

## Factors That Motivate and Deter Faculty Use of Service-Learning

Elisa S. Abes

Golden Jackson

Susan R. Jones

*The Ohio State University*

*The purpose of this survey research was to determine the factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. Faculty responses from more than 500 surveys completed at 29 diverse institutions of higher education were analyzed by institution type, academic discipline, faculty rank, tenure status, and gender. Results indicated remarkable consistency in motivators and deterrents to service-learning use—both for faculty who do and do not use service-learning. An analysis of faculty who do not use service-learning, a relatively unexplored area in the literature, is a significant contribution of this study. The findings suggest several strategies for recruiting and sustaining service-learning faculty.*

### Context and Background

A teaching strategy that depends on reciprocal university-community partnerships, service-learning provides an innovative pedagogical approach to realizing higher education's civic responsibilities (Bringle, Games, & Malloy, 1999; Bringle, Hatcher, & Games, 1997). Despite increased attention to its benefits, service-learning is not thoroughly integrated into the curriculum at most colleges and universities (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Holland, 1997). Lack of integration is often considered a result of minimal institutional commitment to service-learning (Bringle & Hatcher; Holland, 1997; Morton & Troppe, 1996), including scarce administrative support, faculty participation, and funding (Ward, 1996).

Of these elements necessary to institutionalize service-learning, achieving substantial faculty participation has been cited as the most important and greatest challenge (Ward, 1998). Support of faculty is fundamental because implementing service-learning is a curricular decision, and thus within faculty's purview (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995). For service-learning to be institutionalized, faculty recruitment must be followed by efforts to sustain involvement (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000). It is therefore necessary to understand faculty motivation for using service-learning, a research area where critical questions remain (Driscoll, 2000; Giles & Eyler, 1998). The purpose of this research was to describe the factors that motivate and deter faculty

use of service-learning—both for faculty who do and do not integrate service-learning into their teaching. For these two faculty groups, we described the factors according to institution type, academic discipline, faculty rank, tenure status, and gender.

### *Factors Motivating Faculty Participation In Service-Learning*

Little research has been conducted regarding faculty members' motivation to incorporate service-learning into their courses. Hammond (1994) studied the motivations of 130 faculty at 23 institutions who incorporated service-learning into their teaching. She found that the most influential factors were related to student course-based learning, including relevance to course materials, self-direction, and improved student satisfaction with education. On the whole, these course-based considerations were more influential than personal factors, such as personal involvement in service and enjoyment of working with students in co-curricular settings, or student co-curricular factors related to civic involvement or development of moral character.

Hammond's findings are consistent with research suggesting that faculty value service-learning to improve student learning outcomes, such as improving analytical skills and problem solving skills. Hesser (1995) found that more faculty members are embracing service-learning because they value active modes of learning and experiential education. Similarly, Bringle et al. (1997) suggested

that although service-learning's early adopters ("first-generation faculty") were predominately risk-taking "visionary instructors" willing to experiment on limited resources with service-learning's possibilities, current faculty ("second-generation faculty") are less idealistic and more focused on service-learning's concrete outcomes.

Additional influences on the decision to adopt service-learning are institutional and professional considerations. Limited research suggests that faculty involvement in service-learning is more likely to occur if efforts to integrate service-learning into the curriculum are a faculty-led initiative (Morton & Troppe, 1996; Ward, 1996). Faculty adopt and sustain service-learning when they see respected colleagues actively participate (Gelmon, Holland, Shinnamon, & Morris, 1998; UCLA Service-Learning Clearinghouse Project, 1999), and the strength of service-learning programs often depends on the extent of faculty support (Gray, Ondaatje, & Zacaras, 1999).

#### *Factors Deterring Faculty Participation In Service-Learning*

Less research has been conducted on deterrents to faculty use of service-learning. Existing research has primarily explored potential deterrents identified by faculty who use service-learning, rather than deterrents for those who do not use this teaching strategy. A common deterrent is the lack of institutional recognition of service-learning as a scholarly activity (Gray et al., 1999; Hammond, 1994). In particular, the most significant deterrent to faculty involvement in service-learning is its lack of recognition in the faculty reward structure (Morton & Troppe, 1996; Stanton, 1994; Ward, 1998).

Recognizing teaching in the reward structure does not, however, always translate into greater use of service-learning. Where teaching loads are particularly large, faculty sometimes believe that they do not have time to learn how to effectively use service-learning as a new teaching strategy (Hammond, 1994; Ward, 1996) or that it takes time away from other professional responsibilities (Morton & Troppe, 1996; UCLA Service-Learning Clearinghouse Project, 1999). Budgetary constraints also deter faculty members from engaging in service-learning. Specifically, lack of funding for designing new curriculum (Levine, 1994; Stanton, 1994) and for implementing the community service aspect of the service-learning curriculum (Driscoll, Holland, Gellman, & Kerrigan, 1996; Ward, 1996) sometimes prevent faculty members from using this teaching strategy. Resistance is also related to the logistical difficulties of implementing service-learning programs (Driscoll et al., 1996; Hammond, 1994;

UCLA Service-Learning Clearinghouse Project, 1999).

Many important questions remain unanswered regarding why faculty do and do not use service-learning. Hammond (1994) conducted the most comprehensive study on this topic, just as attention to institutional outreach was beginning. Given the change in climate since that time, study of the current situation is warranted. In addition, much of the earlier research is based on relatively small samples of faculty who incorporated service-learning into their teaching. This study, based on responses from over 500 faculty—approximately half of who do not use service-learning—describes the factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. Specific research questions guiding this study included: What factors motivate faculty to incorporate service-learning into their teaching? What factors prevent faculty from continuing to use service-learning? What factors deter faculty from incorporating service-learning into their teaching? Does the faculty member's institution type, academic discipline, faculty rank, tenure status, or gender affect what factors motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning?

## Methodology

### *Instrument*

The researchers designed a survey questionnaire to gather information about factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. In order to maximize reliability and internal validity, a panel of experts at the researchers' home institution pilot tested the survey. Based on the panel's responses and feedback, the survey was modified. The survey contained both closed and open-ended questions. Service-learning was defined in the survey as:

a form of experiential education characterized by all of the following: (1) student participation in an *organized* service activity; (2) participation in service activities *connected* to specific learning outcomes; (3) participation in service activities that *meet identified* community needs, and (4) structured time for student *reflection and connection* of the service experience to learning.<sup>1</sup>

### *Sample*

The sample was drawn from institutions that are members of Ohio Campus Compact (n = 43). Ohio Campus Compact is a membership organization of Ohio colleges and universities established to promote campus-wide student and institutional participation in community and public service. The sample was bound by Ohio Campus Compact institutions

because these schools represented a diverse array of institutions and presumably, by virtue of their membership in Ohio Campus Compact, a stated commitment to community service. Letters were sent to the designated Ohio Campus Compact campus representatives at each of the 43 institutions, requesting that they serve as an institutional gatekeeper for this study. Specifically, the campus representatives were asked to provide a list of all faculty at their institution, as well as a list of all faculty who incorporated service-learning in their teaching. Twenty-nine of the 43 institutions (67%) provided all or some of the requested information.

Surveys were sent to all faculty identified by their institutions' gatekeepers as service-learning faculty (n = 437), and to a simple random sample of 10% of the faculty at each institution who were not identified as service-learning faculty (n = 906). This sampling strategy resulted in a little over one-half of the surveys going to faculty at research institutions, another third to faculty at doctoral and masters institutions, and the remaining to faculty at comprehensive and associate of arts institutions. After mailing a second copy of the survey to all non-respondents and sending two reminder e-mails, 518 usable surveys were returned (eight surveys were undeliverable), a 39% response rate. This response rate was comparable to the 43% response rate in the most recent Higher Education Research Institute national faculty norms survey (Sax, Astin, Korn, & Gilmartin, 1999) and above the 21% response rate in the 1999 National Campus Compact faculty survey (National Campus Compact, 1999).

Forty-nine percent (n = 252) of the survey respondents indicated that they incorporate service-learning into their teaching ("service-learning faculty"); 52% (n = 266) indicated that they do not ("non-service-learning faculty"). Of the non-service-learning faculty, 27% (n = 72) responded that they had not heard of service-learning prior to receiving our survey; 22% (n = 59) responded they had heard of service-learning but had not given thought as to whether or not to incorporate it into their teaching; and 51% (n = 135) responded that they had heard of service-learning and had given thought as to whether or not they would incorporate it into their teaching. Results for non-service-learning faculty were analyzed only for these latter 135 respondents.

For both service-learning faculty and non-service-learning faculty, we analyzed the data according to five variables: institution-type, academic discipline, faculty rank, tenure status, and gender. For each variable, the percentages of faculty who use and who do not use service-learning were calculated. Respondent percentages at each institution-type who indicated that they use service-learning were as

follows: Research: 39.8% (n = 86); Doctoral, Masters: 49.3% (n = 34); Comprehensive: 55% (n = 104); Associate of Arts: 56.3% (n = 18). Service-learning faculty percentages at each faculty rank were: Full Professor: 45.6% (n = 73); Associate Professor: 55.5% (n = 81); Assistant Professor: 42.5% (n = 65); Adjunct Professor: 76.5% (n = 13); Lecturer, Instructor: 50% (n=14). Regarding tenure status, 48% (n = 134) of tenured faculty used service-learning, which is comparable to 45% (n = 64) of the untenured faculty on a tenure track, and 50% (n = 31) of the untenured faculty not on a tenure track. More women (59% (n = 146)) than men (39% (n = 105)) used service-learning.

Open-ended questions were used to solicit information regarding academic disciplines, resulting in over 75 disciplines being identified. Because analyzing the many individual disciplines provided would not have been meaningful, related disciplines were grouped. Within each academic discipline grouping, percentages of service-learning faculty were: social and behavioral sciences: 62% (n = 64); social work, education, human ecology, agriculture: 58% (n = 70); business: 57% (n = 13); health professions: 51% (n = 27); humanities: 46% (n = 41); arts: 35% (n = 9); physical and biological sciences: 25% (n = 13); and math, engineering, computer sciences: 18% (n = 5).

## Results

Responses for all survey questions were analyzed using descriptive statistics and measures to determine statistical significance ( $\alpha = .05$ ). Survey questions related to selected demographic characteristics of service-learning and non-service-learning faculty, including professional responsibilities and institutional priorities; sources of instructional support for service-learning use; service-learning motivators, including sources of encouragement and possible positive outcomes of service-learning; service-learning potential and actual deterrents; and strategies for overcoming obstacles to service-learning use. The results are discussed below.

### *How do service-learning and non-service-learning faculty describe their professional responsibilities and institutional priorities?*

In order to understand the value that service-learning and non-service-learning faculty place on various professional responsibilities, all respondents were asked to indicate the personal importance of five professional responsibilities, and how they perceived the institutional importance of each of these same responsibilities. The five professional responsibilities were teaching undergraduates,

**Table 1**  
*Importance of Professional Responsibilities by Service-Learning and Non-Service-Learning Faculty*

	Professional Responsibilities									
	Teaching undergraduates		Teaching graduate students		Advising students		Research and publication		Professional service	
	Personal importance	Perceived institutional importance	Personal importance	Perceived institutional importance	Personal importance	Perceived institutional importance	Personal importance	Perceived institutional importance	Personal importance	Perceived institutional importance
Service-learning faculty	3.76	3.58	3.22	3.12	3.33	3.09	2.88	3.00	3.22	2.90
Non-service-learning faculty	3.69	3.54	3.38	3.26	3.36	3.08	3.10	3.11	2.95	2.82

Note. 1 = not important; 2 = somewhat important; 3 = important; 4 = very important

teaching graduate students, advising students, research and publication, and professional service as defined by their institution. An ANOVA indicated that there were significant differences between service-learning and non-service-learning faculty only for personal importance of research and publication ( $F = 2.47; p = .014$ ), which was more important for non-service-learning faculty, and personal importance of professional service ( $F = 16.18; p = .000$ ), which was more important for service-learning faculty. Only slight differences existed between the service-learning and non-service-learning faculty for each of the other professional responsibilities. Table 1 summarizes these results.

*Who successfully encourages faculty to use service-learning?*

To understand who successfully influences faculty

use of service-learning, service-learning faculty were asked to indicate who directly or indirectly encouraged them to use service-learning and the importance of each source of encouragement in their decision. Seven sources of encouragement were listed: president or chief academic officer, college dean, department chairperson, another faculty member in their department, faculty in other departments, a community member, and students at their institution. Respondents most frequently received encouragement from other faculty members, with 60% of respondents receiving encouragement from faculty in other departments and 56% from another faculty member in their department. The fewest number of respondents received encouragement from community members (43%).

Although community encouragement was least

**Table 2**  
*Sources of Encouragement to Use Service-Learning by Faculty Rank, Tenure Status, and Gender*

	Sources of Encouragement													
	President or chief academic officer		College dean		Department chairperson		Faculty in your department		Faculty in another department		Students		Community members	
	%	Importance	%	Importance	%	Importance	%	Importance	%	Importance	%	Importance	%	Importance
<b>Faculty rank</b>														
Full professor	61	2.95	61	2.88	56	2.97	55	2.92	65	2.82	52	3.31	34	2.91
Associate professor	50	2.74	54	2.71	43	3.26	59	3.20	70	2.96	54	3.43	56	3.23
Assistant professor	48	2.82	56	2.73	64	3.00	62	3.11	62	2.82	58	3.53	48	3.24
Adjunct professor	42	3.20	77	3.40	69	2.67	77	2.80	23	2.67	58	3.57	54	3.57
Lecturer/Instructor	43	3.17	29	3.75	57	3.50	57	3.38	71	3.40	50	3.57	29	4.00
<b>Tenure status</b>														
Tenured	55	2.84	54	2.79	47	3.05	55	3.06	66	2.96	56	3.37	48	3.14
Untenured, on tenure track	48	2.89	57	2.76	60	3.03	68	3.15	67	2.78	55	3.48	43	3.32
Untenured, not on tenure track	33	3.40	58	3.28	73	3.23	60	3.50	55	3.12	57	3.48	40	3.32
<b>Gender</b>														
Female	51	2.82	57	2.88	58	3.03	60	3.11	68	2.91	56	3.46	51	3.26
Male	54	3.02	55	2.87	51	3.14	59	3.05	57	2.91	55	3.37	40	3.14

Note. % = percent of respondents receiving encouragement from each source. Importance = importance of encouragement in decision to use service-learning; 1 = not important; 2 = somewhat important; 3 = important; 4 = very important

frequently identified, community members were among the most influential sources of encouragement in the decision to use service-learning. Specifically, using a four-point Likert scale (1=not important, 4=very important), the most influential sources of encouragement were students at their institution (3.43) and community members (3.22). Fifty-two percent of respondents received encouragement from students. In the open-ended survey section, several service-learning faculty elaborated on the importance of student encouragement. One respondent explained that: "Students have indicated that service-learning and applied experience is a very important part of their college careers. In fact, some have identified service-learning experiences as the most important element of their lives."

The means of importance for each of these seven sources of encouragement were analyzed by institution type, academic discipline, faculty rank, tenure status, and gender. An ANOVA indicated no significant differences within each variable. The results of this analysis by faculty rank, tenure status, and gender are summarized in Table 2.

#### *What are the effective sources of instructional support for service-learning?*

In order to understand perceived helpfulness for various forms of service-learning instructional support, service-learning faculty were asked to indicate forms of instructional support that they received and the level of helpfulness of each. Six forms of support were listed and space was provided to write in others. A four-point Likert scale (1=not helpful, 4=very helpful) was used to rate helpfulness. The mean for each of the six forms of support and the percentage of respondents receiving each form were: mentoring (3.22; 33%); advice from colleagues (3.16; 67%); professional organizations/conferences (3.10; 55%); institutional faculty development (3.07; 51%); professional journals (2.91, 49%); and faculty teaching handbook (2.76; 18%). Several respondents added that a community service office on campus was also a particularly helpful source of instructional support. No significant differences were found when these forms of instructional support were analyzed by institution type, academic discipline, faculty rank, tenure status, and gender.

#### *What service-learning outcomes motivate faculty use of service-learning?*

Service-learning faculty were asked to indicate the importance of the potential for positive outcomes in their decision to incorporate service-learning in their teaching. Using a 4-point Likert-scale (1=not important, 4=very important), the mean for "student-

learning outcomes" was 3.70, compared to 3.11 for "community-based outcomes." Service-learning faculty were then asked to choose no more than three motivating factors from a list of 15 factors that were most important in their decision to use service-learning. Space was also provided for respondents to include additional factors. The complete list included factors related to student-learning outcomes, community outcomes, and professional responsibilities. On average, student-learning outcomes were selected most frequently as motivating factors (mean frequency = 69.5), followed by community outcomes (mean frequency = 38.6), and finally, professional responsibilities (mean frequency = 19.0). Mean frequencies were used because there were an unequal number of factors in each grouping.

In particular, the five factors that most strongly motivated service-learning use (i.e., selected by at least 25% of respondents) were "increased student understanding of course material" (47.2%); "increased student personal development" (36.9%); "increased student understanding of social problems as systemic" (32.1%); "provided useful service in the community" (29.0%); and "created university-community partnerships" (25.4%). The importance of increased course-based learning as a motivating factor to use service-learning was echoed in the open-ended section of the survey, in which several respondents commented that service-learning increases course-based understanding by applying theory to practice. For instance, a respondent commented that service-learning, "helps to tangibly tie theory to practice; to get my students applying themes learned in the classroom to 'real life' and thereby learn by doing. This is the number one reason I engage in it."

The frequencies for each of the 15 motivating factors listed in the survey were analyzed by institution type, academic discipline, faculty rank, tenure status, and gender. A Pearson chi-squared test was used to determine significant differences within these five variables for the five factors that most strongly motivated service-learning use. The chi-squared analysis indicated that a significant difference existed among academic disciplines on the variable "increased student personal development" ( $p=.039$ ). There were also significant differences between male and female respondents on the variables "increased student understanding of social problems as systemic" ( $p=.003$ ), and "provided useful service in the community" ( $p=.011$ ), which were both selected by more women than men. Overall, the chi-squared analysis clearly demonstrated the consistency of the five factors that were most influential.

Table 3

*Factors that Potentially Deter Continued Use of Service-Learning by Faculty Rank, Tenure Status, and Gender*

	Time intensive	Difficulty coordinating community service	Difficulty securing funding
	%	%	%
<b>Faculty rank</b>			
Full professor	45	25	
Associate professor	36	26	
Assistant professor	74	25	
Adjunct professor	31	31	39
Lecturer/ Instructor	29		
<b>Tenure status</b>			
Tenured	42	25	
Untenured, on tenure track	42	25	
Untenured, not on tenure track			
<b>Gender</b>			
Female	40		
Male	38	30	

*What factors might cause faculty not to continue to use service-learning?*

In order to determine how best to sustain faculty use of service-learning, service-learning faculty were asked to indicate the likelihood that they will continue to incorporate this teaching strategy into their teaching. Using a 5-point Likert-scale (1 = very likely, 5 = very unlikely), the mean for all respondents was 1.46. An ANOVA indicated that there were no significant differences within institution type, academic discipline, faculty rank, tenure status, or gender.

Although they indicated a strong intention to continue using service-learning, the service-learning faculty were asked what, if any, factors might cause them not to continue to incorporate service-learning in their teaching, or to do so less frequently. Respondents were asked to choose no more than three factors from a list of nine potential deterrents. Space was also provided to write additional potential deterrents. The potential deterrents included factors related to time, logistics, and funding; student and community outcomes; reward structure; and comfort with ability to effectively use service-learning. On average, concerns related to time, logistics, and funding were selected most frequently (mean frequency = 52.4), followed by the reward structure (mean frequency = 42.0), concerns related to student and community outcomes (mean frequency = 39.5), and ability to effectively use service-learning (mean frequency = 18).

The two strongest potential deterrents to continued use of service-learning (selected by at least 25% of the respondents) were, “service-learning courses are time-intensive and therefore difficult to balance with

other professional responsibilities” (38.9%), and “difficulty coordinating the community service component of the course” (25.4%). Several respondents elaborated on these potential deterrents in the open-ended section of the survey. For instance, one respondent explained that, “Quality service-learning takes not only commitment to the pedagogy but [also] time and effort to establish and coordinate. I would continue to incorporate service-learning into my courses but without institutional support, its quality [will be compromised].”

The frequencies for each of the nine potential deterrents listed in the survey were analyzed by the same five variables. A Pearson chi-squared test was used to determine significant differences within these variables for the two strongest potential deterrents. The chi-squared analysis produced no statistically significant differences, but instead demonstrated the consistency of time and coordination difficulty as most likely to be potential deterrents to continued use. Frequencies by faculty rank, tenure status, and gender are summarized in Table 3. Frequencies by institution type and academic discipline are summarized in Table 4. Only factors selected by 25% or more of at least one faculty grouping are included in the tables.

Although the literature suggests that lack of reward and recognition in the tenure and promotion process is one of the strongest deterrents to the use of service-learning, only 16.7% of all service-learning faculty indicated that they might not continue to use service-learning as a result of not having been rewarded in their performance reviews and/or tenure and promotion decisions for their use of service-learning. Because of the literature’s emphasis on faculty reward structure as a deterrent, the previous question

Table 4

*Factors that Potentially Deter Continued Use of Service-Learning by Institution Type and Academic Discipline*

	Unsure students benefited	Time intensive	Difficulty coordinating community service	Difficulty establishing partnerships	Difficulty securing funding	Not rewarded in tenure and promotion
	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Institution type</b>						
Research		47				27
Doctoral/Masters		27	27			
Baccalaureate		39	32			
Associate of arts		28				
<b>Academic discipline</b>						
Humanities		37	34			
Social & behavioral sciences		39	25			
Physical & biological sciences		54				
Math, engineering, computer science	40			40		
Business	31	46	39		39	
Social work, education, human ecology, agriculture		36	26			
Arts		44	44			
Health professions		48				

regarding potential service-learning deterrents was followed by a specific question related to the role of faculty reward structure as a deterrent. Specifically, faculty were asked, “As you think about whether you will continue to incorporate service-learning into your teaching, how important is it that you be rewarded in your performance reviews and/or tenure and promotion decisions for doing so?” Using a four-point Likert-scale (1 = not important, 4 = very important), the mean for all service-learning faculty was 2.36. An ANOVA indicated a significant difference ( $F = 4.83$ ;  $p = .009$ ) between tenured faculty (2.20) and non-tenured faculty who are on a tenure track (2.71). No significant differences existed within institution type, academic discipline, faculty rank, or gender.

Consistent with this mean response, several respondents indicated in the open-ended section of the survey that internal motivation rather than external rewards drives their use of service-learning. One respondent commented, “My motivation to do service-learning was not external. I do not do it for personal reward. My primary motivation is the successful learning of course objectives by students in alternative ways.” Similarly, another observed that:

Service-learning is the type of pedagogy which requires faculty to gain rewards from personal commitment to student learning and community involvement. One cannot (should not) do service-learning to seek praise from students (because they might not realize learning until after evaluations) or from peers at review time (because others might not recognize everything

involved with such a project).

*What factors deter faculty who do not use service-learning from doing so?*

In order to understand the actual deterrents to the use of service-learning, faculty who indicated that they do not use service-learning—but had given thought as to whether or not to incorporate it into their teaching—were asked to indicate the reasons that they chose not to do so. Specifically, faculty were asked to indicate for each of 19 factors the extent to which the factors contributed to their decision not to use service-learning. Space was also provided to write in additional deterrents. A five-point Likert scale was used (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The deterrents listed in the survey were grouped into four categories. The means for each of these categories were: time, funding, and logistical concerns (2.95); curricular and pedagogical concerns (2.68); institutional and professional concerns (2.06); and concerns regarding student and community outcomes (1.80).

In particular, the four factors that most strongly deter faculty from using service-learning (mean greater than three) were: “anticipate having logistical problems coordinating the community service aspect of the course” (3.23); “do not know how to use service-learning effectively” (3.18); “is not relevant to the courses I teach” (3.11); “have not been given or do not anticipate being given release time to develop a service-learning course” (3.08). An interesting aspect of logistical difficulties on which several rural campus respondents commented in the

open-ended section of the survey is the difficulty in finding appropriate and convenient service sites. For instance, one respondent commented, "I teach Black Studies and the small liberal arts college where I teach is several miles from a community with a significant population of Black Americans." Several respondents also commented on the lack of time to develop and teach a service-learning course: "Service-learning seems to be very time-intensive to get going and it demands vigilance on the part of the instructor to be sure everyone benefits."

The means for each deterrent included in the survey were analyzed by the same five aforementioned variables. As with the service-learning motivators and potential deterrents, there were few differences in the strength of deterrents according to each variable. The greatest variation existed within the academic disciplines. For only the physical and biological sciences, "taking time away from teaching critical content," and, "is not academically rigorous," were significant deterrents. Physical and biological sciences faculty were also strongly deterred by their perception that service-learning is not relevant to the courses they teach. Lack of relevance was also a strong deterrent for respondents from the arts and mathematics, engineering, computer sciences. Science and mathematics faculty frequently commented in the open-ended section of the survey that they do not believe that service-learning is relevant to their disciplines. For instance, a mathematics professor stated, "I can think of no service projects in the community that will enhance student learning of the abstract reasoning skills they should be learning in mathematics." A chemistry professor stated: "I teach

chemistry—a clean lab is useful, service would not help me reach objectives for those courses."

While some respondents were resolute in their belief that service-learning was irrelevant to their discipline, others were willing to learn how it might be relevant: "Some examples of service-learning technique, applied to large physical science classes would be helpful to me and might provide a stimulus for action on my part." To the contrary, faculty from education, social work, human ecology, and agriculture were primarily deterred only by logistical difficulties and lack of funding. An ANOVA indicated that there were significant differences among disciplines for the deterrents "will not benefit students" ( $F = 2.67; p = .010$ ); "is not academically rigorous" ( $F = 3.53; p = .001$ ); "is not relevant to the courses I teach" ( $F = 4.96; p = .000$ ); and "will take away time from teaching critical content" ( $F = 2.40; p = .019$ ). A sheffe post-hoc analysis indicated that the difference between physical and biological sciences and social and behavioral sciences, as well as between physical and behavioral sciences and social work, education, human ecology, agriculture, accounted for these differences for three of the four deterrents. Although there was an overall significant difference, no significant pair-wise comparison existed for the deterrent "will not benefit students." An ANOVA also indicated a significant difference among tenure status for the deterrent, "is not relevant to the courses I teach" ( $F = 3.38; p = .037$ ). A sheffe post-hoc analysis indicated that the difference between tenured faculty (3.32) and untenured faculty on a tenure track (3.26) accounted for this difference ( $p = .047$ ).

Results for the analysis by faculty rank, tenure

Table 5  
Factors that Deter Faculty Use of Service-Learning by Faculty Rank, Tenure Status, and Gender

	Anticipate logistical problems	Do not know how to effectively use	Not relevant to subject matter	Lack of release time	Take time away from teaching content	Difficulty securing funds	Time intensive/hard to balance with other responsibilities	Difficulty establishing community partners	Not encouraged by president	Not encouraged by dean
<b>Faculty rank</b>										
Full professor	3.34	3.17	3.38		3.33		3.20			
Associate professor	3.18	3.45	3.03	3.13						
Assistant professor	3.16		3.05	3.16						
Adjunct professor	4.00	3.00		4.00		4.00		3.67	3.67	
Lecturer, instructor	3.33	3.50	3.17	3.50		3.83		3.00		
<b>Tenure status</b>										
Tenured	3.23	3.25	3.32		3.17					
Untenured, on tenure track	3.26	3.11	3.26				3.00			
Untenured, not on tenure track	3.38	3.25	3.20	3.56		3.44				
<b>Gender</b>										
Female	3.30	3.05		3.22						
Male	3.19	3.30	3.30		3.07					

Note. 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neutral; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree

status, and gender are summarized in Table 5. Only those deterrents with a mean score of three or higher are included in the table. Despite the literature's emphasis on the reward structure as a deterrent, concerns regarding promotion and tenure were not a deterrent for any of the faculty groupings.

*What might increase the likelihood that faculty who do not use service-learning will do so in the future?*

Respondents who do not use service-learning, but had given thought as to whether or not to do so, were asked the likelihood that they will incorporate service-learning into their teaching in the future. Using a five-point Likert-scale (1=very unlikely, 5=very likely), the mean was 2.87. Thirty-nine percent of respondents were "very unlikely" or "unlikely" to use service-learning; 31% were "likely" or "very likely." The results were analyzed according to the same five variables. The categories of faculty most likely to use service-learning (mean greater than three) were health professions (3.50); social work, education, agriculture, human ecology (3.42); adjunct professors (3.33); assistant professors (3.21); females (3.12); comprehensive institutions (3.11); and social and behavioral sciences (3.10). The categories of faculty least likely to use service-learning were physical and biological sciences (2.00); math, engineering, and computer science (2.50); business (2.50); lecturers and instructors (2.50); and full professors (2.51).

An ANOVA indicated a significant difference for three variables in the likelihood of using service learning: gender ( $F = 4.20; p = .043$ ), (female = 3.12; male = 2.68); academic discipline: ( $F = 2.57; p = .013$ ); and tenure status: ( $F = 6.62; p = .002$ ). A post-hoc sheffe test indicated that comparisons between tenured faculty (3.45) and non-tenured faculty on a tenure track (2.58) accounted for the differences within tenure status. Although there was overall significant difference within academic disciplines, no significant pair-wise comparisons existed.

To supplement the data regarding likelihood of non-service-learning faculty using service-learning in the future, non-service-learning faculty were asked to answer an open-ended question on what might increase the likelihood that they will incorporate service-learning into their teaching. Responses mirrored the quantitative data regarding factors that deter faculty use of service-learning. Numerous respondents indicated that greater knowledge as to how to use service-learning would increase their likelihood of doing so; many also suggested assistance with logistics, increased release time, and relief from other professional responsibilities. One respondent explained that she would like:

release time to develop a service-learning course, institutional structures, resources, and support to help locate projects where service-learning could make a meaningful contribution to the community/organization in question within the small time frame of a quarter, and which would not have people hanging when the quarter ended.

Several other respondents also commented on the importance of assistance in finding service that fits students' busy schedules. Many respondents called not only for ideas as to how service-learning is relevant to their academic disciplines, but also for evidence that it would improve their course. Only two respondents mentioned recognition in promotion and tenure decisions as a factor that would increase their likelihood of using service-learning.

### Discussion and Implications

This study's purpose was to understand why faculty use and do not use service-learning. Accentuating familiar faculty refrains, such as difficulty balancing professional responsibilities and concern that students understand the course material, the near uniformity in results was remarkable. The overwhelming consistency in the factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning—regardless of whether these factors are analyzed by institution type, academic discipline, faculty rank, tenure status, or gender—provides a basis for considering effective and realistic strategies for recruiting and sustaining service-learning faculty.

#### *Successful Sources of Encouragement for Service-Learning Use*

The results clearly indicated that it is important to actively involve community members and students in recruiting service-learning faculty. The advocacy strength of these two groups has not been emphasized in prior literature. A strategy for doing so might include involving current community partners and students in service-learning instructional workshops and faculty meetings where service-learning is being promoted. For community members who are not existing university partners, it is important that an infrastructure exists within the university to facilitate connection with the university (Driscoll, 1998).

The results also suggested that colleagues, especially department chairpersons and faculty within departments, are an important impetus to service-learning use. This result is consistent with findings from previous studies (Gelmon et al., 1998; UCLA Service-Learning Clearinghouse Project, 1999). An anecdotal finding of this research, learned

through interactions with the institution gatekeepers, was that many campuses have a difficult time identifying their service-learning faculty. It is especially important that institutions identify and make visible their service-learning faculty, and create opportunities for these faculty members to promote service-learning and the scholarship associated with service-learning. At least one institution in this sample has established a successful working group of service-learning faculty from various disciplines who promote service-learning use throughout the curriculum (Jones, 2001). Based on this study's results, such a service-learning faculty group might have the most success promoting service-learning if members encourage service-learning use within their respective departments, and ideally, through individual mentoring. Encouragement of this nature might also address the fact that 27% of survey respondents who do not use service-learning had not even heard of service-learning prior to receiving our survey.

#### *Motivators to Service-Learning Use*

Enlisting various strategies to encourage service-learning use is wise because the results indicated that service-learning faculty are motivated by a range of factors, some of which might be more effectively conveyed by faculty or students, and others by community members. In general, student-learning outcomes provided the strongest motivation for service-learning faculty. In particular, increased course-based understanding was most influential. This finding confirms Hammond's (1994) conclusion that curricular concerns drive faculty use of service-learning, as well as Bringle et al.'s (1997) observation that "second-generation" faculty demand evidence of concrete learning outcomes. To a lesser extent, service-learning faculty were also motivated by building university-community partnerships and providing useful service in the community. Students and faculty might best offer evidence of positive academic outcomes, whereas community members might best discuss community benefits.

#### *Deterrents to Service-Learning Use*

However, the results indicated that no matter the strategy employed, many non-service-learning faculty will not use service-learning without logistical support, evidence that it improves the academic outcomes of the course, and instruction in how to effectively use service-learning. Providing logistical support is essential, as anticipated logistical and time difficulties were not only the most frequently cited actual deterrents to service-learning use, but also the most frequently cited potential deterrents to service-learning faculty's continued use. The latter finding is consistent with Hammond's

(1994) results. As suggested in prior literature (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Driscoll, 1998), a strong community service office is especially useful for alleviating faculty's time-consuming logistical difficulties. Indeed, survey respondents at institutions that have such a resource frequently commented on its helpfulness. Another useful strategy might be for faculty to have students assist with logistics. Students enthusiastic about service-learning might help faculty with their courses, a strategy that would also benefit students through increased faculty interaction and community involvement (Eyler & Giles, 1999).

Non-service-learning faculty were deterred by not having evidence that service-learning will increase student learning. Yet, the most frequently cited reason why faculty use service-learning was that it increases students' understanding of course material. These seemingly incongruous results highlight the importance of service-learning faculty sharing their success stories with non-service-learning faculty. Again, these results make apparent the importance of identification and visibility of service-learning faculty. Because non-service-learning faculty were often deterred by a concern that service-learning was not relevant to their particular discipline, success stories which highlight service-learning's academic rigor should be shared, when feasible, by faculty in the same discipline. Although it might be most effective for colleagues to personally discuss their service-learning courses' positive outcomes, it is also important to present and publish these outcomes in journals and at professional meetings focused on specific academic disciplines (Zlotkowski, 1995). Evidence of service-learning outcomes is frequently published in service-learning journals and other journals related to higher education, which are likely not read by faculty in disciplines asking for evidence of success, such as math and science. In addition to publishing results, it is important that service-learning course outcomes be formally assessed and the results disseminated within the department.

Not knowing how to effectively use service-learning also was a deterrent for non-service-learning faculty. Strategies for addressing this deterrent must be carefully considered, since instruction must fit within faculty time constraints. Because the results suggested that instructional support was most helpful when it is relationship-based or personalized, it would likely be helpful to have experienced service-learning faculty serve as mentors. Other effective strategies might be sharing service-learning syllabi and offering development workshops. Again, university infrastructure is necessary to support and facilitate the provision of this instruction (Driscoll, 1998). No matter the strategy, learning how to effectively teach service-learning courses takes time.

Therefore, offering release time and/or funding support would be extremely helpful to encourage service-learning use.

*Impact of Institution Type, Academic Discipline, Faculty Rank, Tenure Status, and Gender*

Although the motivators and deterrents to service-learning use were essentially the same within institution types, academic disciplines, faculty ranks, tenure status, and gender, there were a few important differences that impact strategies for recruiting and sustaining service-learning faculty. Perhaps most apparent is the difference among academic disciplines in non-service-learning faculty's perception of service-learning's relevance and academic rigor. For instance, math and science faculty were far more skeptical that service-learning would improve their courses than were education and humanities faculty. It is therefore necessary that service-learning faculty and students from within these less receptive disciplines provide evidence of the positive outcomes for their successful service-learning use.

*Role of the Faculty Reward Structure*

On the whole, concerns regarding tenure and promotion were not a considerable deterrent to service-learning use. In fact, the reward structure's relative unimportance in decisions to use service-learning is the most apparent difference between this study's results and the prior literature (Morton & Troppe, 1996; Stanton, 1994; Ward, 1998). Although untenured professors were more concerned about the reward structure than were tenured professors, the only faculty group for whom the reward structure was an important consideration was service-learning faculty at research universities. Thirty percent of these faculty indicated that not being rewarded in performance reviews and tenure and promotion decisions might cause them to discontinue using service-learning. In general, service-learning faculty appear to be internally motivated and for the most part unlikely to stop using service-learning if they are not rewarded for doing so. Likewise, the reward structure played a fairly insignificant role in the decision-making process for non-service-learning faculty. These results do not imply that it is unimportant to incorporate service-learning into the reward structure, but instead, that doing so could be less a priority than providing logistical support, evidence of academic relevance and rigor, and instruction for effective use. Perhaps more important than emphasis on changing the reward structure is demonstration of how service-learning can support and enhance "rewarded activities," i.e., improved teaching and learning and contributions to a research program.

This study's findings must be understood in relation to three apparent limitations. First, although respondents were asked to use a service-learning definition included in the survey, not all respondents interpreted the definition in the same way. Therefore, some respondents who were considered service-learning faculty in this study might not have actually used service-learning as intended by the definition, but instead, might have included in their courses student teaching, internships, and clinical experience. Second, comparisons within institution type and academic discipline were made using unequal sample sizes. For instance, there were 218 faculty in research institutions, compared to 32 faculty in associate of arts institutions; and there were 104 faculty in the social and behavioral sciences, compared to 26 in the arts. This disparity may have resulted in greater differences within the variables than there otherwise might have been. Additional research on motivators and deterrents specific to particular institution types and academic disciplines would be worthwhile. Third, as a quantitative study based on survey responses, the results provide only a surface understanding of service-learning motivators and deterrents. In-depth qualitative research based on these results would provide a richer understanding of why faculty do and do not use service-learning.

The strategies that emerge from this study are not simple solutions, nor will they address all obstacles to increased service-learning use. For instance, even the most competently staffed and well-funded community service office cannot make a relevant service site appear in an easily accessible location where one does not exist. Limited time and resources are also realities. Therefore, when deciding which strategies to pursue, institutions will likely need to determine whether to focus greatest attention and resources on faculty members who are most likely to use service-learning, or on those who appear to need the greatest encouragement. Although effective approaches will vary by institution, the following key strategies that emerged from this study provide a useful starting point from which institutions can work to meet their particular needs.

- Involve community members and students in recruiting service-learning faculty, capitalizing on their advocacy strength.
- Identify, organize, and make visible service-learning faculty and create opportunities for these faculty to promote service-learning and its associated scholarship within their academic departments or disciplines, and throughout the institution.
- Assess academic learning outcomes for service-learning courses and disseminate results

within academic departments and disciplines.

- Develop an infrastructure within the institution to support a centralized service-learning office to connect potential community partners with the university, provide funding, create incentives to try new approaches, assist faculty with logistical support, and provide developmental instruction to new or potential service-learning faculty.

It is important to keep in mind that service-learning is not right for all faculty and courses, and should always be incorporated into a course in a way that will not reinforce students' stereotypes or harm the community. Nonetheless, service-learning's many benefits to the students, community, and institution serve to encourage development and implementation of effective strategies to increase the number of faculty and academic disciplines responsibly using service-learning. Indeed, thorough integration of service-learning into the curriculum must be an institutional priority in order to help colleges and universities realize the vision of becoming engaged and socially responsible citizens.

### Notes

The Indiana Campus Compact, through a special arrangement with the Ohio Campus Compact, provided funding for this research.

<sup>1</sup> This definition draws upon those in the National and Community Service Act of 1990, Howard (1998), and Jacoby & Associates (1996).

### References

- Bringle, R. G., Games, R., & Malloy, E. (1999). *Colleges and universities as citizens*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bringle, R. G. & Hatcher, J. A. (1995). A service-learning curriculum for faculty. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2, 112-122.
- Bringle, R. G. & Hatcher, J. A. (2000). Institutionalization of service learning in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(3), 273-290.
- Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., & Games, R. (1997). Engaging and supporting faculty in service learning. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 2(1), 43-51.
- Driscoll, A., Holland, B., Gelmon, S., & Kerrigan, S. (1996). An assessment model for service-learning: Comprehensive case studies of impact on faculty, students, community, and institution. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 3, 66-71.
- Driscoll, A. (1998). Comprehensive design of community service: New undertakings, options, and vitality in student learning at Portland State University. In E. Zlotkowski (Ed.), *Successful service-learning programs: New models of excellence in higher education*. (pp. 150-168). Boston: Anker Publishing Co.
- Driscoll, A. (2000). Studying faculty and service-learning: Directions for inquiry and development [Special Issue]. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Fall 2000, 35-41.
- Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gelmon, S., Holland, B., Shinnamon, A., & Morris, B. (1998). Community-based education and service: The HPSISN experience. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 12(3), 257-272.
- Giles, D. E., & Eyler, J. (1998). A service learning research agenda for the next five years. In R. A. Rhoads & J. P. F. Howard (Eds.), *Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection* (pp. 65-72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Gray, M. J., Ondaatje, E. H. & Zakaras, L. (1999). *Combining service and learning in higher education: Summary report*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Hammond, C. (1994). Integrating service and academic study: Faculty motivation and satisfaction in Michigan higher education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1(1), 21-28.
- Hesser, G. (1995). Faculty assessment of student learning: Outcomes attributed to service-learning and evidence of changes in faculty attitudes about experiential education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2, 33-42.
- Holland, B. (1997). Analyzing institutional commitment to service: A model of key organizational factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 4, 30-41.
- Howard, J. P. F. (1998). Academic service learning: A counternormative pedagogy. In R. A. Rhoads & J. P. F. Howard (Eds.), *Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection* (pp. 21-29). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Jacoby, B., & Associates. (1996). *Service-learning in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Jones, S. R. (2001). The service-learning scholars roundtable: A model for engaging faculty in service-learning theory and practice. In J. B. Anderson, K. J. Swick, & J. Yff (Eds.), *Service-learning in teacher education* (pp. 220-233). Washington, DC: AACTE Publications.
- Levine, M. (1994). Seven steps to getting faculty involved in service-learning: How a traditional faculty member came to teach a course on "voluntarism, community, and citizenship." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1(1), 110-114.
- Morton, K. & Troppe, M. (1996). From margin to the mainstream: Campus Compact's project on integrating service with academic study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15, 21-32.
- National and Community Service Act of 1990. Public Law 106-70, as amended December 17, 1999.

Authors

- National Campus Compact (1999). *1999 National Campus Compact faculty survey*. Providence, RI: The National Campus Compact.
- Sax, L. J., Astin, W., Korn, W. S., & Gilmartin, S. K. (1999). *The American college teacher: National norms for the 1998-99 HERI faculty survey*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 435272)
- Stanton, T. K. (1994). The experience of faculty participants in an instructional development seminar on service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1(1), 7-20.
- UCLA Service-Learning Clearinghouse Project (1999). *1999 Service-learning needs assessment*. Retrieved July 9, 2000, from <http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/slc/slcp.html>
- Ward, K. (April, 1996). *Service-learning and student volunteerism: Reflections on institutional commitment*. Paper delivered at the American Educational Research Association. New York, N.Y.
- Ward, K. (1998). Addressing academic culture: Service learning, organizations, and faculty work. In R. A. Rhoads & J. P. F. Howard (Eds.), *Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection* (pp. 72-80). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Zlotkowski, E. (1995). Does service-learning have a future? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2, 123-133.

ELISA S. ABES is a doctoral candidate in the Higher Education & Student Affairs program at The Ohio State University. She has assisted Susan R. Jones with research projects on service-learning as it relates to student identity development and student understanding of HIV/AIDS, designed service-learning faculty development materials, and co-instructed an undergraduate service-learning course on leadership in community service.

GOLDEN JACKSON is associate professor in the College of Human Ecology at The Ohio State University. Her scholarly interests are in the areas of social/economic aspects of housing. Current projects focus on building community in one of the University neighborhoods. She and Susan R. Jones are co-directors of a grant funded by the Corporation for National Service to support development of service-learning courses throughout the university.

SUSAN R. JONES is assistant professor in the Higher Education & Student Affairs program at The Ohio State University. Her research and teaching interests include service-learning as it relates to community partnerships and reciprocity, student identity development, and faculty engagement. She and Golden Jackson serve as the co-conveners of Ohio State's Service-Learning Scholars Roundtable.