when appropriate. Finally, I holistically described and explained what was found in the data by conducting analysis on each case as well as across cases.

Participant Selection

The six teachers participating in this study were chosen purposefully based on Morse’s (1991) definition of a good informant. According to Morse, a good informant is “... one who
has the knowledge and experience the researcher requires, has the ability to reflect, is articulate, has the time to be interviewed, and is willing to participate in the study” (p. 228). The teachers in this study met the definition of a good informant. First, the participants had knowledge of service learning. This was due primarily to their participation in a professional development experience in the form of a graduate class offered at a university. Second, they had experience both in the teaching profession and with implementation of service learning. Third, they were available and willing to participate in the research process.

In order to select teachers who met these criteria, I first identified all pre- and in-service teachers who had completed the undergraduate/graduate-level service-learning course at The University of Georgia. Since I was interested in having both novice and veteran teachers (K-8) as participants I then determined which teachers met this criteria. The course instructor provided me with a list of 10 novice and veteran teachers. This identification of teachers was based on the instructor’s knowledge of where they taught, how many years of teaching experience they had, and how accessible they might be for interviewing. My next step was to contact them to assess the third and fourth considerations, whether or not they agreed with the service-learning philosophy and whether or not they were willing to participate in the research. I contacted all 10 teachers. Three teachers had moved and were unreachable and one was no longer teaching. The other six met my participant criteria. Three were novice teachers who had fewer than 2 years of teaching experience, and three were veteran teachers with more than 2 years of teaching experience. During an initial phone call, I asked each possible participant about her perceptions of service learning and shared the purpose of the research. In this study pseudonyms will be used for each participant. See Table 1 for an overview of each participant’s teaching experience.
including the number of years and grades levels taught, the degrees and certifications they earned, and the year they took the service-learning course.

Table 1

Summary of Participants’ Professional and Educational Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Grades Taught</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Certificates</th>
<th>Year of Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>Spring 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7, 5, 4</td>
<td>B.S M. Ed</td>
<td>4 - 8</td>
<td>Spring 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>B.S M.Ed</td>
<td>K-8 Gifted Math</td>
<td>Spring 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>B.S M. Ed</td>
<td>T-5</td>
<td>Spring 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>K, 1</td>
<td>B.S M.Ed</td>
<td>T-5</td>
<td>Spring 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pre-K &amp; K 1, 2, 4</td>
<td>B.S M.Ed</td>
<td>Pre-K-5 T-5</td>
<td>Spring 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Information in this table was taken from the context questionnaire given to each participant.

The University Service-Learning Course

The service-learning course identified in this study is available to all undergraduate and graduate students, regardless of major, at the University of Georgia. The purpose of the course is twofold: first, to help students understand the philosophy and methodology of service learning,
and second, to have students plan and implement a service-learning project of their own design.

To understand how the course unfolds, it is first important to recognize that it is carried out democratically. Students and the instructor make collaborative decisions about what is to be learned, how it is to be learned and assessed, and the importance of that learning.

During the first and second weeks of class the course instructor helps students differentiate between volunteerism, community service, and service learning. The course instructor also shares a variety of portfolios documenting service-learning projects with the class. With this basic understanding of service learning, students are then provided with a framework highlighting the critical components of service learning (e.g., need, learning, participants, service, reflection, evaluation, publicity) and important questions to ask about service learning (e.g., What role will collaborators have in the project?, When and where and how will reflection occur?).

Students use this framework to guide and evaluate their service-learning projects. By the third week or fourth week of the 15-week course, students have designed and begun their service-learning projects. The instructor’s role in the course then changes from a transmitter of information to one of a facilitator. The instructor serves as a mentor and offers support for each project according to individual needs. Class sessions are used for reflection, problem solving, and reporting the progress of each project. Depending on the needs of the students, class sessions may be used as a time for students to work on their projects or as a time to learn additional information about the field of service learning. As the semester ends, students share their projects and portfolios with peers during a get-together celebrating the outcomes of their service and learning.
Data Sources, Collection, and Analysis

Data sources in this study included context questionnaires, three individual-interviews, artifacts, and a field-work journal. A context questionnaire is a questionnaire that provides information relative to the place where the participant is working. Interviews, as defined by Seidman (1998), are a mode of inquiry with the purpose of understanding the experiences of other people and the meaning they make of that experience. Artifacts, as defined by Merriam (2001), are written, visual, and physical materials that communicate relevant information to the study at hand. Examples of artifacts include diaries, calendars, worksheets, newspapers, and pictures. A field-work journal is kept by the researcher to document observations, participant expressions, and potential questions to ask at a later date. The combination of each of the above-mentioned sources of data served as triangulation to confirm the emerging findings from this study and strengthen reliability as well as internal validity (Merriam, 2001). The detailed use of each method in regards to this study are described below.

Data Sources

Context questionnaire. A context questionnaire serves as a means for accessing information about the context within which each participant works. For the purposes of this study the context questionnaire was an avenue for accessing information regarding the participants’ districts, schools, teams, classrooms, and service-learning experiences (see Appendix A). Understanding the context of each participant contributed to this study by offering insight into previous experiences with service learning which, for some, played a role in service-learning implementation. A one-on-one meeting was conducted with each participant to provide an opportunity to get acquainted and time for them to complete the questionnaire prior to the first
interview. The meetings lasted approximately 30 minutes. Some took place at the school where the participants worked and some at a restaurant near the participants’ houses.

*Interviews.* The interviews for this research were semi-structured, conducted one-on-one in a sequence of at least three interviews per participant. As Seidman (1998) suggests, the first interview sought to establish the context of the participants’ experiences. In this study, the context of the participants included educational background, teaching experience, and teaching philosophy. The first interview also drew upon the participants’ reflections about their experience with the service-learning course taken at the university. Each of the six participants answered the same questions for interview one (see Appendix B). The location of the first and subsequent interviews was determined by the participant. Although most interviews took place at the school where the participant worked, some chose to meet at their home or a local restaurant. All interviews (with the exception of one) were tape recorded with two tape recorders to assure reliability in gathering information. The average interview lasted 1 hour and included follow-up questions that were carried out through e-mail or telephone conversations.

In the second interview, participants reconstructed their experiences with service learning. Each of the six participants were asked specific interview questions based on their service-learning experiences both during and following the university course. One set of interview questions was relevant to novice teachers and one to veteran teachers (see Appendix C).

Finally, according to Seidman (1998), it is during the third interview that participants reflect on the meanings their experiences hold for them. In this study, the participants reflected on the factors they mentioned that facilitate and hinder service-learning implementation and how their feelings about service learning have evolved. They also discussed where they envision
themselves going with service learning in the future, how the service-learning course, as well as the support from their school district and administration, helped them with service-learning endeavors, and anything else they felt inclined to share. During the third interview participants were given a list of factors they had mentioned during their first two interviews that contributed to or hindered implementation of service learning. From the list, each participant provided additional factors according to their insights (see Appendix D).

The interview questions were used as a guide for the purpose of gaining insight into the participants’ perspectives on their service-learning experiences. As Yow (1994) suggests, I used an interview guide with topics that allowed for flexibility in conducting the interviews. The interview guide established a framework that allowed me to get the information needed, but provided leeway for the unexpected. According to Patton (1990), “the purpose of interviewing . . . is to allow us to enter into the other person’s perspective” (p. 196). This was the main objective of each interview. During each interview, questions were asked in a non-leading manner to encourage completely candid responses from the participants. My intention was to probe to gather further information while listening to the participants. To end each interview, the participants were asked to contribute any insights that had not yet been discussed. After information about factors that influence implementation was gathered from each participant, a comprehensive list was compiled and e-mailed to provide each participant an opportunity to contribute further insight if desired.

Artifacts. Artifacts were a second source of data for this study and helped ground the investigation in its context while adding a richness to the data. Merriam (2001) calls artifacts “documents” and comments that they are a “ready-made source of data easily accessible to the imaginative and resourceful investigator” (p. 112). Merriam shares that the first step in using
artifacts is finding relevant materials, followed by assessing their authenticity. Next the researcher must adopt a system for coding and cataloging each artifact. For the purposes of this study, the artifact used was a portfolio produced by the participants during their service-learning course. This portfolio not only described the participants’ experiences with their service-learning project, but also included writings such as their philosophies of service learning before and after their experience. Access to the portfolios was facilitated by working with the service-learning course instructor. By examining their portfolios, I gained insight into the participants’ chosen projects and further understood their experiences with service learning during the course.

Furthermore, I was interested in understanding participants’ beliefs about service learning at the time they were involved in the class and how their beliefs may have evolved with time and teaching experience. I also explored any other information the participants chose to include. This information was primarily found in their reflection journals, a required component of the portfolio. Additional artifacts were selected throughout the study based on my discretion. Such artifacts included evidence from the teachers about service-learning projects from their own classrooms. For example, some teachers recorded their service-learning projects on a web page or in newspaper articles. Others had artifacts consisting of information they used to facilitate service-learning implementation, such as notes to parents and collaborators. Some teachers, who had completed a master’s degree, had a detailed description of their philosophy of education.

*Field-work journal.* As Silverman (1993) suggests, I kept a field-work journal to document the procedures and record problems and ideas that arose throughout the research process. Merriam (1998) suggests that from the beginning of a study, researchers put forth the details of their position (i.e. assumptions, the basis for participant selection, a description of the setting). The field-work journal assists the researcher in triangulation of the data leaving an
“audit trail” that details how data were collected, how categories originated, and how decisions were made throughout the inquiry. The field-work journal was the avenue through which I chose to document the details of my data collection as well as the analysis of the data.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection and analysis were conducted in a sequential manner with each of the six participants. After completing the first individual interview, I transcribed the data and conducted a preliminary analysis in which I began to see common factors emerge throughout the data. I took notes of the possible factors (e.g., time, resources, support) that surfaced and may have been potential answers to my research questions. I organized the factors according to those that participants suggested facilitated implementation and those that hindered it. This allowed me the opportunity to evaluate what I had learned and informed me of topics I would like to pursue in the second interviews. Upon completion of the second interviews, I compared the data from both interviews and proceeded to the third, all the while continuing to add to the list of common factors. In addition to the three interviews with the participants, I also kept lines of communication open through e-mail and telephone conversations to further address questions that surfaced from the data. Throughout the process I took notes of possible factors (e.g., time, resources, support) that surfaced and may have been potential answers to my research questions. I continued this recursive process until I reached saturation – until I had uncovered no new factors. This method used to analyze data is referred to as constant comparative (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Strauss (1987) defines the constant comparative method of data analysis as a method by which “many indicators (behavioral actions/events) are examined comparatively by the analyst who then ‘codes them,’ naming them as indicators of a class of events/behavioral actions” (p. 25). Although Glaser and Strauss use the term categories to organize data, in this
study I use the term factors because the purpose of my study is to understand the factors that facilitate and hinder implementation. Without such ongoing analysis while collecting data, Merriam (1998) believes that the data “can be unfocused, repetitious, and overwhelming in the sheer volume of material that needs to be processed” (2001, p. 162).

Prior to data analysis I reread the review in Chapter Two. I did this for the purpose of extracting factors identified in the literature. I created a framework chart prior to data collection and analysis. To do this I reread my review of the literature and highlighted any mention of facilitators or hindrances to service-learning implementation. According to research conducted prior to this study, there are nine factors that facilitate and eight factors that hinder service-learning implementation in the classroom. From these factors I created two charts: one for facilitators and one for hindrances. Some factors appeared as both facilitators and hindrances (e.g., resources, support system). Some factors appeared in only one chart but could have easily appeared in another. For example, “years of teaching experience” was cited by Seitsinger and Felner (2000) as a facilitating factor indicating that teachers with more teaching experience are more inclined to implement service learning. Although this factor was cited in the literature as a facilitator the converse could also be true. Since it was not mentioned in the literature as both, I made the decision to place factors on the charts based exclusively on the literature. For each factor I created a working definition and summarized a description of the factor based on the literature. I used it as a framework as I examined the data to make decisions about whether factors from my study confirmed prior research or were new findings to the field of service-learning research. See Table 2 for factors from the literature that facilitate service-learning implementation and Table 3 for factors from the literature that hinder service-learning implementation.
Table 2

Factors From Literature That Facilitate Service-Learning Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors that Facilitate According to Literature Review</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Description of the Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teaching experience</td>
<td>The number of years that the participants have been full time teachers.</td>
<td>teachers’ who are inclined to implement service learning are often those with more teaching experience (Seitsinger &amp; Felner, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher knowledge</td>
<td>The understanding the participants have about service learning gained from the course or from experience.</td>
<td>assists in understanding what it is all about and the value it carries in regards to implementation (Seitsinger &amp; Felner, 2000); not an “add-on” but another way to teach (Kinsley, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service-learning experience</td>
<td>The direct participation the participants have in service learning.</td>
<td>the more personal experience teachers have with service learning the more likely they are to recognize that caring, social responsibility, and self-esteem are often outcomes of service learning (Magelssen, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support system</td>
<td>A network of people who promote and encourage the interests of service learning.</td>
<td>school community, including the administration, staff, and parents; service-learning coordinators, teacher mentors, and peer consultants; school district (Kinsley; 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources</td>
<td>An available means to supplies needed to carry out service learning.</td>
<td>materials, transportation, publicity (Kinsley, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional development</td>
<td>The process teachers go through to develop the skills, knowledge or experience needed to conduct service learning.</td>
<td>understanding service learning comes from development that: 1. revolves around instructional conversations in conjunction with implementing service learning; 2. are about instructional change; 3. takes place in the context of work; 4. that occurs in the spirit of continual improvement (Shumer, 1997a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that Facilitate According to Literature Review</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Description of the Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience with community service</td>
<td>Participation in community service (service in the community with minimal reflection and no specific attempt to link to academics) before learning about or implementing service learning.</td>
<td>Service on behalf of a community, such as church, with minimal attention to link to academics; understand its overall potential and wish to foster similar types of enthusiasm and learning in their students (Wade, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>match with self and school philosophical goals</td>
<td>Alignment between the philosophy of the participants and the philosophy of the school in which they work.</td>
<td>Service-learning programs are more successful if the philosophical goals of teachers align with those of service learning (Schine, 1997); principal understands service learning and makes it a part of the school improvement plan (Kinsley, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social trust</td>
<td>Reliance on the character, ability, strength or truth of others within the workplace.</td>
<td>Social conditions in which they work. Social trust is a key element because “service learning and civil society are involved in a cycle of circular causality. Each needs the other; positive relationships (Toole, 2002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

**Factors From Literature That Hinder Service-Learning Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors That Hinder According to Literature Review</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Description of the Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>class and planning time</td>
<td>The amount of time needed for teachers to carry out activities in the classroom, as well as the amount of time it takes to plan the activities.</td>
<td>not one that easily aligns with the day-to-day events of most classrooms, which presents a problem when considering the procedures for carrying out service learning (Carter, 1997; Scales &amp; Koppelman, 1997; Wade, 1997; teachers feeling overwhelmed (Wade et al.1999); school already places too many demands on them (Schine, 1997); the curriculum is already overcrowded with insufficient time for planning (Billig, 2000; Carter, 1997; Scales &amp; Koppelman, 1997; Wade, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making contacts with the community</td>
<td>Establishing communication with collaborators.</td>
<td>difficult to implement because it requires collaboration between and among youth, teacher, and community and asks implementors to strengthen such relationships (Toole, 2002); oftentimes such relationships are with others who hold conflicting opinions about appropriate ways of teaching and learning, which creates a lower level of support for the person attempting to implement service learning (Billig; Carter, 1997; Scales &amp; Koppelmann, 1997).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors That Hinder According to Literature Review</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Description of the Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher knowledge</td>
<td>A teacher having the knowledge of what service learning is and the desire to do use it in the classroom.</td>
<td>initial breakdown occurs due to a lack of awareness or commitment about service learning (Greenberg, Domitrovich, Graczyk, &amp; Zins, 2001); teacher must be committed to success of program (Billig, 2000) unanswered questions about its implementation (Sheckley &amp; Keeton, 1997); see it as an “add-on” to the curriculum rather than something that complements it (Schine, 1997; Zeldin &amp; Tarlov, 1997); teachers are often left confused about what defines service learning (Zeldin &amp; Tarlov, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support system</td>
<td>Having access to a network of people who promote and encourage the interests of service learning.</td>
<td>lack of principal support (Wade et al.1999); lack of supervision, poor communication, and lack of technical assistance to address ongoing needs or problems (Greenberg, Domitrovich, Graczyk, &amp; Zins, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional development</td>
<td>Teachers going through the process to develop the skills, knowledge or experience needed to conduct service learning.</td>
<td>specifically in terms of insufficient planning and training (Greenberg, Domitrovich, Graczyk, &amp; Zins, 2001); service-learning implementation is a difficult process because it reaches to the heart of educational organization. For example, it affects the school’s mission, curriculum, faculty expectations, quality, administrative structure, and budget (Kendall, 1986); limited staff training (Billig, 2000; Zeldin &amp; Tarlov, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social trust among faculty</td>
<td>Reliance on the character, ability, strength or truth of others within the workplace.</td>
<td>people and the social conditions in which they work; trust issues among teachers regarding purpose, structure, learning, leadership, political, cultural (Toole, 2002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors That Hinder According to Literature Review</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Description of the Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>resources</td>
<td>A means to supplies needed to carry out service learning.</td>
<td>relatively few resources are available and those that are available are not easily accessible (Carter, 1997; Scales &amp; Koppelman, 1997); lack of funding (Wade et al., 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangible incentives</td>
<td>Motivation to conduct service learning because of a concrete reward.</td>
<td>lack of recognition; no additional pay (Billig, 2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constant comparative was the most appropriate method for analyzing data from this study for two reasons. First, it helped to uncover factors previously identified in the literature as well as new ones. Construction of factors was an obvious means for understanding such information as it unfolded from the data because it emphasized the barriers and contributors to service-learning implementation in an organized manner. Another reason the constant comparative method was appropriate was that constantly comparing data informed the organization and content of subsequent interviews intended to access further understandings.

Data analysis through a constant-comparative method can include both within-case and cross-case analyses (Merriam, 2001). In this study, I first analyzed data from each participant using the constant-comparative method to identify factors. Next I analyzed data across the six cases to find common and differing factors. As a guide for using the constant-comparative method of analyzing data, I used five of Bogdan and Biklen’s (1997) six-step recommendation. First, I collected data from the cases; second, I identified important issues and recurring events to form factors; third, I collected additional data to add more examples or more elaboration on the factors; fourth, I wrote about the factors to describe how they account for all the documented
and, fifth, I identified patterns and relationships between the factors. Developing a theory was not one of my goals so I did not use the sixth recommendation of theory development.

In an attempt to accurately represent the information in an organized manner, I followed Miles and Huberman’s (1984) suggestion to display information in an organized matrix that readily presents the information to the reader. Table 4 is a skeleton of such a matrix and organizes each case study with the factors they identify that facilitate or hinder service-learning implementation.

Table 4

Case Study Analysis Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That facilitate</td>
<td>That hinder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 1 (novice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2 (novice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3 (novice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 4 (veteran)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 5 (veteran)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 6 (veteran)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As data were gathered and organized in the matrix, it became obvious that participants had both similar and different perceptions regarding factors that facilitate and hinder service-learning implementation. To preserve the authenticity of the data I placed the information gathered from each participant precisely where they suggested it be (if they did) during their interviews, even when the experiences of other participants suggested it be labeled differently.
For example, one participant mentioned background experiences of students in her class as a facilitator while another participant referred to student background experiences as a hindrance.

The cross-case analysis of the first research question related to novice and veteran teachers’ perspectives of factors that facilitate service-learning implementation. For the cross-case analysis I looked across the three novice teachers to see if they had similar or differing perceptions of facilitating and hindering factors of service-learning implementation. I did this same process for the three veteran teachers. The cross-case analysis of the second question related to novice and veteran teachers’ perceptions of factors that hinder service-learning implementation. As with the first question I first looked across the three novice teacher to see if they had similar or differing perceptions of facilitating and hindering factors of service-learning implementation. Then I did the same with the veteran teachers. Finally, I examined factors across all six teachers. For the third research question related to the university service-learning course and how it influenced service-learning implementation, I examined aspects of the course which were identified individually by participants only and not across cases.

Verification Steps

*Internal Reliability and Validity*

Several measures were taken to secure both internal reliability and internal validity. Internal reliability, as described by Goetz and LeCompte (1984), is the extent to which data are authentic representations of the reality. They suggest that internal reliability can be assessed when researchers, using a set of previously generated constructs, can match data in the same way as the original researcher. Merriam (1998) echoes this definition by stating that reliability is the extent to which the research findings can be replicated. However, she cautions that for a variety of reasons, qualitative studies will not yield identical results, which does not discredit the
original study. Merriam proposes that a more fitting question to ask is, “Are the results consistent with data collected?” (p. 206). This question aligns with Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) suggestion to think about the “dependability” or “consistency” of the results obtained from the data. Aligning with the suggestions established by Goetz and LeCompte (1984) inference descriptions were minimized and direct quotes were used to shed insight into the original data. Through these precautions this research was established upon a foundation of what Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, and Allen (1993) term as trustworthiness and authenticity.

Internal validity has been described by Merriam (2001) as dealing with the question of how congruent research findings are with reality. When accounting for internal validity, Merriam again advocates clarifying researcher biases from the outset and using triangulation throughout the study. She also supports collaborative modes of research, which means involving participants in all phases. This can be accomplished through member checks, where participants take part in authenticating the data as it unfolds by checking the researcher’s interpretations for accuracy in representing their views. Another means for ensuring internal validity is through what Merriam terms “peer examination.” This research study followed the recommendations of Merriam by adhering to her suggestions for ensuring internal validity. All participants were involved in each phase of the data analysis by reading the analysis and contributing further input or clarification. A colleague of the researcher, who is also involved in the processes of qualitative research, was asked to serve as a peer examiner and participated in the processes by discussing the analysis with the researcher and editing the written description of the analysis. By taking such precautions for internal validity this study established a solid and meaningful foundation. As Guba and Lincoln (1981) explain “once a study has solid internal validity, only then can it be questioned as
generalizable - there is no point in asking whether meaningless information has any general applicability” (p. 115).

External Validity

The final assurance to be made in preparation for generating trustworthy results is external validity. Merriam (1998) indicates that external validity is the “extent to which the findings of one study can be applied to other situations” (p. 207). To set up a study that is secure in this area, Merriam suggests using rich, thick descriptions so that researchers who are making subsequent investigations will be prepared to assess their own research conditions and see how closely they align with the conditions of the original research. With detailed information, it can be left up to the consumers of the research to determine how closely the findings may apply to their situation. Finally, assurances for external validity were met by describing how typical each research case was so that users can make comparisons to their own research (LeCompte, Preissle, & Tesch, 1993).

Researcher Biases

In qualitative research the role of the researcher as the primary source of data collection includes identifying personal beliefs and biases at the beginning of the study. “Research methods are not neutral tools; they embody assumptions about causation and control, about how knowledge is acquired, and about the researcher’s relationship to what is being studied”(Bissex & Bullock, 1987, p. 12). With this in mind, it is important to acknowledge that my perceptions of service-learning implementation are influenced by my experiences on three different levels. I have been involved in service learning as a student (high school and graduate school), I have conducted service learning as a fifth-grade teacher, and I have encouraged service learning as a teaching methodology while working as a pre-service teacher educator at a private university. As
a student involved in service learning, I engaged in a myriad of activities that had a positive impact on my life. It was because of such experiences that the benefits of service learning rang true to me as a teacher and influenced my desire to incorporate it into my classroom. As an elementary teacher I felt the tug-o-war that often keeps educators from doing the things they know really matter. I was limited by the time factors involved in public education and soon recognized that high-stakes testing drives many of the decisions made in the classroom. However, these difficulties did not keep me from advocating service learning as an instructor in the university setting. This role was also influenced by my belief that service learning has the potential to make a significant impact on society and should be a part of the classroom. Because of my experiences with service learning, I bring knowledge from the perspective of a student, a teacher, and a teacher educator. I believe the information I have gained from these contexts enhanced my awareness and sensitivity to the participants I interviewed.

It is also important to note that because of my previous experiences with service learning, I brought various biases to this study that should be acknowledged. As alluded to above, I believe service learning has the potential to make a difference in the classroom experiences of children because it takes them into a real setting and provides them with authentic opportunities to extend their learning into the community. I also feel that in order for teachers to understand the potential ramifications of service learning they should first participate in a service-learning activity (preferably of their choice followed by a service-learning experience with children). Participating in an educational setting with children is the ideal way for teachers to get needed experience that will transfer into their own classroom setting. I believe that service learning can be best implemented in a school where there is administrative support and all or most teachers are participating in the methodology.
CHAPTER 4

CASE STUDIES: NOVICE TEACHERS

Chelsea, Emma, and Sheila are pseudonyms given to the novice teachers who participated in this study. Each shared the common experience of learning about service learning through a course at a university as preservice teachers. For contextual information about each participant I will provide their philosophy of teaching, definition of service learning, a brief description of their classroom service-learning projects, and their feelings about service learning. Findings will then be presented for each research question. Quotes from participants are indicated by italicization.

Chelsea

Chelsea as a Teacher

As a first-year seventh grade science teacher in an urban middle school, Chelsea had a deep belief in the importance of helping students reach their highest potential and feels that service learning is one way to do that. Part of her conviction for using service learning in the classroom comes from her personal experience with it. Although Chelsea seemed like a rather outgoing individual, before taking the service-learning course she was painfully shy. She contributed this transformation from being an introvert to an extrovert entirely to the experience she had in her university service-learning course.

The core of Chelsea’s philosophy of education was to create situations where her students could solve real needs and problems through science labs and in the community. Chelsea stated,
“My philosophy is more based on getting the students involved in things that are going to help them later on. So getting them involved in things that they do need to know [is important].” She was concerned about her students’ dependency on textbooks. She said, 

The students want to use their textbooks. They don’t really have to think about it . . . it is written in bold at the end of the chapter, so all you have to do is to go back and write down the question, flip the page back and write down the answer. There is no thinking involved. You don’t have to do anything except write something down.

Chelsea had her own definition of service learning. When asked what it was, she responded,

Service learning to me is something that you do that helps benefit someone else, but at the same time it is benefitting you because you are learning something along the way. Or it could be the other person is learning from stuff you are presenting to them. But I think that the primary thing with service learning is that there is learning involved and you could label it with a QCC [Quality Core Curriculum state-mandated content] if you really wanted to.

Chelsea took knowledge she gained about service learning from her university course to her classroom. During her first year of teaching Chelsea engaged her students in two service-learning projects. The first was a project on epidemiology and the second on mosses. When asked about these service-learning projects Chelsea responded, 

. . . we talked about how diseases were spread from one to another and then we made little pamphlets about how diseases were spread and it was something they could use to share with a younger brother or sister. The other one we are currently working on now is growing mosses. They are experimenting growing mosses in different ways and then they
are going to write up an explanation of the best conditions that could be used for anyone interested in growing moss gardens. They built a terrarium and grew moss in it. They learned about growing conditions and care of moss gardens. After learning about moss gardens, they made a brochure to share with others.

Chelsea felt so strongly about service learning that she was already planning a year-long service-learning project for the upcoming school year. According to Chelsea,

The service-learning project that I want to do next year... [is] to make a garden with these students. And so my goal next year is to do this huge project, pretty much all year long, service-learning project, and the students are going to learn how to harvest the garden. They are going to learn about the nutrients in the food.

What Factors Facilitate Service Learning?

Chelsea identified seven factors that she believes facilitates service-learning implementation (see Table 5).

Table 5

Factors Identified by Chelsea That Facilitate Service-Learning Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors That Facilitate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C student characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C characteristics of the teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C support system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C teacher knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C experience with service learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C innate human behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student characteristics. During her interviews Chelsea commented on the group of students she taught. She felt that being knowledgeable about the students you teach facilitates service-learning implementation. She said,

*Know the students . . . what the students can do on their own. Find out what they know and what they can do and help them to raise it up to the next level. They are very social, so that kind of gets them going. I mean, they get to share their knowledge with someone, which they really enjoy. Letting someone else know that you know something is a great thing. I guess the motivation behind the students is a facilitator because they are ready to do it, they are ready to go.*

According to Chelsea, students were motivated by service learning. They got emotionally involved in their project and the emotion drove them to want to learn and do more. She used this knowledge about her students to help her set-up and implement service learning projects.

Resources. Another facilitating factor according to Chelsea was having access to resources. In her project on mosses students created a brochure intended to be distributed at area greenhouses. This is considered to be an indirect project because her students never met face-to-face with recipients of their service. This kind of project generally requires fewer and more readily available resources. According to Chelsea, *Making things to share, that is easy to do as far as getting materials to make it.* She had sufficient resources (e.g., paper, computer) available to her to facilitate the project.

Characteristics of the teacher. Characteristics of a teacher, such as motivation and personality, was another factor Chelsea mentioned in her interviews. She said,

*When I say I am going to do something I [will] and nobody is going to stop me from doing it. I think the mind set you go into during service learning reflects in your project*
too. If you are really excited about it and you really want it to work then you are going to work harder to make it work.

During one interview she provided insight into her personality. She characterized herself as 
crazy and stubborn.

Support system. Having a support system also facilitated Chelsea’s service-learning implementation. Support from her peers was important. For example, according to Chelsea, [There was] tremendous support. The other science teacher on the team and I have worked together trying to do a lot of what we have done. She has been here, this is her third year here so she has had more experience with, ‘Hey, wait a minute, that is not really doable the way you are thinking about it so let’s do it this way.’ She helps me to adjust things.

Having a supportive administrator was also important in facilitating service-learning. She said, 

He [the principal] is really good at working with us in a way that is not always cut-and-dried every time. I think that as more is done with service learning and more is brought out about what it can bring, I think that administrators will be more opened to it because you will have written documentation.

Teacher knowledge of service learning. According to Chelsea, teacher knowledge of service learning facilitated its implementation. She commented on the importance of being aware of the impact of service learning on her students. She said, 

[Service learning] builds on their [her students] self worth. I think that individuals naturally get a feeling of confidence, self worth, [and] just a little bit of joy out of helping other individuals and seeing other individuals get help. So knowing that they can learn
while they are helping someone else learn is just, I think it is just a really great way to teach.

Experience with service learning. Closely related to, yet different from, teacher knowledge of service learning is personal experience with it. When asked why she kept doing service learning, Chelsea responded, “. . . mainly because of the experiences I have had with it. I mean just the difference that it made in my educational experience. The difference it is making with my own students.” She also suggested that the more a teacher works with service learning, the easier it becomes to implement.

Innate human behavior. Chelsea believed that service learning works because it taps into human nature. She stated, “People have an innate desire to help others and share what they have learned. Believing in the people you are working with and valuing what you are doing [is important].” This innate desire to help others, according to Chelsea, is perhaps one of the greatest facilitators for implementing service learning.

What Factors Hinder Service Learning?

Chelsea identified seven factors which are listed in Table 6 that she believes hinders service-learning implementation.

Teacher knowledge of service learning. Although Chelsea mentioned teacher knowledge of service learning as a factor that facilitates service learning, she also placed it in the category of a hindrance because she felt that lack of knowledge about service learning does nothing to promote its success. She specifically commented on how important it is to understand the varying degrees of magnitudes possible in service-learning projects. Some projects can be simple because they do not require a lot of resources or time, while other projects are more difficult. She said, As far as having middle schoolers doing big projects . . . it is difficult for me to organize.
She was concerned that her service-learning project ideas would become too large and unwieldy, perhaps resulting in students not being motivated, becoming distracted, and not learning required content.

Table 6

Factors Identified by Chelsea That Hinder Service-Learning Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors That Hinder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C teacher knowledge of service learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C fear of failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C class and planning time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C student characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C support system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C teacher inexperience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fear of failure.* Fear of failure was another hindrance according to Chelsea. She said,

_I didn’t want to do too much my first year because I didn’t want to get in over my head and . . . you know, here is this big thing and it is going down the tubes. And I didn’t want my students to see this huge failure._

She was concerned that,

 . . . a student will really be impassioned about what they are doing and work really, really hard on it, and then something won’t go right and they will just be completely furious with themselves, furious with me, furious with whoever was helping.

*Resources.* Chelsea also identified resources as a hindrance, specifically transportation, facilities, and funding. She said,

_Had I had the resources [in the epidemiology service-learning project] we could have gone to maybe an elementary school and talked about washing your hands and why it is
important and the impact it would have, and how germs were spread and how they make
them sick. But we just didn’t have the busses to go and didn’t have a classroom readily
available for the number of seventh grade classes I would have had to take. Actually
going somewhere to share it is difficult.

She specifically mentioned that she was writing grants to “try to get some money and try to get
some things going.” She said this was a slow process.

Class and planning time. Another hindrance to service-learning implementation was
class and planning time. Chelsea discussed the amount of time it took to complete one service-
learning project. As she said,

It takes a little more time to plan it out because you don’t know what to expect, and
dealing with what you get when you don’t know what to get is kind of hectic. You just
don’t realize how long it takes to do stuff in the classroom.

Student characteristics. During her interviews Chelsea remarked repeatedly on the
impact students had on hindering service-learning implementation. She specifically commented
on their backgrounds (e.g., home environments, neighborhoods, socioeconomic status) and their
lack of motivation. In her discussion of their backgrounds she was not being demeaning to the
students, rather expressing great concern about their welfare. She felt their background may have
had an impact in their involvement in the class. She stated,

Most of our children are either alcohol syndrom, crack syndrom, um, they are the project
kids. They are not coming from stable families that come and greet them at night. It is not
just the poverty that is the issue, it is also the family stability . . .

Along with the backgrounds of students Chelsea commented on their lack of motivation.

According to Chelsea,
. . . so many students have given up. I can’t tell you how many . . . I have that are just like, whatever, anytime we do anything. I mean we could do a lab and they are like “aaarrr.” We could go outside and “aaarrr.” And of course, book work, even that they are “aaarrr.”

Support system. Chelsea also identified an support system as a hindrance. She simply stated, “But who do I talk to?” She made references to doing it alone.

Teacher inexperience. The hindrance Chelsea referred to most often was her lack of experience as a teacher. She said,

*Being so new into my experience, I haven’t made all of the connections that I need to make. Connections with the community, connections with people who could come and help out, connections with anyone who has anything that they could donate to help us do a service-learning project, connections with just how to set up a bus to go to an elementary school. I need to learn that process. . . .*

Making connections within the school and community was important to the success of her projects. Chelsea felt because she was a new teacher she hadn’t yet established those connections.

Chelsea also felt she did not have enough experience with effective classroom management strategies to be totally effective with her projects. She wanted students to make decisions but felt uncomfortable with the process. She elaborated on this as she said,

*Letting them go with something and letting them lead . . . it is something very difficult for me to do. And it is difficult for them to stay on task, and it is really hard. They want to talk about other things, they want to work on other homework they haven’t done. . . . So stuff like that really hinders getting any project done, but you know, service learning too.*
Chelsea also referred to her lack of experience in relation to her ideologic expectations of her projects. She said,

*When I first took the [university] class I thought you could do all these great and wonderful things right away, but the reality is that you have to kind of build the students up to it. That wasn’t something I realized while I was taking the class, but at the same time I didn’t have any teaching experience at all, so it is just kind of, oh yeah, sure my kids can do this.*

**What About the University Course?**

Chelsea was not at all hesitant to talk about her pre-service experience in the university course. At first she felt uncomfortable in the course partly because of her timid nature and partly because the class was designed to be very democratic. She said, “*[It was] uncomfortable at first for me because [the instructor] does not give you a project to do, you pick your own project. . . . You get in there and the syllabus is practically blank, so I was intimidated.*” She quickly adapted to the course and collaborated with another preservice science teacher on a project.

Chelsea’s service-learning project was entitled *Science Supplies*. She and a partner collected supplies for an integrated science program at a local middle school. This program had recently shifted from a traditional lecture format of science instruction to an integrated program that categorizes science concepts according to themes. This transition left many science teachers *desperately seeking materials while not exhausting their own funds*. Chelsea and her partner spent a great deal of time learning about integrated science and the specific science curriculum by observing in classrooms and interviewing science teachers. They found out precisely what supplies were needed, then approached 20 area businesses to solicit donations that they then gave to the middle school teachers.
Although their goal of gathering supplies was successfully achieved, Chelsea reported that it was only a small portion of the true benefit that came from being involved in the service-learning project. She said, “In addition to learning about the curriculum, we also gained valuable communication and computer skills. The need to effectively communicate led us to become more assertive and gave us a better insight to school-community relationships.”

In both the interviews and in her project portfolio Chelsea talked about what she had learned that facilitated her work. According to Chelsea,

Learning how to work around one another [project partner] will really help us when we are trying to work with future coworkers. Another important thing I have learned is that you need connections! [The course instructor] has played a vital role in our project by giving us names of individuals in which we can get in touch with. I just hope that they will share as many ideas as we have while working on this project. I learned how to talk with people. It made me a more forceful person because I was extremely shy. . . . eventually I learned how to empower myself and learned how to speak up for myself and let my thoughts and feelings be known. So now I do it all the time. Seriously, I can’t say enough for that side of the course because I am completely different from before and after. I can talk about helping people, such a great thing. Here is a way to bring it into the classroom and show students how they can help other people and yet at the same time teach them.

Chelsea remarked frequently about the course instructor. One of the characteristics that stood out for Chelsea was just how passionate the instructor was about service learning. She was also impressed with how available the instructor was to facilitate each student’s individual project. As she said, “I had to go back to the instructor and ask, what do we do? It is like [the
instructor] *knows everybody in the county and everywhere else to connect everyone with.*”

Chelsea also commented on the instructor’s high level of energy and commented that “. . . *she’s just so energetic . . . you can’t help but enjoy it and get a lot out of it.*” Chelsea has strong feelings about service learning. She said,

*I think service learning impacts everyone a little differently. What you take away from it might not be the same as what someone else takes away from it. I really believe in what service learning can bring. I think that it [service learning] is a great motivator.*

When Chelsea finished the class, she was very excited about service learning and was anxious to implement it in her own classroom. She commented that the ideal conditions for having service learning happen would be *endless funding, imaginative students, and finding projects that covered the QCCs.*

Emma

*Emma as a Teacher*

Emma is a second-year fourth grade science teacher who at the time of this study was working in an inner-city elementary school. Her first year of teaching was in the fifth grade, so Emma has faced the challenges involved in getting to know a new curriculum. Her school participated in a program they called “looping” which means that she will followed her fourth grade students into the fifth grade giving her the opportunity to teach them for 2 years. Emma, at times, was reticent to share her feeling about factors that facilitate and hinder service learning because according to her, she had not yet fully implemented it into her classroom. She felt awkward sharing her opinions about what a wonderful tool it could be in the lives of children when she herself had not yet made it a part of her classroom. She was reassured that her insight
was needed because one purpose of the study was to investigate novice teachers perceptions of factors that facilitate and hinder the implementation of service learning.

Emma’s philosophy of education revolved around the child and she believed they should be the center of focus. She specifically commented that teaching should be about the child, and she made it a point to get to know each of them individually. She described her philosophy as follows:

*I guess my basic philosophy of teaching is that all students can learn given the opportunity and the hard thing about that is the opportunity is different for each . . . because there are different types of learners. . . . I guess my basic philosophy is that you have to try reaching out to all those students. . . . In the end it is about the students, it is not about me.*

Emma recognized that in order to know the whole child it is necessary to know their lives inside as well as outside of school.

Along with getting to know each child, Emma made it a point to help students understand that they can make a difference. She commented,

*I feel like we need to start children, at a young age, believing that they can make a difference. Not only that they can make a difference but that they can see the difference. . . . If we can teach our kids it is important to give back to the community, then we are doing a larger service. That is just a personal philosophy. I mean, if you have a kid who can memorize all these facts, or a kid who knows the value of helping out another human being, or helping out the environment, you know, then I have done a better job. Kids should learn to give back to the community.*
Another important part of Emma’s philosophy of education included instilling a love for learning in her students. She commented,

> . . . I really feel that what you need to do with the younger students is to have them love science, just want to do it, want to be involved, want to participate. Because that is what I think will carry them through when it gets harder and they aren’t doing things they love so much, where it is not necessarily fun all of the time, and it is hard and it is difficult. Students need to feel a love for learning.

Furthermore, Emma felt that students need to have as many experiences as possible working with groups of other students. She stated,

> . . . I try to work on their group skills working together in groups, cooperative learning groups, and it just amazes me how some of them have a real hard time . . . You know, they think they can say, “Okay, I don’t want to work with so-and-so and you know, other problems.” So I do this big thing and tell them, look, your boss could be a person you don’t like very much but you are going to work with them and you are going to get along and do a good job, you know. So I try to do that a lot. I switch them into a lot of different groups.

When asked about her philosophy of service learning, Emma stated,

> I guess that when I think of service learning I think of doing a project with the students in the community that enriches both the students and the community. And, it is a learning experience for both. . . . It is something that is both a learning tool and a facilitating tool for both sides.

Emma stated up front in her interviews that she had not yet implemented a service-learning project in her classroom. She said her experience in the service-learning course created a deep belief in the possibilities it offers students and that service learning clearly aligns with her
philosophy of education. Although she had yet to implement it, she had already made plans for incorporating it in the future. She shared,

*If I were going to stay in the classroom I would definitely do a watershed project. We have a creek that runs right by. Well, see, I am a little bit biased I think, not I think, I know, toward environmental stuff, because that is such a passion of mine.*

**What Factors Facilitate Service Learning?**

Emma identified six factors that she believed facilitated service-learning implementation. These factors are presented in Table 7.

**Table 7**

*Factors Identified by Emma That Facilitate Service-Learning Implementation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors that Facilitate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C match with self and school philosophical goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C class and planning time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C student characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C a community need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C support system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Match with self and school philosophical goals.* During the interviews, Emma commented many times about the importance of a match with her own and the school’s philosophical goals. Emma readily shared that she considered it a great strategy for *teaching what really matters.* She said,

*I like it [service learning]. I think that a lot can be done with it. And I just, you know, I have always liked the idea of Foxfire. . . . the idea of students taking their learning and*
applying it to where they live. I mean, it makes complete sense. It is the world we live in and that is where we work and it should be a part of education.

She felt that if the philosophy of the school aligned with that of service learning it would greatly facilitate the implementation process. In her words,

. . . I think that it would help to have a school whose philosophy is, we are going to be out there . . . we are going to be in the community. Then you have parental support and . . . it is simply a way of thinking and doing. Not that it can’t be done by just one teacher but I am just saying that I think that like to make it really a part, to make it really fluid and something that is done and something that people know about and it is a whole school initiative.

Emma felt that by having a school-wide philosophy of service learning there would be fewer hassles and the whole process of conducting service learning would be facilitated because everyone would be doing the same type of thing. She stated,

. . . when we take a field trip you have to fill out two forms and then call the transportation people and then send permission slips home and wait for them to get back. It would be ideal if you could send home a slip at the beginning of the year and say, “You know, we are a service learning school, our fifth grade is having a service learning year. And we are going to be doing such and such programs. And we are going to visit this area three times over the course of the year. If you would like your child to participate in these outings please sign here and that will indicate that they can go there.” So that you are not doing the constant paper work and trying to keep up.

Class and planning time. Emma felt that having a sufficient amount of time both for planning service learning and carrying it out in the classroom is also a factor that would facilitate
implementation. When asked about facilitators to service-learning implementation she immediately responded, “Oh, sufficient time to plan and do the work.” She felt that by using time in the summer to plan a service-learning project teachers will avoid the frustration that many face as they begin a new year. In her words,

I think what you need to do is like, in the summer, come up with a project and then be ready to start on it. Because the first two months of school are crazy and if you are trying to figure out the project then . . . I think you really need to kind of come into the school year saying, alright, this is what we are going to do. That way you have a vision for it.

Teaching experience. Teaching experience was another facilitating factor according to Emma. This is Emma’s second year of teaching and the second grade level she has taught. She feels that with more years of experience she would be better able to manage many of the issues involved in implementation of service learning.

It is easier because you know more people, you know the community, like you know... for instance I know about the watershed down there and I know all the issues that are going on down there. . . . But it wasn’t really until this year that I got an idea of that. You know the community better, you have more contact with people, you are more familiar with the curriculum and that type of thing.

Student characteristics. Emma believed that the student characteristics plays a large role in facilitating the implementation of service learning. In her words,

And it really does depend on your class. Like I said, my first class, I could have taken them all . . . I could have taken all 60 of them by myself, so. You know, and maybe one other teacher down to the river and known that they would have done what I asked. They would have cleaned and done things and we wouldn’t have had any problems.
A community need. Emma felt that tapping into a genuine community need was another factor that facilitates implementation because having a need that matters warrants the effort and time expended to address the need. She stated,

Targeting a real need [is a facilitator]. Because, I don’t know, maybe sometimes you can target things that are maybe a need, but like . . . I want a real need. Like, I am saying working with this watershed I think would be a real need. I think it would be something neat. I think the kids would really derive something from it, rather than just a project to do a project. Because I think there are so many needs out there and I think that maybe we just don’t know about them . . . . you don’t tend to know a lot of needs until you start being around the community a while.

Support system. Emma acknowledged that service learning is different than many of the more traditional educational programs. For a new teacher, going against tradition can be intimidating. Perhaps this is why Emma also mentioned having a good support systems as a means of facilitating service learning. One support mentioned by Emma was the importance of having the administration backing your efforts. She said,

If you have support, it makes the world of difference, and if you don’t, it makes a world of difference in the opposite way. And, you know, that is the main key. That is the one thing. Because I can do a lot of things if I have support. I can get the money. I can, you know, but if I don’t have the support and it is just an uphill battle, you know, it is just tough. Not to say it can’t be done, but it makes it a whole lot tougher.

Emma commented at various points throughout the interviews that creating connections with team members would also facilitate implementation. She said,
That is another thing that I think would be nice to do a service-learning project, like to have a team teacher that is doing a similar project, because no matter what you are doing in life, and this may just be a personal thought from me because I tend to work well with other people . . . but I always think that things are so much better when you work with another person. It just eases the burden, you come up with, I think, better ideas. Because you know, you can come up with a really good idea yourself, but then somebody would say, well, why don’t we tweak it here and here and here. And so I think that it just, in the classroom I think that . . . something that we could do a better job of is that we could give teachers other adults to work with to enhance some things.

Emma also mentioned that parental support is a factor that would facilitate service-learning implementation. Emma encouraged a possible connection with a specific program titled Partners in Education that teams schools up with a local business to further educational and business goals. She said,

_I think that is something that could be helped by community members is that you know how they do the partners in education? . . . because I feel like that is kind of a name only. Or in monetary donation only. Because it is just like somebody from Kroger sends something to eat on PTA night. You know what I mean? . . . that should be such a much more valuable connection. It should be something that we really use._

**What Factors Hinder Service Learning?**

Emma identified seven factors, which are detailed in Table 8, as factors that she believes hinder service-learning implementation.
Table 8

Factors Identified by Emma That Hinder Service-Learning Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors That Hinder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C class and planning time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C pressures to cover QCCs in preparation for high-stakes tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C teacher inexperience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C mismatch with self and school philosophical goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C teacher knowledge of service learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C student characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Class and planning time.** One of the first hindrances mentioned by Emma was class and planning time. In regards to time, she believes that it is very difficult for teachers to find time to do the type of teaching that really matters. In her words,

> But then you get into the constraints of the classroom, like time. Coming up with your own stuff takes just a lot of time. And so that is a trade off. And sometimes you do find yourself looking at the textbook and I find myself going, wow, look at that nice easy lesson right there. And I see it and it is like aaahhhh! It is like an internal battle, to use it or not to use it... that is the question. And I am like, no, don’t do it! So anyway, it takes a lot of time.

She felt that by planning early in the year a teacher will be more prepared to carry out a service-learning project with her class. Lack of planning, on the other hand, according to Emma, hinders service-learning implementation. She stated,

> If you don’t have it planned out ahead of time, that can be . . . if you are trying to scramble at the beginning of the year to come up with something. Because it can be very difficult time at the beginning of the year, the first two months of school to come up with something. You are so busy, that is when teachers are just so busy and things are just so
crazy. And then you kind of get settled in and things get easier. So I think planning ahead of time. If you don’t plan ahead of time I think that could be a constraint.

Pressures to cover QCCs (Quality Core Curriculum) in preparation for high-stakes tests. Emma expressed frustration with the current trend of the educational system for teachers to focus their efforts more on testing than on teaching. She felt strongly that her time with her students is compromised as a result of current mandates. She explained,

... I only have 45 minute classes. A very short about of time. And then of course the focus of my teaching and it might be that in other schools it is not like this, but they focus on standardized testing, particularly for fourth grade because they are the scores that are published.

Emma further explained that teaching and testing the QCCs, which are the mandated curriculum objectives of the state of Georgia, goes against her personal philosophy of education. She stated,

You caught me in a year that I am feeling the pressures of testing and QCCs. And it is not my personal philosophy. My personal philosophy does not involve how kids do on their standardized tests, because I happen to know personally many people who have not done well on standardized testing. You know, like the GRE, the SAT, they are bright, intelligent, have a ton to offer. Yet it is not reflected in their scores. So it is not a part of my philosophy. It just basically rubs everything wrong.

Teacher inexperience. Another hindering factor mentioned by Emma is teacher inexperience. In general, Emma described the first years of teaching as overwhelming for many reasons. It is a time when you are “learning the ropes. It is a time when you are getting to know those with whom you work as well as the community within which you work.” She explained,
... and I think it is harder for new teacher to do that [service learning] because you are learning the ropes and there are so many things going on. And like for me, I am a new candidate, I didn’t know the community that well. I can see how if I stayed at this community, at this school, I could in the next year or two, I could do a year long service-learning project but start out from the get go. Because I am starting to know more of the community members and that. So the facilitation of that sort of thing would be easier, there would be more support. So I can see how it can get easier the more time you have in a place.

Furthermore, as a new teacher Emma felt overwhelmed because she had to learn a variety of new things, such as working with parents and managing paperwork, which was an unexpectedly tedious part of the job and left her feeling overwhelmed. She explained, “... there are all these other things going on like learning how to deal with parents you know, all the other things that you deal with and don’t know about until you are actually there doing it.” Emma was also surprised at the amount of paperwork involved in teaching and the difficulty of getting to know a new curriculum. She stated,

*There is just so much paper work that you do on students. Just kind of, you know, meetings and um, working with parents. Just kind of all the new things . . . including a new curriculum because I went from 7th grade [student teaching] to 5th grade.*

*Mismatch with self and school philosophical goals.* A fifth factor mentioned by Emma that hinders service-learning implementation dealt with a mismatch between her and her school’s philosophical goals. The school where Emma worked required teachers to put in many hours of their time on paperwork because of the demands of a school-wide program. This program
represented a direct mismatch between Emma’s philosophy and that of the school where she worked. She explained,

_The public school system . . . adopted a reform program to implement in order to raise test scores. Okay, well, that is how I paraphrase it, that may not be true . . . but it is to enhance the student learning and achievement (ie: test scores) . . . so we were required to teach a certain amount of core knowledge units and the material and so, we also had to have documentation of the units and type up these units. I mean most of these units were in like two inch binders and so I mean, the time that you put into that . . . The time put into that last year was just unbelievable. And the stress that went along with that too. Cause it was just added stress. It was like just stuff, you know, most of it I had already taught and I was going back and writing up a lesson for it._

The time invested in creating materials and displaying them in binders created such a large amount of work for Emma that she felt stress trying to keep on top of what was required of her at school. She felt that such a requirement is a direct result of the lurking pressures for improved test scores and teaching the QCC. Emma further explained that,

_Because I think that it is a philosophy of change that has to be on a higher level. . . . I can see how maybe the emphasis on test scores and I guess some of the other constraints like time in the classroom, and stuff like that. It makes some of it difficult and I think that it kind of needs to be a philosophy of the school. . . . constraints by the system as far as if you don’t have a school that has that type of a philosophy . . . or at least has a leader that has that type of philosophy or is at least okay with that type of philosophy, they might not be okay with the amount of time that is spent on it. If it is not addressing a QCC, you know, or because some schools are worst about that than others. That could be a potential negative._
Teacher knowledge of service learning. Another hindering factor mentioned by Emma was teacher knowledge of service learning. Specifically, Emma felt that having a lack of understanding about types and lengths of projects hinder its implementation. For example, she said,

. . . to me service learning . . . when I took the class it was more of like a long term thing. Like to do a service-learning project you do this really long project. Because that is the only type of project we did. And we could have done a better job over a longer period of time. You know, because we did it spring semester. And it is not like we could have . . . I could see how it really would do well over a year.

Student characteristics. Emma identified student characteristics as another factor that may hinder implementation of service learning. She explained,

With my first class, I could have done anything with them. This class would be a lot more difficult. This class has a lot more behavior issues. There are a lot of kids that conflict with each other. This years class, we would probably need a chaperone for each of five students. I mean, I know you know that from teaching. You know that different years you get different classes. And I think with departmentalization at the elementary level, because I work with 60 students, you know; we see that even more. It is kind of like working with a middle school. And so, that would be my concern this year. Behavior problems could be a potential negative, if you had a lot of behavior problem students.

Resources. Finally, Emma mentioned having too few resources as a factor to consider. She explained,

Not my school system, but another one does not allow field trips anymore because of funding. So, if you are doing a service-learning project that included an outing
somewhere, well then that would ixnay that. And maybe funding would be a problem, depending on what type of project it was.

What About the University Course?

Emma took the university service-learning course while doing her student teaching. Her cooperating teacher was also in the course, which, according to her, made the experience doubly beneficial. Together they worked on a project that addressed the needs of the English as a Second Language (ESL) population. The county in which they worked was having an influx of the Hispanic population yet none of the educational paperwork was in Spanish. Their project focused on translating forms into Spanish and organizing a handbook for students that addressed many of the keywords they needed to survive in their new educational environment. The contents of the handbook came from a school-wide survey conducted by Emma and her cooperating teacher to assess the greatest needs. Furthermore, they talked with the school ESL coordinator for additional guidance on what to include. Because there was a great need for such a handbook, Emma and her cooperating teacher also tailored it for the local police department.

The thing Emma appreciated most about the service-learning course was having a forum with other professionals where ideas were shared and valued.

. . . what I did like about it [the course] was that it gave us time to talk as professionals which a lot of times you don’t get in education. I mean, you are like starved for adult conversation. Especially in the elementary classroom. Because I had, you know, 45 minutes to an hour of planning with our team. And granted you weren’t always sitting around with your team everyday, but you were doing stuff, but I mean, at least you had adult time where in elementary school, I don’t have adult time, ever! So it is really refreshing when you do have adult time, and time to give ideas.
Furthermore, Emma felt that all students in the course were treated as professionals as they developed their projects and organized their own learning in a democratic fashion. Emma appreciated the fact that the instructor made it a point to meet with each of them individually and give feedback according to their needs. “[The instructor] always gave us time to meet with her, you know, to discuss what we were doing. And that was great because she gave great feedback and that type of thing . . . and very supportive.” Emma expressed that although the instructor’s expectations were high, so was the degree of support that she offered. She commented that the course helped her think about implementation because there were a lot of people doing a lot of different things. Hearing about their individual projects gave her ideas about how she might eventually incorporate it into her classroom. In her words,

Well, there were just lots of people doing lots of different things. So when you heard about others doing other things, you know, it gave you ideas of things that you could do yourself. Once again, that is the whole idea of professionalism. So, I guess that is the main way, just the exchange of ideas and hearing other people come up with ideas and hearing what they had done.

At the end of the service-learning course, Emma felt what she had learned made sense. When asked how she would have changed the course, Emma was unable to offer suggestions. She liked the idea of service learning and recognized it as a core part of her teaching philosophy. Although she felt it was an ideal method of teaching, she also felt it would be a daunting task to implement. She worried about having enough access to “manpower” or adults who could contribute time and support. She also worried about being a new teacher in a situation where she did not know the community needs. At the time of this study after teaching 2 years, Emma could more easily envision actually making service learning a part of her classroom. Additional
experience seems to be the key to the security she was feeling. Additional experience brought with it more connections to the community and the people within the community. With this foundation, Emma felt more prepared to identify a real need and work with others to solve it. If she continues to teach, Emma stated that she will use her summer to make plans for implementing a service-learning project that addresses the need of the community watershed problem.

Sheila

Sheila as a Teacher

At the time of this study Sheila was a first-year seventh grade mathematics teacher working in an urban middle school. Although Sheila often found herself in survival mode as she strove to meet the demands of teaching, a colleague who worked with her claimed that one thing stands firm – “each student in Sheila’s class knows that she loves them and cares deeply about their success.”

Sheila’s philosophy of education has evolved throughout her schooling, and continues to change as she gets personal teaching experience in the classroom. She recognized the importance of addressing students’ emotional well-being before being able to focus on academics. She also felt that each student has the ability to learn, but perhaps not all in the same way. She commented, “Sometimes there are other things that take precedence over learning - especially in middle school. As a teacher I have to deal with those things first before you can talk about multiplying decimals.”

Sheila also believed that each child deserves an adult advocate. She made it a point to watch out for those who struggle and find it hard to fit into the school community; they knew they were safe with her. She stated,
I believe that the classroom is a community. I want them to walk into my room and know that they are safe, and that they are respected and they are loved. I believe that every child should have an advocate in the school . . . every child should have one adult advocate that looks after them and that is a very important thing for me right now. It’s just seeing how hard it is for these kids in their lives and they don’t have a whole lot. My whole philosophy has shifted not so much to the education, but to their emotional and their well being . . . it is so important.

Sheila believed that learning is better achieved if it is real and meaningful and, according to her, it needs to be connected to something that makes sense to the students. That is one of the reasons Sheila liked service learning. She said service learning connects academics with something that is real and has the potential to produce an emotional response. To get an idea of what is meaningful to the students, Sheila felt that students’ voices needed to be heard and their desires should be treated with respect. Giving students a voice will give them ownership in the curriculum, and such ownership is the first step in taking responsibility for learning and making it meaningful. This notion of meaningful learning and getting students emotionally involved in the curriculum was important to Sheila long before she knew what service learning was. She took the service-learning course right before obtaining her first job. As she learned about it she began to feel that it seemed like the perfect way of getting her students emotionally involved in the curriculum and she was excited to know about such a strategy. She felt it was important because,

. . . it teaches what matters in life. I don’t think my students are going to look back and say, oh yeah, [she] taught me how to solve an equation. . . . But learning, and service
learning and helping, they’ll remember that. They will remember doing things like that because it will make an impact on life later.

Sheila had a clear understanding of service learning and defined it as follows:

*Service learning is to me learning while also, I hate to say serving, but it’s a deeper learning experience. It’s multifaceted, they get their academics, but all those things that are important to me in my philosophy they can also touch those, because when you give, when you make a difference, it changes the way you look at yourself. So service learning is an opportunity where kids can grow academically and emotionally, and contribute to their community.*

While taking the service-learning course Sheila recognized the potential that service learning had in the classroom and was very excited, but she also had many questions about how to make it work in the classroom. She asked herself questions such as, “How do I do this in the classroom with a group of kids?” “How do I cover the content area while doing service learning?” “How do I handle classroom management?” Now that Sheila has teaching experience, she sees service learning “in a more realistic way.” She still believed in the philosophy; however, she has not yet figured out how to make it work in the classroom. She said,

*I got in here and I thought, it is something I can do later. I have all these things in my mind, service learning and other things that will come later in my career. But right now it is all about surviving. These first three or four months were tough. I guess I didn’t feel anything about service learning because it became less of a priority for the moment.*

In spite of the fact that Sheila has not incorporated service learning into her teaching she had ideas for how it could become a part of her teaching. For example, she had students in her class who struggle to read. Sheila thought of an idea that included having advanced students read
the history textbook on tape for students who struggled with reading. This idea, albeit a great one, was pushed into the back of her mind because she did not teach social studies. Sheila was concerned the social studies teacher would be offended by her suggestions about service learning when it really wasn’t a part of her curriculum.

Although she had not made it a part of her mathematics curriculum, it meshed with her teaching philosophy and, at this point, her thoughts. She felt that eventually, “after things settle down and I am no longer in survival mode, I will be able to do some of the ideas that I think matter.”

Although Sheila felt overwhelmed as a first year teacher she was convinced that service learning was a strategy of teaching that she will implement into her classroom eventually. She stated,

I realize standing up here teaching does not cut it. It does not meet my kids needs. I’m afraid that this class is going to haunt me for the rest of my life because I haven’t given them what they have needed this year. But it’s because I don’t even know what I need.

What Factors Facilitate Service Learning?

Sheila identified five factors that facilitate service-learning implementation (see Table 9).

Support system. Throughout the interviews, Sheila commented on various occasions that one of the greatest facilitators for implementing service learning would be to have someone else involved with her. She suggested that if such a person had the same philosophical foundation as the one she received by taking the service-learning class, they would be a good team and together be more likely to implement service learning.
Table 9

Factors Identified by Sheila That Facilitate Service-Learning Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors That Facilitate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C support system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C class and planning time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C social trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having someone say, ‘yes, I want to do this with you,’ even if it was another math teacher. Or let’s try to incorporate math more integrated with the subject, that would help having a partner. . . . that would be most helpful.

Class and planning time. Sheila also believed that class and planning time is an important consideration when incorporating service learning into the classroom. As she discussed the importance of having time to do service learning, she commented both on the time needed for a teacher to plan a project, as well as on the time needed in the regular school day to implement it.

Social trust. Because Sheila focused so much on the importance of student/teacher relationships, it comes as no surprise that developing social trust in her classroom is important. Specifically, Sheila believed that a good relationship with the students, one where the students trust the teacher, is a prerequisite to experiencing success with service learning.

Trust is everything, and once you gain that you can do so much through these children just because they trust you. But it takes a while to get that. So I think because I have their trust, if I was to come in tomorrow and say, guys we are going to . . . I don’t even know what we could do, count all the bed pans at the nursing home and make a graph, but it would be ok. I can get them to buy in.
According to Sheila another important factor to facilitating implementation is the teacher. She felt that teachers play a large role in the success or failure of a service-learning project because it begins with them. They have to first have the desire to do service learning along with the knowledge of how to make it work. Then they must make it a priority in their teaching. She felt that if a teacher had established a good relationship with the students then he or she will be prepared to involve them in a service-learning project. She stated,

*The teacher can help and inhibit, based on her own style of learning and her teaching style. Because to me, from where I sit in my math room . . . I see all these opportunities in language arts and social studies where it wouldn’t take, not that it would take a lot of work and effort, but that the pieces fall a little bit closer together. Oh, Wow, we could really do this, and we could really hit this, this, and this. But if the teacher doesn’t see that what can you do, have the knowledge and basic resources in the teacher’s know how, all the things that . . . your best teachers look like.*

*Teaching experience.* Sheila felt that the number of years of teaching experience a teacher has plays a part in facilitating implementation. However, Sheila was not of the belief that being a first-year teacher carries with it only disadvantages. Throughout the interviews she mentioned a variety of reasons why being a new teacher can also be a facilitator to service-learning implementation. For example, she felt that beginning teachers are not so tied to their way of doing things that they cannot try new things. She said,

*One thing that will help is . . . I’m not tied to anything. I don’t think this is the only way I can do it. I’m not in a hole where I’ve done it this way for seven years and I’m not going to change because it became very easy. So it wouldn’t be that big a deal for me to change*
next year and do something totally differently with my curriculum. In fact I plan on changing next year and doing something totally differently.

Sheila also felt that having just left the academic community places her in a position where cutting-edge research is still fresh on her mind. She also appreciated having connections to professors who are willing to help her with resources or whatever it is she needs to be successful.

*Just being out of the academic community helps cause it's still fresh in my mind. Having the contact to resources, I could call [the course instructor] and I'm planning on doing this to help me. There are so many things that are positive about being a beginning teacher.*

In addition, Sheila felt at ease with some of the latest technology because she was young and fresh out of college.

*I don't want to make the judgement that all older teachers don't have the technology savvy, but a lot don't and I do. Because I just, I just know about it so I'm not scared of doing something that might use a video camera or a digital camera or if I have to make a web site, cause I can do those things. It wouldn't be such a great huge learning jump for me. I still see teachers averaging grades on a calculator. I mean I set up my own, there are plenty out there that you can buy, but I did my own. I set up my own grade book . . . I haven't written a grade down all year. They're just resistant to change.*

**Curriculum.** The last factor mentioned by Sheila that facilitates service learning is the curriculum. Throughout the interviews she commented various times on the difficulty she had thinking about implementing service learning into the mathematics curriculum. She felt that other subjects align better or easier with the tenets of service learning. In her words,
The curriculum . . . it can help or it could hurt. Because it does lend itself to certain areas. Writing a letter to the mayor or superintendent. . . . You correct that letter for grammar, you correct that letter and you talk about apostrophes, and you talk about commas and headings in that letter. It’s just more meaningful than just making up some dumb letter to write to some fake person.

Interestingly, as Sheila continued thinking about the mathematics curriculum throughout the interviews she was able to come up with a variety of possible service-learning projects she could do in math. She still maintained, however, that certain subjects such as language arts and social studies lend themselves better to the philosophy of service learning.

What Factors Hinder Service Learning?

Often the most informative knowledge can be gleaned from an experience that was difficult or unsuccessful. Because Sheila struggled to implement service learning in the classroom, she had a great deal of insight concerning factors that hinder such implementation. Sheila provided eight factors that hinder service-learning implementation. These factors are listed in Table 10 below, and are explained in further detail in the following paragraphs.

Teacher inexperience. One of the first things mentioned by Sheila as a factor that hinders implementation is teacher inexperience. She felt that being new is hard for various reasons. Beyond the difficulties involved with classroom management, Sheila felt that she is often functioning in survival mode. She stated,

*I got in here and I thought it [service learning] is something I can do later, I have all these things in my mind, service learning and other things that will come later in my career, but right now it was all about surviving. These first, three or four months were tough. I guess I didn’t feel anything about it because it became less of a priority for the*
moment. Change is so hard. I never thought I would be [the type of teacher who would say] turn to page 272 and do this, kind of teacher – and I just did it. It’s conformable there, don’t you think? It’s I’m in charge, I don’t have to let go of my control. . . . I think you have to continue to change and grow, challenge yourself or you’ll just get stuck on page 272, one through 25, odds.

Table 10

Factors Identified by Sheila That Hinder Service-Learning Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors That Hinder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C teacher inexperience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C pressures of covering the QCCs in preparation for high-stakes tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C class and planning time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C support system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C characteristics of the teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C student characteristics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another difficulty that came with being new was that Sheila felt insecure and simply did not have enough confidence in herself. Such confidence comes over time, but it is not just automatically there from the beginning. Sheila explained,

*I’m a first year teacher, I feel . . . not that my voice doesn’t matter but that I’m not confident in expressing it. Because I don’t have the experience or whatever to back anything that I say up. I just have my gut, my heart, and my thoughts to back up what I think. A couple of years down the road I think I would feel more comfortable just saying, ‘We should try this. This should be something . . .’ and I think as much as they don’t want to admit it people have a stereotype of new teachers and they are very skeptical because*
they think we are all very la tee da, pie in the ski. The reality of the classroom hasn’t yet hit us. So I want to do all this stuff, but it’s also hard and intimidating to bring it up, like aaahhh, I have this idea, without having success, prior success to back it up.

Sheila was especially concerned about the responsibility of a new teacher to justify their teaching to parents, colleagues, and the administration. She commented,

>You know, parents think you’re a new teacher and wonder what you are doing . . . is it going to look like what they are used to? Maybe they don’t like what I’m teaching, maybe they are questioning me. It’s so easy for people to question a first year teacher and it’s so hard to defend yourself because you don’t have the experience and you don’t have the knowledge to back yourself up. You know you feel what you are doing is good, you just don’t know yet. All those things are daunting to me.

Sheila also struggled being a new teacher because she did not yet know the curriculum content. She explained this difficulty as follows:

>The whole first year teacher, just not knowing your curriculum, getting to know the system. I have a mentor the other seventh grade teacher, so she sits with me, tells me, helps me like know where we are going. . . . I don’t really know what I’m supposed to be teaching yet as a first year teacher. But now at the end of this year I can look back and say, ok when we do decimals what could we do with that, or what could we do with fractions or, I’d look at a service-learning opportunity and say, now here’s an opportunity, how does that fit into my curriculum?, how can I marry the two? But when you don’t know your curriculum, you can’t do that. That was, that was probably my major . . . all I was focused on in the first six months was what I teaching. What am I supposed to teach those little critters today? Not tomorrow, not yesterday, today, then tonight, every night before I go to bed, I would be like, okay, what am I teaching
tomorrow? Because I can’t, it is so hard to get ahead, even a week, like I’d look at my plan book and I would plan for Monday and Tuesday, but there is no way that I even write anything down for Wednesday, Thursday and Friday yet, because I had to know how far we got on Monday and Tuesday. So it’s just like I had to do it day by day. That’s a first year problem.

Sheila continued to explain that being a new teacher is difficult because she did not yet know the ins and outs of the system. This made it hard to organize things like busses. She said, 

Another first year thing is just not knowing the ins and outs of the system and rules and what you have to have and what you can do and what you can get away with. As far as taking kids out of school and how do you do all that and just not knowing . . . and having to figure all that out.

Finally, Sheila mentioned another difficulty of being new was not having time to build up a reputation for being a successful teacher. This made it hard for parents, peers, and the administration to trust that what she is doing is of value. It is also easy to come across in a pushy or know-it-all manner, which Sheila was very sensitive to and tried hard to avoid. In her words, 

I say to a faculty member or my team mates, ‘What do you think about this?’ and sometimes they don’t have the philosophical background. I mean, we got it when we were in that class and some of my colleagues haven’t been in a classroom other than their own in 20 years. . . . and so it’s hard to jive, to fit that in and just have them look at me and say, ‘Oh you’re just being idealistic.’ That’s tough, that’s really tough. So that’s kind of another reason why I hesitate right now.

Curriculum. A second factor mentioned by Sheila as a hindrance to implementation was that there are certain areas of the curriculum that more appropriately align within the parameters
of service learning. She was a mathematics teacher and felt that it was difficult to find service-learning projects that address real mathematical needs. She explained,

*I think it [service learning] could be in the language arts very easily. I think it can be done in a social studies and even a science classroom. I don’t think that it can’t be done in a math classroom, I just think that it would . . . take a lot more depending on what you’re doing. But sometimes with the math, I can see where it could be a stretch. But I don’t want it to sound like it wouldn’t work in math. Because I do. I just think it would take, it’s going to take a lot of thinking on my part. And some connection. You want to build a connection, that’s real learning. I just don’t know how.*

*Pressures of covering the QCCs in preparation for high-stakes tests.* Sheila mentioned that another factor that hinders service-learning implementation is the pressure she felt to cover the QCCs in preparation for high-stakes tests. As the end of the year approaches more emphasis gets placed on testing. Sheila explained,

* . . . and it’s scary to think about because my kids, their performance determines my performance. That’s scary to think that we can take two weeks out and go do this. But I realize they would be doing things, it’s letting go and realizing that my standing in front of them is not going to be the only way they are going to learn. They are going to learn other ways and it’s equally valid. So just taking that leap of faith. I would probably do it with my advanced or accelerated [students] first because then behavior wouldn’t be an issue, and those are my best classes. But I say that, but in my heart and mind I know that my lower kids would be the ones to benefit from it most. It’s like a tug-of-war.*
Although service learning is meant to incorporate the core curriculum, Sheila felt it was difficult for a new teacher to make the connections and explicitly teach the core while doing service learning.

*Class and planning time.* The pressures of covering the QCCs influence another hindrance of service-learning implementation mentioned by Sheila, class and planning time. Sheila explains, “I think about the time that it would take to do, and it would take class time and I think about that book, the objectives that we have to reach.” The lack of class and planning time seemed to be an issue felt by many teachers as they made choices about their teaching and learning experiences. As a beginning teacher Sheila also recognized the importance of planning. She had quickly learned how useful advanced planning would be when thinking about implementing a strategy such as service learning. She stated,

> So I filed all these things away, and I’m like, when it’s summer I’ll have a chance to sit down and really plan, because the planning for service learning would be a monster in itself. That’s really why. It’s all the things I think about, but when you can plan this summer, so hopefully I can plan one good unit this summer is what I’m hoping to do. So next year I can do that and then the next summer another, so it will just get better and better. Then I think about all these things and I’m like, you see, we just kind of talked about it. Just making it better, more real, it’s just so hard as a beginning teacher.

*Support system.* Sheila mentioned having a support system as facilitator of service-learning implementation. On the other hand she also commented on how support systems can be considered a hindrance. She states,

> It [service learning] is just something that nobody around here has ever done. So it takes a whole team, takes a whole grade to get behind you, and say, “we’re going to do this!”
I’m the one with the idea and I have all these ideas but if I can’t get my other team mates to buy into it . . . I don’t feel . . . I think whom you work with is huge. I think I’ve got out of four, two of them are veterans and have taught for a long, long time. It would be difficult, not because they are veterans, but personality wise . . . lets just say personality conflicts and philosophy differences – I wouldn’t necessarily want to do it the way she would want to do it.

Characteristics of the teacher. Sheila recognized how important the role of the teacher is when attempting to implement service learning. She felt that if a teacher does not have the philosophical belief that service learning is a good practice it will never happen. In such a case the characteristics of a teacher can be a hindrance in service-learning implementation. She said, . . . it really falls on the teacher and you can train and train and train but it really just depends on the teachers own philosophy and belief’s about school and willingness to change and willingness for an adventure. It’s one thing to get a book and study it and read it and know it and another to be able to teach it.

Sheila also felt that teachers need to be reflective about what they do in the classroom, and reflection is not something that all teachers do. She commented,

Some teachers don’t reflect on their own teaching, we don’t know how. We’re never taught that. That’s one thing service learning taught me remember we always reflect and I always hated it. Because you don’t sit down, and I don’t keep a journal, and I should but really thinking about what you are doing it and why your doing it, really helps you to change it. So when teachers don’t do that, they don’t even know that they need to change.

Resources. Sheila believed that not having access to resources is another factor that hinders service-learning implementation. She said,
That would be hard getting people to sign onto it, money is an issue for my school system as well as anybody’s school system. What money would I need and where could I get it?

How could I convince them that it’s a worthy, not that it’s worthy but that they are going to learn? How am I going to show them that they are going to learn?

Other resources mentioned by Sheila include getting busses to take students to a place of service and purchasing materials needed to carry out service.

**Student characteristics.** The final factor mentioned by Sheila that hinders service-learning implementation was student characteristics. When considering a service project, Sheila believed that the developmental readiness of students needs to be considered because often students do not have a concept of what the project will require. She stated,

*Your students can if you want to let them, if you want it to be student work and you let them pick they can pick some crazy stuff, it’s not going to work. They don’t have any concept that it’s not going to work because they’re just twelve. They think oh, so that can be an issue with everything.*

Sheila also felt it was important to consider the background of students. She commented,

*My population of kids, a lot of them are not successful in the school climate. They’re just not. They didn’t have it early on. You can’t fight the fact when a child goes home and isn’t talked to, isn’t touched, isn’t loved, isn’t read to, never hears the word half. When you are talking to a kid, if you have children and you say, “Just eat half your sandwich. Just little things, like pick up half your toys, they’ve never been told those words. . . . they are not successful in a school climate.*
What About the Service-Learning Course?

The service-learning course was very enjoyable for Sheila, mainly because it rang true in her heart as a valuable way to teach. During the course, Sheila got involved in a project with a team of others that worked in collaboration with the Greensboro Dreamers. Greensboro Dreamers was developed to sponsor a group of second graders as they went through elementary school clear until the time they were in college. If the 54 second graders eventually graduated from high school, the sponsor of Greensboro Dreamers agreed to pay for their college education. Throughout their schooling experience the students participating in the Greensboro Dreamer’s program have a variety of activities to keep them motivated to learn, such as putting on in-school programs, field trips, community service, and after-school programs dedicated to further learning. Sheila and her team contributed to the Greensboro Dreamers’ initiative by doing a service-learning project that focused on the newsletter they send out. As a service, Sheila and her team worked to put the names and addresses of those receiving the newsletter on labels that could be printed rather than hand written. They also made a brochure to hand out to people about the Greensboro Dreamers.

There were many things that Sheila appreciated about the course. She enjoyed having the freedom to choose a project that mattered to her and work with a group to meet the needs of their project. She also enjoyed working at her own pace and was very grateful for the course instructor who provided a plethora of resources and knowledge to help them accomplish their goal. In fact, Sheila had such a good experience that she feels the course should become a teacher-education requirement.

... have it be a teacher education teaching requirement. It’s a great undergraduate teacher education requirement, although there are already so many requirements. There
are so many things you could do with that. You could teach your social studies method
course though service learning. Social Studies is something that fits quite well that way.
Sheila also appreciated getting ideas from her peers in the service-learning class. She
said,

*I did get ideas, remember that group that translated books? Well, I realized that what we
need here is we need like the social studies textbook read on a tape, for our kids just in
English who can’t read or can’t read very well.*

Sheila offered a variety of recommendations for the service-learning course. First,
because there were students who were not in the teacher-education program, she felt it would
improve the course if only preservice and in-service teachers were allowed into it. Then more
foci could be placed on the process of implementation and other items such as assessment and
classroom management. She also suggested that if it were a course only for teachers, there could
be class times set aside for seeing examples of service learning in the classroom.

... it’s under education, it’s under the umbrella of education, but anybody can be in it,
so I think there needs to be two courses. Then, if one course was for teachers, we could
ask, What does it look like in the classroom? How do you do this and how do you do this
with kids? Because, here’s where you sit and do it as a participant, and here’s where you
become the model, the leader and it’s two totally different things, that would have been
helpful and that is what I would have done, if I could have had it for teachers
specifically. Because when you get in a classroom with non-educators there are so many
things specific to educators that they don’t know. So it changes it. That’s probably the
biggest thing.
Sheila mentioned that seeing service learning in the school setting would have helped her get a vision for how it looks and what needs to take place in order to make it successful.

*Because I didn’t have a classroom, I didn’t make the connection, because I wasn’t a classroom teacher when I took it and they were still kinda of separate to me . . . and they still kinda are until I can sit down and look around and say okay, what does the community need? What could we do? How can we benefit it? How does our curriculum fit into it? And stuff. I don’t feel very confident about implementing it right now.*

Although she left the course with a strong testimony of the value of service learning, Sheila lacked the confidence needed to implement it into her curriculum. She stated,

*I think I wish that I could see it more in a school setting, cause you know, we were acting as the students in that class and I wish I could have seen more of . . . this is what a teacher did with her kids. This is what a middle school has done, more of that kind of stuff. Cause that’s more beneficial for me to get ideas.*

Sheila also expressed a need to having explicit instruction about how to manage assessment of service learning as well as handling behavior. She said,

* . . . how to assess it. So we go and do this but at the end of the day, by the end of the nine weeks I’ve got to give them a grade. What kind of assessment . . . but I guess rubrics can be a good way. What are my components or how do I set this up? Behavior, how you manage it, the reality. That my biggest problem, is discipline, management. I feel like every day I’m fighting a losing battle. Sometimes it’s good and sometimes it’s just bad. I hope it gets better.*

In the future Sheila sees herself teaming up with someone and taking baby steps toward making it a successful part of her teaching.
Summary of Novice Teacher Case Studies

Although Chelsea was the only novice teacher who continued to implement service learning in the classroom after taking the course, all three of the novice teachers believe it is a valuable way for students to learn and recognize the potential benefits it brings to students, schools, and communities. All three novice teachers have indicated they will implement service learning in the future.
CHAPTER 5

CASE STUDIES: VETERAN TEACHERS

Whitney, Sarah, and Sharon are the pseudonyms given to the veteran teachers who participated in this study. Each veteran teacher sheds insight about factors that facilitate and hinder service-learning implementation. They also share insight regarding the components of the service-learning course they took as in-service teachers that influenced implementation for them individually. Quotes from participants are indicated by italicization.

Whitney

Whitney as a Teacher

At the time of this study, Whitney was working in an urban middle school of approximately 700, sixth through eighth grade students. Whitney was highly committed to the teaching profession and was determined to help her students find success; she stayed current with research and regularly mentored student interns and student teachers from a nearby university. In Whitney’s words,

. . . I think that I am a teacher who is open to new ideas. I think I am a teacher who is constantly trying to stay in touch with what is going on, you know, like by taking classes . . . like getting my master’s degree and I am working on my specialist. And I am constantly having interns in my room, right now I have a student teacher and I try to stay up with the newer things that are happening and keep my students involved in that.

Service learning easily fit with Whitney’s philosophy of education and was not difficult for her to implement. She believed that service is an avenue for self-improvement and that
students learn best by being actively involved. As a science teacher, Whitney did a lot of hands-on experiments that allowed the students to be actively involved. She used manipulatives and often did inquiry-based learning where the students discovered for themselves as they learn.

*teach science so I do a lot of hands-on teaching. We do a lot of experiments. If someone were to come into my room I think they would still think there is a lot of hands-on teaching. A lot of manipulatives going on. We do some reading out of the book, but whatever we read we do together, because I have a lot of students who can’t read. And I do a lot of guided reading type things, and a lot of visuals. I use a lot of pictures. And then we do a lot of interactive [work] between other classes, so I don’t know, there has kind of been an integrated curriculum with social studies and math, we have a lot of math going on. And then, um, so the math teacher will come over and we, we’ll swap out in different places.*

Whitney believed that variety is important to reach different students, so she only used the science text as one resource for teaching. She also believed in integrating the science curriculum with other subjects so students can get the whole picture rather than individual pieces. Whitney believed it was important to listen to students’ voices so that together they can negotiate what will be learned in the classroom as well as how it is learned.

Whitney defined service learning as “*anything that teaches the students about what you need to teach them and at the same time does a service for the community.*” She learned about service learning while taking a service-learning course 4 years ago as part of her master’s degree requirements and has since had many opportunities to incorporate it into her teaching. When she learned about service learning, it made sense to her as a way she could teach in alignment with her philosophy of education. Because Whitney was teaching when she took the service-learning
course she had the added benefit of making connections in a real classroom setting and actually experience it with her students.

Whitney shared some of the success she felt as she implemented service learning in her classroom. For example, one year she did a service-learning project that integrated language arts with social studies. Her students learned about Russia and sent books, magazines, and clothes to children there. Another example was when she created a book-review club. Because the library had books that the librarian had not yet previewed, the book-review club volunteered to preview the books and write a review about what they found. If they found inappropriate language or content, they noted it on a review sheet. They also included whether or not they would recommend the book for other students. Whitney also had her students participate in a service-learning project to review science textbooks. Because the district was going to adopt a new textbook for science, Whitney divided her class into groups and had them each review a different science book series. The information from this experience was valuable to the district as they made their decision based in great part on the comments gathered from the students in Whitney’s class. These are only a few of the successful service-learning projects Whitney has experienced with her students.

Whitney mentioned that after taking the service-learning course she had a good understanding that service learning could be applied anywhere in the curriculum. She also recognized that projects could be either big or small and learned how to narrow them down if they got too big. She finished the course enthusiastic about making service learning a part of her curriculum partly because of the experience she and her students had with it.

Whitney’s project during the service-learning course involved creating a list of Internet sites for each of the content areas that teachers and students could use to enhance the curriculum.
Although Whitney felt the project had been very successful, she was concerned about a couple of issues. Whitney knew how hard her students worked and how much she had learned from their experience. She was concerned that even after all their work, some teachers would simply file the list away and not incorporate the Internet into their teaching. She was also concerned about some of the other teachers’ opinions about her not covering the curriculum exactly as they did. Although Whitney felt confident with the way her students’ time was spent, she did not want other teachers to question it.

*What Factors Facilitate Service Learning?*

Whitney identified seven factors that she believes facilitate service-learning implementation as shown in Table 11 below.

**Table 11**

*Factors Identified by Whitney That Facilitate Service-Learning Implementation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors That Facilitate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C support system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C teacher knowledge of service learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C student characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C characteristics of a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C class and planning time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teaching experience.* Whitney first pinpointed teaching experience as one of the greatest factors in facilitating implementation. She commented,

*So, I think that my years of experience have definitely played in . . . taking on a service-learning project does not seem like as hard of a task. And I can definitely see, you know, okay, I am going to plan this QCC and this QCC and this test objective and I am going to
see if I can maneuver the kids this way and this way and at the same time pick up on all their interests. You just see more ways that you can work more things.

Because she had teaching experience while taking the service-learning course, she was able to predict potential obstacles and possible benefits of implementing it into her classroom. “I think it was exciting to do and, I think as someone who had taught for . . . three years, I saw obstacles that were realistic and I saw the benefits that could come out of it.” It was easy for Whitney to implement service learning in her classroom because she was familiar with the objectives in the core curriculum. She also knew that she had not finished teaching the entire curriculum in other years, so she did not place blame on the time spent doing service learning. Her teaching experience helped her know where the students were academically and what they were capable of doing. Furthermore, she had multiple resources to enhance their learning. She stated, . . . if you are secure in what you teach already, like I had already built up a collection of resources that I could use to compact the curriculum in some areas and expand in other areas. So I could . . . do a project like that as opposed to somebody who would maybe be new to the profession that hadn’t really built things up, and was still new to the curriculum.

Whitney felt that perhaps one of the most beneficial outcomes of having prior teaching experience is that she was confident and secure in her teaching. She knew what good teaching was and was able to use it to meet the goals of education. And I think that after you teach for a while, you figure out that . . . teaching is teaching. If you can teach, you can teach anything, and you learn that particular trait, and I mean, you can give me any content and I can teach it. Just because, I think it is almost a personality. It is a way that you handle yourself, and it is a way that you work with kids.
And if you can get that down, and you are prepared, you know what you are going to . . . you know what content you are going to give them, it is a way that you work a room, it is a way that you see three different things at a time and you can multitask. You can get this thing going and you can watch so and so’s behavior, you know, and someone is coming in the door and they are calling you over the intercom and you are sick at the same time. You know? I mean it is just that kind of thing. And once you learn how to do that, you get more self-confidence. And you start trying more things. So really, and I don’t know if everyone feels that way, but it has just been in the last year that I have realized that I think I can teach anything because I have learned how to teach.

Whitney felt that confidence with teaching cultivated further confidence as she attempted to incorporate service learning, which she felt was very different from traditional learning methods.

Professional development. Having a good experience taking the course was another factor mentioned by Whitney that facilitated implementation. Not only was she able to experience it personally, she was simultaneously able to implement it in her classroom. She learned a variety of strategies while taking the course that helped facilitate implementation. For example,

Dr. Pate really helped me narrow it [the topic] down. I can’t really remember how she got me to do it, it was just like a dialogue and we just narrowed it down, and um, that helped a lot. But it wasn’t necessarily . . . um the topic we chose to do. Because it started off that the kids wanted to recreate the curriculum. (laughing) It started out as something huge, and then ended up, you know, we finally narrowed it down to specifically finding web sites. . . . She also had, I want to say, graphic organizers that helped you narrow it down into, you know, you had your huge topic, well, what were some sub-topics and they were what we ended up choosing. And how could you mainly have your topic but have a
smaller part of the topic so that maybe you could look up this topic this year and this topic next year and it would all fit into the main topic.

Support system. Whitney recognized the potential impact of a support system. She felt that connecting with other professionals, such as colleagues and professors at the university, facilitated service-learning implementation. In fact, while taking the course, she connected with the course instructor in a way that helped her feel the support needed to be successful with service-learning implementation. Whitney also commented that working with a colleague who knows about the service-learning philosophy and shares the same vision is a priceless tool in making it work. She expressed various times throughout the interviews how important the connection with others has been for her in successfully implementing service learning. In her words,

I think it would be easy to just drop it [service learning], but if you have another adult involved, it is a lot harder to drop it. And so it might make you see things through, stick it out a lot more, and it also gives you someone to bounce things off of . . . I mean any time you have another teacher to bounce things off of, to recommend kids, you know, or give recommendations for how to use kids in your project, or how to use them in a different way because of the different ability levels, it is a good thing.

Teacher knowledge of service learning. Teacher knowledge of service learning is another important factor Whitney mentioned that facilitated implementation. She specifically felt it was advantageous knowing how to justify service learning to others. She commented,

It is important . . . how you present it to them [parents] and how you present it to other teachers too. You know, there were other teachers upset because I wasn’t following the exact curriculum. Sometimes there is a concern through parents of, you know, especially
if they have twins or if they have other children in that same grade level. If they have one child on one team and one child on the other team and one child is learning science in one specific way and the other child is learning science, but they are two chapters behind, but they are learning it through a different way. And maybe they are covering more QCCs, just not through the chapters exactly delineated. You know, there is a lot of concern there, and they will actually pull you in and have you talk to the principal. I have actually had that happen and as long as you can back yourself up and if you don’t have documentation and organization it will hurt you.

Whitney’s experiences with service learning have led her to the conclusion that being able to justify the benefits that come from it will greatly facilitate implementation.

Another component related to teacher knowledge of service learning is knowing how to make a project manageable. Whitney commented that while taking the course the instructor helped her scale down her project so it did not become overwhelming. As she said, “Because it started off that the kids wanted to recreate the curriculum (laughing). It started out as something huge, and then ended up, you know, we finally narrowed it down.” Knowledge of service learning helped her make projects manageable. She believed that working into service learning gradually was a contributing factor in facilitating implementation. Whitney recognized the importance of knowing her limits as a teacher and how they will influence her efforts with implementation. For example, during a year that Whitney was overwhelmed trying to learn a new curriculum, she simply implemented a service-learning project that she had done with a different group of students. The service-learning project was not difficult because she had already done it once and knew what to expect.
Student characteristics. Whitney felt that knowing her students played a vital role in facilitating implementation. Whitney believed that students perform better when they know someone cares about them. One way that she showed she cares was by getting involved in their lives outside of school. She has been known to show up at their basketball or baseball games to cheer them on. This gave her the opportunity to get to know their families and develop a connection with them. She felt that this connection increased the amount of support her students felt personally and academically. Whitney also felt that knowing her students well increased her ability to incorporate their individual needs and interests into the curriculum.

*I think that the classroom is . . . 50% teaching, and 50% having to care about them. They can tell if you care and they can tell if you don’t. I go to basketball games and I go to baseball games, and do a lot of things with them, with different families. Things like that. So, it really does make a difference because kids know that I know who their families are and their families know other families, and they talk.*

Characteristics of a teacher. Whitney shared her belief that the teacher plays a vital role in facilitating service-learning implementation. She recognized characteristics of a teacher as something important to consider. She said,

*I think that you have to be someone who is outgoing. I don’t think that you can be somebody who is, and maybe you can be, but if you are really shy and inhibited it is going to be harder for you. I don’t know, I think that often I just see that more outgoing people try things more often than people who are shy, I mean this is just through the teachers that I have worked with, people who are shyer tend to stick to more the same thing. Of course, I don’t know many teachers who are really shy, to tell you the truth.*
Class and planning time. Finally, Whitney mentioned that class and planning time was a factor that influenced service-learning implementation. She felt that without time to plan and carry out a project in the classroom, service learning will not be a common practice of teachers. 

... having the time to actually plan for and do the service is very important and very rare. ... it is amazing how much is expected of teachers and how little time they actually have to perform. It is a definite problem in the educational system.

What Factors Hinder Service Learning?

Whitney identified five factors that hinder service-learning implementation. (see Table 12 below).

Table 12

Factors Identified by Whitney That Hinder Service-Learning Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors That Hinder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C pressures to cover the QCCs in preparation for high-stakes tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C support system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C student characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C teacher knowledge of service learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C class and planning time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pressures to cover the QCCs in preparation for high-stakes tests. Whitney felt that the decisions teachers make about what and how they teach are highly influenced by the amount of pressure applied from the administration. She felt that such pressure hinders service-learning implementation. According to Whitney,

We’ve had QCCs shoved down our throats in the last two years. ... and there is a lot of pressure on us for covering the things that are going to influence how the kids are going to perform on the tests instead of really exploring knowledge and being able to do
something with it. Like I am this year, I am completely overwhelmed with the curriculum and really being pushed by our administration to cover QCCs, and improve our test scores. And whereas when I first started out with service learning, it wasn’t really an issue.

Support system. Although Whitney believed support would greatly contribute to service-learning implementation, she felt that an inadequate support system from administrators, parents, and colleagues would greatly hinder efforts made by teachers to implement it. Whitney had been a teacher long enough to have experienced both a supportive and unsupportive administration. At the time of this study she had felt less support from her administrator because of the shift in the political agenda from teaching and learning to a focus solely on testing students. She commented,

*When I started service learning in the classroom it was four years ago, and the atmosphere and the administration was very different. And I should say the whole political atmosphere was different. When [the governor] came in and started really pushing tests . . . and I understand why they push test scores, they have to have some way to measure, I understand that, but the atmosphere then was any way you can get these kids to learn . . . get them to learn. And I think that we did really well through the projects we did. I’ve had other projects besides just service learning and it has been very successful. The atmosphere is really pushing tests and they are really focused on making sure you cover your QCC objectives and using the curriculum you are given. And so that is one issue I think.*

Parents are another group of individuals who have the potential to hinder implementation of service learning through inadequate support. There are parents who are not involved at all in
their children’s education and there are those who are overly involved and demand that teachers justify everything they are doing and how they are covering the QCCs. According to Whitney, either of these extremes is likely to hinder service-learning implementation.

Whitney also commented that when colleagues lack a philosophical understanding of service learning, they might question the way teachers involved in it are spending their time and whether or not they are appropriately covering the QCCs. She says this has the potential to hinder the implementation process. Whitney described her experience with colleagues as follows:

So, that was something that bothered me. Um, some of the other teachers were concerned ‘cause I didn’t finish the curriculum that I was supposed to teach. But there hasn’t been one time in seven years that I have finished the curriculum that I teach, so it was a good trade off to have kids excited about science, and learning more I think. And if you are taking on a project like this it is overwhelming at times, and if you are stepping outside of the box then you may be taking some heat from the administration and some other teachers, and to be able to say, ‘Look at the way this is modified, look at the way some of these kids are learning, the ways they are taking things on themselves, and the areas of science it does apply to.’ When you can say something like that it helps. But it is still hard.

Student characteristics. Whitney also believed that the type of students you have has a lot to do with whether or not service learning works in the classroom. At the time of this study she worked with more behaviorally-disordered students and many students who were not at grade level in academic performance. She said,
I am co-teaching a collaborative class with our resource teacher and I think I have seven BD [behaviorally disordered] kids out of 27 kids. And, it makes it kind of tough because you are constantly redirecting behavior. So the kinds of kids you have can make it frustrating, especially for a first-year teacher or a teacher who is not used to dealing with behaviors much. And there is a lot of time taken up with being able to get the kids to even understand some abstract concepts whereas it seemed like before, some of the higher level kids were coming in and they just pick up on stuff right away. It was easier. I hate to say it, it is, it is just the reality. I guess my point is that we spend a lot more time trying to get them through the basic parts of it rather than just being able to say, okay, I take it for granted that you can read, let’s do this. It is a lot harder for them to do some of the things that we were doing.

Although Whitney recognized that service learning was a good practice for all students, she felt that the reality was there were some who struggled more and needed constant attention. She was constantly redirecting their behaviors and found herself explaining things more. Instead of taking on projects such as service learning, Whitney felt that she needed to address the basics, like teaching them to read. In her words,

*I cover different things in different ways with different kids. Every year my kids have been different and have different needs and you see different sparks with different groups. I have had groups that are so bad that all I have wanted to do with them is book work and that is all I can possibly think about doing. And then you see groups that come in and they just have something extra and they are fun and they are energetic and it makes you energetic. I think the group of kids you work with makes you either want to go a step further . . . or not.*
Teacher knowledge of service learning. Whitney believed that one of the most important individuals involved in making a service-learning program work was the teacher. Unquestionably, teacher knowledge of service learning played a big part in implementation. A teacher with limited knowledge was not going to be as successful as a teacher who fully understands the components of service learning. Not only is knowledge about service learning important, but also knowledge about teaching and understanding what it means to be a good teacher. A teacher should also have knowledge of the needs of the community, as well as of the needs of their individual students in order to make service learning work. Limited knowledge in these areas would undeniably play a part in hindering service-learning implementation.

Not only do teachers need to understand what service learning is and how to make a project doable, they also need to understand how to work with students and what the needs are of the community. . . . They need to know what good teaching is. Because I have taught for several years it would be easy to step into any situation and teach.

Knowledge of teaching skills is important.

Class and planning time. Finally, Whitney mentioned class and planning time as a factor with the potential to hinder service-learning implementation. In her words, insufficient time hinders it.

What about the Service-Learning Course?

Whitney’s first experience with service learning took place while she was taking a service-learning course at a nearby university while simultaneously working full time. She recognized the need within the school community for teachers to have helpful Internet sites with which to work. She also recognized the importance of helping students learn to navigate the Internet. In their project, students wrote to teachers within their school, telling them about their
goal of creating an annotated bibliography of web sites and asking them about curriculum needs. After receiving feedback from the teachers, students spent time in the computer lab looking for Internet sites that complemented the curriculum.

As the project evolved, Whitney and her students began to recognize the varying quality of Internet sites and saw it as an opportunity to develop an instrument to evaluate web sites. The result was a student-constructed rubric that offered five things to look for when evaluating web sites. The first suggestion was to look for accuracy, which could be determined by answering the following questions: How reliable and free from errors is the site? Were there editors and fact checkers involved in the web page? Were there reliable references included supporting the information? The next suggestion was to look for authority. To do this it was important to look at the author’s qualifications for writing on the subject or determine if they were part of a reputable organization. The third suggestion was to look at objectivity. This could be done by assessing whether the information presented was free of bias or tried to sway the opinion of the reader. The fourth suggestion was to consider currency. How current or up-to-date was the information and when was it last updated? Finally, Whitney and her students suggested that coverage was a very important part of evaluating a web site. It was important to look at the topics that were included in the work and to what depths they were covered. By addressing the above areas, Whitney’s students were able to determine the quality of each web site before they included it in their compilation of web sites for each subject area.

As part of the democratic manner involved in carrying out the service-learning project, Whitney devised a way for students to self-evaluate and provide her with information they needed for support with their projects. She asked them whether or not they completed their research for the week, what assistance they still needed with their research, what materials they
needed to complete their project, and what goals they had for the following week. The evaluation instrument provided Whitney with a student-directed way to address time management of the project, control misbehavior, as well as support the work each group was doing.

For Whitney, one of the most beneficial aspects of the course was the course instructor. The course instructor took a great interest in what Whitney was doing and spent a lot of time working with her, narrowing down her project in order to make it workable. Whitney also appreciated the course instructor’s caring nature. Whitney explains,

She [the course instructor] also has a real sense of caring. I mean, you don’t feel like you are just a number in her class. I felt like at any point in time I could go to her and say, ‘You know, this is not working,’ and she would help me, and she wouldn’t go, ‘Hmmm, I don’t have time, or maybe you are not as good as teacher as so-and-so said you were, you know, it would be working if you were really trying.’ So I really, she always looked at the individual person and the things that were going on in their lives too.

Another thing Whitney appreciated about the service-learning course instructor was that she was very involved in the public schools. Whitney felt that it made the service-learning class more relevant than others because she was in touch with reality. Because the course instructor was involved in the schools she had built a relationship with the principals. Their relationship seemed to give principals more confidence in the teachers involved in service learning because it was a program embraced by the course instructor. Whitney explained,

The professor who is teaching service learning at the university level needs to be involved in schools. They don’t need to be some professors who sit in the Ivory Tower as we call it, you know, for 15 years. You know, that taught about it or was involved in it a long time ago, but isn’t involved in it now. You know, the course instructor would come
into my classroom and make visits. She was in the schools all of the time and she knew
the principals. She was constantly giving the principals the reassurance that the subject
material was being taught, and so . . . it is almost like, you need a professor who is going
to be in there to reassure the administration and realizes the realities of your situation
and realizes the reality of your kids.

Whitney also appreciated how the course instructor demonstrated the principles of a
democratic classroom. She did more than lecture about it; she set up her classroom so students
participated in what she was teaching. Although she directed and guided the course, she allowed
the questions and concerns of the students to guide the content.

. . . everybody always tells you, well, not everybody, but people who are into democratic
classrooms tell you to go into it with a blank syllabus, but they never do it, they never
show you how to do it. So, I think that people are really thrown off. They don’t really
know what to do with it. I just think it is interesting that we don’t teach our teachers the
way we teach them to teach.

Some examples of how the course instructor modeled a democratic classroom are as follows:

When students were concerned about grades, she suggested to them that they come up with a
rubric for being evaluated. When they questioned the legitimacy of using service learning as a
teaching strategy, the course instructor invited to class a panel of teachers who made it a part of
their curriculum. After the teachers shared their experiences, students had the opportunity to ask
a variety of questions about the logistics of service learning. The course instructor shared
examples of service learning and provided a variety of graphic organizers to be used when
setting up a service-learning project. Finally, Whitney mentioned that the course instructor made
reflection a vital part of each class. Time for reflection seemed to cement learning as students participated in individual service-learning experiences.

Although Whitney eventually appreciated the fact that the course was democratic, one of the things she suggested that was not as beneficial as other components was working with a blank syllabus. The “blank syllabus” approach to learning required students to create their own objectives for learning. Whitney would have preferred having an outline for how the course would be carried out, then allow the students to modify it according to their interests and needs. Whitney explains,

*I think knowing a basic plan for the class and then being able to deviate from the plan, you know, if she [the course instructor] made a plan and presented it to the class and said, ‘Here is what has worked for other classes, how do you want to change that? I don’t want to leave this plan the way it is. . . . I want to make this plan more us, so how can we do that?’*

Whitney also suggested that having a book about service learning might have helped in terms of providing information. She commented,

*Well, we didn’t have a book with any examples, with any explanation, any ideas. I hate to give anyone a list of ideas because it would be too easy. Especially if you are just looking to get through the course.*

For Whitney the least beneficial parts of the course were working with a group. She found that because she had access to children, others in the class joined her service-learning project but had very little to do with carrying it out. Whitney worked with the course instructor on this problem and felt her support in addressing the issue with her team. Whitney explained,
I think as a Master's student going through it I got a lot more than an undergraduate student did. I think that um, because I already taught in the classroom I knew what I was capable of, I knew my kids, I knew um, I had no expectations of my administration. I think that my expectations were realistic.

Whitney felt the class should have been more for in-service teachers rather than pre-service teachers.

Sharon

Sharon as a Teacher

Sharon is a veteran teacher who, at the time of this study, had taught for 11 years. Her experience had been with students in pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, first, second, and fourth grades. At the time of this study she was teaching all subjects in fourth grade in an urban pre-K-5 school with approximately 360 students. The school had been recognized by the state school superintendent for its improvement of standardized test scores and was continually striving to meet students’ needs by creating a responsive environment of teamwork, open communication, and shared responsibility.

Sharon was an energetic individual who has earned a master’s degree in Early Childhood Education. At the time of this study, she was involved in a variety of volunteer activities outside the classroom that contribute to the improvement of her school and profession. Sharon explained that she enjoyed volunteering for projects that make the school a better place. For example, she single handedly put together a career fair for the entire school. She believed that one of her greatest qualities was that she follows through on her responsibilities in a very professional manner. She explained that because she is so willing to volunteer for extras in the school she often finds herself overwhelmed with responsibilities.
Sharon’s philosophy of teaching had changed since the time she finished her undergraduate degree. At that point in her life she felt she had a box full of all the tools she needed to be a successful teacher. As she began teaching, however, she realized that “any application of even the greatest tool is nothing unless you know your students, how they learn, and their individual needs. As she put it, it is not the tool box that is important, it is who holds the tools.” At the time of this study her philosophy of teaching focused more on the individual needs of each student. She approached teaching by first knowing who her students were and then thinking of what they needed to be successful.

I really feel like teaching has to be done based on the students you are teaching. What I teach today is based on what my students do today. What I teach tomorrow is based on what they do then. It is a fluid kind of thing. I think that when you teach you have to teach to a whole child and you really have to base all your decisions about the way you teach on the children you are teaching.

Because Sharon believed so strongly in focusing on the individual child, she did not repeat the same lessons from year to year because she did not have the same students. She also saw teaching as much more than a 9-to-5 job. She saw the bigger picture of teaching because she viewed it more as a calling than a job.

I am a teacher. . . . It is who I am, not just what I do. I think teachers like this are more willing to do things outside the box. They are more willing to do those things that are a little less traditional. I can’t imagine anything else. I won’t be happy doing anything else.

It is the way I am wired! I can’t not be a teacher. I can’t turn it on and turn it off.

Without apology Sharon wore the title of the meanest teacher in the school. She wore that badge with honor because she knew why students thought she was mean - she had high
expectations. Her expectations were high in the areas of both behavior and learning and she refused to lower them in return for a “nice teacher” reputation. Her high expectations meant that she required students to give their best every day; second best was not good enough. According to Sharon, her strict manner led to well-behaved students who had high self-esteem because they pushed themselves and grew in ways they did not recognize as possible.

Sharon believed it was important to use a variety of modalities to address the individual needs of her students. She worked with some deaf and hard-of-hearing students, so she made it a point to include more visual and tactile learning experiences. She constantly monitored the learning in her classroom and adjusted if a student needed a different manner of teaching in order to learn. Sharon rarely used textbooks although she felt they are a good resource. She believed that there are many other more motivational ways for students to learn. For example, to teach students about graphing, Sharon brought in M&Ms and they graphed each of the different colors. When they finished, her students were curious why there were so many brown M&Ms in every bag. To satisfy their curiosity and work on their writing skills, Sharon had her students write a letter to the M&M Corporation to learn the answer. Sharon had also tapped into the interests of her students by having them practice their writing with pen pals. They corresponded with their pals throughout the year and planned to host them for an entire morning in a culminating activity to celebrate the friendships that developed. These activities are examples of how Sharon used the interests of the students to create an atmosphere of learning. She believed that by using different modes of teaching she would more likely accommodate the learning styles of each of her students and have fun at the same time.

Like each of the teachers participating in this study, Sharon learned about service learning through the university course. She defines service learning as “a meaningful way of
“learning through the mode of service.” She is convinced that service learning is a good practice and has many positive outcomes for students, teachers, schools, and communities.

Sharon’s ambition when it comes to the teaching profession is nonstop. Teaching required a great deal of sacrifice on her part. She was committed to her students and made every effort to incorporate the type of teaching she felt would best accommodate their individual needs. From the time Sharon took the service-learning course she had made her classroom more democratic and was looking forward to adding service learning.

What Factors Facilitate Service Learning?

Sharon identified six factors that facilitate service-learning implementation which are listed in Table 13.

Table 13

Factors Identified by Sharon That Facilitate Service-Learning Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors That Facilitate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher knowledge of service learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching experience. Sharon believed that her teaching experience facilitated implementation for a variety of reasons. Sharon was not struggling to survive like many beginning teachers do as they acclimate to working with so many children. She said,

*I’m not playing the survival game anymore. I can go into most any classroom and not feel like I’m just having to keep my head above water. I have a bigger bag of tricks and I have a bigger wealth of background knowledge, so it’s not as much work for me to do*
certain things and certain things I do instinctively now that I didn’t when I was first teaching. I’ve figured out the shorter ways to do things rather than the harder ways to do things. So I think that it does make it easier to implement service-learning projects.

Also, because of her experience Sharon had good classroom management skills. In Sharon’s words, “You’re a better discipline manager. You’re better at managing a classroom. I mean you’ve got to have those classroom management skills in order to do a service-learning project. ‘Cause they [the students] can get away from you.” Sharon also felt more organized, had better teaching skills, was more instinctive about teaching, and had more confidence in herself as a teacher. She already knew the curriculum and had figured out the best way to maximize learning and minimize the time it took. She commented,

You have more organizational skills. You have a better understanding of how children really learn because you think you know how children learn when you first start teaching, but the longer you teach the more refined that knowledge becomes and the more you have a true understanding. Your actual academic teaching skills I think are better the longer you have taught. You’re very confident your first year I think, most people are because it’s your first classroom. You’re very confident at least your first six months. Then after that I think you really question your confidence as things arise and different events happen. You question your confidence. . . . I think confidence does play a big part. I’m a very confident teacher now. And I WAS NOT my first few years of teaching, not at all. I did not become a confident teacher until I had probably been teaching five or six years.

Because of her teaching experience, Sharon knew what mattered to her as a teacher, and what mattered to her students as they learned. Service learning directly aligned with her core
philosophy of teaching and learning. Having a solid belief that service learning is an educational approach that promotes good teaching and learning facilitated the implementation process.

*Student characteristics.* Another factor that facilitates service-learning implementation is knowing your students, their wants, and needs. Students get turned on to learning when they feel there is a purpose behind it. Sharon stated,

*Service learning is so motivational to them. . . . It makes me want to do it because it is fun when we are doing it and it is very exciting and I know I am doing good teaching when I do it. Once I get it started, it keeps going. It is just taking it from the idea stage to the implementation stage. Once it is going, it is going. The children won’t let you stop it.*

*Support system.* Sharon also believes that implementation is facilitated if teachers have an adequate support system. She mentioned the importance of teachers being able to work closely with each other. She commented that, “*having another person involved makes it [service learning] a little easier.*” This is one of the reasons she is looking forward to next year. She and a colleague have made plans to incorporate service learning into both their classrooms and Sharon can already see the value it will bring to her students. In her words,

*A good support system, as far as parents, as far as personnel in your classroom, as far as buddies at grade levels, whatever it is. Support from your administration. My administration was all over it, she thought it was wonderful. You get to have that . . . the expectation that it [service learning] is the norm and the environment that supports doing it. You need the sorts of things to be in the school that are accepted and encouraged and that’s a positive thing and that is not an uncommon thing, and if it is uncommon, that people are trying the uncommon. So that you’re not out on the lone ship, so to speak.*
Sharon believed that an overall school philosophy in favor of service learning would facilitate implementation. She commented that \textit{“the overall involvement of the school with service learning makes a difference in whether or not it is implemented because a school that is highly involved would facilitate the process.”}

\textbf{Resources.} Sharon believed that having access to resources is another factor that facilitates service-learning implementation. While she was conducting her project for the course, she was able to tap into funding from a grant that she says contributed to the success of their project.

\textit{I was nervous about writing my grant because this was the first grant I had ever written so that was nerve wracking. I heard that Northeastern was having a class where you could go and write these mini-grants so I went to a class. They said here is the format and this is what you do. So I did it and it worked! I wrote it and got \$500. . . . I’m not sure how we would have made it work without the money because everything costs money these days.}

\textbf{Teacher knowledge of service learning.} Sharon also recognized the importance of teacher knowledge in making service learning work. She felt that in order for teachers to implement service learning they must make it a part of their teaching philosophy and believe in the benefits that result from its use. They must see it as a good teaching method and make the effort to extend students’ learning into the community. When teachers understand the variety of ways to handle service-learning projects, implementation is easier. For example, Sharon knew how easily a project could get out of hand. As she said,
And I see how I can do this on a much smaller scale, and it can actually be more meaningful. I keep coming up with big projects. The more I think of service-learning projects on a smaller scale the more doable they seem.

Sharon felt that smaller projects would have the same benefit as large ones; however she would feel more capable of doing them with her students, even under the current pressure she feels for covering QCCs and testing.

**What Factors Hinder Service Learning?**

Sharon identified five factors that hinder service-learning implementation as shown in Table 14.

| Factors Identified by Sharon That Hinder Service-Learning Implementation |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| C Being overly-involved                                      |
| C Pressures to cover QCCs in preparation for high-stakes tests |
| C Class size                                                |
| C Support system                                            |
| C Class and planning time                                   |

*Being overly-involved.* One hindering factor that influenced Sharon’s implementation efforts was the fact that she was overly involved in other activities. She felt that being so involved taxes a person’s mental resources and makes it difficult to add yet another responsibility. In Sharon’s words,

*I wish I could do more with service learning... it has been one of my biggest disappointments. I feel like I haven’t done as much but it is because I have my fingers in so many things. I am transitioning in my life... my son is coming to school and my*
position in the after-school program is changing. The last few years I have done so much and been involved in so much that eventually you have to pull back and say no.

Pressures to cover the QCCs in preparation for high-stakes tests. Sharon felt that the curriculum was a mile wide and the pressures to cover QCCs in preparation for high-stakes tests continue to grow. Testing seemed to be the main factor that drives the decisions being made in schools and was the second factor identified by Sharon as a hindrance to service-learning implementation.

I think it [service learning] is what we need to do, but there are a lot of things that make it hard. Things like a big test you have to give and your students have to score above this level and you better make sure they can do x, y, and z. The progression toward standardization and accountability really makes it hard . . . it ties your hands. I have not had many opportunities because of the pressures that have been on my time and the pressures with testing and curriculum has made me take a step back.

Sharon felt that because of pressure it was hard to justify the time it takes to incorporate service learning into the curriculum, especially to those who do not believe in it or understand the philosophy. She felt it would be easier to implement in a private school rather than public because they do not have the same testing pressure.

I can see doing this in a private school setting easier than a public school setting in that you don’t have the same rigors of standardization and that you will be on page 42, in chapter 19, on the fourth Tuesday of the month. Not having that kind of pressure would be good. You would have more freedom to be independent.
**Class size.** Sharon expressed that class size is another factor that hinders service-learning implementation. She felt that fewer students in a classroom would make service learning easier. She explained,

*I have 22 children right now and 24 at the beginning of the year. And that is really hard to manage when it is just you in the classroom trying to manage a project of that scope.*  
*Class size is really hard. If I only had 15 children, it would be a lot easier.*

**Support system.** Another factor Sharon felt hinders service-learning implementation was having an inadequate support system; specifically, not having much parental involvement. She explained,

*The school where I am doesn’t have as much parent involvement and the community doesn’t get involved because we are sort of on the fringes of the county. People don’t think of us as part of the school system so they are less likely to get involved in this way.*  
*We don’t have that many partners and things like that and those are some of your natural allies. When you get ready to do things like this [service learning] that is who you turn to.*  
*Also, lack of support from colleagues, parents, and the community falls under the category of . . . hindering service-learning implementation.*

**Class and planning time.** Sharon believed that class and planning time was a factor to consider as a hindrance to service-learning implementation. She felt that time for planning was more difficult, finding time in the school day was difficult, and finding more time as the teacher to do the extras it takes to implement service learning was difficult. She explained the difficulties related with planning and how it influences the teacher as follows,

*It is difficult because . . . service-learning projects take a lot of time planning and take a lot to implement. Sometimes they don’t take much time at all, sometimes it takes more.*
My students wrote the letters to partners but I had to write the letter that went with it. I
had to do the follow up phone calls, I had to get all of the materials, I had all of those
kinds of things. I think that factors into it. I still feel very strongly about the philosophy.
And I think that as I keep going I am going to do more and more.

Sharon also commented that finding time in the school day was difficult. She said,
The time issue could [hinder implementation] because my day is only so long and there
are so many things I have to teach in it. Just having a little period of time during the day
makes it mentally seem ‘I really can’t do this, I can’t fit it in my schedule.’ I think a lot of
the ideas, a lot of what you do, with service learning especially, with younger children
you have to do a lot more scaffolding. You know there are great ideas out there but fitting
them in and fitting them in the school day and getting everything ready for them.

Not only did Sharon find it difficult to find time to plan and implement service learning into an
already full day, she also struggled to find time as a teacher to do the extra work service learning
requires. She explained,

. . . because I work with smaller children there are a lot more things that I have to do in
order for them to be able to do what they need to do. And because of that it takes more of
my outside time and, you know, I have very little planning time and my time that I am
able to put into my classroom has changed over the years so that is just harder too. Time
is a big issue.

What About the University Course?

Sharon took the service-learning course while working on her master’s degree because it
was highly recommended by a friend. As Sharon got involved in the course, she was impressed
with the variety of people who were enrolled. She was accustomed to taking classes with other
teachers who all had the common platform of teaching. However, in the service-learning course there were undergraduates, graduates students, and faculty members from across the university.

Sharon’s first experience with service learning took place during the course. Because she was teaching in an elementary school at the time, she was able to use the students from her classroom and involve them in the project. For their project, Sharon and her students took a courtyard that was outside of the classroom and turned it into an outdoor classroom. To fund the project Sharon wrote a mini-grant and was awarded $500 to cover costs. It was exciting for Sharon to see her students so highly motivated by the service and how they worked together to make it a success. The students in her class were interested in incorporating artwork in their service so they came up with the idea of painting a mural on the wall. However, they were discouraged to find that it would not be allowed. Sharon used her interpersonal skills to jump through some bureaucratic hoops and, in the end, her students were able to have their artwork displayed. Besides the occasional problem that had to be faced, their experience with service learning was motivational and a beneficial part of their positive learning experience that year.

Sharon identified four beneficial components of the service-learning course: modeling a democratic classroom, diversity of students taking the course, implementing it into her own classroom, and personalized learning experience. Sharon enjoyed the service-learning course for a variety of reasons, but mainly because it made her a better teacher. One of the ways she became a better teacher was through the experience of a democratically run course. She identified this as one of the most beneficial components of the course. She said,

_I would say that the way the course is run as a truly democratic class is the most beneficial part of it, but I would say that the diversity adds to that. Because it is run as a_
democratic class and a democratic classroom, but if everybody in there is very much the same sort of person, then it is not going to have the same element to it.

Sharon appreciated the way the course instructor organized the course to model democratic teaching and has since made it an integral part of her own teaching.

As mentioned in Sharon’s comments in the paragraph above, she believed that the diversity of students taking the course was another beneficial component because it resulted in a variety of projects which helped expand her thinking about what was possible with service learning.

Another beneficial component of the service-learning course was that Sharon was given the opportunity to implement the project in her own classroom. She felt that experiencing service learning this way helped her understand the implementation process. Sharon also valued how the structure of the course provided each student the opportunity to personalize the experience to their learning, interests, and needs by giving them control over their own learning.

I really like the way the class was structured, it was very much a ‘we are going to learn this but we are going to learn it in a meaningful way.’ I really like that it gave you a lot of control. . . . You were fed just as much as you needed as you went along, so that you weren’t overwhelmed and you knew you had to do this project, so that you never got swamped with knowledge that you couldn’t use.

When the course was over Sharon felt that each student involved left with a substantial service experience that produced a meaningful outcome. She was excited about service learning and motivated because she saw the value of using it with her own students. She felt it was not only a fun way to learn, but very empowering to those who participated. Her belief in it has only continued to grow.
Although Sharon identified the diversity of students taking the course as a beneficial component, she also felt diversity was one of the least beneficial aspects of the course because, with so much variety, it was often difficult to understand the intricacies of the other projects. In order to collaborate and share, a lot of time was spent creating a foundation so students could understand the points being made.

Sharon identified the large class size as another non-beneficial component of the course. She suggested that one way to improve the course would be to make enrollment smaller. Fewer students would provide an atmosphere where students could be involved in helping others with their projects because they would be a more united group.

Sharon felt it would also be helpful to understand the varying degrees of magnitude involved in service-learning projects. When she finished the course, she saw service learning as only a big endeavor. She has since come to realize that it can occur in smaller degrees. Sharon feels that the idea of service learning being huge has been overwhelming to her and is part of the reason she has not fully implemented it in her teaching.

Sarah

Sarah as a Teacher

Sarah is a veteran teacher who at the time of this study had been teaching kindergarten for 33 years in a rural school setting. Becoming a teacher was an easy decision for Sarah because it was simply something she had always wanted to do. She loved working with children and watching them learn and, although she was retiring at the end of the year this study was conducted, she desired to continue working in education in some capacity. Her preference was to work as a district service-learning specialist.
Sarah’s philosophy of education revolved around the quality of kindness; she believed the most important part of being a teacher was to love the students and get them to love each other. She stated,

*I do think it is important that in the classroom you build that comradery with the children so they grow to like each other. It has been several years since I have had a group of children who did not like each other. . . . If you build it [comradery] in as a core part of the class, children learn to love each other. We have a little boy who is here just for this year because his parents are missionaries from Thailand. The children in the class have already talked about how they will hate it when he goes back to Thailand because they will be separated. So, they love each other in our class.*

Sarah built relationships in her classroom by getting to know her students and modeling love. As she grew to love her students and become aware of their individual needs, she then taught them according to their knowledge and individual experiences. She toke them as far as they could go in the time they were together and felt it was very important to have fun along the way. Another important part of Sarah’s philosophy was that she felt a deep responsibility to help her students learn to read. She commented that, “If children can read, they can learn anything else.” Sarah learned where her students were individually, then planed her lessons to accommodate their needs. She also believed deeply in the importance of service and made it an essential part of her life through opportunities she had within the community and her church. She believed that service was an important part of citizenship and that we all have a responsibility to our community to make it a better place. Consequently, service learning was a concept that made sense to her and she readily adopted it as a teaching strategy.
Sarah learned about service learning through the course she took as part of her master’s degree requirements. She defined service learning as, “Using something that you are already learning in the classroom, a skill that is in our curriculum, and using that skill to work on a project of service to the community.” From the course Sarah learned that service learning is a good way to build public relations within the community. She felt the importance of developing good relationships could not be understated as it takes “all of us to provide a complete education for the children.” Besides gaining an understanding of what service learning is, Sarah learned that it is not an add-on to the curriculum. She said,

\[
\ldots I \text{ learned about the importance of involvement in the community, the fun of doing it, the fact that it does relate and it is not an add-on to what you are doing – the stuff that you are teaching. It is simply part of it and another way of having the children learn what you are teaching in the classroom.}
\]

Sarah has had many experiences using service learning in the classroom. Her first experience with service learning took place while she was taking the university service-learning course. Since that time she has been successful with various service-learning projects and has done so by utilizing a democratic teaching model. One of the service-learning projects that Sarah completed with her students addressed a need that is very close to her heart. Sarah loved animals and is very concerned with the way they are treated. She was aware of research that indicates that if children are taught kindness to animals, they are less likely to be violent or commit violent crimes. This is one of the reasons that Sarah saw a need for students to understand the importance of caring for animals. In this project students learned about taking care of pets and as a service the students put together “doggie bags” full of treats for the animals at a local shelter.
They also developed a pamphlet that illustrated key ideas for caring for pets and distributed it through the shelter.

At the time of this study Sarah’s class was just finishing their service-learning project. They were writing and illustrating a book that included concepts learned at the beginning of the school year, concepts such as numbers, colors, shapes, and letters. Creating this book served not only as a review for her students, but will also used in a preschool class to teach younger students about important concepts contents in preparation for kindergarten. The book was printed professionally and then Sarah’s students all wore matching shirts and hats and read the book with the younger students. Her students were excited because they each got to have a copy of the book they had written and illustrated. Sarah said,

*This is probably the most exciting project that we’ve done. It’s been really exciting because reading has become so important to these children. Everybody in our class can read this year and they are really good readers. So it has been really an addition to the excitement that they’ve already had with reading. They all had a part . . . we made sure that we put everybody’s name next to their illustration in the book.*

The kindergarten students shared their service-learning experience with a news reporter and their story was broadcast on a local television in their community.

Sarah also commented that because of her experience while taking the class, she felt very prepared for the task of implementing service learning. She felt it was due in part to the fact that she had the experience of implementing service learning with her own class while learning about it.

At the end of the course Sarah was convinced that service learning was a valuable method for teaching. She felt that each experience she and her students have had with service
learning has been successful, which confirms her belief that it is a worthwhile and important practice and that it makes a difference in the lives of the children. She stated,

*It does make a difference. I believe there are children who are readers because of the books that we gave them and who are excited about reading. I think there will be people who will read because of the project that we have done. I think there will be people who will maybe take care of their animals better because of that project. And there are animals at the animal shelter who were happier because they got treats. I guess it is the feeling that you can really change things, that you can contribute and make a difference.*

The more experiences Sarah has with service learning, the more she is convinced it is a valuable way to teach children. Her testimonial of its value was shared with many other educators in a service-learning conference during the fall of 2002. At her presentation she was able to give teachers insight into how service learning works by sharing her experiences with the projects mentioned above. She also offered other teachers who were interested in service learning ideas about how to earn money to pay for service-learning projects.

*What Factors Facilitate Service Learning?*

Sarah identified eight factors (see Table 15) that facilitate service-learning implementation.

*Teaching experience.* Sarah felt that one of the greatest facilitators in implementing service learning had to do with the fact that she has taught school for 33 years. She felt confident about herself as a teacher and knew what was best for her students. Because of her confidence she has been able to filter comments from colleagues that might have intimidated a teacher with less experience. She said,
### Table 15

**Factors Identified by Sarah That Facilitate Service-Learning Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors That Facilitate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C experience with service learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C support system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C a community need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C class and planning time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C freedom to make curricular choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C endurance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sometimes when teachers do things that attract good publicity to them there may be other people who are jealous of that publicity and sometime you take some flack from people around you. . . . We hate to think about that in education, but a beginning teacher may not be willing to take that. When we had the good publicity for giving away books . . . there were some catty comments made, you know from colleagues too. There are the wonderful supportive colleagues that I’ve talked about, and then there are those with that ‘Ahhh, you didn’t do anything special,’ with that attitude and I guess to me it would be harder as a beginning teacher to take that and still be willing to continue. As a veteran teacher I know that is going to come.

Instead of getting discouraged Sarah simply went forward trusting her own judgement. In her words,

. . . there was a quote I remember something that my Dad had said to me. To lead, a person must be willing to go forward alone. And I guess as a beginning teacher you might be more concerned with being a part of the group in fitting in. As a veteran teacher you say, ‘This is right for my children and we’re going to do this.’ You know, and if we
do go forward alone, that’s all right then. I do remember years ago teaching and if somebody wasn’t happy with something I’d been doing I just might not do it anymore.

But now I would probably do it the same way.

Sarah also believed that because of her experience she is more confident with the curriculum and had a variety of resources to support her teaching. Sarah said,

Once you have taught several years you feel confident enough with the content you are teaching. You know, it is easy for me to teach kindergarten . . . because I know what to do and everything. I guess that gives you the confidence to do service learning because you don’t have to spend all your time digging in your manuals and if you had to spend all your time reading in your reading lesson and all, it would be harder to do service learning. Once you have taught a grade for so long, you have all your materials collected and all that. I’ll bet it is easier.

Experience with service learning. A second factor mentioned by Sarah was that the more involved you are with service learning, the easier and less overwhelming it becomes. During the interviews Sarah expressed various times that at first service learning seemed very overwhelming. In fact, while learning about it in the service-learning course she went to the course instructor and told her she did not see how she would be able to implement service learning into the classroom with kindergarten students. However, the more experience she had with service learning, the easier it became. In Sarah’s words,

The more I’ve done, the more it has not been an add on, but the more experience I have with the service learning the easier it is, to make it just a part of the learning. . . . plus it is easier for collaborators who are also involved. The community now understands what
service learning is and the principal is very supportive because he sees the value of other projects we have done . . . it just gets easier.

Support system. Sarah commented frequently that support systems were a significant factor in facilitating service learning. She commented that the support from her principal was an important part of the success she experienced in each project. She said,

*The main thing is, of course, the principal support and that is a really big thing, because if we didn’t have that it would be so hard to do. . . . he [the administrator] is so good about his support. Anything we’ve needed or wanted, he’s willing to help us get it. If it’s something that takes funding or whatever he has been very willing to help in that way. When we had our little dinner for the community supporters he came and ate with us and worked with us on that too. He has just been really supportive. He says he feels like it has been a benefit to the school and the community, the projects that we’ve done. Our school administrator has been wonderful. There is nothing more that he could have done. . . . he could either make or break your project if he were not supportive it would be very hard to complete one. He’s just been great.*

In a casual conversation with the principal where Sarah works he mentioned that one of Sarah’s greatest strengths was making connections with the community, another aspect of support. He felt these connections were a beneficial result of each service-learning project and had noticed a definite relationship had developed between the school and the community because of them. Sarah agreed that connections are one of the most important factors to facilitating a service-learning project. She felt that making such connections facilitated implementation because it created more support from others teachers and parents.

*When we really get into a project sometimes and could use an extra hand and the parents
have been very good about coming to support us, too. And I think they have appreciated the projects that we’ve done. So I guess the support of other people when we get really, really busy, even the support of colleagues, the people, other teachers who teach with me. I remember one time we called on an art teacher to help us with something, because with the time crunch too, we got so many things I just didn’t know if I could get them all completed. The teacher who teaches next to me is really supportive and she did some things for me. I guess really the support of other people around us all, even parents.

A community need. Sarah also believed that developing a project that was a genuine community need was one factor that facilitated service-learning implementation. She said,

I guess just making sure what we did was a help. Both to the children here and to the community – that was an area of concern that we not just waste our time or do a project that would not really make a difference. ’Cause I’ve always felt like, too, whatever you do, time is valuable. Whatever you do it needs to make a difference to somebody.

Class and planning time. Sarah recognized that having time was necessary to carry out service-learning projects. As she said,

Also time wise too, you know, we have so many mandated things to do I guess time is always a factor in getting things done. As teachers we never have time to do all that we want to do. Just because everything we do as teachers we just rush and do this and rush and do this and we never have time to do all that we need to do. I guess the time crunch was the one thing that made it difficult . . . the thought that we just need to be through . . . I guess the concern of just being able to get everything done . . . that we needed to do.

Freedom to make curricular choices. Sarah also appreciated working in a grade setting
where she had the freedom to make choices about her curriculum and what is best for her students. Sarah said,

*The freedom in how to do it, I guess the freedom within the classroom too. We’re not so, I think they’re not so mandated that we don’t have time to do what we need to, and that’s another thing I’ve enjoyed about kindergarten. In kindergarten you do have time to teach what you need to teach and do the fun things that relate.*

(resources. Resources was another factor mentioned by Sarah that facilitates service-learning implementation. Specifically she focused on funding. She said,

*I guess funding would really make a difference, too. I guess teachers are, it’s just a part of us to be creative in getting what we need or whatever we . . . and that goes along with community support and all, too. Funding really helps if you have it. You can provide your own funding or teachers spend their own money, a lot of times, but that pretty much makes or breaks a project too if you have the material and supplies that you need.*

(endurance. Sarah believed that in order to make service learning work it is important to have endurance. She felt that if a teacher will stick to a task, even if it gets tough, things will likely get easier eventually. In her words,

*When it’s hard, when things don’t go well to say that this is important enough that we are going to continue. But I really believe this is important enough that whatever it takes I’ll stick to it and get it done. And I think when you start something you need to finish and that is one thing we try to instill with the children so that when something is started, if it’s important, and if we believe in it, no matter how hard it is or whatever . . . we may hit a slump, but we go back and regroup and continue on.*

*What Factors Hinder Service Learning?*
Sarah shared five factors that hinder service-learning implementation (see Table 16).

Table 16

Factors Identified by Sarah That Hinder Service-Learning Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors That Hinder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C  Support system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C  Class and planning time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C  Concerns for accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C  Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C  Social trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support system. Sarah’s experiences with service-learning implementation have given her insights into the importance of support from those with whom she works. Sarah first mentioned support as a factor that facilitates service-learning implementation, but also noticed that inadequate support systems is a factor that hinders service-learning implementation.

*I guess if you didn’t have the support of your colleagues, the people around you, the principal. If you didn’t have community support, if you chose a project that other people didn’t believe in or weren’t interested in. It would be very hard to do it if you didn’t have the support of other people.*

Sarah had first-hand experience with an inadequate support system because she received no support at the district level with her service-learning projects. She commented,

*We have not gotten a lot of support district-wide from the officials in our central office. . . . We had in our system the person who first did our grant writing for service learning . . . who has now left our system and gone to a new position. I think he was the one who was interested in it [service learning]. When he left the administration of the service-learning funds was sort of dumped on the curriculum director of our county. I really*
don’t think she, I don’t want to say that she doesn’t believe in service learning, but I
don’t think it’s a priority for her. And it may be that she felt like it was dumped on her.
I’m being very truthful here, this is just my feeling. We didn’t see a lot of support for it. I
think there’s not really an advocate in our system now for service learning.

Class and planning time. Sarah felt that Time is a factor that hinders service learning.
She specifically mentioned that teachers are involved in so many responsibilities beyond those of
teaching children that at times it takes away from their teaching. She said,

I guess time is always a factor in getting things done. We have other things that we do in
education, like, things that are very important. Like each year we adopt a new text book
series. This year it’s been reading which is very important but that means that the
teachers look at the text book series and evaluate those. When you do lots of different
ones, it just takes lots of time to do that. And you know things like that have to be done.
And yet that takes time away from your actual teaching time.

Concerns for accountability. Another factor that hindered service-learning
implementation mentioned by Sarah is her concern for accountability. Throughout the interview
Sarah expressed how careful she was about working with community members. She felt a great
responsibility to them as collaborators in the service-learning project.

I do feel really responsible with the community support or any support that we have. I
feel really responsible to use that business’ money wisely and to make sure that we’ve
done exactly what we said we were going to do with it. That it’s used in a good way, and
really with that first project, what we said to the businesses, we said we have other
money for our other things that we need in our project and the money you give to us will
only go to buying children’s books to give away to children. We will not buy anything
else with this money. So it was a concern to me that we show those people that we had
done this, that we had been responsible with their money. So it was a big concern that we really show them we were doing what we said we would do and that we weren’t just taking their money and then being irresponsible with it or using it in a different way. And to make sure that these people were pleased with what they had done and that the children had learned what we were teaching them too.

Resources. Sarah also mentioned not having access to resources as a hindrance to service-learning implementation. Specifically Sarah felt that funding was an issue that could make a real difference. In her words,

*I guess in an ideal world, if you had all those things, the resources, the support, the abilities of those that you’re working with, then you would have lots of money, lots of time... but teachers simply don’t have it... in fact the administrator in our district who was the one who was interested in it... when he left, the service-learning funds and all were sort of dumped to the curriculum director of our county. I really don’t think she, I don’t want to say that she doesn’t believe in service learning, she may believe in service learning, but I don’t think it’s a priority for her. I’m being very truthful here, this is just my feeling. She is not interested in funding service learning and... I guess funding would really make a difference too. I guess teachers are, it’s just a part of us to be creative in getting what we need... and funding really helps if you have it. You can provide your own funding or teachers spend their own money, a lot of times, but that pretty much makes or breaks a project too, if you have the material and supplies that you need.*

Social trust. The last factor mentioned by Sarah was social trust. As she organized service-learning projects with her class she found herself in a situation, although not of her choosing, where she received a lot of publicity. Although there were many teachers who were
excited about the outcomes of service learning, there were some who seemed jealous about 
Sarah’s intentions. In Sarah’s words,

\[
\ldots \text{sometimes when teachers do things that attract good publicity to them there may be}
\text{other people who are jealous of that publicity and sometimes you take some flack from}
\text{people around you. When we had the good publicity for giving away books \ldots there}
\text{were some catty comments made, ya know, from colleagues. There are the wonderful}
\text{supportive colleagues who I’ve talked about, and then there are those that say ‘Ahhh, you}
\text{didn’t do anything special,’ with that attitude. I guess to me it would be harder as a}
\text{beginning teacher to take that and still be willing to continue. As a veteran teacher I}
\text{know that it is going to come and that it is going to go \ldots and people are going to come}
\text{and they are going to go \ldots because they have through the years. We’re [veteran}
\text{teachers] going to do what we think is important no matter what.}
\]

**What About the University Course?**

At the end of the first class session during the service-learning course Sarah expressed 
herself doubt to the instructor about making service learning work in a kindergarten setting. The 
instructor reassured her that she could do it. For her course project, Sarah proceeded by first 
identifying a community need within her own school boundaries. She recognized that many 
students did not have books in their homes, so she and her students decided it would be a 
valuable service to collect a variety of books and give one to each child in the school. She had 
her kindergarten students design their own stationary and write a letter requesting donations 
from businesses in the community. The money collected from the donations, which was over 
$1000.00, was part of the money used to purchase over 2000 books for other students. Then, 
once the books had been purchased and organized, Sarah’s students invited all the businesses
that had donated money to come to the school for lunch. They were able to witness the students in each class in the school select a free book. Sarah created a book plate with the names of the supporters and put one in each book as a means of acknowledging their contribution. According to the school principal, the business representatives found it very rewarding to witness the service to which they had contributed. Sarah commented,

*We were so excited with the support of the community that we had a little thank you luncheon at the school and the children ate with the community supporters and we had a little program for them. And you know, here are people who probably haven’t been to an elementary school in years, unless they have children there. But they came and had lunch with the children and watched their little program and we gave them little thank you gifts.*

Sarah believed that the students found their service rewarding as they watched other students become so excited about selecting their books. Sarah also experienced the satisfaction that came from watching the students stand in the bus line reading their books and sharing them with their friends.

Sarah expressed that one of the most beneficial parts of the service-learning course was working with the course instructor. Sarah felt that the instructor’s enthusiasm for service learning was contagious and was one of the factors in getting the students taking the course excited about it. Sarah said,

*I think her enthusiasm spreads. She is one of those people . . . just a facilitator, people who just so quietly meet the needs of anybody in the class, you know not a big show, so it’s just so easily done, so I really appreciate her and the chance to work with her.*

The students also had a lot of fun together as they worked on their projects. Sarah commented,
“That is one thing that I was so grateful to [the course instructor] for providing that course where we could have fun and enjoy our projects.” Sarah also appreciated the way course instructor treated the students as professionals and taught clearly about service learning and how to make it work in the classroom. She valued the course instructor’s support of each student by asking about his/her individual needs and then addressing them. If the class needed ideas, they brainstormed them. If they needed contacts with certain people, the course instructor arranged contacts. If they needed resources, she brought in resources. In fact, the majority of class time revolved around the needs of the students. Sarah commented,

*I think the most beneficial thing was that we were able to do what we needed to do, speaking time wise again. In the course the way that [the course instructor] set it up, it was really set up so that what we needed to do we had time to do. You know in some courses you do something almost totally unrelated and then you have to do what you really have to do at another time. She had it set up, so that in the class time we could really work individually if we needed to on what we needed to do for our project. . . . and that was such a great help because it did give us that time to feel like we were doing an effective way and doing the best we could do on our project. . . . She gave us all the support that we needed, she would bring resource materials and everything every time. She would always ask us was there anything we needed her to do and if she needed to bring something for the next class, she would always do it. So she really taught individually so that whatever our special needs were, they were met.*

Sarah appreciated that although the course instructor was highly involved in each of the
projects, she did not want to take credit for its success. She quietly facilitated each student’s project, then stood back as they were rewarded with the favorable outcomes. In Sarah’s words,

... we all know teachers and people who you can just tell that their interest is in showcasing their students and that was her purpose in the class ... not to bring attention to herself. At every opportunity she gave us the attention and us the publicity, and us the positive responses. I think that was important too and what made it so positive for all of us.

Sarah expressed that one of the greatest things she learned from the service-learning course was the importance of making connections with the community. In her words,

From the course I learned that this is a time that we can build good public relations within the community and I think that is so important cause it does take all of us to provide that complete education for the children. And if we can have the community support it just makes everything go smoother. It really enhances the education of the children when we have this program in the community. So I guess those things really are what service learning is, along with the joy of the service-learning project, the ability to involve the whole community with the project and the good that comes from that.

Because we have found such positive things, even from our very first project and so many of those people have asked me, ‘Are you going to do this again? Please let us know. We want to give more support, if you do that project again. And so we’ve not really had time to do that first one again, but we would like to sometime. So I guess the thing from the course could be the involvement of the community, the fun of doing it, the fact that it does relate and it’s not an add onto what you’re doing. The stuff that you’re teaching, that it’s just a part of it and another way of having the children learn what you’re teaching in the
Summary of Veteran Teacher Case Studies

Of the veteran teachers involved in this study, Whitney and Sarah had continued to implement service learning in their classroom. Although Sharon believed that it was a powerful strategy for learning, she had felt too overwhelmed to make it a part of her teaching practice. Each of the participants, whether they implemented service learning or not, were able to offer many valuable insights into factors that both contribute to and hinder service-learning implementation.
CHAPTER 6
CROSS-CASE ANALYSES

In this chapter, I present the cross-case analysis of novice and veteran teachers. For questions one and two, I will first present the common factors that surfaced from a cross-case analysis within novice teachers followed by the common factors that surfaced from veteran teachers. This will be followed by presenting the common factors that surfaced from a cross-case analysis of novice and veteran teachers. The chapter will conclude with a summary of the cross-case analysis.

As a reminder, Chelsea, Emma, and Sheila are novice teachers with fewer than two years of teaching experience. Chelsea, a seventh-grade science teacher, has taught for one year. Emma currently teaches fourth grade but has also had experience in fifth grade as a full time teacher. Sheila is a seventh-grade math teacher in her first year. Whitney, Sharon, and Sarah, are veteran teachers with anywhere from 7 to 33 years of experience. Whitney, a sixth-grade science teacher, has taught middle school for 7 years. Sharon has taught for 11 years and has a variety of teaching experience with elementary students. She has taught Pre-K, K, 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd}, and 4\textsuperscript{th} grades. Sarah is a kindergarten teacher who will be retiring after 33 years of classroom teaching experience.

Question #1: What are Novice and Veteran Teachers’ Perceptions of Factors that Facilitate Service-Learning Implementation in Their Classrooms?

Common Factors That Facilitate Service-Learning Implementation for Novice Teachers

When identifying factors that facilitate implementation of service learning, novice teachers shared some common experiences and opinions (see Table 17).
Table 17

Common Factors of Novice Teachers That Facilitate Service-Learning Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chelsea</th>
<th>Emma</th>
<th>Sheila</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support System</td>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
<td>Support System</td>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Support system.* Chelsea, who has made service learning a part of her teaching, had worked with another teacher on her team as a person with whom she could discuss ideas, ask questions about the ins and outs of the school system, and get help with classroom management. Both Sheila and Emma, however, did not implement service learning into their classroom and felt that if they were working with a team that also believed in the philosophy of service learning, it would have made a difference in their abilities to make it a part of their classroom practice.

*Student characteristics.* Student characteristics was a factor that was identified by Chelsea and Emma. Chelsea commented that service learning is highly motivational for students and creates an emotional response to their learning. Witnessing such emotion from her students made implementation easier because there was such a positive outcome. She believed that in this way the group of students facilitate implementation. Emma agreed that the group of students plays a large part in facilitating implementation. In her experience she had already recognized huge differences in the students she taught. She expressed that during her first year the students would have easily adjusted to the requirements of service learning because they were very well behaved and worked hard to get things done. However, her second year the students would have been more resistant to it because they were less disciplined and self motivated.
Teaching experience. Both Emma and Sheila identified teaching experience as a factor that facilitates service-learning implementation. Even though Emma was just starting her teaching career, she recognized that teaching experience mattered because with more years of experience she would have been better able to manage many of the issues involved in implementation of service learning. For example, she suggested that a teacher with more experience knows more people, knows the community better and therefore the community needs, and is more familiar with the curriculum. Sheila felt that while more teaching experience could facilitate implementation, having fewer years also brought with it some advantages. She felt that it was to her advantage that she was not “stuck in her ways” about teaching when she learned about service learning. She also felt that coming fresh from the university meant that she was up-to-date on recent research about what matters in educating children and she also had many of the skills with technology that assist her in teaching.

Common Factors That Facilitate Service-Learning Implementation for Veteran Teachers

As with the novice teachers, when identifying factors that facilitate implementation of service learning veteran teachers shared some common beliefs as shown in Table 18.

Table 18

Common Factors of Veteran Teachers That Facilitate Service-Learning Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whitney</th>
<th>Sharon</th>
<th>Sarah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support System</td>
<td>Support System</td>
<td>Support System</td>
<td>Support System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>Teacher Knowledge of Service Learning</td>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Knowledge of Service Learning</td>
<td>Teacher Knowledge of Service Learning</td>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
<td>Class and Planning Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class and Planning Time</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support system. Each of the veteran teachers felt that having a support system was one of the most important factors to consider when implementing service learning. Whitney felt very supported as she was being trained in service learning and recognized that such a support system was a vital part of being successful. She also commented on the importance of the administration when she needed support to conduct a project. In addition, she felt it is important to have colleagues and parents as supportive partners when doing service learning. Sharon agreed with Whitney about the importance of having support from the administration and the parents when implementing service learning. In fact, she believed that if the whole school supported the service-learning philosophy, it would greatly facilitate implementation. Sarah agreed with Whitney and Sharon when it comes to the importance of feeling supported from the administration, colleagues and parents. Furthermore, she felt that having the support of the community is an important part of being successful with implementing service learning in the classroom.

Teaching experience. One of the common characteristics of each of the veteran teachers was that they had several years of teaching experience. Each of them felt that their experience as teachers greatly facilitated their abilities to implement it into their classrooms for a variety of reasons. Each veteran teacher mentioned that they felt more confident because of their experience and were therefore able to trust their own judgments while implementing it. They also commented on how their teaching experience placed them in a situation where they knew the curriculum and therefore were able to think more clearly about how to tie it to service. In addition, Whitney felt that her teaching experience facilitated implementation because as she learned about it through the service-learning course she did so through experienced eyes. Because of this she was able to predict potential obstacles as well as understand the benefits that could come from it. Whitney also expressed that experience facilitated implementation because
she knew the capabilities of her students. Not only that, she also knew that she never made it all the way through the curriculum other years so she didn’t blame it on service learning once she started to implement it into her classroom. Whitney also explained that she had many resources already in place to teach the curriculum so her time was freed up for other things.

Sharon expressed that when she implemented the service-learning project she conducted simultaneously with the course, experience helped because she was not functioning in survival mode. She had good classroom management, was more organized, and knew what mattered to her and her students. Sarah felt that her teaching experience helped because she was able to filter out some of the negative things that happened along the way, such as negative comments from colleagues. Because of their teaching experience, Whitney, Sharon, and Sarah more easily implemented service learning into their curriculum.

*Teacher knowledge of service learning.* Whitney and Sharon both agreed that teacher knowledge of service learning is something that facilitates implementation. Whitney felt that it was especially important for teachers to understand how they could scale projects down to make them manageable. She also felt that having knowledge of service learning places a teacher in a position where they are able to justify it to colleagues, parents or the administration. In fact, she encouraged teachers who would like to implement service learning to send a note home to parents explaining not only what service learning is, but also detailing the project the class will be doing for service learning. Sharon agreed that knowledge of service learning was important because she felt a teacher would never be able to implement something they don’t understand or make it a part of their philosophy of teaching.

*Student characteristics.* In addition to teacher knowledge of service learning, Whitney and Sharon both felt that student characteristics involved plays a large role in making service
learning successful or unsuccessful. Throughout her teaching experience, Whitney has recognized that different groups of students get excited about different types of things and have different needs to be successful. Sharon’s experience was that her students have had relatively few experiences in the community. She recognized a need for them to extend beyond the walls of the classroom and get a larger vision of what it takes to be a citizen. She also explained that the ages of the group of students plays a role in facilitating implementation. She felt that the older the group, the less dependant they are on the teacher and the easier it is to implement it into the curriculum.

*Class and planning time.* Whitney and Sarah both commented on the importance of having sufficient class and planning time when trying to make service learning a part of the curriculum. Whitney simply felt that without the time to plan or implement service learning it is next to impossible to make it happen. Service learning is something that takes both time to plan, and time in the classroom to implement. Sarah’s opinion corresponded with Whitney’s, and furthermore she stated that when it comes to planning, the younger the students are the more the responsibility falls on the teacher to do the extras that service learning requires.

*Resources.* Sharon and Sarah both agreed that having access to resources is something that facilitates service-learning implementation. Both teachers specifically mentioned that having access to financial resources facilitated implementation. Sharon was able to write a grant while taking the service-learning course and was awarded $500.00 to carry out her project. Brenda was able to get donations through business in the community. Both knew personally the impact of having access to resources as they implement service learning into their classroom.
Cross-Case Analysis of Factors That Facilitate Service-Learning Implementation for Novice and Veteran Teachers

This section is a cross-case of common factors that emerged from the experiences of both novice and veteran teachers regarding the facilitation of service-learning. In comparing their perceptions, they shared only one common factor: a support system. The remaining factors were identified by at least two of the participants (See Table 19).

Table 19

Cross-Case Analysis of Factors That Facilitate Service-Learning Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chelsea (N)</th>
<th>Emma (N)</th>
<th>Sheila (N)</th>
<th>Whitney (V)</th>
<th>Sharon (V)</th>
<th>Sarah (V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Knowledge of Service Learning</td>
<td>Teacher Knowledge of Service Learning</td>
<td>Teacher Knowledge of Service Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class and Planning Time</td>
<td>Class and Planning Time</td>
<td>Class and Planning Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristics of the Teacher</td>
<td>Personal Characteristics of the Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-Learning Experience</td>
<td>Service-Learning Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question #2: What are Novice and Veteran Teachers’ Perceptions of Factors that Hinder Service-Learning Implementation in Their Classrooms?

Common Factors That Hinder Service-Learning Implementation for Novice Teachers

As with question #1 novice teachers had many common experiences when identifying factors that hinder implementation of service learning. Four factors were mentioned by all three novice teachers and four common factors were mentioned by at least two of the participants (see Table 20).

Table 20

Common Factors of Novice Teachers That Hinder Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chelsea</th>
<th>Emma</th>
<th>Sheila</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class and Planning Time</td>
<td>Class and Planning Time</td>
<td>Class and Planning Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Inexperience</td>
<td>Teacher Inexperience</td>
<td>Teacher Inexperience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Knowledge of Service Learning</td>
<td>Teacher Knowledge of Service Learning</td>
<td>Teacher Knowledge of Service Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support System</td>
<td>Pressures to Cover QCCs in Preparation for High-Stakes Tests</td>
<td>Support System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pressures to Cover QCCs in Preparation for High-Stakes Tests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Resources.* Chelsea identified resources as a factor that hinders service-learning implementation because not having access to resources was one of her biggest frustrations as she tried to implement service learning. Specifically she found it difficult to access busses or any type of funding to carry out the project. Chelsea expressed that one of her goals for next year is to write some grants that will help her get access to the type of resources she needs to have success. Emma concurred with Chelsea that funding is a hindrance to making service learning
work. She explained that schools are even starting to eliminate field trips because of it, so making requests to do service-learning activities might very well be denied. Along with Chelsea and Emma, Sheila expressed concern about accessing the funding needed to pay for buses or for project materials.

*Class and planning time.* In addition to resources, each novice teacher identified class and planning time. Chelsea commented that doing service learning sometimes takes more time because you don’t know what to expect. Also, she feels it takes more time to plan for an activity when you don’t know what to expect. Emma is of the belief that it is difficult for a teacher to do the kind of teaching that really matters because it is hard to create your own resources. Sometimes she struggles with whether to use teaching materials that have already been prepared and are easy, or to do what she knows is good learning but takes more time. She feels that some of the stress could be eliminated if teachers use their summers and start the school year already prepared. Sheila agrees with Emma that using the summer to prepare would make the issue of limited time more feasible.

*Student characteristics.* In addition to resources and class and planning time, Chelsea, Emma, and Sheila all agreed that student characteristics have the potential to influence implementation. Chelsea expressed concern for her students because of their background, such as their home life. She felt they came to her already at a disadvantage and with problems that she is unable to solve. Because of this, she was unable to address some of their most pressing issues. In addition, Chelsea felt very frustrated at times with students lack of motivation. She felt like it was difficult to get them excited about anything, no matter how much she tried. Emma also felt like the group of students has an influence on service-learning implementation. She focused on the behavior of each group of students and commented that some groups are just easier because
they have better behavior. Sheila also feels that it is important to consider the impact of the students. She agrees with Chelsea that the background of the student has a large impact on hindering service-learning implementation.

*Teacher inexperience.* In addition to resources, class and planning time, and students, each of the novice teachers felt that their inexperience as teachers was a factor that hindered service-learning implementation. Although Chelsea was successful implementing service learning, she felt it was a struggle at times because she was just starting out in the teaching profession. She commented that her lack of teaching experience made classroom management more difficult which often left her feeling discouraged. She also felt uncomfortable letting students decide the way the project should go as well as with the way they wasted their time when working on a project. She felt that with more teaching experience she would be better at managing the students and the projects.

Emma expressed that being a beginning teacher made implementing service learning difficult for a variety of reasons. First of all, she commented that she often felt overwhelmed. She was learning the ropes of the teaching system, getting to know her colleagues, just beginning to learn more about the community within which she worked, trying to learn how to work with parents, and doing her best to juggle the demands of all the paperwork.

Sheila also expressed the difficulty of feeling overwhelmed. She commented that she spends a good deal of time functioning in survival mode. Like Chelsea, Sheila worried about classroom management. She felt that because she was new she wasn’t as confident in herself as a teacher with more years of experience might be. Because she lacked confidence she thought it would be difficult to justify service learning to colleagues, the principal, and parents.
**Teacher knowledge of service learning.** Chelsea and Emma both commented on the importance of a teacher having a good understanding of service learning. Just as Chelsea felt that a teacher with a good understanding of service learning can facilitate implementation, she also felt that lack of knowledge of service learning will hinder it. She especially felt it was important to understand that service learning has varying degrees of intensity. When she first finished the service-learning course, she saw service learning as a huge project that lasted several months. As she has begun teaching, however, she has come to the realization that service-learning projects can be small scale and still have a powerful impact on the students. Emma agreed with Chelsea that understanding varying degrees of service learning is an important understanding for teachers to have if they want to implement it into their classroom.

**Support system.** Chelsea and Sheila both agreed that an inadequate support system is a factor that hinders service-learning implementation. Chelsea felt that support, both from her colleagues and the administration, was a very important part of her success as she implemented service learning. She also felt that without such support she felt isolated and alone and implementing service learning was more difficult. Sheila agreed with Chelsea and furthermore feels that if a whole team of teachers get behind an idea it is much more likely to be successful.

**Pressures to cover QCCs in preparation for high-stakes tests.** Emma and Sheila both commented on the pressures they felt to cover QCCs in preparation for high-stakes tests. Emma felt frustrated with the current political trends that push testing because she feels that because of it her teaching time with students is compromised. Furthermore, it goes against her personal philosophy to base so much on testing. Sheila felt pressure because she recognized that the results of the tests students take reflect upon her; their performance reflects on her performance.
Common Factors That Hinder Service-Learning Implementation for Veteran Teachers

Veteran teachers also identified common factors that hinder implementation of service learning. Two factors were mentioned by all three novice teachers and one common factor was mentioned by at least two of the participants as shown in Table 21.

Table 21

Common Factors of Veteran Teachers That Hinder Service-Learning Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whitney</th>
<th>Sharon</th>
<th>Sarah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support System</td>
<td>Support System</td>
<td>Support System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class and Planning Time</td>
<td>Class and Planning Time</td>
<td>Class and Planning Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressures to Cover the QCCs</td>
<td>Pressures to Cover the QCCs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Preparation For High-Stakes Tests</td>
<td>in Preparation For High-Stakes Tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support system. Whitney, Sharon, and Sarah all agreed that an inadequate support system was a factor that hinders service-learning implementation. Whitney also identified an adequate support system as a factor that facilitates implementation. While she was taking the service-learning course she felt very supported by the course instructor and recognized during that time how important it is to be a part of a supportive system. She also recognized that without such support implementing service learning is much more difficult. Whitney has had personal experienced concerning the impact of support in the school where she works. When she began to teach she felt a lot of support from the school principal. Now, with so many pressures placed on teachers to have students perform well on tests, she feels less support for doing the types of activities she feels really matters in education.
Sharon’s experience with service learning made it clear to her that a good support system is needed to make it work. Like Whitney, Sharon felt very supported by the course instructor while learning about service learning and was grateful for a grant she received that helped her carry out her project. She also recognized the potential impact parents have on supporting an endeavor such as service learning. Unfortunately she works in a situation where she does not get a lot of parental support which makes it more difficult to successfully implement service learning.

Sarah expressed that an inadequate support system is a factor that hinders service-learning implementation. Although she felt extremely supported by her principal, most of her colleagues, parents, and the community, she felt no support from the school district for which she works. She recognized the contrast that existed between her school and the district, and expressed how important it is for a teacher to have a high quality support system in place to be successful. In fact, it is so important to Sarah that when she retires she would like to work in the offices of the school district as a service-learning specialist whose main job it would be to support those involved in service learning.

*Class and planning time.* In addition to an inadequate support system, each of the veteran teachers identified class and planning time as a factor that hinders service-learning implementation. Whitney expressed the importance of having the time needed to plan a project as well as carry it out in the classroom. She felt like it was getting more difficult because of the current shift in education toward testing. However, because she believes service learning is such a powerful way for students to learn that she makes time for it happen.

Sharon also expressed the difficulties that come from limited class and planning time. She explained that service learning is a teaching strategy that takes extra time to make it happen.
and it is difficult for her to find extra time in her day to prepare for it. She also suggested that there is only so much time in the day to teach the curriculum and sometimes it is difficult to imagine fitting in anything else. She recognizes, however, that through service learning it is easier to teach a variety of skills at the same time, which actually saves time in the classroom.

Sarah agreed with Whitney and Sharon that limited class and planning time makes it difficult to implement service learning. She commented on the pressures that teachers face outside of the classroom that occupy their time and keep them from planning the way they should.

*Pressures to cover QCCs in preparation for high-stakes tests.* Whitney and Sharon both identified pressures to cover the QCCs in preparation for high-stakes tests as a factor that hinders service learning implementation. Whitney felt that often times teachers make decisions about what and how they teach based on the amount of pressure they feel from others, such as the administration. Sharon agreed with Whitney that about the impact of pressure. In fact, she suggested that service learning would be easier to implement in a private school where teachers are free of the pressures of testing.

*Cross-Case Analysis of Factors That Hinder Service-Learning Implementation for Novice and Veteran Teachers*

This section is a cross-case analysis of common and additional factors that emerged from the experiences of both novice and veteran teachers regarding factors that hinder service-learning implementation (see Table 22).

In comparing the perceptions of novice and veteran teachers, they shared only one common factor: class and planning time. Five (two novice and three veteran) teachers mentioned support system as a factor that hinders implementation of service learning. Students, pressures to
cover QCCs in preparation for high-stakes tests, and resources were mentioned four times each by the teachers. All three of the novice teachers mentioned teacher inexperience as a factor that hinders implementation and three teacher (two novice and one veteran) commented that teacher knowledge of service learning is a factor that may hinder implementation.
CHAPTER 7
DISCUSSION AND FINAL THOUGHTS

Factors That Facilitate and Hinder Service-Learning Implementation

In this section I present a discussion of factors identified by more than one teacher that facilitate and hinder service-learning implementation. First, I present the factors found in my study that confirm prior research. Then, I present factors not found in prior research. I then present advise given by novice and veteran teachers’ to other teachers regarding implementation, as well as suggestions to teacher educators regarding instruction. Finally, I provide recommendations for future research.

Factors Common to Teachers That Confirm Prior Research

This section details the factors identified by participants in my study that confirm prior research. These factors include support system, resources, teacher knowledge of service learning, social trust, teaching experience, personal experience with service learning, and class and planning time. Each of the factors discussed in this section contributes to the field of service-learning research by confirming prior research.

Support system. In this study support system is defined as a network of people who promote and encourage the interests of service learning. A sufficient amount of support from other teachers, the administration, the community, and parents is a factor that has a large impact on whether service learning does or does not get implemented into the classroom. In fact, having a support system was mentioned by all six teachers as a factor that facilitates implementation if it
is present; five out of the six participants identified it as a factor that hinders implementation if it is not.

The sentiment of feeling support from the administration and colleagues while implementing service learning was made manifest by the participants to varying degrees. Concerning the administration, four of the teachers expressed feeling supported when their principals simply “left them alone” because it allowed them freedom to teach in the manner they deemed appropriate. The other teachers expressed their dream of working with a principal who had also been trained in service learning and would make it a part of their educational philosophy, therefore a focus of the school. They felt that under such circumstances they would feel more supported, which would contribute to the implementation process. Each of the participants also expressed the importance of working with a colleague who values the philosophy of service learning. Of the three participants who implemented service learning after they were trained, all three had at one time worked with other teachers to some degree to make it happen. Two teachers felt supported by a colleague because they had someone to talk to even though they were not actually involved in a project. The other teacher enjoyed the experience of working on a project with a colleague and her class on a common project. Also of interest, both novice and veteran teachers expressed the importance of support from their colleagues and the administration in attempts made to implement service learning. However, veteran teachers extended the significance of having support from parents and the community as well.

Research on the importance of support is plentiful. Shumer (1997b) found that of the many factors that may facilitate service-learning implementation in the classroom, feeling a sense of support from the administration is one of the most important. Schine (1997) agrees with Shumer and suggests that service-learning programs are more successful if teachers have the
support of the school community including the administration, staff, and parents which was also expressed by the participants in this study.

Wade (1997) believes that if educators tap into funds and curriculum resources they will be more successful implementing service learning. Furthermore she feels school districts can facilitate the process by providing support systems such as service-learning coordinators, teacher mentors, or peer consultants to assist. In addition, Wade et al. (1999) conducted a study investigating factors that effect implementation of service learning. Their findings suggest that teachers will be more apt to implement service learning if they “are provided with support for implementing service learning in the schools” (p. 683). The importance of peer consultants was also mentioned by each of the participants in this study who were successful implementing service learning.

Resources. In this study resources is defined as an available means to supplies needed to carry out service learning. While having resources means having access to supplies, insufficient resources refers to the problem of not having access to supplies. Chelsea, a novice teacher, and Sarah, a veteran teacher, each made reference to the potential impact of working with sufficient resources as well as working with too few resources. Sharon, a veteran teacher, commented that having access to resources would be a facilitator of service-learning implementation and Emma and Sheila made reference that having too few resources would hinder service learning.

Obviously, when it comes to implementing service learning, resources play a consequential role. Interestingly, resources can be influenced by time. One of the ways that time influences resources is when considering the amount of time that goes into preparing needed resources. In fact, two of the veteran teachers in this study suggested that their teaching experience played a role in accessing needed resources because they had several years to
accumulate the resources needed to teach they were not spending time creating new items. Therefore, more of their time could be spent focusing on the organizational issues that accompany service-learning projects. Another way time influences resources is apparent when considering the amount of time it takes to do fund raisers or write grants that will bring in money for resources. By the time teachers do the aforementioned activities, there is not much time left for them to focus their efforts on service learning.

While having access to resources provides teachers with an avenue for successfully incorporating service learning into their classrooms, not having access to resources impacts the degree to which it can be implemented. The participants suggested that the more resources available to a teacher, the higher the degree to which they could implement service learning. For example, without resources a teacher might only be able to do a project such as creating a brochure because paper is a resource that is accessible to most teachers. On the other hand, more resources, such as access to busses, allows teachers to take students into the community to conduct a project. Therefore, resources influence the degree to which service learning can be implemented.

Findings from this study confirm research on the impact of resources on service-learning. Carter (1997) and Scales and Koppelman (1997) suggest that it is a major factor in successful implementation and that, with shrinking budgets, relatively few resources are available and those that are available are not easily accessible. This in turn has an impact on whether teachers are able to implement service learning successfully. Wade (1997) believes that educators must tap into funds and curriculum resources in order to make their service-learning endeavors successful.

Teacher knowledge of service learning. For the purposes of this study, teacher knowledge of service learning has been defined as the understanding participants have about service
learning gained from the course or from their experiences. Research in the area of teachers’ understandings of service learning indicates that it is a very important part of implementing service learning successfully. Seitsinger & Felner (2000) state that the knowledge a teacher has about service learning is an important factor in his or her perception of what it is all about and the value it carries in regards to implementation. Chelsea, a novice teacher, and Whitney, a veteran teacher, both agreed with Seitsinger & Felner that teacher knowledge of service learning facilitates implementation. Furthermore, Sharon, a veteran teacher, identified teacher knowledge of service learning as a facilitator to implementation while Emma identified insufficient knowledge as a hindrance.

The participants in this study indicated that there are a variety of ways that knowledge of service learning influences implementation. For implementation to happen a teacher must first understand what service learning is, why it is important, how it impacts students, and how to make it work. Only then will teachers be in a position to make it a core part of their teaching philosophy. With a service-learning philosophy in place, teachers are ready to implement it into their classrooms. Implementation happens best when teachers have the knowledge about how to connect projects with the curriculum and how to set up projects that are manageable. Without such knowledge many teachers become frustrated with the overwhelming task of addressing curricular objectives through service-learning projects. They should also have knowledge of the positive impact service learning can have on students and the community. With such an understanding, they are often more motivated to make it continue in their classrooms. In addition, the more knowledgeable teachers are about service learning the more prepared they are to justify it to parents, the administration, and other teachers who may not have knowledge of service learning. In summary, implementing service learning begins with teachers making it part
of their teaching philosophy and continues when teachers know how to connect projects to the 
curriculum, make projects manageable, and see the positive benefits that come from service 
learning, all of which come from having knowledge about service learning.

Social trust. Social trust can be defined as reliance on the character, ability, strength or 
truth of others within the workplace. Sheila identified social trust as a factor that facilitates 
service-learning implementation while Sarah identified lack of social trust as a factor that 
hinders implementation.

Social trust is a factor that influences implementation because teachers do not work 
alone. They work with principals, colleagues, parents, and students and are constantly faced with 
the responsibility of working on developing relationships with them. In this study emphasis was 
placed on the relationship the teacher has with the students and other teachers. Several 
participants mentioned that if there is a relationship of trust between the student and the teacher, 
the students will be more likely to buy into a type of learning to which they may not be 
accustomed. It is also important to develop relationships of trust with colleagues. When lack of 
social trust is an issue it means there is a breakdown in a relationship and it is important to work 
toward a solution that will improve the relationship. However, lack of social trust should not 
discourage a teacher from doing what he/she thinks is most important for the students with 
whom they work.

Two participants in this study, Sheila and Sarah, confirm research in the area of social 
trust as it relates to service-learning implementation. Toole (2002) feels that social trust is one of 
the most important factors related to service-learning implementation. He investigated how 
social trust influences the ability of schools to implement service learning and found that in 
schools with a high degree of trust among teachers there were certain elements of social trust in
place. In these schools, the purposes of service learning were seen as authentic, administrators were appreciated rather than despised, and teachers worked together to improve and contribute to service-learning implementation rather than being bitter about other teachers’ successes.

*Teaching experience.* In this study teaching experience is defined as the number of years the participants had been full-time teachers. All but Chelsea identified number of years of teaching experience as a factor that facilitates implementation. Emma and Sheila commented that service-learning implementation would be easier after they had more teaching experience. Whitney, Sharon, and Sarah each suggested that their years of experience as teachers had greatly influenced their experiences with implementing service learning.

The participants identified a variety of reasons that teaching experience influences service-learning implementation. From the perspective of novice teachers there were many concerns about classroom management with a non-traditional form of learning. They also felt that because they were new they had not developed many relationships with others. With more teaching experience there would be time for relationships to develop with others in the school, as well as in the community. In addition, with more teaching experience, teachers would be more familiar with the needs of the community.

Veteran teachers felt that their years of experience played a vital role from the time they took the service-learning course. Because of their experience they were more familiar with the curriculum and were, therefore, more able to connect it with service-learning projects. They knew the developmental readiness of students and what they would be able to accomplish on their own, as well as where they would need help. They had already spent a lot of time developing resources and so were more able to focus on service learning. Perhaps one of the most important benefits of teaching experience is that it generally brings with it more confidence
and security in teaching. Teachers have learned good teaching practices and are able to use them to meet the goals of education. They can also ignore unimportant issues that arise, such as colleagues who do not agree with the service-learning philosophy.

Seitsinger and Felner (2000) examined attributes of teachers who implemented service learning in their teaching. They found that the teachers who are inclined to implement service learning are those with more teaching experience, such as Whitney and Sarah. However, in a study conducted by Wade, Anderson, Yarbrough, Erickson, and Kromer (1999), the researchers found that some novice teachers are successful implementing service learning in spite of the fact that they are just beginning their careers, as was the case with Chelsea.

*Service-learning experience.* For the purposes of this study, service-learning experience is defined as the direct participation the teachers had with service learning. Both Chelsea and Sarah identified experience as a factor that facilitates implementation. The value of experience with service learning cannot be underestimated. Experience with service learning refers not only to personal experiences that participants had when they participated in a project, but also to work with students in the classroom. Both participants expressed that the more they worked with service learning the easier it became because they learned more about the process. It was easier because they were more familiar with the intricacies of various projects and could anticipate ways to make them run smoothly. They also felt that with more service-learning experience colleagues, parents, students, the administration, and the community grew in understanding and also began to value service-learning experiences. It seemed to create an energy that continued to sustain itself and made it difficult to discontinue.

In Wade et al. (1999), the researchers investigated the experiences of 30 K-12 teachers who had previously received instruction on service learning. Through interviewing these
teachers, the researchers found that one of the factors that most affected the implementation of service learning was limited experience with it on the part of the teachers involved. The researchers suggest that teachers are more apt to implement service learning if they “participate in varied high-quality service learning experiences.” Wade and Eland (1995) further proclaim the importance of service-learning experience. They examined pre-service teachers’ commitment to service learning and found that it may be enhanced by the combination of three factors. First, pre-service teachers should be provided with opportunities to develop a personal commitment to service learning by being actively involved in it, which was the case with the participants in this study. Each was given the opportunity to implement service learning while taking the course. Second, pre-service teachers must learn how to implement service learning in the classroom. This can happen through practicum experiences in schools that are involved in service-learning activities. While veteran teachers in this study were able to implement service learning in their own classrooms, novice teachers were unable to implement it an actual classroom setting. Finally, teacher educators should structure the course in a way that offers students the opportunity to plan units and lessons incorporating service learning. They should also encourage teachers to reflect on their service-learning experiences and discuss the difficulties of using service learning in their future teaching, which occurred in the course offered to participants in this study. Developing such a comprehensive approach to service learning in teacher education programs will provide pre-service teachers’ experiences with service learning that will contribute to their knowledge and experience base (Cleary & Benson, 1998).

*Class and planning time.* For this study class and planning time has been defined as lacking the amount of time needed for teachers to carry out activities in the classroom, as well as
the amount of time it takes to plan activities. Each one of the participants identified limited class and planning time as a factor that hinders their implementation efforts with service learning.

Both novice and veteran teachers commented on the correlation of limited class and planning time with feelings of being overwhelmed. Teachers are faced with increasing demands on their time and find it more and more difficult to do the extra work that comes from activities such as service learning. Organizing and conducting service-learning projects takes a lot of time which most teachers don’t have because of other obligations, whether personal or professional.

In Wade et al. (1999) the researchers found that limited classroom time was a major factor affecting the implementation of service learning. They also discovered that teachers felt they did not have enough time to plan for service-learning projects. In this study novice teachers felt overwhelmed by the demands of teaching. Veteran teachers, on the other hand, expressed that much of their frustration with limited time is due to the new mandates of testing. They feel that limited classroom time directly correlates with the stress teachers are feeling in today’s classrooms to improve students’ test scores.

Cairn and Kielsmeier (1991) suggest that there are many ways to address the issue of limited time. For example, teachers could create before and after school time slots where issues of service learning could be addressed. They could also team up with others, for example other teachers or community organizations, and share the burden of program responsibilities. Cairn and Kielsmeier also suggest that employing a service-learning coordinator is one way to address the issue of limited class and planning time. Research conducted by McPherson (1990) suggests that linking the curriculum to the service-learning project is the key to covering that which needs to be covered. He also believes that creating team projects that utilize combined class periods is
another way to get more people involved and therefore distribute the burden of responsibility across the board.

Factors Common to Teachers That Are New From This Study

This section details the factors identified by participants in my study that were not found in prior research. These factors were student characteristics, characteristics of the teacher, classroom and planning time, pressures to cover the QCCs in preparation for high-stakes tests, and teacher inexperience. Each of the factors discussed in this section contributes insights into influences that facilitate and hinder service-learning implementation.

Student characteristics. For the purposes of this research study, student characteristics has been defined as the attributes inherent in the group of learners in each of the participants’ classes. Chelsea, Emma, and Whitney all identified student characteristics as both a factor that can facilitate implementation as well as a factor that can hinder it. Sharon identified student characteristics as a facilitator to implementation while Sheila identified it as a hindrance.

When participants mentioned student characteristics as a factor that facilitates or hinders service-learning implementation there were a variety of perspectives about what “student characteristics” meant. One of the perspectives considered the impact of the behavior of the students. While working with students who are well-behaved facilitates implementation, students who are not well-behaved makes service learning more difficult to implement. A second perspective shared by participants dealt with the socio-economic situation from which students come. Some students from lower socio-economic situations were behind academically according to national standards. Sharon felt that her students’ experiences were limited, so she got excited about the idea of extending their learning into the community in order to broaden their understandings. In addition, teachers working with students from lower socio-economic
conditions often feel it is their responsibility to first teach the basic subjects, like reading and math, in a traditional manner. A third perspective from the participants focused on the motivational level of the students. Students who are not motivated to learn or who learn in different ways made it difficult for a teacher to make service learning work. The age of the students was another perspective shared by one participant when talking about student characteristics. The age level of the students has an impact on a teacher’s ability to implement service learning because the younger the students (kindergarten through third grade), the more responsibility rests on the teacher’s shoulders. Older students (fourth grade and beyond) are usually more able to take on some of the responsibility for carrying out service-learning projects.

In each perspective the participants recognized the impact of student characteristics on making service learning work in the classroom. Three of the participants commented on the importance of teachers knowing their students. They felt that teachers must first understand what their students can do independently and what they need to progress to the next level. Teachers must also know their students’ needs and their desires before service learning will work. They must know what motivates the students, then allow the students’ motivation to fuel the service-learning project. By tapping into students’ interests, service learning is easier to implement because students are motivated.

Student diversity is a fact of life in all classrooms. Research on the influence of student characteristics is plentiful and indicates that the diversity that exists should be celebrated, treated sensitively, and addressed with the goal of giving students equal opportunities to be successful. For example, Slavin (2000) indicates that students differ in many ways, such as performance level, learning rate, learning style, ethnicity, culture, social class, religion, abilities, and disabilities. He believes that the goal of teachers is to ensure that each child, regardless of their
differences, has access to equal learning opportunities. Wolfolk (1998) also covers in great depth the importance of teachers understanding the wide array of diversity that exists in the classroom, from cultural differences to learning differences. Teachers must know each student individually and respect their unique abilities and differences. They must have high expectations of all and teach them what they need to know to be successful.

In addition to the research mentioned above, Cruickshank, Bainer, and Metcalf (1999) explain that the diversity in today’s classrooms is due to the changing American population. They believe that effective teachers care about children enough to accommodate for diversity, while less effective teachers simply do not notice it and treat the class as a homogenous group. The authors believe that our schools need teachers who care about economically disadvantaged youth and provide them with experiences that help develop positive personalities. Finally, Ryan and Cooper (1998) suggest that although the developmental stages children go through today are like those of yesterday, the world around us has changed and constantly influences our current condition in education. Ryan and Cooper feel that children are affected more than any other segment of society by changing social conditions, which inevitably shows up in the classroom. They feel that teachers must be sensitive, not only to the diversity in the classroom, but also to the societal factors that directly affect the lives of students. They suggest that one of the most feasible ways for teachers to address student characteristics and the students’ needs is by using all the resources available to them, including parents and other professionals.

The research above indicates that regardless of the student characteristics and the diversity that exists in a classroom, teachers have the responsibility to know their students, celebrate diversity, and address students’ learning needs accordingly. In spite of the fact that some groups of students seem to make service learning more difficult, teachers need to make
every effort to give students equal opportunities to learn and be successful. It may be that teachers who find a certain group of students difficult will also find that these are the very students who could be most successful or learn the most from service-learning experiences.

**Characteristics of the teacher.** Characteristics of the teacher is defined as each individual teacher’s traits or qualities that distinguish him/her from other teachers. In this study, characteristics of the teachers was identified by Chelsea and Whitney as a factor that facilitates implementation. It was mentioned by Sheila as a factor that hinders it. The personal characteristics they mentioned included having the drive to do what you believe in, following through on tasks, being outgoing, being willing to change a paradigm that does not align with the tenets of service learning, and being a reflective individual.

Obviously, teachers are more than trained professionals. They bring many experiences and personal characteristics to the classroom that influence the decisions they make. Many research studies have investigated teacher characteristics and attributes and correlated them to increased student learning. Cruickshank, Bainer, and Metcalf (1999) have organized the research into three categories. First they listed a motivating personality as a teacher characteristic that influences student learning. This includes enthusiasm, variety, warmth, and humor. The next category includes an orientation toward success. This means that teachers believe in their own and their students’ abilities to be successful. Finally, they define professional demeanor, which means that the teacher is focused on helping students learn, as an attribute that influences student learning. All of the above-mentioned teacher characteristics could obviously contribute to the successful implementation of service learning. Teachers must be enthusiastic about service learning, believe in their students and their abilities to carry it out successfully, and then help them work toward success.
Class and planning time. For the purposes of this study, class and planning time is defined as having enough time to plan service learning as well as carry it out in the classroom. Emma, Whitney, and Sarah each identified having sufficient time to plan service learning and then carry it out in the classroom as a factor that facilitates service-learning implementation. The factor class and planning time appears in prior research as a factor that hinders service-learning implementation when there is insufficient time. However, in this study the participants also identified it as a factor that facilitates implementation if there is sufficient time. Clearly everyone has equal amounts of time in a day. So when considering what participants meant by having sufficient amounts of class and planning time, it is important to consider what was taking priority over efforts to implement service learning. For novice teachers much of their time was spent in what they labeled “survival mode” where they were constantly doing their best just to keep their heads above water. The veteran teachers felt pressure to spend class time preparing students for standardized tests. Outside of the classroom all of the participants seemed to feel overwhelmed with other school-related responsibilities such as being on committees or attending meetings.

Teachers seem to be facing a daunting problem in education: lack of planning time to prepare lessons and lack of classroom time to teach them. The importance of both of these issues cannot be dismissed. Unfortunately, there are limits to the amount of time teachers have to plan what they teach as well as actually teach what they plan. According to the thousands of teachers that Cruikshank, Bainer, and Metcaf (1999) interviewed, teachers do not have sufficient time to prepare for class, carry out what they have prepared, or assess the learning about the topic. Furthermore, teachers are frustrated because too often they take school work home to complete leaving them little time for a personal life. The luxury of having sufficient time is in short supply and does not seem to be improving, which poses a serious problem for teachers and students.
In the area of classroom time there is a large body of research that makes it clear that more time spent on instruction has a positive impact on student achievement; however, the effects of additional time are modest (Gijselaers & Schmidt, 1995). What does make a difference is the quality of the time available for learning (Adelman, Haslam, & Pringle, 1996). In other words, the most important thing to consider with classroom time is that the organization and learning are of high quality. Slavin (2000) suggests that in order for teachers to use the allocated time in class effectively they must prevent lost time that can occur by starting class late or finishing early, frequent interruptions, mishandling routine procedures, and spending too much time on discipline. Furthermore, teachers can use time effectively by teaching engaging lessons, keeping the pacing moving along in lessons, making sure instruction is smooth, managing transitions effectively, keeping the group focused during lessons and seat work, overlapping (attending to more than one thing at a time), and developing withitness (awareness of students and surroundings at all times). All of these suggestions are important when considering a service-learning project. As teachers become increasingly effective utilizing class time, service-learning implementation would become more feasible.

_pressures to cover the QCCs in preparation for high-stakes tests._ For the purposes of this study, pressures to cover the QCCs in preparation for high-stakes tests is defined as the constraints teachers feel to teach each objective in the curriculum in order to prepare their students for tests. Emma, Sheila, Whitney, and Sharon each identified pressures to cover QCCs as a factor that hinders service-learning implementation. They each felt a conflict with their personal philosophy of education and how students learn best and the pressures they were feeling from the administration, district, state, and nation to test students. They also felt a great deal of pressure knowing that the test scores would be published and reflect upon them as teachers. They
recognize that it is wrong to focus more on testing than on teaching, but they did not know how to stop feeling the stress that comes from external sources.

In the 21st century, with testing becoming such a driving force in the classroom, many of the freedoms once felt by teachers to make curricular decisions are beginning to fade and testing is destroying attempts teachers make to organize innovative curriculum (Goldberg, 2004). Research in the area of high-stakes tests indicates that teachers feel significant external pressure to have their students perform well on standardized tests, therefore they do what is necessary to prepare them (Herman & Golan, 1993). Furthermore, many teachers often adjust their instructional emphasis in order to match the content and use the methods students will encounter on these tests. The classroom emphasis becomes mastering basic skills that align with the tests, with a decreased emphasis on cooperative learning, project work, and technology that do not appear on tests. Teachers believe that gearing instruction to standardized tests is educationally unsound but nevertheless succumb to the pressure to teach to the test (Olson, 1999; Herman & Golan, 1993; Smith, 1991). Because of the pressure teachers feel for testing, they adjust their instructional emphasis which clearly influences whether or not they undertake service learning in the classroom.

Teacher inexperience. In this study, teacher inexperience is defined as not having much time in the classroom to personally encounter practical knowledge and skills. Each of the novice teachers (Chelsea, Emma, and Sheila) commented that their inexperience as teachers hindered their ability to implement service learning in their classrooms. They felt their lack of experience made service learning difficult for a variety of reasons. First, being new meant they had little experience with the curriculum which made it difficult to connect the community needs to what students needed to learn. They worried about classroom management and were unfamiliar with
the developmental abilities of the students. They also had not had time to learn the ins and outs of the educational system. They did not have resources needed to teach and were overwhelmed with responsibilities such as keeping up with planning and paperwork. As Sheila put it, “I was shocked by the difference between my ideological impressions of teaching and the realities of teaching.” Besides all of the overwhelming responsibilities the novice teachers faced, two of the three lacked the confidence necessary to implement a strategy that was different from the norm. And justifying service learning to parents, colleagues, and the administration was difficult because they had not yet built up a reputation. All of these factors made it easy to settle into a more traditional form of teaching because it was more comfortable.

Although teachers have spent many years as students in a classroom, it is a very strange experience to step in as the teacher (Ryan & Cooper, 1998). Not having a lot of experience can be very difficult, yet all teachers must face it as they begin teaching. According to Woolfolk (1998), beginning teachers share many common concerns, such as disciplining, motivating students, differentiating for student needs, evaluating student work, and dealing with parents. These responsibilities that all teachers find difficult become easier with time. New teachers take more time to do what veteran teachers find routine. They are often overwhelmed with simply planning for the next day; however, they are asked to step in and do the same things that veteran teachers do (Renard, 2003).

Many frameworks of skill and competencies for beginning teachers have been developed. For example, the University of Cambridge Department of Education has a comprehensive checklist that includes the following important competencies for beginning teachers: relationships with pupils, subject knowledge, planning, classroom management, communication, assessment, reflecting on practice, professionalism, and personal qualities. However, such
frameworks imply that all beginning teachers fit into the same mold when the truth is that teaching is a complex activity and beginning teachers are complex human beings (Field & Field, 1996). Regardless of the fact that novice teachers face many difficulties as they begin teaching, Kauffman, Johnson, Kardos, Liu, and Peske (2002) suggest that often new teachers do not receive guidance about what they are supposed to teach. Being left alone places them in a situation where they struggle to plan what is needed day by day rather than working within the comfort of long-term goals. Cruikshank et. al. (1999) also suggest that many beginning teachers face the difficulty of not feeling connected with others in their schools. However, as novice teachers gain more experience their confidence grows and they are more able to focus on what it is students need to learn rather than on the details of their teaching skills (Wolfolk, 1998).

Novice and Veteran Teachers’ Suggestions To Other Teachers About Service Learning

From the teachers who participated in this study come a broad array of suggestions to other teachers interested in implementing service learning in their classrooms. They suggest that there are both intrinsic and extrinsic factors that should be in place to create an ideal situation for implementation. Intrinsic factors signify that which occurs within a person and influences their ability to implement service learning. Extrinsic factors refers to that which originates outside a person and influences their ability to implement service learning. By offering suggestions it is hoped that teachers will be assisted in the process of implementing service learning.

_Intrinsic Influences on Service-Learning Implementation_

C develop a knowledge base: Teachers need to have a deep understanding of what service learning is, the rationale behind it, and how to make it work in the classroom.
Once teachers have learned about the method of service learning they are prepared to adopt it as part of their philosophy of education. It is only after teachers embrace it as a part of their teaching philosophy that they are prepared to implement it into their classrooms. The best way for a teacher to learn about and gain a conviction of service learning is to have a personal experience with it so they can recognize the impact it can have. Although almost any experience with service learning will contribute to a teacher’s conviction of its importance, the best way for a teacher to be prepared to implement service learning is by having an experience with a class of students.

C Gain confidence: Teachers should gain confidence in their abilities to make service learning, a non-traditional form of learning, successful in the classroom.

Another intrinsic factor that contributes to a teacher’s proficiency with implementing service learning is confidence. This is where the differences between novice and veteran teachers become most obvious. Due to limited experience and confidence, the participants from this study suggest that a novice teacher will likely need to organize a project that is less overwhelming. Veteran teachers, on the other hand, may feel confident in taking on larger projects because their experiences and prior successes will make them more confident as they implement it in their classrooms.

C Develop strong interconnections of social trust: Teachers need to work to develop strong relationships of trust with students, colleagues, the administration, and the community.

The final consideration mentioned by participants in this study concerning intrinsic influences on implementation has to do with strong interconnections of social trust. Understanding social trust is significant to the field of service learning because, as mentioned in the literature as well as in this study, it has the potential to facilitate or hinder implementation.
With an understanding of the importance of social trust, it is imperative that teachers be explicitly taught what it is and how it influences their practices as educators. With such a foundation, teachers would be more able to influence positive relationships of social trust within the work environment, as well as watch for breakdowns and work to keep them from influencing their teaching practices.

Understanding social trust is also significant because it justifies taking time for teachers to meet together in a setting other than the classroom to work on these issues. Meeting together, teachers would be encouraged to talk and support each other’s teaching endeavors and build relationships of trust. They would get to know each other better and learn what is going on in one another’s classrooms. The responsibility of the administrator in making this happen is very important. He/she should set the tone of the school and provide opportunities for teachers to get to know each other on a more personal level and work more closely together professionally.

**Extrinsic Influences on Service-Learning Implementation**

C  Work in a school with a service-learning philosophy: Teachers should work in a school where the philosophy of service learning is understood and practiced.

When considering extrinsic factors that play a role in implementing service learning, an ideal situation for teachers would be placement in a school where their philosophical goals align. They would work in a positive environment where each faculty member had been trained in service learning and would try to make it a part of their curriculum. Additionally, working with a colleague to carry out service-learning projects was a theme throughout the data for both novice and veteran teachers and is a very important point to consider for sustaining service-learning endeavors. The data from this study implies that working with others whose philosophies align with the tenets of service learning may be a factor that provides the strength teachers need in the
midst of so many outside pressures. In such a setting, a teacher would feel supported and would have the opportunity to work with colleagues to make service learning successful.

C Work with a service-learning facilitator: Work with a teacher released from teaching to act as a support and mentor for teachers working to implement service learning.

An extrinsic factor suggested by participants in this study calls for school districts to support service-learning implementation by providing schools with service-learning facilitators. Just having a service-learning facilitator would send a message to teachers that service learning was supported by the school and school district. In addition, there are many other ways that teachers could be supported by a facilitator, depending upon their needs. For example, the service-learning facilitator might be responsible for conducting in-service training addressing the specific needs of the teachers. They could also be a support to teachers by assuming some of the extra responsibilities that come with conducting service-learning projects. For example, if contacts needed to be made in the community, a teacher could go to the service-learning facilitator and have them make the arrangements. Facilitators could also cover classes for teachers if the need arose to be out of the classroom. When teachers go into the community to conduct the service, facilitators could accompany them and help with class management. These are a few of the ways that service-learning facilitators could be supportive of a teacher trying to implement it in the classroom.

C Obtain access to sufficient resources: Having access to supplies needed to carry out a service-learning project.

There are a variety of ways schools can be involved in procuring resources. Schools often have a PTA (parent teacher association) that matches funds on projects with which the school is involved. Many also have found success forming partnerships with nearby businesses. What
better way to involve the community in all aspects of service learning. Clearly, however, the school will not likely be involved in issues related to gathering resources for service learning unless the principal is involved. Administrative support is likely one of the most important aspects of gaining access to resources.

In addition, teachers need to understand how to obtain access to resources. Funding opportunities are becoming more plentiful through grants provided by the government and other organizations. It is also important to note that not all projects require funding. Teachers need to be aware of how to tap into meaningful service-learning experiences that are available when funding is not. Teachers should also consider the available resources and support when making a choice as to the intensity of the service-learning project. If there is a sufficient amount of each, teachers and students will be more capable of taking on larger projects without feeling overwhelmed. If not, it is wise to start small by considering needs within the classroom or school community, rather than in the larger community where the students live. Obviously, access to funding is an extrinsic variable that provides additional incentives when it comes to implementing service-learning projects in the classroom.

C Use time wisely: Organize and manage time in a way conducive to planning and implementing service-learning projects.

Time is another extrinsic factor that influences service-learning implementation. The district, the administration, teachers, parents, and students can all play a part in addressing issues that arise from limited time. Principals could address the issue of time by paying for teachers to be trained in service learning and have service-learning planning time where they are released from their classroom responsibilities. Teachers could support each other by working together to tie service learning to curriculum standards and better understand the implications of integrating
the curriculum. Parents could be recruited as volunteers to help teachers with service-learning activities and, finally, students could work together in groups or clubs which would be formed independently to advocate for service-learning activities.

C Involve students: Include students in planning and carrying out service-learning projects to increase ownership and motivation.

Finally, students are also an extrinsic factor influencing implementation of service learning. Understanding the dynamics of a group of students is significant because it plays a large role in how a teacher will set up their classroom to make a program such as service learning successful. Teachers need to first gain the respect of students and build a relationship of trust with them. When deciding upon a project a teacher should make sure that students are involved in making the decisions so they feel ownership and are motivated to make it work.

In summary, there are both intrinsic and extrinsic factors that influence service-learning implementation. The participants in this study suggest that intrinsic factors such as knowledge of service learning, a belief in its value, the confidence to carry it out in the classroom, and strong interconnections of social trust are essential to successful implementation. Extrinsic factors, such as being placed in an environment where the philosophical goals of the teacher and the school are aligned, working on projects with a colleague, having a service-learning facilitator, having access to resources, having sufficient time, and involving students all contribute to a solid foundation for experiencing success with service learning.

Novice and Veteran Teachers’ Suggestions For Teacher Educators

There are many reasons why in-service training is an essential part of successful implementation of service learning and many concrete suggestions that the participants in this study provided for it. In-service training is the foundation for making service learning work or
fail in the classroom. As mentioned previously, teachers must first have a solid understanding of the principles of service learning and a deep belief in the philosophy before they can integrate it into their classrooms. Therefore it is important to make pre-service or in-service training of service learning a high-quality learning experience. The participants in this study offer teacher educators six suggestions to consider for a high-quality service-learning course.

C Understand differing needs: Teacher Educators need to understand that novice and veteran teachers have differing needs when learning about service learning and accommodate them accordingly.

The results from the present study suggest that some of the in-service needs of novice teachers are different from those of veteran teachers. For example, while veteran teachers are secure in their abilities to manage a group of students completing a service-learning project, novice teachers need more explicit instruction on classroom management because of their lack of experience. They need practical ideas and the opportunity to witness the evolution of a service-learning project. Novice teachers were also concerned with assessing their students when conducting service learning. Tying the core curriculum to the goals of service learning is foundational to assessment, yet was a concept that was unclear to the novice teachers in this study. If those being trained in service learning are beginning teachers, they might do well to learn more about strategies for managing their classrooms during service-learning projects and connecting the learning to QCCs so students perform well on end-of-year tests. They should be given examples of a variety of projects that work in classroom settings so they will be more prepared to generate their own. Veteran teachers, on the other hand, might find it more beneficial to receive advanced in-service training such as learning how to write grants to access available resources. With this information, teacher educators may be more prepared to base their
instruction on novice teachers’ needs and consequently eliminate some of the insecurities
beginning teachers might feel when attempting to implement service learning. Teacher educators
may also be prepared to base their instruction on the needs of those who are more prepared to
implement service learning because they have more teaching experience.

C Teach about varying degrees of intensity: There are varying degrees of intensity involved
in service-learning projects that range from simple classroom community needs to
projects that address an outside community need.

From the data in this study, it was apparent that novice teachers focused mainly on the
events occurring directly in their classrooms while veteran teachers addressed the needs in the
community where the students live. It would be to the advantage of both novice and veteran
teachers to understand the varying degrees of intensity involved in service-learning projects and
how projects can start small by focusing on the needs of their own classroom community. After
feeling success with smaller projects they can become larger, expanding into the school
community or the community where the children live. Participants in this study suggested that
teacher educators of service-learning could encourage them to implement service learning in
small degrees and within the context of their own classroom or school community. By so doing,
teachers might avoid feelings of being overwhelmed when beginning and experience the success
that contributes to confidence for extending service learning beyond their classrooms.

C Require participation in service learning with a group of students: Those being trained in
service learning should be involved in implementing a project with a group of students
while they are learning.

According to the participants in this study, it is to the advantage of both novice and
veteran teachers to conduct a service-learning project during the time they are learning about it.
After an initial project with a group of students, teachers will be more prepared to implement it in a classroom because they will have actual experience with it during the time they are learning. They will know what service learning entails, not just what service learning seems to be. Also, if novice and veteran teachers are provided the opportunity to conduct a service-learning project while they are being trained, it will most likely take place with the support of peers and a trainer. As mentioned previously, feeling supported is one of the most important predictors for being successful. It is also significant for teachers to understand that at first it may seem difficult to implement service learning, but it becomes easier with more experience.

C Be enthusiastic about service learning: Teacher educators need to show their enthusiasm for service learning as they teach about it.

Both novice and veteran teachers have the same attitude about the characteristics of the person training them in service learning. According to the suggestions offered from the participants in this study, high-quality learning occurs in a positive setting with a trainer who is enthusiastic about service learning and encourages trainees to participate in a service-learning project focusing on their individual interests.

C Model democratic learning. Teacher educators should model a democratic style of learning when teaching about service learning because it demonstrates how service learning should work in the classroom.

In an ideal setting, the training would be conducted in a constructivist manner with a democratic learning environment, because that exemplifies how service learning is best managed in the classroom. Democratic learning places the students in charge of the class and the teacher becomes the facilitator rather than someone who dispenses knowledge to the students.
Teach when teachers can be released from classroom responsibilities: In-service teachers should be released from their teaching responsibilities while learning about service learning because it eliminates stress, accommodates issues of limited time, and allows them to learn in a setting with their peers.

Veteran teachers in this study suggest that teachers benefit from training when they can be released from their classroom responsibilities, because teachers are too busy to find time to do it otherwise. It is important to have teachers released so they can visit other exemplary programs and witness what other teachers do who share the same philosophy. Also, high-quality training would continue throughout the year, as one-time in-services do not make much of an impact. Interestingly, each of the participants in this study experienced success while implementing service learning during the service-learning course likely because they each had the support of the course instructor and other class members. Furthermore, one of the elements of the success that Chelsea experienced was that she continued to receive support from the course instructor after the course.

Recommendations for Future Research

Not only does this study shed light on novice and veteran teachers’ perspectives of factors that facilitate and hinder service-learning implementation, it also points to many interesting avenues for further research. Seven suggestions for further research are detailed in the paragraphs below.

Conduct quantitative research: In order to generalize to a larger population quantitative research would highlight the experiences of a larger population.

This study was purposefully restricted to six participants to gain in-depth understandings of their experiences with implementing service learning. However, qualitative studies with few
participants do not allow for generalizations to larger populations. Additional research that focuses on the experiences of both novice and veteran teachers’ experiences implementing service learning is a valuable direction for future research to take.

C Investigate secondary teachers’ experiences: Study the experiences of service-learning implementation with secondary teachers.

The participants involved in this study were elementary and middle school teachers. Understanding the experiences of secondary teachers would add additional insight to the literature on service-learning implementation and provide more information about the needs of secondary educators.

C Investigate teachers’ decisions: Investigate the reasons and rationales behind the decisions that teachers make for implementing or discontinuing service learning.

There are many research studies that share the positive outcomes for students who are involved in service learning. However, if teachers are the pivotal agent in implementing service learning, then the focus of research should shift to understanding their decisions for using it in their classrooms. Have they had personal life-changing experiences with it? Has their life been filled with a philosophy that service is an integral part of being a good citizen? Do they see service learning as an agent of school reform? What is their motivation? Researchers must examine both intrinsic and extrinsic characteristics of teachers to understand their desires for incorporating it into their curriculum.

C Investigate teachers who have discontinued implementing service learning: Look at teachers who at one time had implemented service learning into their classroom and have since discontinued the practice.
The results of this study indicate that three teachers (two veteran and one novice) had implemented service learning in their classrooms and three (two novice and one veteran) had not. The participants were either involved with service learning or had not arrived at the point of implementing it all. To understand a deeper layer of factors that hinder implementation of service learning, it would be interesting to investigate a group of teachers who had at one time implemented service learning, but for various reasons had discontinued its use. Understanding why teachers discontinue service learning would provide information to pre-service and in-service teachers, as well as those involved in training. Such information may help prevent the discontinuance of service learning before it occurs.

C Investigate academic performance with service learning: How well do students who have participated in service learning do on standardized tests compared with their peers who have not participated in service learning?

In the face of educational reform, it is not unrealistic to think that pressures for covering a broad curriculum in preparation for testing will continue to flourish. Such a movement directly contradicts the tenets of service learning and places teachers in a situation where they feel they must make a choice of surrendering to pressures, or staying true to what they feel represents good teaching and learning. Although research currently states that students who are involved in service learning do not score lower on standardized tests than their peers who are not involved, teachers continue to feel the pressure to make a choice: surrender to current pressures and cover the details of the curriculum through a teacher-directed mode, or cover the curriculum through the student-directed mode of service learning. With this in mind, teachers need to be taught how to efficiently tie their core curriculum to the goals of service learning and then be confident that students will do well on mandatory tests. More investigation into this process would be valuable.
for understanding how service learning can complement the curriculum and meet federal requirements for student learning.

C  Further investigate individual factors: Examine in depth each of the factors that were found to facilitate or hinder service-learning implementation as a result of this study.

The results of this study shed light on facilitating and hindering factors on the implementation process of service learning. However, simply listing the factors as a facilitator or hindrance to implementation does not provide concrete suggestions to teachers who are interested in implementing service learning and teacher educators who are training teachers in service learning.

C  Service learning in times of accountability: Investigate how teachers manage service learning in times of accountability.

As suggested by the participants in this study, many teachers feel that they have to teach the skills and the format of the tests because they are held accountable for student scores. This makes teachers hesitant to teach with alternative methods such as service learning. With so much pressure on teachers for accountability, investigating how teachers manage to make service learning work while preparing their students to pass norm- and criterion-referenced tests would contribute to the service-learning literature.
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APPENDIX A

CONTEXT QUESTIONNAIRE
Name ____________________________________ Date ___________________

1. How many years of teaching experience have you had?
   ____________________________________________________________________

2. What grades have you taught?
   ____________________________________________________________________

3. What degrees do you have?
   ____________________________________________________________________

4. What certification do you hold?
   ____________________________________________________________________

5. How long ago did you take the course on service learning?
   ____________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX B

FIRST INTERVIEW
| First Interview: Establishing the context. | C Could you provide an overview of the manner in which you teach?  
C Why did you choose to become a teacher?  
C What is service learning to you?  
C How did you get interested in service learning?  
C What do you remember about the service learning course? (I am not after “accuracy” but how well you remember the course).  
C How did you feel about service learning at the end of your service learning experience at UGA?  
C How did you feel about implementing service learning in your classroom at the end of your service learning experience at UGA?  
C What were your concerns?  
C What was most beneficial to you about the way the course was constructed?  
C What was least beneficial?  
C In what ways, if any, did the course help you think about implementation of service learning in your own classroom?  
C If you could revise the course, what would you do? |
APPENDIX C

SECOND INTERVIEW
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell me about your service learning experiences as a teacher.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How involved is your school or district in service learning?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors facilitate implementation of service learning in the classroom and why?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors inhibit implementation of service learning in the classroom and why?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you think of factors that both facilitate and hinder service learning implementation in the classroom? (for example, funding).</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering the factors you just mentioned, why do you still implement service learning in your classroom?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the process of how you implement service learning?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What characteristics do you have as a teacher that have contributed to service learning implementation?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has being a beginning teacher played into your experiences with service learning implementation?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What advise would you give a beginning teacher who is trying to implement service learning in their classroom?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an ideal world, what would be the necessary conditions for implementing service learning?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell me about your service learning experiences as a teacher.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How involved is your school or district in service learning?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors facilitate implementation of service learning in the classroom and why?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors inhibit implementation of service learning in the classroom and why?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you think of factors that both facilitate and hinder service learning implementation in the classroom? (for example, funding).</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering the factors you just mentioned, why do you still implement service learning in your classroom?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the process of how you implement service learning?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What characteristics do you have as a teacher that have contributed to service learning implementation?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has being an experienced teacher helped you with implementing service learning?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you implement service learning as a beginning teacher? Why or why not?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an ideal world, what would be the necessary conditions for implementing service learning?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell me about your service learning experiences as a teacher.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How involved is your school or district in service learning?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors facilitate implementation of service learning in the classroom and why?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors inhibit implementation of service learning in the classroom and why?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you think of factors that both facilitate and hinder service learning implementation in the classroom? (for example, funding).</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering the factors you just mentioned, why do you still implement service learning in your classroom?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the process of how you implement service learning?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What characteristics do you have as a teacher that have contributed to service learning implementation?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has being an experienced teacher helped you with implementing service learning?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you implement service learning as a beginning teacher? Why or why not?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an ideal world, what would be the necessary conditions for implementing service learning?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

THIRD INTERVIEW
| Third Interview: Novice teacher reflection on meaning. | C  Given the amount of time that has passed since you participated in the service learning course at UGA, do you still feel the same about implementing service learning in your classroom? In what way?  
C  Given what we have discussed, where do you see yourself, as a classroom teacher, going with service learning in the future?  
C  How would you counsel a teaching colleague who would like to implement service learning into their classroom?  
C  What could your administrator, school, and district do to support the process of implementing service learning?  
C  Do you think having more teaching experience would facilitate your efforts with implementing service learning.  
C  Is there anything else you would like to share? |
| --- | --- |
| Third Interview: Veteran teacher reflection on meaning. | C  Given the amount of time that has passed since you participated in the service learning course at UGA, do you still the same about implementing service learning in your classroom? In what way?  
C  Given what we have discussed, where do you see yourself, as a classroom teacher, going with service learning in the future?  
C  How would you counsel a teaching colleague who would like to implement service learning into their classroom?  
C  What could your administrator, school, and district do to support the process of implementing service learning?  
C  Do you think your teaching experience has played a part in your ability to implement service learning?  
C  Is there anything else you would like to share? |
| Third Interview Continued Novice Teachers | C  | Given the following list ..., are there any additional inhibitors to service learning implementation that you would like to add? |
|                                          | C  | Given the following list ..., are there any additional facilitators to service learning implementation that you would like to add? |
|                                          | C  | What could the university have done to better prepare you for implementing service learning in your classroom? |
|                                          | C  | What could your school have done to support your service learning systems? |
|                                          | C  | How did your lack of experience as a teacher play a role in your service learning endeavors? |
|                                          | C  | Given the following list ..., are there any additional inhibitors to service learning implementation that you would like to add? |
|                                          | C  | Given the following list ..., are there any additional facilitators to service learning implementation that you would like to add? |
|                                          | C  | What could the university have done to better prepare you for implementing service learning in your classroom? |
|                                          | C  | What could your school have done to support your service learning systems? |
|                                          | C  | How did your experience as a teacher play a role in your service learning endeavors? |
| Novice and Veteran Teachers              | C  | Are there any additional comments you would like to contribute? |
I, ______________________________________, agree to take part in a research study titled “Factors that facilitate and hinder service learning implementation: Perspectives of novice and veteran teachers,” conducted by Janet Lofgran, Middle School Education Department, (801-836-7933) under the direction of Dr. Elizabeth Pate and Dr. Denise Glynn, (706-542-4244).

I understand that this participation is entirely voluntary; I can withdraw my consent at any time without penalty and have all information about me, to the extent that it can be identified as mine, returned to me, removed from the research records, or destroyed.

I understand that participation in this project entails the following procedures:

1. The reason for the research is to examine both novice and veteran teachers’ perceptions of factors that contribute to or hinder implementation of service learning in their classroom, and to investigate how a service learning course (7060) contributes to the implementation or non-implementation of service learning. No reference will be made to my district, school, team, or classroom.

2. There is no direct benefit for participating in this project, and I will not be penalized in any way for refusing to participate. No discomforts or risks are expected from my participation in the study.

3. If I volunteer, I will be expected to participate in three individual interviews that will last approximately one hour each. I will be asked to share artifacts that may contribute an understanding of service learning implementation. Also, I will be asked to complete a context questionnaire that will establish the context within which I work.

4. The results of this participation will be confidential, and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without prior consent, unless otherwise required by law. I will be assigned a pseudonym, which will be used on all of the data connected with me. The researcher will not mention or make reference to my school or the classroom within which I teach.

5. Interviews will be audio taped. Transcriptions will be made from the audiotapes, leaving out identifying information. Only the researcher and her advisor’s will have access to the audio tapes and transcripts resulting from them. I understand that audio-taped interviews and transcript data will be analyzed by the researcher, and kept indefinitely for educational and research purposes.

All information concerning me will be kept private. If information about me is published, it will use pseudonyms. However, research records may be obtained by court order. I understand that audio and videotapes and copies of transcripts will be kept indefinitely by the researcher for research and educational purposes. There is a possibility that the audio tapes with my voice could be used in either teaching or conference presentations. However, this is subject to my permission (see below).

Use of audio records:

Audio records can be shared at academic meetings with other researchers.

Yes ________  No ________
Records can be shown in classrooms to students.

Yes ________ No ________

The researcher, Janet Lofgran, will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, and can be reached by telephone at (801) 836-7933 or via E-mail at lofgranj@arches.uga.edu.

I agree to participate in the interview sessions and artifact collection described above. My participation is entirely voluntary, and I will receive a copy of this consent form for my records.

_______________________________________________________ __________________
Signature of Participant Date

_______________________________________________________ __________________
Signature of Investigator Date

For questions or problems about your rights please call or write: Chris A. Joseph, Ph. D., Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-6514; E-mail Address: IRB@uga.edu
APPENDIX H

SERVICE LEARNING RESOURCES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Corporation for National Service  
1100 Vermont Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20525  
telephone: (202) 606-5000 ext. 136 or 117.  
www.learnandservce.org |
| National Youth Leadership Council Service Learning  
Clearinghouse and Exchange  
1910 West Country Rd.  
B, Roseville, MN 55113  
telephone: (651) 631-3672  
fax: (651) 631-2955  
nylcinfo@nylc.org |
| The National Service-Learning Clearinghouse  
University of Minnesota  
1954 Buford Ave., Rm. R460  
St. Paul, MN 55108  
telephone: 1-800-808-SERV  
http://umn.edu/~serve/ |
| The National Exchange Center  
Peer-Based Service Learning and Technical Assistance  
telephone: 1-877-LSA-EXCH  
www.lsaexchange.org  
lsaexchange@nylc.org |
| National Dropout Prevention Center/Network  
College of Health, Education and Human Development  
Clemson University  
209 Martin St., Clemson, SC 29634-0726  
telephone: (864) 656-2599  
fax: (864) 656-0136 |
| Association for Supervision and Curriculum Devel.  
Service Learning/Experiential Learning Network  
2109 Wynnewood Drive  
Valparaiso, IN 46383  
(219) 462-3986  
(A special interest group of the Association for  
Supervision and Curriculum Development. |
| American Association of College for Teacher Education  
1307 New York Avenue, NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 293-2450  
www.aacte.org |
| Association for Experiential Education (AEE)  
P.O. Box 249-CU  
Boulder, CO 80309  
(303) 492-1547;  
(303) 492-0526 (fax) |
| Constitutional Rights Foundation (CFR)  
601 South Kingsley Drive  
Los Angeles, CA 90005  
(213) 487-5590  
(213) 386-0459 (fax) |
| Corporation for National Service  
1100 Vermont Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20525  
(202) 606-4880 |
| Council of Chief State School Officers  
Service Learning Alliance  
One Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20001-1431  
(202) 408-5505  
(202) 408-8072 (fax) |
| National Helpers Network  
245 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1705  
New York, NY 10016-8728  
(212) 679-3482  
(212) 679-7461 (fax) |
| National Society for Experiential Education  
3509 Haworth Drive, Suite 207  
Raleigh, NC 27609-7229  
(919) 787-3283  
(919) 787-3381 fax |
| National Youth Leadership Council (NYLC)  
1910 West County Road B  
Roseville, MN 55113  
(800) 366-6952  
(612) 631-3672  
(612) 631-2955 (fax) |
| Learn and Serve America Exchange, National Center  
National Youth Leadership Council  
1910 West County Road B, St. Paul, MN 55113  
(877) 572-3294  
www.nslExchange.org |