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Abstract

Service-learning is a high impact practice that is considered a new pedagogical shift in higher education. Even with the evidence of the benefits of this pedagogical method, college faculty are not using service-learning in their classrooms. The purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore community college faculty experience with service-learning pedagogical practices. The research question for this qualitative study was: How do community college faculty experience service-learning pedagogical practices? The study employed a qualitative methodology with an interpretative phenomenological analysis design. The primary sources of data were semistructured interviews, follow-up surveys, and a focus group discussion from a pool of participants who have engaged in service-learning at the community college level. According to the findings of this research study, faculty reported that service-learning was beneficial in some way to student understanding, experience, and connections to the community. Faculty also experienced challenges within the service-learning implementation or utilization process. The themes that emerged from this study of faculty experience were community connections, connecting theory to practice, and challenges within the service-learning process. The results will be of interest to faculty interested in service-learning and administrators interested in improving service-learning programs and increasing service-learning participation.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction to the Problem

Service-learning is experiential education at its best, with personal and social development at the center of enhanced learning (Eyler, Giles, & Astin, 1999). This academic course experience involves students’ participating in community-based service activities with reflective activities that emphasize course content and expand personal values and civic responsibility (Gardner & Emory, 2018). This experiential pedagogy is included in the list of high-impact practices or teaching methods that utilize different educational approaches that positively affect a student’s educational progress (Taylor, Pruitt, & Fasolino, 2017). These practices include 10 specific pedagogies: first-year seminars and experiences, learning communities, writing-intensive courses, collaborative projects, cohort learning, undergraduate research, service or community-based learning, global learning, internships, e-portfolios, and capstone projects (Kilgo, Ezell-Sheets, & Pascarella, 2015).

Analysis of service-learning programs has shown that students in courses with a service-learning component demonstrated significant gains in scholastic performance (Celio, Durlak, & Dymnicki, 2011). High-impact educational practices such as service-learning enhance the quality of students’ experience, increase learning, improve retention, and promote success, especially among underserved students (Scrivener & Weiss, 2012).

Despite the evidence of benefits of this pedagogical method, college faculty are not using service-learning in their classrooms. In a recent survey of community college student engagement (Community College Faculty Survey of Student Engagement [CCFSSE], 2018), faculty were asked if during that academic year they incorporate service-learning in their courses; 73% of all faculty reported that they do not. In addition, 73% of students surveyed report that they have never participated in service-learning within an academic course. Nearly three-quarters of the community college student body have never experienced the advanced learning and social engagement that
service-learning provides. Society needs civically minded graduates with a higher learning experience. Buzz words and catch phrases aside, service-learning works, and it is not being utilized enough.

**Background, Context, History, and Conceptual Framework for the Problem**

Service-learning is an innovative pedagogical strategy, or high-impact practice, that has been noted to have an influence on student success and retention (O’Banion, Weidner, & Baker, 2010). In a study of faculty members and their use of high-impact strategies, the participants were asked to list the three most crucial factors that contribute to success with innovation of any kind, and two areas were highly rated: personal enthusiasm and the need to innovate. Many faculty members may choose to use service-learning pedagogy based on personal experience, the desire to be active in the community, and the inspiration to bring students into the field (Schalge, Pajunen, & Brotherton, 2018). Within the literature, the requirement for high-impact educational practices is well expressed and includes the need for service-learning experiences (Fink, 2016). These service-learning practices are important since students of all ages and levels of experience do not always have awareness, control, or the ability to process and learn quickly (Willink & Jacobs, 2011).

In addition to the desire for personal and student growth, the need for peer and administrative support is equally important. It can be interpreted as a supportive environment that facilitates a social structure that nurtures change and development. Acknowledging the needed support for faculty in areas such as time and financing can facilitate innovative development. If communication with faculty is disjointed, incomplete, or inaccurate, faculty perceptions may turn negative, and they may resist adoption or implementation of service-learning pedagogies.

Key impressions of faculty experience and perceptions of service-learning recognized within the literature reviewed for this study include features of emotion and social experience, including communication, perception, resistance, and the need for support. Support includes the
need for more time, for project funding, for administrative support, and for professional
development. Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, and Sitarenios (2001) defined a core principle of
intelligence as abstract reasoning, which emphasizes the need to see key similarities and
differences while analyzing individual parts of an experience to understand it in its entirety to
determine validity. Faculty perceptions of service-learning can impact their motivation to employ
this pedagogy within the classroom. These perceptions may form within their experiences with the
implementation of service-learning components in the classroom, or in their interactions with
others.

Social constructivist theory proposes that learner construction of knowledge, and in this
case the learner is the faculty, is the product of social interaction, interpretation, and understanding
(Adams, 2006). Demonstrating social constructivism, teacher perceptions have been revealed to
influence their teaching practices within the classroom (Kaymakamoglu, 2018). Using a social
constructivist lens can facilitate a better understanding of the faculty experience with service-
learning pedagogical practices to evaluate faculty needs, communication, perception, and
resistance.

Prior research indicates that service-learning can be a successful pedagogy at different
levels of education, and within diverse student populations and community locations. It is
important to fully explore how these practices become successful—to analyze how they are
implemented and the challenges that emerge between initiation and implementation. The social
constructivist lens can be applied to further understand the main concepts within this study and
assess how these factors affect implementation of high-impact educational practices like service-
learning. Of particular concern are how the information regarding the need for high-impact
practices was communicated, the support and communication received, benefits and limitations of
the innovation, and the context in which the information was delivered. Inaccurate or selective
communication can result in perceptions that can be detrimental to implementing new innovative techniques like service-learning. Perceptions of difficulty can create a reality that misrepresents service-learning pedagogical practices and creates a common trend of faculty resistance because the notion of difficulty is too immense.

**Statement of the Problem**

Service-learning, as a high-impact practice, is an innovative pedagogical shift in higher education. Service-learning presents new challenges, and many faculty members are not adopting this type of change or using service-learning pedagogical practices. Faculty members are valuable within the higher education system and often experience change and perceive obstacles to success in ways that are different than an administrator or student. Obstacles, or barriers, to service-learning, exist at various levels, and understanding this differing experience allows for a more thorough process of implementation. Perceived obstacles can include issues such as a lack of time; technical challenges; inadequate funding; absence of peer or administrative support; missing evidence of the success of the innovation; and other influences such as difficulties working on the innovation or other faculty, departments, or administrators (O’Banion et al., 2010). Negative perceptions or a lack of understanding of the importance of high-impact practices like service-learning can also impact implementation and perceptions of risk in innovation could create a lack of initiative support (Darby & Newman, 2014).

To best support an educational environment that facilitates enhanced learning experiences through high-impact practices, community colleges must explore how faculty understand and experience service-learning. In addition, a careful exploration of faculty experiences with service-learning pedagogical practice will offer more information that will help support the development of improved support services, professional development, and incentive programs within the community college.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this phenomenological study is to explore community college faculty experiences with service-learning pedagogy and service-learning implementation. Specifically, this study was designed to understand faculty challenges and successes with service-learning, along with the barriers that faculty experience in their implementation of this pedagogical practice. To best support an educational environment that facilitates these enhanced learning experiences (Kilgo et al., 2015), understanding how faculty experience service-learning is essential. In addition, exploring barriers, opportunities, and successes that faculty have experienced with service-learning can inform community colleges as they seek to provide better services to enhance faculty and student engagement in service-learning and other high-impact practices.

Exploring how faculty experience service-learning and resistance to service-learning can help expose areas that are challenging to the service-learning process. By unpacking these experiences, community college leaders can identify problematic areas in service-learning implementation and sustainability while developing support or policies that exist for service-learning. Examining these key areas in service-learning pedagogy will allow community colleges to support strong service-learning projects that are well communicated and supported with faculty incentives and professional development.

In discovering the experiences of community college faculty service-learning, program chairs, directors, student support services, and college-wide administrators can help to support these valuable curricular endeavors. A program that contains a communication policy and sufficient support services is necessary to maintain a consistently supported program. In addition to developing a supported service-learning program, administrators can offer more substantial and focused professional development for faculty and staff that promotes informed and well-educated stewards of service-learning pedagogical practices.
The principal research question for this study was: How do community college faculty experience service-learning pedagogical practices?

Within the principal research question were subquestions that explored how community college faculty members describe their experiences with service-learning pedagogy, how these experiences form perceptions of service-learning, and how they describe their experience with the implementation process.

1. How do community college faculty members describe their experiences with service-learning pedagogy?
   a. How do community college faculty members describe how their experiences formed perceptions of service-learning pedagogy?

2. How do community college faculty members describe their experience in service-learning implementation at the course level?

The research questions connect to the study’s phenomenological focus, the community college faculty members’ experiences with service-learning, and can elicit information on the experiences of faculty with service-learning pedagogical practices. Faculty members’ experiences often generate perceptions that influence curriculum and classroom practices at the college level (Jaschik, 2015). This study was designed to shed light upon faculty member experiences in implementing service-learning and how these experiences have shaped their own perceptions of this phenomenon.

Rationale, Relevance, and Significance of the Study
In a 2018 survey of community college student engagement and faculty (CCSSE, 2018) faculty were also surveyed and it was revealed that 81% of all faculty do not incorporate service-learning in their courses. This number increased to 89% when part-time faculty were surveyed. There is a noteworthy gap in the research of faculty perceptions of service-learning and how these factors arise in the implementation process. The faculty experience and challenges that they encounter play an important role in the formation of these perceptions, which directly relates to the implementation of service-learning.

Faculty-perceived barriers impact implementation of new initiatives, and faculty are often in positions where they are not prepared to implement an innovation. Better processes for implementation of high-impact practices such as service-learning are needed, and professional development for faculty may create an improved understanding of service-learning. Learning about these barriers to implementation may facilitate improved communication and future successful infusion of high-impact practices into curricula, which in turn may improve student retention, persistence, and achievement. Communication and understanding may also diminish barriers to implementation, and thus encourage an increase in high impact practices.

**Definition of Terms**

**Barriers.** Barriers include time constraints; technical issues; lack of financial support; lack of peer or administrative support; lack of proof of the success of the innovation; and other influences such as difficulties working with the innovation or other faculty, departments, or administrators (O’Banion et al., 2010).

**Communication.** The purpose of communication is to educate individuals to understand what others mean and be understood as ideas are expressed through speech, key writings, plays, movies, television, and artistic expression (Mezirow, 1991).
**Theory of emotional intelligence.** The theory of emotional intelligence uses a defined core principle of intelligence as abstract reasoning. It stresses the need to see key similarities and differences while analyzing individual pieces to understand the idea in its entirety to determine validity (Mayer et al., 2001).

**High-impact practice.** High-impact practice teaching methods are defined as educational approaches that have been thoroughly studied and researched, and have been shown to positively affect a student’s educational progress (Taylor et al., 2017).

**Innovation.** Innovation in higher education is loosely defined by the League of Innovations in the community college as the development or adoption of new or existing ideas for improving policies, programs, practices, or personnel (O’Banion et al., 2010).

**Specific pedagogies,** High-impact practices include 10 specific pedagogies; first-year seminars and experiences, learning communities, writing-intensive courses, collaborative projects, cohort learning, undergraduate research, service or community-based learning, global learning, internships, e-portfolios, and capstone projects (Kilgo et al., 2015).

**Lack of funding.** Lack of funding and predominance of adjunct faculty often contribute to the underuse of high-impact practices (Goldrick-Rab, 2010).

**Technology.** In a study of faculty profiles, four profiles for each way a faculty member perceived what innovation is in teaching and technology were established, and of the four groups, three shared similar outlooks. Most faculty showed attitudes that acknowledged the value of technology in teaching, but one of the four groups showed a careful attitude and doubted the merit of using this teaching method (Kopcha, Rieber, & Walker, 2016).

**Service-learning.** Service-learning is defined as a credit-bearing course experience that requires students to participate in community-based service activities with reflection activities that
accentuate course content and enhance personal values and civic responsibility (Gardner & Emory, 2018).

**Social constructivism.** A theory that suggests that learner construction of knowledge is the product of social interaction, interpretation, and understanding (Adams, 2006).

**Innovation.** In a study of faculty members, the participants were asked to list the three most crucial factors that contribute to success with innovation of any kind, and two areas were highly rated: personal enthusiasm and the need to innovate (O’Banion et al., 2010).

**Assumptions, Delimitations, and Limitations**

There are assumptions within this study that need to be addressed. It is assumed that faculty who have engaged in service-learning will have a desire for student success. It is assumed that study participants had an interest in completing the study to further promote service-learning and to help improve the process for other faculty. It is expected that the study participants were community college faculty who have participated in service-learning pedagogy in their classrooms. It is presumed that the participants answered all questions honestly within the study.

There is no generalizability, reliability, or true validity of the findings in a qualitative design, so it is imperative to use triangulation, horizontalization, and measures of trustworthiness (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2013). Triangulation is a method of checking the integrity of the study by drawing on multiple data sources, investigators, perspectives, or methods (Smith et al., 2013). For this study the use of three data collection methods allows for verification of the data collected. Horizontalization is a process that treats each participant’s statement of experience as equally valued (Moustakas, 1994). Prospects within phenomenological research are limitless and frequently shifting. Perceptions of experience appear and disappear, and each phenomenon has equal value as it appears (Moustakas, 1994). Each account must be taken into consideration and analyzed to ensure validity.
To ensure as much validity as possible in the study participants were initially screened to ensure they did indeed have experience in using service-learning pedagogy. They were community college instructors from more than one institution, and were willing participants in the interviews (Fusch & Ness, 2015). Adherence to these criteria allows for confirmation of realistic and transferrable data that represents their experiences with service-learning pedagogy.

There can be challenges in a purposeful sampling strategy in any study (Palinkas et al., 2015). These challenges can arise from a variation in a sample that is not always identified at the start of the sampling. By specifically sampling faculty who have employed service-learning pedagogies in their classrooms, unintended variation is diminished. In fact, any variation left after gating this population will allow for diversification of the experiences with service-learning pedagogy and resistance.

Research studies that employ interpretive phenomenological analysis may encounter four major conceptual and practical limitations (Tuffour, 2017). The first limitation concerns the limited recognition that phenomenological studies give to language. In the case of this study, language is addressed in interview narratives and active discussion. The second limitation can arise if the method captures opinions rather than the meanings of participant experiences. In this study, opinions are centric to personal experience and will allow for the visualization of faculty experience with resistance to service-learning pedagogy. The third limitation is that often a focus on perception occurs and limits understanding. Understanding the lived experience is the purpose of phenomenological analysis, but it does not explain why these experiences occur (Tuffour, 2017). Perceptions are important to understanding the resistance to service-learning, and this perceived limitation becomes a benefit within this study. The last limitation is cognition, which in phenomenology is often not properly understood (Tuffour, 2017). In this study, however, the
process of experience and how faculty acquire service-learning knowledge is important to understanding faculty resistance to service-learning pedagogical changes.

Summary

Service-learning has a significant effect on student success but is not used frequently within community colleges. Barriers and perceptions to implementation are identified but have been reviewed from a student success perspective instead of at the faculty level. Faculty work directly with students and are responsible for the implementation of critical high-impact education practices within the classroom, but the faculty voice is rarely sought to address the barriers that exist and prevent implementation.

Based on this review of literatures, which develops a conceptual framework using the importance of high impact practices, service-learning, and critical areas in high impact practice implementation to understand the challenges and perceptions that exist from a faculty perspective, there is sufficient reason for thinking an investigation examining the impact of these faculty experiences would yield socially significant findings. The interpretive phenomenological analysis was the design chosen to include purposeful sampling, diversified sample selection, semi structured interview guide creation, data checking, and transcription confirmation. Study participants were voluntary, kept confidential, and free to withdraw at any time. Informed consent was sought, and consent forms signed and stored. All actions within the research study were maintained in a research journal, and transcriptions were checked consistently to ensure the validity of the data.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction to the Literature Review

Civic outcomes intended for students are a priority for many institutions. Education task forces at varying levels are continually placing a call for more civic learning to enhance student success. This focus has created an increase in civic learning in higher education (Hatcher, Bringle, & Hahn, 2017). Service-learning is defined as a credit-bearing course experience that requires students to participate in community-based service activities with reflection activities that accentuate course content and enhance personal values and civic responsibility (Gardner & Emory, 2018). Service-learning is a pedagogy that is at high demand and is included among 10 recognized high-impact practices (American Association of Colleges & Universities [AAC&U], 2014).

High-impact practice teaching methods are defined as educational approaches that have been thoroughly studied and researched, and have been shown to positively affect a student’s educational progress (Taylor et al., 2017). The 10 specific pedagogies are first-year in college programs, learning communities, courses with an intense writing module, group projects, cohort learning, undergraduate research, service or community-based learning, global learning, internships, e-portfolios, and capstone projects (Kilgo et al., 2015).

Key features of high-impact practices include increasing student retention, improving engagement, and providing lifelong learning techniques (Scrivener & Weiss, 2012). Another key feature of high-impact educational process is that these techniques work for students of all educational backgrounds and socioeconomic levels (Harackiewicz, Canning, Tibbetts, Priniski, & Hyde, 2015). High-impact educational practices are methods of instruction and learning which have been tested and proven to show benefits for diverse college student populations (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000).
High-impact educational practices are unique and are designed to be incorporated into classroom pedagogy or institutional structure changes to improve student outcomes. Analysis of 62 studies of service-learning programs showed students in courses with a service-learning component demonstrated significant gains in academic performance (Celio et al., 2011). Community-based learning has also been successful in keeping students employed in the local area after college and connecting them with their local community (Sasser, 2009). This immersive learning experience produces long-term connections and student success.

The shift to high-impact practice pedagogies is relatively new in higher education practices and is not widely known among faculty members. High impact practices, therefore, are underused and are mostly optional (Jaschik, 2015). Studies performed in higher education settings often seek academic officers to report on the status of high-impact practices, but faculty are rarely surveyed on what drives them to adopt high-impact practices such as service-learning. In addition to faculty perceptions, barriers to high-impact practice pedagogies are also rarely explored.

The Study Topic

High impact practices are the latest innovations in higher education. Service-learning is a type of innovation that includes a process in which organizations transform ideas into new or improved programs, services, and pedagogy to serve the growing demands of the changing student population (Hasanefendic, Birkholz, Horta, & Sijde, 2017). Despite many successful initiatives in higher education, many faculty members are not engaged in service-learning activities. Faculty members’ experience also often generates perceptions that connect to their use of a high impact practice (Jaschik, 2015).

In a review of the literature, I identified multiple experiences that affect the development of faculty perceptions of innovative pedagogies like service-learning. Faculty avoid service-learning for various reasons, but some of the most striking reasons are the time it takes to prepare and
properly integrate into courses, the lack of control over learning when students are in the field, and lack of assessment of learning while outside the classroom (Ziegert & McGoldrick, 2008). In some cases, a lack of desire to improve teaching strategies plays a role in resistance to change regarding continuing education (Paloş & Gunaru, 2017). In other faculty experience, an ambivalent attitude creates avoidance and resistance (Karlsson & Erlandson, 2018). In addition to directly impacting the classroom, leadership support and financial investment in important high impact practices also play a key role in development and sustainability of initiatives and the willingness of faculty to explore new pedagogies like service-learning (Lozano et al., 2015). Perceptions of many of high impact practices, including service-learning, are often viewed from a student success perspective and faculty experience is rarely sought. Understanding faculty perceptions of service-learning pedagogies as high impact practices is important to fully evaluate why faculty do not engage in service-learning.

The Context

Curriculum practices that utilize service-learning pedagogy have been recognized as high-impact educational practices as service-learning helps promote active and engaged learning while increasing student academic performance (Kuh, 2008). Extensive research has shown that using high impact educational practices like service-learning enhance the students’ experience, increase learning, improve retention, and promote success, especially within underserved students (Scrivener & Weiss, 2012). Long term results show moderate improvements in student success even many years after participating in high impact activities (Sommo, Mayer, Rudd, & Cullinan, 2012). In a review of national data, Finley (2012) suggested that constructing the learning environment with high impact educational practices provides a critical piece to student success and achievement.
With a lack of implementation of these practices, at-risk student populations served in the community college often struggle with success and graduation, especially in science-based courses (Harackiewicz et al., 2015). Understanding this need for high impact practices, like service-learning, will enhance understanding of factors that influence the use of high impact educational practices. Faculty have differing experiences in service-learning implementation and perceptions form based on these experiences within the development process. High impact practices are helpful tools to improve student success and with community colleges focusing on retention of students it is more important than ever to understand barriers to implementation.

The Significance

Despite positive evaluations of high impact educational practices, faculty resistance to the implementation of service-learning into academic courses persists (Kilgo et al., 2015). In a recent survey of community college student engagement (CCSSE, 2018) faculty were asked if during that academic year they incorporate service-learning in their courses and 81% of all faculty do not. This number was shown to increase to 89% if only part-time faculty were surveyed. There is a notable gap in the research of faculty perceptions of high impact practices, especially service-learning, and how these factors arise in the implementation process. The faculty experience and challenges encountered play a vital role in the formation of these perceptions, which directly relates to the implementation of service-learning.

The Problem Statement

Service-learning is categorized as a high impact practice and is considered a new pedagogical shift in higher education. Service-learning has brought about new challenges adopting this type of change and many faculty members are not using service-learning pedagogical practices. Faculty members are valuable within the higher education system and often experience change and perceived barriers to success that are different than an administrator. These barriers to
high impact educational practices, like service-learning, exist at many levels and understanding this differing experience allows for a more thorough process of implementation. Some perceived barriers include time constraints, technical issues, lack of financial support, lack of peer or administrative support, lack of proof of the success of the innovation, and other influences such as difficulties working with the innovation or other faculty, departments, or administrators (O’Banion et al., 2010). In a 10-year study (Englund, Olofsson, & Price, 2017) exploring teachers’ preconceived notions of technology and habits in teaching and learning exposed that more experienced teachers were observed to have little or no change in their conceptions. In addition, more experienced teachers failed to engage in high impact educational practices. The more established faculty have often invested time and resources into their courses, are often reluctant to change, and some simply do not believe in the process or are forced into accepting the change (Karlsson & Erlandson, 2018). Lack of funding and predominance of adjunct faculty often contributes to the underuse of high impact practices (Goldrick-Rab, 2010). Other barriers that have been identified are emotional in nature and range from negative perceptions to a lack of understanding of the importance of high impact practices. Faculty perception of risk in innovation demonstrated that even a small doubt could create a lack of initiative support (Darby & Newman, 2014).

Faculty are the center of an institution, as are their perceptions and experience with a new process. To best support an educational environment that facilitates enhanced learning experiences, community colleges should explore how faculty understand and experience service-learning. In addition, a careful exploration of faculty experiences with service-learning pedagogical practice will provide information that will allow for the development of better support services, professional development, and incentive programs within the community college.
The Organization

To fully understand how service-learning pedagogical practices affect the community college, it is important to first discuss the high impact practice pedagogy. I will review two bodies of literature; high impact practices and service-learning and high impact practice pedagogical challenges. The first content area of research includes studies of high impact practices, service-learning, programs in development, action, and post-implementation. This first content area also includes successes and failures of service-learning innovations. The second content area of research includes the challenges and barriers found to impede high impact practices including faculty resistance and perceptions of service-learning. Following these two bodies of literature, a review of methodological issues and synthesis of the research findings will also be included. The conclusion of this literature review will include a critique of previous research and a chapter summary.

Conceptual Framework

Major concepts identified within the literature reviewed for this study involve key features of emotion and social experience and they evolve into need, communication, perception, and resistance. These key features connect the main concepts found in the two bodies of literature. This review addresses and these concepts help to facilitate a better understanding of how high impact educational practices like service-learning are received and processed. Each of these concepts falls under the idea of abstract reasoning and delivery methods. Mayer and associates (2001) discussed the theory of emotional intelligence and defined a core principle of intelligence as abstract reasoning. It stresses the need to see key similarities and differences while analyzing individual pieces to understand the idea in its entirety to determine validity. In this theory, abstract reasoning does not occur without an input function, as it requires a vector to deliver the information. In addition to obtaining the information, the mind must process and connect it to their experience.
within a social setting. Social constructivism suggests that faculty, as learners, construct knowledge from their social dealings, interpretation, and understanding (Adams, 2006). Using a social constructivist lens can facilitate a better understanding of the faculty experience with service-learning pedagogical practices to evaluate the following; faculty needs, communication, perception, and resistance.

Faculty needs within this literature review manifest as the need for understanding of high impact practices like service-learning, the need for educational enhancement, the need for personal advancement, the need for peer and administrative support, and the need for financial support. It is well established that high impact educational practices are innovative strategies and projects that have been noted to have an influence on student success and retention (O’Banion et al., 2010). In a study of faculty members, the participants were asked to list three most crucial factors that contribute to success with the innovation of any kind and two areas were highly rated; personal enthusiasm and the need to innovate. Disjointed approaches to the availability of technologies overall were also influential in expanding innovation (King & Boyatt, 2015).

Within the literature, the need for high impact educational practices is well expressed and includes the need for service-learning experiences (Fink, 2016). High impact educational practices are important since students of all ages and levels of experience do not always have awareness, control, or the ability to process and learn quickly (Willink & Jacobs, 2011). In addition to the need for personal and student growth, the need for peer and administrative support is equally important. Using the social constructivist lens, this can be visualized as forming the faculty member’s reality. In one study, leadership commitment at an institution was a leading cause of sustainable development or innovation (Lozano et al., 2015). Using this lens, it can be construed that a supportive environment can facilitate a social structure, or reality, that nurtures change and development. Acknowledging the need and desired support for faculty in areas such as time and
finances can facilitate innovative development. Time is a key issue for faculty and in a study surveying initiative development; the teachers needed more time for themselves, more autonomy, and self-organization (Serdyukov, 2017). The faculty members also expressed a need for peer validation and support, again contributing to the faculty reality in innovation, or in this case implementation of high impact practices. In a survey of community college administrators, the notion of the curmudgeon was identified as directly effecting faculty motivation and administrative support and cooperation. This curmudgeon can slow or stop change, create a culture that is negative and hostile, undermine respect and trust, create adversarial relationships, and can even take their vitriol to the outside community (O’Banion, 2015).

Financial support is critical in community colleges, where the institution is funded primarily by state and federal programs as many students utilize financial aid. In a climate of declining high school graduates and decreasing state funding, an innovation that is supported internally at an organization is more likely to succeed than one which is externally backed (King, & Boyatt, 2015). Challenges to implementation that were noted are the lack of planning, lack of evaluating the needs and capability of implementation, policies within the government, and erratic support. Many internal regulations have also stagnated the progress if the education of the proposed innovative initiative is lacking (Gómez-Merino, Trejo-Téllez, Méndez-Cadena, & Hernández-Cázares, 2017).

Communication challenges were also common throughout the literature review. Mezirow (1991) tells us that the purpose of communication is to educate individuals to understand what others mean and be understood as ideas are expressed through speech, key writings, plays, movies, television, and artistic expression. Communication of what high impact practices are defined as or what technology in education is, appear to be disjointed and inconsistent. Definitive statements on the meaning of technology-enhanced learning are rare and a shared understanding has not been
developed in higher education to define what enhances the student learning experience (Kirkwood & Price, 2014). Study results showed profiles for each way a faculty member perceived what innovation is in teaching and technology. Most faculty showed attitudes that acknowledged the value of technology in teaching, but one group showed a careful attitude and were doubting the merit of using technology-enhanced teaching (Kopcha et al., 2016). Humans will gravitate to results that don’t always make sense. Our sympathetic nervous system makes it so, like thinking an “expert” television will present content that is more accurate and succinct when, televisions do not think and present only what they are directed to (Nass & Yen, 2012). This example showcases how much we rely on what we feel and that even in the case where our brain should know better. Under this social constructivist lens if communication with faculty is disjointed, incomplete, or inaccurate the reality created is not the true reality and can influence perceptions and resistance to service-learning implementation. In fact, in one survey faculty members indicated that they had not seen any data on successful institutional high impact practices, thus creating an environment that seemingly has no successful High impact practices (Paulson, 2012).

Social constructivist theory suggests that knowledge is tied to the situation in which the knowledge is gained and can often be difficult to apply elsewhere (McKinley, 2015). It is recommended that learning environments should be as close to real-life as possible (Hodson & Hodson, 1998). Using this lens, inaccurate or selective communication can result in perceptions that form a new reality that can be detrimental to implementing new innovative techniques like service-learning. Perceptions of difficulty can create a reality that distorts the true ease of service-learning pedagogical practices and creates a common trend of faculty resistance because the notion of difficulty is too immense. Interview results of faculty members show a perception of risk was noted and demonstrated that even a small doubt can create a lack of initiative support (Darby &
Newman, 2014). Demonstrating social constructivism, many teacher perceptions have been shown to influence their teaching practices within the classroom (Kaymakamoglu, 2018).

This experience-driven social distortion can give rise to faculty resistance, which can further alter the perceived reality and culture of the institution. Often the individuals who exhibit the most resistance are established intellectual stakeholders, more specifically the professors (Deneen & Boud, 2014). Researchers also examined educators’ perceptions and methods of teaching and learning with technology and the results demonstrated experienced teachers having stagnant and solid conceptions, thus believing their teaching approach was more than adequate and change was not necessary (Englund et al., 2017). Other perceptions can be influenced by a deficiency in administrative or peer support, incomplete funding, professional development, interference with preparation time for tenure or promotion, required college service, teaching, grading, advising, no compensation for time, and only a diminutive advantage to tenure or promotion (Sutton & DeSantis, 2017).

High impact educational practices, like service-learning, have proven to be successful at diverse levels of education, student populations, and community locations. It is important to fully explore how these practices are successful to be equipped to analyze how they are implemented and the challenges that are presented during the time of initiation to full (or no) implementation. The social constructivist lens can be utilized to further understand the main concepts within this literature review and assess how these factors affect implementation of service-learning based on how the information regarding the need for this high impact practice was communicated, the support and communication received, benefits and limitations of the innovation, and the context in which the information was delivered.
Review of Research Literature and Methodological Literature

Innovation in higher education is loosely defined by The League of Innovations in the community college as the expansion of ideas for refining procedures, programs, practices, or employees (O’Banion et al., 2010). High impact educational practices, innovative strategies, and projects have been noted to have an influence on student success and retention. Categories of innovation can include but are not limited to; course development, instruction, student support services, community engagement, diversity, technology, learning outcomes, and sustainability. Course and program development are the major areas in community colleges where individuals embark upon innovative projects. Faculty and staff development and student support services also have high innovation potential. These areas are where high impact practices are most useful as student success and retention are most closely affected. One of the more common high impact practices is service-learning. This high impact practice is a pedagogy that integrates community service with instruction and reflection (Voss, Mathews, Fossen, Scott, & Schaefer, 2015). This combination of service and learning facilitates active learning in a meaningful way while fostering a sense of civic responsibility (Groh, Stallwood, & Daniels, 2011). Each of these service-learning course projects is unique and have beneficial results on student success and retention.

Service-learning as a high impact practice. Service-learning consists of four key identifiers that define service-learning scope of practice and what qualifies as a service-learning project. The first identifier is the learning itself must be experiential in nature, requiring the student to lead the learning process and experience it firsthand (Voss et al., 2015). Service-learning must include engaging activities that serve a need within the community and connects the students to the population they serve. Lastly, a reflective process must be included to allow students to complete their experiential path without outside bias (Voss et al., 2015). In a study evaluating experienced nursing preceptors’ experience with service-learning four common themes were extracted from the
data collected; reciprocity, intentional planning, and clarity, meaningful experience, and beneficial contributions that addressed an identified need (Voss et al., 2015). The preceptors that were interviewed had multiple experiences with service-learning projects and were able to reflect across these experiences. This study was a positive experience and highlights the benefits of utilizing service-learning pedagogical practices. Interviewing students within another nursing program described new and meaningful experiences that are useful in developing new programs (Knecht & Fischer, 2015).

A meta-analysis of 62 service-learning program studies with 11,837 students demonstrated that students participating in service-learning programs demonstrated important gains in their self-confidence, attitudes toward their ability in education, civic learning, social skills, and scholastic performance (Celio et al., 2011). Supporting this idea of service-learning influencing student success, comparative effects of service-learning on how students develop in college and how their learning experience is enhanced were evaluated (Astin et al., 2000). Within this early study (Astin et al., 2000) 22,236 college undergraduates were assessed in the fall semester of 1998 having entered college in 1994 as a freshman. Thirty percent of the students within the study had taken a course that had a service-learning component. In addition to this course-based service-learning, 46% of the students evaluated had participated in at least one other community service experience. The study utilized outcome measures that spanned from academic performance, values, to leadership. In addition, the study evaluated the student’s choice of service-learning careers and future intentions to participate in service after graduation. Qualitative findings within the study demonstrate that service-learning works to improve students’ outlook in personal efficacy, awareness of community, personal ethics, and engagement within the classroom. This early study of service-learning facilitated a base of success to encourage and enhance future service-learning.
Service-learning is also considered to be experiential learning. Another benefit to service-learning is engaging locally in the community with prospective employers. Experiential learning is an important piece in education and a 2009 study showed that recent college graduates left New England for jobs elsewhere (Sasser, 2009). The need for internships is there. The study shows that internships not only help educate students but can also assist in educating students about the local community, the local job opportunities, and assist employers in finding new talent and help boost the area community and reputation. In a survey of 2- and 4-year colleges, 41% of the 4-year colleges surveyed reported as having service-learning experience and 69% reported high-performance in service-learning and retention (Habley, & McClanahan, 2004). In a 2018 survey of community college students 73% of participants (students) had never participated in a service-learning project as part of a regular academic course (CCSSE, 2018)

**Challenges with high impact practices.** Research has shown that using high impact educational practices like service-learning help with the improvement of the students’ experience, enhanced learning, better retention rates, and academic success, especially in the underserved student population (Kuh, 2008). Despite positive evaluations of high impact practices, resistance still exists and influences the implementation of these innovations. Challenges manifest in many ways; ranging from a lack of time to faculty and student perceptions. Challenges are not often acknowledged even as they impact even the smallest projects from installing a new 3-D printer to a change to a learning management system. The challenges, or barriers, addressed in this study are the lack of time, technical issues, lack of financial support, lack of support from fellow colleagues or leaders, lack of evidence of effectiveness, resistance, effort, and perception.

Time is one of the major roadblocks to any change process and is apparent in a study of teachers (Collinson, & Cook, 2001). In this 2001 survey, it was discovered that there was no consistent perception or definition of time. Time was given, but no improvement had been noticed.
in performance outcomes. Delving further, teachers were looking for time will fellow instructors, uninterrupted time, time to learn recent technology, time to renew, and time to plan. In another article, a team-teaching approach was evaluated in an article regarding the development of an introductory course in Women’s, Feminist and Gender Studies. The author, one of nine teachers, described one of the most challenging aspects of the project: time. Time was a problem in the course preparation and the course suffered from the need for additional development time. The teachers needed more time for themselves, more autonomy, and self-organization (Serdyukov, 2017).

A study of faculty focus groups and interviews performed individually also showed a barrier to institutional adoption of an innovation was the disjointed approach to the availability of technologies for the whole institution (King, & Boyatt, 2015). In addition to this fragmented approach, institutional infrastructure, employee attitudes and skills, and perceptions of student expectations were determined to be essential to the adoption of e-learning. Definitions of success and failure of an educational technology ventures will depend on the perspective of the innovator within the organization, the adopter at the institution, and if they are open to reasonable negotiation and risk-taking. Individual innovations are often presented but need both financial and moral support. An innovation that is supported internally at an organization is more likely to succeed than one which is externally backed (King, & Boyatt, 2015).

In a time where state and federal funding are shrinking and the high school graduating population shrinking, funding plays a significant role in how high impact practices are implemented. There have been major initiatives to combat the underperformance in education, science, technology, and innovation in Mexico. Structural reorganizations in education, technology, and science that were proposed in the country since 2012 have not been successfully implemented (Gómez-Merino et al., 2017). Challenges that were noted are the lack of planning,
lack of evaluating the needs and capability of implementation, policies within the government, and erratic support. Many internal regulations have stagnated the innovation and education of the proposed innovation is lacking.

A survey of 77 community college presidents studied issues like the curmudgeon and their effect on the institution (O’Banion, 2015). Within this survey 97% of respondents had encountered a curmudgeon at the college and the primary classification was full-time faculty (O’Banion, 2015). These curmudgeons were shown to resist change, dwell on past failures, and are classified as the ultimate contrarian. They can influence others within the college population and can be detrimental to any innovation. The description CAVE stands for colleagues against virtually everything. The curmudgeon can slow or stop change, create a culture that is negative and hostile, undermine respect and trust, create adversarial relationships, and can even take their vitriol to the outside community (O’Banion, 2015).

Transforming learning frequently requires reassessment by teachers of what establishes teaching and learning. It requires erudite reasoning about the goals of any innovation, the design, and the interpretation of the results within an educational framework. Technology in learning is utilized to connect information and communication technologies with teaching and the learning process (Kirkwood, & Price, 2014). Definitive statements on the meaning of technology-enhanced learning are scarce and a mutual understanding has not been clearly defined in higher education to define what enhances the student learning experience.

An AAC&U survey of academic officers in over 1000 institutions show the use of some High impact practices which show a significant impact, but are mostly optional (Jaschik, 2015). Over 1000 institutions evaluated, and data showed that High impact practices were in use but not required (Jaschik, 2015). Voluntary requirements are not as successful. In addition to the lack of requirement, the more seasoned instructor often is capable of the least amount of change. In a
study spanning 10 years, the researchers examined educators’ perceptions, teaching methods with technology, and student learning with technology. The results demonstrated differences between beginner and veteran teachers. Although then newer teachers primarily held more perceptions focused on teaching and teacher-centric problems, they demonstrated a better ability to embrace innovations than their more seasoned colleagues. Experienced educators tended to express stagnant and solid conceptions. The respondents that demonstrated no change give the impression of pedagogical inaction; their teaching approach is more than adequate, and they do not need to change (Englund et al., 2017).

In a 10 year follow up study after participating in service-learning faculty were enabled to show their experience in service-learning from barriers to benefits. Some of the challenges presented included the amount of time needed for faculty and students, the lack of institutional support or the support of colleagues, limited financial resources, and minimal reward procedures. Faculty members who do use service-learning pedagogy are supported by their own dedication to social justice and by the significant effect it can have on others. (Cooper, 2014). Data from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE, 2018) and the Community College Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (CCFSSE, 2018) exemplify many of the challenges in innovating at the community college level and how adjunct faculty predominance and lack of support can influence student success (CCSSE, 2018). For example, 73% of students have never taken a service-learning infused course, and 47% of faculty have never participated in a service-learning activity (CCSSE, 2018). There is minimal documentation regarding faculty effect on students and many community college professors do not have any incentive to engage in professional development or in learning new teaching strategies, including technology (Goldrick-Rab, 2010). A predominance of adjunct faculty and other faculty issues can affect how a student learns and impact their success.
**Faculty perception.** Faculty perception is a primary motivation in any initiative and can often color not only the individual creating the perception, but those in contact with as well. In a 2016 study results showed profiles for each way a faculty member perceived what innovation is in regard to teaching and technology (Kopcha et al., 2016). When evaluating the data, four profiles were established and of four groups three had similar outlooks. Most faculty showed attitudes that acknowledged the value of technology in teaching, but one of the four groups showed a careful attitude and were doubting the merit of using this teaching method (Kopcha et al., 2016). A benefit to risk evaluation was evaluated when 24 faculty members from a university were interviewed about what benefits and challenges exist in teaching service-learning courses and what motivates faculty to continue to use this pedagogy. Using the interview results of faculty members, an article proposes a framework for understanding faculty members’ teaching service-learning courses and sustaining the courses (Darby, & Newman, 2014). The perception of risk here was higher in the fourth group and demonstrated that even a small doubt can create a lack of initiative support.

In a study that evaluated faculty perceptions of general education, a LEAP project that incorporated high impact educational practices (HIP) was followed. The study shows a connotation in comments that categorize the underserved student population separately from the traditional students (Paulson, 2012). Underlying assumptions regarding the high impact practice project were analyzed and 87% of target faculty responded. High impact practices in this study are utilized within general education, but many faculty members indicated that they have not encountered data that shows the impact of high impact practices. The study also looked at the infusion of High impact practices and faculty perceptions and results suggested that institutions should closely view the role of the institution in encouraging the faculty to use the available data and make changes to their curriculum. The study also showed that institutions should also look at tenure and promotion factors.
When evaluating teacher perceptions, a 2018 study showed that what faculty members perceived they practiced and what they actually practiced in the classroom differed in self-proclaimed traditional and constructivist teaching styles. Interview data showed teachers who supported and believed in constructivist learning and teaching showed their practice was traditional (Kaymakamoglu, 2018). Traditional practice was utilized more than a constructivist practice. This study demonstrated teacher perceptions influencing their belief in practice. (Kaymakamoglu, 2018). The constructivist curriculum can pose new problems in the classroom and student perception and a case study that viewed a change in curriculum created a contested and disrupted closed and top-down system of knowledge construction. Students in this study were tasked with focusing and controlling their own education. These students had difficulties and struggle while having to take responsibility for their own learning as is highlighted and encouraged in high impact practices.

**Review of Methodological Issues**

**Quantitative research studies.** A meta-analysis of the influence of service-learning on scholars (Celio et al., 2011) was performed to evaluate what the outcomes are in service-learning programs and the factors that indicate a more successful program. Previous studies in this area had been inconsistent and limited thus creating an appearance of minimal effect on student success. Understanding program effects can lead to better overall effects. A literature search from 1970 to 2008 was performed in databases, manually, and reference lists within were reviewed. Lastly, senior scholars that attended a 2007 Service-Learning Emerging Scholars seminar were contacted and asked for studies to review. In addition to the previously mentioned data collection, the study was limited by establishing inclusion criteria. The studies needed to meet six criteria areas that included being in English before 2008, evaluate a program that fits the definition of service-learning as an integral part of the curriculum, involve students in all levels of education, have a
control group, have enough data to calculate the size of the effect, and evaluates the service-learning course as a primary program component. Statistical review of previous quantitative research studies and a literature search was performed using a coding manual that defined each of the following sections: publication features, participant features, program features, methodological features, and outcome features. In a review of 62 studies compared to the control groups gains in five outcome areas were demonstrated. These areas included student attitudes toward self-identity, education, civic engagements, social skills, and performance in academics. In K–12 Service-Learning standards four recommended elements were used. All K–12 studies showed a significant positive effect on the five outcomes and programs that used all four recommended practices showed an even higher effect.

Viewing the retention of college graduates in New England Sasser (2009) focused his article on the importance of internships in New England to foster a graduate and employer connection to promote local job attainment. The researcher desired to demonstrate the need for internships in local businesses and focus on benefits that could be gained from these student internships. A survey and literature review using the Worcester Regional Research Bureau and the National Association of Colleges and Employers data was performed. Quantitative statistical analysis of descriptive research survey data demonstrated the primary reasons for leaving the local job market relate to the student knowledge of the area and the perceptions of available jobs in the area. Findings suggest internships to ease transparency into place, showcasing the available jobs and recruiting students.

A study performed in 2015 using data from a survey administered by the AAC&U was designed to evaluate the use of high impact educational practices in institutions within the United States (Jaschick, 2015). The key practices have been linked to student learning, engagement, and completion improvements. The AAC&U wished to survey the extent of adoption of these High
impact practices and created a survey regarding the requirement of high impact practices in their institutions. The study participants were 325 Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) within the AAC&U. The CAOs were asked to define if the key individual High impact practices were required or optional. This quantitative study demonstrated that other than a required first year-experience, academic series, and global cultural studies, high impact practices are primarily optional within the institutions surveyed.

**Qualitative research studies.** Kopcha and associates (2016) explored faculty perceptions of innovation in teaching strategy and education technology in their study that seeks to understand faculty perceptions of innovating teaching with technology. The goal of this study is to understand what faculty perceptions exist in innovation in teaching with technology in a research university. The goals of the study were in response to a new initiative at the university. These goals were to further explore the meaning of innovation in faculty teaching and learning, technology beliefs, and the subjectivity of the definition of innovation. In an annual faculty meeting, the attendees were questioned on their explanation of innovation in teaching methods that utilize technology. Thirty-six faculty agreed to participate (36 %) and definitions were broken into single sentences. This generated sixty-nine statements and researchers added nine. From this total a pilot of three teaching assistants evaluated and final 33 were chosen to Q sort. Twenty faculty members from nine different departments, varying ranks and almost equal male to female ratio were asked to rate the definitions by importance. Using Q methodology Mixed methods analysis of descriptive data was performed. Four perception profiles were demonstrated in the data set. Three of the four profiles shared the value of the importance of technology. The fourth group had a cautious and more reserved view of technology in teaching. The results also showed the definition of innovation within education is not always synonymous between different faculty members and terms should be used cautiously.
The goal of Cooper’s (2014) “Ten Years in the Trenches: Faculty Perspectives on Sustaining Service-Learning” was to revisit service-learning faculty members 10 years after initiation of service-learning projects. The study results assemble factors that have either assisted or impeded the faculty’s ability to sustain service-learning. The study was performed to review the success (or failure) of service projects in a selected faculty population. In a medium-sized public institution, an initiative began in 1998–2000 called Presidential Service-Learning Scholars. Fourteen faculty members from differing areas of specialty became members and initiated service-learning projects. Ten years later nine of the 14 agreed to interviews with five women and four men participating in the interview process. A constructivist comparative method was utilized to obtain the faculty perceptions on why they chose to participate, the impact on faculty tenure or possibility of promotion, the challenges, and benefits, and what sustained them in their service. Within the interview process, assorted reasons were given as to why faculty engaged in service-learning and felt it had a positive influence on their tenure process. Three participants had stated that negative peer attitudes toward service-learning were determined to be deterrents to the implementation of service. Three of nine individuals felt service-learning didn’t have a positive impact nor had a negative impact on tenure or promotion. Sustainability is demonstrated here to be determined by faculty and student perceptions and this influences the appeal of transformative properties of service-learning within the pedagogy.

Another study, Exploring Faculty Members’ Motivation and Persistence in Academic Service-Learning Pedagogy (Darby, & Newman, 2014) sought to provide a framework of understanding of faculty members’ reasons to persist in using service-learning pedagogy. The study was utilized to organize goals, expected outcomes, the perceptions of success, perceptions of difficulty in using service-learning pedagogy, and recommendations to secure success. Twenty-four service-learning faculty (6.5% of total faculty) at liberal arts universities in the southeastern
U.S. were interviewed. The participants were primarily female and were selected from an email list of service-learning faculty. Participants were asked what they felt were the overall benefits and challenges to using a service-learning pedagogy. In addition, they were asked motivation factors and deterents, and how to maintain and garner future support. Within this qualitative interview process, results demonstrated a cycle of reflection process that includes perceived causes of success and difficulty aligned with goals and outcome expectancies. Success is often perceived as student success, meeting community needs, developing core values, and faculty recognition. Difficulties are perceived as lack of student response, lack of recognition or administrative support, logistics, and negative community partner relationships. In continuing to analyze faculty perceptions and high impact practices the AAC&U (2017) explored faculty perceptions of high impact practices in general education. The study was developed to review the AAC&U’s program Give Students a Compass. This program was included in the Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative to include more High Impact Practices in the general education system. The study followed faculty from the nine participating institutions. Of the 12% of respondents 87% were faculty or instructional staff from many departments. Questions within the survey included fixed ratings and open-ended questions. Three researchers independently analyzed the written responses. Qualitative survey results within this study showed that faculty generally support high impact practices, but some faculty still hold onto traditional and habitual ways of teaching. Half of the respondents indicated high impact practices at their institutions would improve student learning outcomes and were aware of research taking place at their institution. When asked to rate the use of high impact practices by title vs. definition of the title it indicated a lack of clear definition of high impact practices. Faculty also indicated the availability of institutional high impact practices outcome data was lacking or nonexistent.
Delving further into faculty perceptions, in 2018 Kaymakamoglu compared how faculty perceived their practice was and what the actual classroom practice was in relation to Traditional and Constructivist teaching theory. The purpose of this study was to explore teachers’ perceived practice and their actual practice (Kaymakamoglu, 2018). The study evaluated traditional teacher-centric practice versus constructivist learner-centric practice and was designed to further understand teacher’s beliefs and the effect on student success. Ten EFL faculty members were selected to participate in interviews and observations in the classroom. Data was collected from the participants within the Cyprus Turkish State Secondary School system using qualitative interviews and observations. Faculty interviewed perceived their teaching as constructivist, but the observations showcased a majority of faculty adhering to the more traditional teacher-centric pedagogy. The faculty believed in the constructivist teaching and learning but failed to initiate the practice at the classroom level. In another study, the research question looked to evaluate student experience in a constructivist classroom and taking responsibility for their learning in a new course on curriculum design (Blignaut, 2014). In response to a merge of institutions in post-Apartheid South Africa, the researcher wished to explore the student experience with constructivist pedagogy in the new courses. Data was collected from reflective journal notes taken after each lecture in a new course. Additional data were also collected from focus group interviews, and student evaluation forms upon completion of the course. Participants were students enrolled in a 2008 curriculum design course ranging from age 18 to 23. The study included 67 students of varying ethnic backgrounds with the majority from upper to the middle class as the primary participant pool. The 2009 and 2010 courses were used as comparative groups. The qualitative reflective case study demonstrated that constructivist classroom changes are difficult, but ultimately result in deeper learning. Student resistance and satisfaction were the primary themes of the study.
Synthesis of Research Findings

Within this literature review full analysis of the articles demonstrated two major themes; faculty understanding and perceptions of service-learning. High impact educational practice research has demonstrated areas that have gone previously unnoticed. The success of high impact education practices has been well established and supports the requirement to drive for more service-learning. While establishing there is proven a success and a need for the pedagogy, there is much resistance to these innovative practices. This resistance is often demonstrated in faculty perceptions and manifests as certain barriers to the implementation of high impact practices. Service-learning serves the needs of the student, institution, and the community. This need generates new requirements for institutions and faculty and the key to student success and retention. A literature search from 1970 to 2008 showed service-learning having a significant positive effect on the five outcomes and programs that used all four recommended practices showed an even higher effect (Celio et al., 2011).

The study results also indicated that how faculty members do affect student success. New initiatives that arose and look to support faculty and help communicate changes or proposals by creating professional development and support which can result in more effective teaching (Goldrick-Rab, 2010). In a stunning find, high impact practices are primarily optional within many institutions surveyed (AAC&U, 2015). Proven student success tools are not required at institutions. Orientations, service-learning, experiential learning, and other high impact practices are not required. This creates no motivation for faculty to learn new pedagogy and gives administration the no power to enforce.

Faculty often view service-learning with a cautious attitude at best due to newness, challenges, and emotional changes (Warner & Esposito, 2008). Within the college structure, there are many areas that can affect how a new practice is implemented, or not implemented. The
teachers first needed more time for independence, autonomy, and self-organization for both teachers and students (Serdyukov, 2017). Time is a key piece to implementation and is often not considered or fully evaluated. Faculty were directly asked what their largest difficulty was in any new initiative and time was at the forefront (Serdyukov, 2017). Logistical issues can often create barriers and often a disjointed approach to the availability of technologies for the whole institution can influence the overall successful implementation (King, & Boyatt, 2015). Careful planning and research can improve upon these ideas and promote successful implementation. Lack of support both from peers and administration can impact how innovation is instituted. The curmudgeon (O’Banion, 2015) can take many forms and be a faculty, staff, or administrator. This negative attitude, or experience, and lack of support can derail implementation projects and influence future projects.

Problems in higher education often include the lack of available resources, support, professional development, contributing service provided, classroom instruction and advising, little financial return for their trouble, and a minimal benefit to tenure or promotion prospects (Sutton, & DeSantis, 2017). The time commitment needed for service-learning also competes with important demands like readying for tenure or promotion. These issues contribute to a formation of patterns of perceptions and resistance which can influence how projects are adopted. Effort and perception are influencing barriers and often the well-seasoned tenured faculty exhibit the most negative perceptions and perform at the lower levels (Englund et al., 2017). Faculty are often not acknowledged for the efforts taken and grow into the curmudgeon that O’Banion (2015) artfully describes.

While investigating the challenges to high impact practices it was demonstrated that these perceived barriers do impact the implementation and faculty are often put in positions where they are not prepared for the innovation or supported in implementation (King, & Boyatt, 2015).
these studies, it is demonstrated that a better handle on how high impact practices like service-learning are utilized and implemented is needed, and support and education for faculty can influence a better understanding of service-learning (O’Banion, 2015). Understanding these barriers to implementation facilitates better communication and future success in high impact practice curricula infusions. This will then improve retention, persistence, and achievement. Communication and understanding will also facilitate fewer barriers to implementation thus an increase in high impact practices.

Interview data from faculty members demonstrated results that included four perception profiles in the data set. Three of the four faculty profiles shared the value of the importance of technology. The fourth group was more cautious about technology and a more reserved view of technology in their teaching methodology. The results also showed the meaning of innovation in teaching and technology is not always synonymous between different faculty members and terms should be used cautiously (Kopcha et al., 2016). Three participants had stated that negative peer attitudes toward service-learning were determined to be deterrents to the implementation of service. Three of nine individuals felt service-learning lacked an impact on student outcomes and did not negatively impact tenure or promotion possibilities. Sustainability is determined by faculty and student perceptions, which influence the appeal of the transformative nature of service-learning within the pedagogy (Cooper, 2014). Perceived causes of success and difficulty aligned with goals and outcome expectancies. Success is often perceived as student success, meeting community needs, developing core values, and faculty recognition. Difficulties are perceived as lack of student response, lack of recognition or administrative support, logistics, and negative community partner relationships (Darby, & Newman, 2014). Perceptions in this case either supported or deterred the implementation of high impact educational practices.
Faculty also perceived their teaching as constructivist, but the observations showcased a majority of faculty adhering to the more traditional teacher-centric pedagogy. The faculty believed in the constructivist teaching and learning but failed to initiate the practice at the classroom level. (Kaymakamoglu, 2018). This demonstrates the influence that personal perceptions have on faculty’s way of thinking. A lack of strategic direction, staff attitudes, and perceived student expectations were perceived issues and often faculty felt disconnected from the initiatives.

The faculty generally supported high impact practices, but some faculty still hold onto traditional and habitual ways of teaching. Half of the respondents indicated high impact practices at their institutions would improve student learning outcomes and were aware of research taking place at their institution. When asked to rate the use of high impact practices by title vs. definition of the title it indicated a lack of clear definition of high impact practices. Faculty also indicated the availability of institutional high impact practices outcome data was lacking or nonexistent (AAC&U, 2015) Faculty have difficulty remaining connected to the institution’s strategic plan, administration, initiatives, and the latest research. Faculty have difficulty in realizing that constructivist classroom changes are difficult but ultimately result in deeper learning (Blignaut, 2014).

**Critique of Previous Research**

A literature search from 1970 to 2008 of 62 K–12 studies of service-learning programs showed a significant positive outcomes and programs that used all recommended practices showed an even higher effect. (Celio et al., 2011) Here the researchers established inclusion criteria and the studies needed to meet six criteria areas that included being in English before 2008, evaluate a program that fits the definition of service-learning as an integral part of the curriculum, involves students in all levels of education, has a control group, has enough data to calculate the size of the effect, and evaluates the service-learning course as a primary program component. Utilizing
specific inclusion criteria limits the study and creates a smaller lens. This is critical in such a large study to get meaningful results.

One area that has a striking influence in validity of research is the participants and sample size. In quantitative studies, it is far better to have a larger participant pool to ensure valid statistical analysis. For example, the Student Experience in the Research University, with a vast number of students participating in six different research universities, used quantitative statistical analysis of student survey data (Stebleton & Soria, 2012). Using bootstrapping analysis of the following factors: competing job responsibilities, family responsibilities or other competing responsibilities, weak English or math skills, lack of study skills, lack of good study environment, depression or emotional upheaval, and illness or condition, a map of student barriers was created (Stebleton & Soria, 2012). Utilizing such a large data set allows for a broad sweep of the intended population, thus placing more value on the results.

Other surveys utilized regional college surveys and employers, large numbers of students and faculty to survey the needs of the institutions, community, faculty, and students. Goldrick-Rab (2010) categorized a survey by macro Level, institutional level, and the socio-economic academic level. The search was performed in the Educational Research Center database, Education Full-Text database, and the Social Science Abstracts database. The keywords utilized ranged from community college students to barriers. From this search the results were filtered to fit two criteria: they were quantitative in nature (or qualitative with rigorous research), and they needed to have results that could be applied beyond the study and on community college students. A qualitative multilevel model literature review of previous study data demonstrated areas for policy reform in the community colleges (Goldrick-Rab, 2010). This survey helped to accurately gauge what barriers existed to high impact practices and appropriately choose policies to reform. Other studies had large numbers of faculty participation rates, for example, 36 faculty agreeing to participate (36
and definitions of innovation broken into single sentences (Kopcha et al., 2016). Others had mixed-method approaches with fixed ratings and open-ended questions (AAC&U, 2015) to create a more inclusive survey with a 12% participation rate.

Another valuable resource within a valid study is the utilization of a control group. A study that evaluated traditional teacher-centric practice versus constructivist learner-centric practice was designed to further understand teacher’s beliefs and the effect on student success. Ten EFL faculty members were selected to participate in interviews and observations in the classroom. Bloom and Sommo (2005) analyzed student persistence, completion, and credits earned by using a large sample pool and a control group. The use of a control group validates the true effect of the study areas.

Key areas were evaluated to be weaknesses within the studies reviewed including lack of diversity, reliance on administration evaluation, single courses, smaller research pools, and a lack of established institutions. One article looked to evaluate student experience in a constructivist classroom and taking responsibility for their learning in a new course on curriculum design (Blignaut, 2014) with participants ranging from age 18 to 23. The study included 67 students of varying ethnic backgrounds with the majority from upper to the middle class as the primary participant pool. The lack of age variation and socioeconomic status could skew the results. Within a 2016 study, 706 students participated (15.7% of the total student body) which appears to be a large pool, but not necessarily representative of the whole student population (Junco, Mastrodicasa, Aguiar, Longnecker & Rokkum, 2016).

In other research, 24 service-learning faculty (6.5% of total faculty) were interviewed to the overall benefits and challenges were in using a service-learning pedagogy (Darby & Newman, 2014) providing a very small picture of the use of service-learning. In a 6-year follow up of the previously mentioned study Sommo and associates (2012) sought to measure the initial 2005 study
at Kingsborough Community College six year’s impact on students that participated in the study. The study followed random students six years after completion of a one-semester course. A total of 769 students in the treatment group and 765 in the control group were researched. They collected transcript data, outcomes data, and completion data. Qualitative case study review demonstrated no significant difference between the control group and treatment group in total credits or degree completion, suggesting that if an effect was demonstrated it was not within the data studied.

**Chapter 2 Summary**

In summary, this literature review addressed service-learning in the community college by first reviewing what high impact practices are, what service-learning is and their importance, and what barriers and perceptions exist to implementation. Within this literature review, service-learning was shown to have a significant effect on student success but was also not shown to be utilized within the community college. Barriers and perceptions to implementation are identified but have primarily been reviewed from a researcher or administrative perspective instead of at the faculty level, in the perceived “trenches” (Cooper, 2014). Faculty work directly with the students and are primarily responsible for the implementation of critical high impact education practices like service-learning within the classroom, but the faculty voice is rarely sought to address the barriers that exist to prevent implementation.

Based on this review of literature, which constructs a conceptual framework using the importance of service-learning as a high impact practice and critical areas in high impact practice implementation to understand the challenges and perceptions that exist from a faculty perspective, there is sufficient evidence for an investigation exploring the impact of these faculty experiences would generate socially significant findings. I can thus claim that this literature review has provided solid a support for beginning a research project to answer the following research questions:
1. How do community college faculty members describe their experiences with service-learning pedagogy?
   a. How do community college faculty members describe how their experiences formed perceptions of service-learning pedagogy?
2. How do community college faculty members describe their experience in service-learning implementation at the course level?
Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction to Chapter 3

High impact practice teaching methods are defined as educational approaches that have been thoroughly studied, researched, and positively affect students’ educational progress (Kilgo et al., 2015). Key features of high impact practices include increasing student retention, improving engagement, and providing lifelong learning techniques (Kilgo et al., 2015). These educational practices are designed to be incorporated into classroom pedagogy or institutional structure changes to improve student outcomes. Curriculum practices that infuse service-learning have been recognized as a high-impact educational practice as they help promote active and engaged learning while increasing student academic performance (Kuh, 2008). Service-learning is a pedagogical innovation that fosters a sense of civic responsibility and enhanced learning (Hatcher et al., 2017). Despite the success of service-learning initiatives at multiple community colleges, the majority of community college faculty members do not utilize service-learning pedagogical practices (CCSSE, 2018). Even with continued support for service-learning and documented positive outcomes, many faculty believe barriers exist that deter them from utilizing service-learning pedagogy (Hou & Wilder, 2015).

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore community college faculty members’ understanding of and experiences with service-learning, with an interest in identifying the types of barriers that exist, if any, to the implementation of service-learning pedagogical practices. To best support an educational environment that facilitates enhanced learning experiences, community colleges should explore how faculty understand and experience service-learning. In addition, a careful exploration of faculty experiences with service-learning pedagogical practice will provide information that will allow for the development of better support services, professional development, and incentive programs within the community college.
This chapter includes a description of the procedure of the study. Within this procedure, I outline the research questions, how I chose the research design, and the purpose of the research. I then describe the research population, sampling method, instrumentation, and data collection and analysis processes. In the conclusion of this chapter, I review the limitations of the study, including credibility and dependability along with any expected findings and ethical concerns within the study.

**Research Questions**

The overarching research question for this study was: How do community college faculty experience service-learning pedagogical practices? Subquestions were:

1. How do community college faculty members describe their experiences with service-learning pedagogy?

   a. How do community college faculty members describe how their experiences formed perceptions of service-learning pedagogy?

2. How do community college faculty members describe their experience in service-learning implementation at the course level?

The research questions connected to the study’s phenomenological focus, the community college faculty members’ experiences with service-learning, and elicited information on the experiences of faculty with service-learning pedagogical practices. Faculty members’ experiences often generate perceptions that influence curriculum and classroom practices at the college level (Jaschik, 2015). This study was designed to shed light upon faculty member experiences in implementing service-learning and how these experiences have shaped their own perceptions of this phenomenon.
Purpose and Design of the Study

The purpose of this phenomenological study is to explore community college faculty experiences with service-learning, with particular focus on understanding their challenges and successes with service-learning and the barriers faculty have experienced in their implementation of this pedagogical practice. To best support an educational environment that facilitates enhanced learning experiences (Kilgo et al., 2015), community college leaders must explore how faculty understand and experience service-learning. In addition, a careful exploration of the barriers, opportunities, and successes that faculty have experienced with the service-learning pedagogical practice will provide information that will allow for the development of better support services, professional development, and incentive programs within the community college environment.

Exploring how faculty experience service-learning and resistance to service-learning can help reveal areas that are problematic to the service-learning process. In unpacking these experiences, community college leaders can isolate problematic areas in service-learning adoption and sustainability while scrutinizing what support or policies exist for service-learning. Examining these key areas in service-learning pedagogy will allow community colleges to encourage robust service-learning projects that are well communicated and supported with faculty incentives and professional development.

In exploring the experiences of community college faculty with implementing service-learning, program chairs, directors, student support services, and college-wide administrators can help to support these valuable curricular endeavors. A program that contains a communication policy and improved support services is vital to maintain a consistently supported program. In addition to developing a supported service-learning program, administrators can offer more robust and focused professional development for faculty and staff that promotes informed and well-educated stewards of service-learning pedagogical practices.
I selected the interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) as my research design. With this study, the main objective is to explore how faculty experience service-learning and how their experiences influence their perceptions of this high impact practice. My desire was to analyze their knowledge of service-learning, their experiences with this pedagogical practice, and how they navigate challenges in implementation and learn from their successes. IPA explores how individuals make sense of their experiences (Smith et al., 2013). Researching the lived experience, according to van Manen, allows the researcher to gain a deeper understanding of the meaning of the experience (Heinonen, 2015). The benefits to this research design are that IPA does not attempt to predefine experience. Rather, it seeks to understand each individual experience and individual “things” that contribute to this experience (Smith et al., 2013). With this design, I was able to analyze what faculty experience in teaching with service-learning, what perceptions they form, and how they navigate implementation.

The purpose of phenomenological research is to understand lived experience or phenomena. The phenomena are that which become manifest for us (Heidegger, 1962) and are brought into being by living and experiencing. IPA is committed to researching how people make sense of their major life experiences (Smith et al., 2013). This research design also helps to provide a comprehensive description of the lived experience (Moustakas, 1994). As individuals are engaged in experience in their lives, they reflect on the significance of what is happening, and IPA research focuses on engaging these reflections (Smith et al., 2013). This process of reflection and making sense of experience follows hermeneutics, or knowledge that deals with interpretation. IPA is often termed a double hermeneutic process as the researcher needs to interpret how the participant is interpreting their own experience (Smith et al., 2013). IPA studies have a smaller homogenous sample size with semistructured interviews to allow participants to reflect on and explore the phenomena under investigation. It is imperative to understand the lived experience
when evaluating high-impact practices, such as service-learning, in higher education. Through a phenomenological exploration of faculty experience with service-learning, a greater understanding of implementation, challenges, and successes with this type of pedagogy can be found.

When employing a phenomenological approach, the goal is to conceptualize processes of mental life, how situations are meaningfully lived as they are experienced, with nothing added and nothing subtracted (Giorgi, Giorgi, & Morley, 2017). Within this study, the situation, or phenomenon, is instructing with a service-learning component within a community college. Using this phenomenological approach, it is important to have two procedures to study the lived experience, the epoche of natural sciences and the epoche of the natural attitude. Epoche is the act of refraining from any conclusion for or against anything (Moustakas, 1994). The epoche of natural sciences leaves out other knowledge including theories, prior research, and hypotheses. The epoche of the natural attitude leaves out assumptions and anything extraneous that does not have to do with the experience. Intentionality and phenomenology look to how we are meaningfully connected to the world (Vagle, 2014), and this connection can manifest as resistance. Following Husserl’s theory (1964), this research will explore the life-world as it is lived, or within the faculty experience as they use service-learning in their courses at a community college.

Research Population and Sampling Method

My population consisted of 10 faculty members at one community college who were purposefully selected to participate in this study. The purposeful sampling method engages participants who will give the most vision within the research questions (Creswell, 2013). They are individuals that have experience with the phenomenon being investigated and can provide insight about it. One strategy of purposeful sampling is to identify and select all cases that meet a predetermined criterion (Palinkas et al., 2015). This predetermined criterion, or faculty who have taught with service-learning within their course, is an appropriate sample population to provide
insight in the practice of service-learning. Within this population my goal was to include a diverse group of faculty members at the community college research site. Utilizing full- and part-time instructors, males and females, and instructors with differing levels of experience and areas of expertise allowed for ample insight on this phenomenon. Within community colleges, service-learning courses and participating faculty are often tracked by roster and a civic engagement department or office. Accessing this list from the relevant college office allowed me to invite participants who have used service-learning in their courses.

**Instrumentation**

Since the purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore community college faculty experiences with service-learning, it was best to select a research design that did not manipulate data, instead allowing for an exploration of narratives and participant experiences with a phenomenon (Moustakas, 1994). Utilizing semistructured interviews with open-ended questions allowed for a collection of data from an unbiased interview structure (Creswell, 2013). This individual interview structure allowed the participant to tell the story of their experience within an environment in a way that was free from pressure to provide the “right” answer and free from pressure from peers, and that limited the possibility of others’ influence their answers.

Using a semistructured interview guide, I followed the steps described in this section. I identified prerequisites for using the interview method, and using previous knowledge, I created a preliminary guide, piloted the interview, and used the guide in interviews (Kallio, Pietilä, Johnson, & Kangasniemi, 2016). Using this interview guide allowed me to study participants’ perceptions, opinions, or other complex issues in a way that was meaningful to the participant and diversified the data I collected. Utilizing previous knowledge of both the participants and my own experience allowed for an understanding of service-learning pedagogy that resulted in a more comprehensive interview framework.
Once this framework was established, I began data collection through interviews, using previous knowledge to extract the main themes of the data and generate follow-up questions. Piloting the interview guide allowed me to confirm the scope of the interview, to determine if the questions were relevant to the purpose of the study, and to identify areas that needed restructuring or reformulation (Kallio et al., 2016). This process allowed for any clarifying changes to be made before full implementation of the established interview guide. Once piloted, the guide was used for the initial interview rounds, and further follow-up questions were developed after thematic coding of the initial data was completed. A follow-up questionnaire was administered, and additional follow-up questions were also addressed within the focus group. A semistructured interview method was successful in enabling interchange between the interviewer and each participant, which allowed the interviewer to create follow-up questions based on participants’ responses and thematic analysis, a method for identifying, analyzing, organizing, describing, and reporting themes found within a data set (Kallio et al., 2016). Interview questions were designed to gather data within the participants’ experience with service-learning and allowed the researcher to complete the hermeneutic process (see Appendix B). Themes and final questions were addressed in focus groups upon completion of the two interview steps to further triangulate the data.

Data Collection

Three methods were used to collect data within this study: semistructured interviews, a follow-up questionnaire, and a focus group. Using three data collection methods allowed for maximum data collection and appropriate sample consistency. The goal for this research study was to collect data from a small homogenous sample of faculty members in a community college who have adopted service-learning in one or more course.

Participant demographic and experience survey. Demographics of prospective participants were collected via a survey of faculty members who have used service-learning
pedagogy in their classrooms. This initial demographic survey included questions regarding gender, ethnicity, age, years of teaching, academic discipline, and service-learning experience in the community college (see Appendix A). Interview participants were chosen from the demographic survey results to ensure diverse participants who had experience with service-learning within the sample population. The primary focus of the sampling method was to identify an initial sample of purposively chosen faculty members who have engaged in service-learning pedagogy. Purposive sampling within the pool of faculty members who have experienced service-learning pedagogy was utilized to reduce the number of prospective participants to 10. Participants’ service-learning experience was not limited to the United States, as service-learning projects can be global initiatives, and the experience was not limited to the participant’s current institution, as long as the institution was a community college.

A 10 faculty members was desired with equal representation of full- and part-time faculty, male and females, new and seasoned faculty, and a diverse range of disciplines. The experience portion of the survey contained questions that assessed the participants’ basic experience with service-learning and experience prior to service-learning. These questions also explored their willingness to continue using service-learning, if they would recommend it to a peer, and explanations why (or why not). These survey questions also contributed to the formation of follow-up interview questions for a survey and a focus group after the interview data was collected and coded.

Semistructured interview. The research data was sourced from carefully chosen interview questions to assess faculty members’ level of service-learning and high-impact practice knowledge and experience. The data collection focused primarily on direct interaction with faculty members on a one-to-one basis. This one-on-one interaction consisted of in-depth interviews with a semistructured interview script. The semistructured interviews contained a series of open-ended
questions based on the research questions and faculty experience with service-learning pedagogical practices and resistance to service-learning (see Appendix B). With this semistructured design, I was able to prompt the participant and allowed for expansion into differing experiences to cover the potential areas needed to understand these experiences. The interviews took place in a scheduled room or mutually convenient meeting area and lasted approximately one hour. The interviews were recorded and transcribed from the recording. Recorded data was also confirmed by the participants via email and member checking.

**Follow-up questionnaire.** Following the interviews and coding of the data, a follow-up questionnaire was emailed to the participants (see Appendix C). Additional questions were added to the questionnaire to further explore any themes that were identified from the interview transcripts. Participants were asked within this follow-up process to further assess and connect the importance of the themes that arose in the initial interview data coding.

**Focus groups.** Following both the initial interviews and follow-up questionnaires small focus group of interview participants was held. A focus group is a discussion held within a group of participants on a particular topic for research purposes (Gill, Stewart, Treasure, & Chadwick, 2008). The focus group followed a semistructured question guide (see Appendix D), and the discussions involved the themes identified in the interview process. This approach allowed me to clarify and extend the discussion of the data collected through the interviews. Using a focus group allowed for the collection of collective views and meanings that can be overlooked (Gill et al., 2008). This process allowed for validation of the data in a meaningful way to the participants and completed the data triangulation.
Identification of Attributes

Kolb and Kolb (2012) define learning as the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience. It is important to understand the steps of experiential learning to fully grasp faculty understanding of service-learning, experiences utilizing this pedagogy, and experiences with resistance to this pedagogy. Within experiential learning, these concepts are often presented as a cyclical model, as they continually connect in a transformative learning process. These concepts include concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation in a new situation (Kolb & Kolb, 2012). Within this learning process, a new experience is encountered, and observations are made. From these observations a new idea forms, and finally, the learner applies the newly formed idea in their environment. Within this transformative experience, learners demonstrate new perceptions, knowledge acquisition, experience, and behaviors.

Learners are often presented with situations that will require logical thought, assessment, and reasonable conclusion making. Without the ability to revise existing thoughts when presented with the latest information, humanity would be unable to evolve. These steps—conflict, scanning, imagination, openness, and interpretation—are necessary for facilitating this process. Service-learning embraces these steps as a part of the experiential learning process. These steps are important pieces in the development of a well-rounded and successful student or graduate. A crucial step in transformative learning is a reflection, interpretation of the conflict, and the occurrences after the initial questioning. Service-learning projects also look back on what transpired to further validate within student learning and sharing of this knowledge with others.

High-impact practices like service-learning contribute to the formation of an educational learning base that adults will carry throughout their experiences in life. This solid base allows for future cognitive developments and adjustments of suppositions as new experiences occur. Adults
will have a solid experience to reference and will have developed values and frames of reference that will assist them in their education (Mezirow, 1997).

**Data Analysis Procedures**

Intentional analysis is the procedure of reflecting and describing the how and what of the experience. It also looks at how experiential processes proceed and what is experienced, and it allowed me to analyze how the participants experience service-learning (Smith et al., 2013). The eidetic analysis is a single example of the kind of experience under investigation that allows for free imaginative variation (Smith et al., 2013). This single instance is an example of the phenomenon and includes a generalizing procedure that results in clarifying the characteristics and structure, or essences, of the phenomena. Within the analysis procedures, I utilized eidetic reduction. Eidetic reduction is a process that includes selection, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming collected data (Smith et al., 2013). Eidetic analysis involves respecting and listening to every participant’s unique experiences (Heinonen, 2015).

Concept mapping is a reduction practice that allows for this type of data analysis. Concept maps are used for data collection based on a participant’s generated expression of meaning. After data collection and concept mapping, researchers can then specifically design follow-up questions using participant-generated themes to help guide a more in-depth analysis of the phenomena (Wheeldon & Faubert, 2009). Concept mapping is a practice that establishes how researchers visualize relationships between attributes and concepts within the collected data (Wheeldon & Faubert, 2009).

I used concept maps to frame the faculty experience and assess their knowledge base and experiences with service-learning pedagogical practices in the community college and to determine if additional data collection strategies were necessary. Utilizing a modified mapping process allowed for a reduction process that removed extraneous data and helped determine meaningful
patterns and themes within the data. Within this process the divergent themes and the need for possibly more data collection were identified (Wheeldon & Faubert, 2009). The statements within the map provided direction for the operationalization of a concept or theme within the research.

Within this mapping process, the responses were edited for clarity and sorted for themes, the number of concepts was determined, and the major clustered themes were collected. In vivo coding was utilized in this study to identify common themes within the data. In vivo coding is the practice of assigning a label to a section of data, such as an interview transcript, using a word or short phrase taken from that section of the data (Saldaña, 2016). While the coding process is collective, visual, changing, emerging, and divergent, it should also be verified to identify the trustworthiness of the data (Gelman, 2011). Validity is also established based on the rejection of themes or data that is extraneous. This verifying and validating process allows for a study that is reliable. I conducted this process on my own, and I used NVivo software to verify and validate themes, which provided me with the most reliable coding results. The saturation point of data is respective and thematic, which presented evidence that I had enough data and the coding is valid. Just as mind map teaching techniques help students organize their knowledge effectively, concept mapping in data analysis allows the researcher to categorize themes and better access new concepts (Dhindsa, Makarimi-Kasim, & Roger Anderson, 2011).

**Limitations of the Research Design**

There can be challenges in using the purposeful sampling strategy in any study (Palinkas et al., 2015). These challenges may arise from a variation in a sample that is not always identified at the start of the sampling. By utilizing a sample that specifically considers faculty who have practiced service-learning pedagogy, unintended variation was diminished. In fact, any variation left after gating this population allowed for diversification of the experiences with service-learning pedagogy and resistance to this curriculum change.
Interpretive phenomenological analysis has four major conceptual and practical limitations that can be encountered in a research study (Tuffour, 2017). The first limitation concerns phenomenological studies’ giving little recognition to language. Experience interpretations are limited by language (Smith et al., 2013). In the case of this study, language is addressed in interview narratives and active discussion by acknowledging participants’ experience and with clarifying questions to maintain focus. A careful inclusion of language and culture, while keeping the focus on the particular area of interest and bracketing any pre-conceived bias, allows for minimization of language limitations. The second possible limitation that often arises is whether this method accurately captures meanings of experiences instead of opinions. In this study, opinions are central to personal experience and allowed for visualization of faculty experience with resistance to service-learning pedagogy. The third potential limitation is that often a focus on perception occurs and limits understanding. Understanding the lived experience is the purpose of phenomenological analysis but does not explain why these experiences occur (Tuffour, 2017). In this study, perceptions were important to understanding the resistance to service-learning, and this perceived limitation became an asset. The last limitation is that cognition in phenomenology is often not properly understood (Tuffour, 2017). In this study, however, the process of experience and how faculty acquire service-learning knowledge was important to understand the resistance to service-learning pedagogical changes.

Validation

For this study the use of three data collection methods allowed for verification of the data. Horizontalization is a process that values each participant’s statement of experience equally (Moustakas, 1994). Each account must be taken into consideration and analyzed equally in this study to ensure validity. To ensure validity in the study participants were initially screened to ensure that they had experience using service-learning pedagogy, were community college
instructors, and were willing participants in the study (Fusch & Ness, 2015). This screening allowed for confirmation of realistic and transferrable data that represents their experiences with service-learning pedagogy. Each study participant’s interview was recorded, and careful review of notes and recordings was performed to verify the accuracy of notes taken during the interview process. After typing the handwritten notes, I also confirmed the typed copy with the handwritten notes to ensure no data was lost. Concept maps were created from the interview transcripts (see Appendix A), and thematic coding notes were imaged and confirmed as well. I bracketed off my own perceptions and experience to reduce their influence within the interview process. I also supported protected data by keeping a research journal in addition to recording of the data. The quality of data collected, and the authentication of data and findings are important in qualitative research and require strong commitments to data accuracy (Alase, 2017).

All data within the coding process was kept and journaled to ensure there is no loss of data. A continuous process review was performed to ensure accurate data transcription and catch any errors before and after the coding process. IRB applications were completed for both Concordia University–Portland and at the study site, and all guidelines were followed.

**Expected Findings**

Given my previous research and experience with service-learning, I expected faculty to have extensive experience with resistance to service-learning pedagogy. I expected that they would have experienced it themselves and with fellow faculty members. High-impact practices, as a recent pedagogical shift in higher education, have brought about new challenges. Many faculty members have experienced this change and some of the challenges associated with it.

Faculty members often perceive different barriers to success than administrators do. Barriers to implementation of high-impact educational practices exist at many levels, and understanding faculty experiences allows for a more thorough process of implementation of high-
impact practices like service-learning. These barriers will most likely include time constraints, technical issues, lack of financial support, lack of peer or administrative support, lack of proof of the success of service-learning, and other influences such as difficulties working with the pedagogy.

**Ethical Issues in the Study**

To ensure this study is dependable and ethical I excluded prospective participants who were administrators who also teach, as administrators are often required to participate in process change due to accreditation standards or have had to make decisions with more information at the administrative level. By leaving out administrators it removed an unconscious bias that might be inserted in my data collection and analysis.

**Conflict of Interest Assessment and Researcher’s Position**

This study involved a single researcher, the principal investigator. There may have been bias toward the study because the assumption of the principal investigator was that faculty who have engaged in service-learning will have a desire for student success and would support service-learning. Triangulation, member checking, and research journaling with reflection were used in this study to prevent that bias. No conflicts of interest were reported within this study.

**Ethical issues**

There were minimal risks of ethical issues as the study did not involve a clinical trial or any other bodily or emotional risk. All faculty were invited to participate via an email letter of invitation. This letter included the scope and purpose of the study. It also included a statement of confidentiality, informed consent, voluntary participation, and withdrawal options, and clearly stated the benefits and risks using a consent form. Permission was sought to record interviews; use confidential data, such as quotes from the interview transcripts; and participate in a follow-up interview should one be necessary. Participants remained confidential for the entirety of the study.
They were able to refuse to answer any question and were informed that they could request to withdraw from the study at any time. All data was kept on a password-protected Office 365 One Drive file folder. All computers used in this study were password or fingerprint protected, and data backups were stored on a locked password-protected storage drive. Upon completion of the study and publication of the dissertation all digital materials will be deleted, and paper copies shredded.

**Chapter 3 Summary**

This chapter provided the description of how I conducted this interpretive study. I furnished the rationale for the research design and the creation of an interview framework and guide. I described the rationale for the study population and the selection of participants using purposeful sampling. Interpretive phenomenological analysis was the design chosen for interview data analysis and the research steps were described. In this chapter I also described the methods I used to ensure study dependability and validity. These methods include purposeful sampling, diversified sample selection, semistructured interview guide creation, data checking, and transcription confirmation.

I ensured ethical dependability by fully disclosing all study aspects upon invitation to the study. The participants were voluntary, kept confidential, and free to withdraw at any time. Informed consent was sought, and consent forms signed and stored. All actions within the research study were maintained in a research journal and transcriptions were checked consistently to ensure the validity of the data.
Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Results

Introduction to Chapter 4

This chapter describes the data collected through surveys, interviews, and focus group with 10 community college faculty members who have used service-learning as a pedagogy in their teaching. This snapshot of service-learning experience in a New England public community college presents common challenges and successes in service-learning pedagogy. Exploring how faculty experience service-learning can reveal areas that are problematic to the service-learning process. Using the experience of faculty members, who are at the core of service-learning pedagogy, allows for identification of problematic areas within service-learning implementation and utilization. Probing these important areas in service-learning will allow community colleges to support healthy service-learning projects that are well communicated and supported in the institution.

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore community college faculty experiences with service-learning. The primary focus of this study to understand the challenges and successes faculty have experienced with this pedagogical practice. Despite many successful service-learning initiatives in higher education, many faculty members are not engaged in these activities. This careful exploration of barriers, opportunities, and successes that faculty have experienced with service-learning pedagogical practice provides information that will allow for the development of better support services, professional development, and incentive programs within the community college environment. In addition to developing a supported service-learning program, administrators can offer focused professional development for faculty and staff that promotes informed and well-educated stewards of service-learning pedagogical practices.

The data for this study were collected over a period of three months from 10 community college faculty participants through one-on-one semistructured interviews, a Qualtrics follow-up
survey, and a final focus group. The study began after receiving approval from the University's and
the research site’s Institutional Review Boards (IRB) and concluded on April 2019 with the focus
group. The faculty participants were selected via demographic survey for their service-learning
experience, teaching experience, level of education, race, and gender. The 10 faculty participants
volunteered to participate in a one-on-one interview session. Each individual interview was
recorded and transcribed immediately after the interview, and the transcripts were sent to the
participant via email within 24 hours for a review of accuracy. The interviews were completed in
April 2019.

The Qualtrics survey was self-designed to confirm identified themes after thematic analysis
of the interviews was complete. Within this follow-up survey the faculty participants were asked
simple yes or no questions to confirm their experience with time constraints, workload increases,
student resistance, and institutional support. The faculty participants were also asked in an open-ended question to clarify their experience with the aforementioned themes. The faculty participants
also submitted responses to a variety of Likert-style survey questions regarding experiences and
interpretations of experience. The survey was emailed to the participants in March 2019, and one
reminder email was sent to encourage participation. All participants completed the survey in April
2019. The faculty participants’ responses to the interview questions, follow-up survey items, and
focus group questions provided rich data for answering the overarching research question and
subquestions of this study:

1. How do community college faculty members describe their experiences with service-
learning pedagogy?
   a. How do community college faculty members describe how their experiences
      formed perceptions of service-learning pedagogy?
2. How do community college faculty members describe their experience in service-learning implementation at the course level?

I have extensive experience with service-learning pedagogy and in my role as a faculty member. During this study I restrained from sharing personal preferences and beliefs about service-learning implementation, utilization, and sustainability. During all the research phases (interviews, surveys, and focus group) I did not discuss my own experiences with service-learning, as my sole role was to ask the predetermined questions and record participants’ answers. In some cases, clarification of an answer was necessary to fully grasp the participant experience.

Confidentiality was maintained throughout the research process, and each faculty participant was designated as an interview number and speaker number. After transcribing the interviews each interview transcript was emailed to the participant’s preferred email address to validate the accuracy of the transcript. The follow-up survey was constructed to be available only with a direct link, which was distributed only to the interview participants. The focus group consisted of four faculty participants who had been interviewed.

This chapter details the data obtained from all three phases of research and provides an analysis of the research process itself and the procedures utilized. Each data set is presented as the research progressed, first in regard to the response of the research question and then within subsequent patterns and themes throughout the participant responses. Key findings from this study indicate that faculty view service-learning as an essential tool for student success, but faculty members experience many challenges within the process.

Description of Sample

The study site was a public community college in New England. The college was established in the mid-1960s with one location. By 2018, the college had five physical locations and a prominent presence online. The college boasts a student headcount of about 8,000 with an
over 50% graduation rate, higher than the statewide average community college graduation rate. At the time of this study the college had over 100 full-time faculty members (67% women and 34% men) and over 500 adjunct faculty members (53% women and 47% men). Approximately 83% of all faculty identify as White, 5% identify as Black, 3% Hispanic/Latino, and 2% Asian, with the remaining 5% identifying as Native American, Alaskan Indian, two or more races.

The sample population was selected based upon data collected in a Qualtrics service-learning demographic survey. The survey was distributed via the community college email system to full-time and part-time faculty members who were listed as participating in service-learning in 2018 provided by the Service-learning coordinator. The survey was completed by 33 individuals, among whom four did not consent to participate in the study. Of the remaining 29 respondents, 19 confirmed participation in service-learning, and 10 consented to schedule a timely interview (see Table 1).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Survey Participant Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final participant pool consisted of six women and four men. Four participants were tenured full-time faculty members, five were nontenured full-time faculty members, and one was an adjunct faculty member. Of the 10, 60% had a master’s degree, 30% had a doctoral degree, and 10% had a professional degree (see Table 2).
Table 2

*Study Participant Degree Distribution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Professional Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diverse participant distribution resembled the college’s overall diversity, with 80% White, 10% Asian, and 10% other race (see Table 3).

Table 3

*Study Participant Race vs. Research Site Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants were given pseudonyms to protect their confidentiality. The pseudonyms are included in Table 4.

Table 4

*Pseudonym List*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>Jasmine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>Julia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>Celia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>Arya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 8</td>
<td>Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 9</td>
<td>Jamie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 10</td>
<td>Dawn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Methodology and Analysis**

Service-learning is experiential education at its best, with personal and social development at the center of enhanced learning (Eyler et al., 1999). In this academic course experience, students participate in community-based service activities with reflective activities that emphasize course
content and expand personal values and civic responsibility (Gardner & Emory, 2018). Service-learning, as a high-impact educational practice, is shown to have a significant effect on student success but is not heavily utilized by community colleges (Kilgo et al., 2015). Within the literature review (Chapter 2), challenges and perceptions of service-learning implementation were identified, but they came from a researcher or administrative viewpoint, not directly from faculty. Faculty are primarily responsible for the implementation of critical high-impact educational practices such as service-learning within the classroom, but based on the literature presented in Chapter 2, it is difficult to find faculty voices that address the barriers that exist to prevent service-learning implementation. It is important to understand service-learning is as a high-impact practice and to discern the faculty perspective on the areas that are critical to high-impact practice implementation. There is relevant evidence within the literature to support an examination of the impact of these faculty experiences on the use of service-learning pedagogy. This phenomenological research study was designed to seek clarification of faculty experiences and perceptions of service-learning, describe their common lived experiences, and reduce these to themes.

The data collection tools utilized in this study included semistructured interviews (see Appendix B), a Qualtrics follow-up survey (see Appendix C), and a focus-group (see Appendix D). The questions presented in each of these data collection activities were designed to determine faculty experiences and perceptions of service-learning, including successes and challenges. Through a professional association I was able to contact potential participants via email and service-learning service. Participants were designated by interview number and pseudonym only, and all personal and institutional references were generalized and removed from transcripts to preserve confidentiality. The initial demographic survey to determine participant selection was sent via institutional email in January 2019. The interviews were then conducted in February 2019.
After completion of the final interview and thematic analysis, email request for a focus group was sent to all participants. The focus group included four of the interview participants and was held in April 2019.

Data analysis included determining themes and concept categories as a custom method to understand this unique phenomenon. During the data analysis phase, I evaluated the interview data to identify common themes via eidetic reduction. Eidetic reduction is a process that includes selection, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming data (Smith et al., 2013) and involves respecting and listening to every participant’s unique experiences (Heinonen, 2015). Within this eidetic reduction process, I utilized concept mapping. Concept maps are used in data analysis to base results on a participant’s generated expression of meaning and help researchers visualize relationships between attributes and concepts within the collected data (Wheeldon & Faubert, 2009). After data collection and concept mapping, researchers can specifically design follow-up questions using participant-generated themes to help guide a more in-depth analysis of the phenomenon under investigation (Wheeldon & Faubert, 2009).

I used concept maps (see Appendix A) to frame the faculty experience and assess participants’ knowledge base and experiences with service-learning pedagogical practices in their community college and to identify additional data collection strategies. This modified mapping process allowed for a reduction process that removed extraneous data and helped determine meaningful patterns and themes within the data. Through this process, divergent themes and the potential need for more data collection were identified (Wheeldon & Faubert, 2009). The responses were edited for clarity, sorted for themes, the number of concepts was determined, and the major clustered themes were collected. In vivo coding was used in this study to identify common themes within the data. In vivo coding is the practice of assigning a label to a section of
data, such as an interview transcript, using a word or short phrase taken from that section of the
data (Saldaña, 2016).

While the coding process is collective, visual, changing, emerging, and divergent, it should
also be verified to identify the trustworthiness of the data (Gelman, 2011). Validity is also
established based on the rejection of themes or data that are extraneous (Allen, 2017). This
verifying and validating process allows for a study that is trustworthy. I conducted this process on
my own and created a follow-up questionnaire to validate themes within my research, which
provided me with the most reliable coding results. After transcription of the data, I reduced the
data initially by interview question to search for initial themes (Creswell, 2013). I used a
highlighter to identify the main theme in each individual interview question answer and identified
each open code in the margin of the transcript. I identified over 100 words and synonyms that
aligned with the research question. I then used NVivo software to confirm this coding via the
program’s auto-code feature and word frequency function to identify frequently mentioned terms
and synonyms. The open codes that reflected the overall service-learning experience were
students, service, partners, collaborative, engagement, opportunity, interaction, understanding,
reinforce, respect, practical, and positive experience. Other open codes that reflected more of the
challenges that service-learning brought were work, increased workload, needs, lack of time, lack
of support, overwhelming, and assessment. The open codes were combined into broader categories
using concept mapping (see Appendix A) to identify the overarching themes of participant
responses to all interview questions.

Concept mapping allowed for further categorization of codes into related themes that all
connect to service-learning pedagogy that reflected the essence of what the participants
experienced (Alase, 2017). The major concepts within the data were identified as community,
experience, and challenges within the service-learning process. These concepts created three
overall themes: community connections, connecting theory to practice, and challenges within the service-learning process. The saturation point of data (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006) was reached at interview 10, at which point no new themes or experiences emerged indicating that I had collected enough data, and the coding was dependable.

The follow-up Qualtrics survey was designed utilizing the themes that were identified within the concept maps. The intention of this survey was to explore and clarify areas that faculty participants believed challenged their ability to adequately execute service-learning pedagogy. The common challenges to service-learning pedagogy that were identified in the interviews were time constraints, workload increase, student resistance, and institutional support. In the survey, participants were asked if they encountered any of these challenges in their experience with service-learning pedagogy. The participants were also asked the following Likert scale questions to understand their perceptions of resistance to service-learning.

- Does a positive or negative experience with service-learning cause resistance to service-learning?
- Does hearing about negative experiences with service-learning deter faculty from utilizing service-learning?
- Do negative perceptions of service-learning cause faculty to not utilize service-learning pedagogy?

Following the initial interviews and follow-up questionnaires, a small focus group was held with four of the participants to clarify themes identified within the research (Gill et al., 2008). The focus group was guided by the following questions (Arbelo Marrero, 2013):

- Are some themes more important than others?
- Are these challenges (time, resistance, support, workload) representative of your negative experiences with service-learning?
• How do these themes come together to explain the lack of use of service-learning?
• In what ways, if any, do these themes influence each other?
• Do some themes come before others (are they hierarchical) or are they equal?
• Are some themes more important than others?
• What can we do in the future?

The focus group discussion addressed the themes identified in the interview process. The meeting was guided by a semistructured question guide (see Appendix D), which allowed me to clarify and extend the discussion of the data collected through the interview process regarding challenges in service-learning implementation and utilization.

Summary of the Findings

The findings of this study emerged from analysis of faculty participants’ responses to initial 13-item participant demographic surveys, 10 individual semistructured interviews, the follow-up 12-item Likert online questionnaire for each interview participant, and the culminating focus group session. The faculty participants in this study had all used service-learning pedagogy previously within a course. The service-learning experience varied among the participants, but they shared common successes and challenges. All the faculty participants in this study reported that service-learning was beneficial in some way to student understanding and experience. However, they all also experienced challenges in the implementation and use of service-learning that impacted students or faculty.

The community college faculty participants described their experience with service-learning as positive and noted that it was an opportunity for students to engage and understand by linking course theory and practice by interacting with their community. Faculty participants found that service-learning allowed students to gain practical experience while serving a need in the community. The participants felt this collaborative process allowed students to interact with fellow
peers and community partners to gain further understanding of the subject matter presented to them within their particular course curriculum. One participant indicated the service-learning experience was a good opportunity for students to become actively involved in a solution but experienced challenges with institutional support and variability of projects. Another indicated the service-learning experience was a good opportunity for students to become actively involved in solving a problem, but that participant experienced challenges with institutional support and variability of projects.

In this study community college faculty participants describe their perceptions of service-learning as having developed from many experiences—as a layered, or scaffolded, experience (see Figure 1). The first layer of their experience is a general lack of knowledge of the basic principles of service-learning and what is available on their campus to facilitate the process. This lack of knowledge includes faculty members’ own lack of knowledge in addition to that of peer faculty and administrators. One participant, (Julia) described her initial perceptions of service-learning as volunteerism but later realized that service-learning is much more than volunteering. Participants felt that their unfamiliarity with service-learning pedagogy influenced initial perceptions of the pedagogy—that service-learning would be too difficult, or that a service-learning project cannot fit into a course or program curriculum. The second layer of experience is the reality that exists as faculty members implement and use service-learning pedagogy: the increased workload. Faculty participants found that initially it requires more effort and energy, which creates the perception that service-learning takes a great deal more work than a traditionally instructed course would. One participant felt that this misinformation dominates many college campuses and negatively impacts faculty experiences.

The third and final layer of experience begins after the faculty members have completed infusing service-learning pedagogy into a course and have completed the project: when students
begin the reflection process that is integral in service-learning. At this point, students reflect on their projects and their experience with service-learning as a whole, and faculty gain a unique view of the process and begin to see the value of this pedagogy for both students and faculty.

![Service-learning scaffold diagram](image)

*Figure 1. Service-learning scaffold.*

Faculty participants felt that most faculty members do not value service-learning as a teaching tool due to a lack of information and the perception of an increased workload. One participant felt that service-learning often appears “not so shiny and gold and lacks incentives” (Mack). Some faculty felt that the more the college community sees successful projects, the more likely faculty will engage in service-learning. Faculty participants who experienced challenges within service-learning still recommended using it as a teaching tool.

Although the faculty participants described their implementation of service-learning as a positive and beneficial experience for the students, it has not been without challenges. These challenges presented as increased workloads for faculty, a lack of time for both faculty and students, a lack of institutional support for pedagogy infusion, and student resistance to service-
learning or group work. Faculty participants experienced an increased workload from designing
the course to finding community partners. In some participant experiences, increase in workload
came from acting as a liaison between the client (community partner) and the students (Celia). In
addition to the increased workload, time presented as a challenge for both students and faculty.
Faculty had too few hours to keep up with the increased workload that service-learning required.
Students had issues with availability outside scheduled class time, as community college students
frequently have full-time jobs, families, and other commitments that limit their time. According to
one participant, students were unwilling to invest time outside the course.

Another poignant participant experience concerned a lack of institutional support (Jasmine,
Julia, Celia, & Ryan). Participants were discouraged that there was not more institutional
commitment to supporting faculty members eager to implement service-learning (Julia). Another
participant experienced a lack of support staff to help circumvent scheduling problems and
facilitate designating the course as a service-learning course (Jasmine). The overall lack of peer
support, technical support, financial support, and administrative support posed challenges not only
to the faculty participants who used service-learning, but also to other faculty members who were
interested in service-learning (Julia).

The final major challenge that participants encountered in the implementation and
utilization of service-learning pedagogy was resistance. Specifically, students resisted the time and
work required of service-learning activities and/or the associated group work that had to take place
outside of class time, and faculty peers and administrators were not consistently supportive of the
faculty in their desire to implement service-learning practices.

Presentation of the Data and Results

The framework for this study was the social constructivist theory that suggests that faculty
members, as learners, construct knowledge from their social dealings, interpretation, and
understanding (Adams, 2006). Major concepts identified within the literature reviewed for this study involve key features of emotion and social experience, which evolve into need, communication, perception, and resistance. Following this framework, the presentation of the data and results is led by faculty participants’ perspectives of service-learning and experiences with need, communication, perceptions, and resistance. Themes were identified through concept mapping, and the codes that emerged were community, experience, and challenges within the service-learning process (see Table 4). This section presents the results of the interviews, follow-up survey, and focus group by themes identified within the coding process.

The questions that participants were asked during the semistructured interviews sought to gain insight on their expectations, experiences, values, success, and challenges with service-learning. Participants had most to say when asked about their expectations of the process along with their successes and challenges. Participants were then asked how experiences in implementing and utilizing service-learning pedagogy influence community college faculty perceptions and support of service-learning. Three major themes emerged from the responses collected in these initial interviews: community, experience, and challenges within service-learning. Further clarification of these themes was obtained through the follow-up survey and focus group, which focused on the challenges encountered in service-learning pedagogy.
Table 4

*Themes, Codes, and Categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Connections</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Students connect and relate to the community in a positive way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serve and Help</td>
<td>Students serve a need in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Students and faculty have positive experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Students connect and relate to the community in a positive way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students serve a need in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting Theory to Practice</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Student experiences with learning are enhanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engaging</td>
<td>An opportunity to practically apply knowledge and engage with the information and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Encourages understanding by practically applying theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Student experiences with learning are enhanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>An opportunity to practically apply knowledge and engage with the information and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges to Service-Learning</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Faculty and students lack time to complete tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resistance</td>
<td>Students resist service-learning or group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of</td>
<td>Support from the institution, administrators, and peers is lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Faculty workload increases with implementation and utilization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Themes**

The overarching research question was: How do community college faculty experience service-learning pedagogical practices? The results of the study that explored this question are organized by themes that emerged in the data analysis process: community connections, connecting theory to practice, and challenges within the service-learning process. Each theme is presented with subcategories within each section. Extant literature (Chapter 2) assisted in the
development of anticipated codes. Anticipated codes that were defined prior to data collection were need, resistance, collaborative, and work.

**Theme: Community connections.** Within the initial demographic survey, faculty participants all described their definition of service-learning. They described service-learning as an important component in the curriculum, an enriched learning environment for the students, and a high-impact practice. They described the process of combining service to benefit a community with enhanced learning of an aspect of the course content. The experience was described as experiential education and practical work experience. All faculty participants stated they believed service-learning was an integral part of enhanced learning and student success.

When asked to describe some of the successes and challenges of their service-learning experience, faculty participants felt that service-learning facilitated connections for faculty and students with the community. Julia stated, “This has allowed me to go back and create relationships with entities right outside the academic community, and it has helped me stay relevant.” Julia also felt that in addition to its educational value, service-learning allows students to contribute to the community that the college serves. Similarly, Joseph suggested that students who participate in service-learning become more aware of the community they are in after they engage in the project. Joseph and Mack felt that service-learning helps the students and the community, with Mack highlighting the benefits to students:

I think what I came away with was that the students come to realize the importance of service-learning. I think when they start the project, they see it as overwhelming, but as they get in there and, at least from my perspective with what my students were doing, they saw the value of what they were doing and that they were making an impact with the community partners they were working with.
Participants Joseph and Dawn felt that service-learning connects students to the community and allows for self-confidence and empowers the students in their learning. In addition to building students’ self-confidence, Mack suggested that service-learning also showcases to the community what community college students can and educates the community on the theory of the service-learning project topic. In some cases, community partners have reached out to the instructor to give positive feedback on the students and the partner experience.

Faculty participants all felt that service-learning is student-centric while focusing on the community. When asked how the service-learning experience influences their teaching approach many of the faculty participants stated they chose to implement service-learning to help the students gain practical experience in a real-life setting (Julia, Celia, & Arya). Julia felt that service-learning facilitates a deepening of student learning and allows student to apply what they are learning. Dawn felt that service-learning is an important student-focused teaching tool and stated, “I thought service-learning was aligned with best practice in that it was student-focused. It was interactive. It did apply critical thinking and allowed empowerment to students. It was aligned with my principles of learning.”

Faculty participants agreed that the process of service-learning was indeed focused on student learning and enhancement of theory. They also suggested that it helped to create a strong connection with the community and community partners. Participants felt that utilizing service-learning helped students develop skills they will need in the professional world to maintain these connections.

Service-learning ties the community together with the college and our students. I think it gives us a real-time explanation in some ways or shows them what you’re talking about in class, like some of the challenges that are faced by businesses. This can be something that
gives them an idea of some of the things that they may experience out in the work force themselves. (Amanda)

Through this interaction with the community, faculty participants found that students connected to the community partners became more aware of the community they were in. When asked what values they uphold as most important for service-learning, participants felt that the partnerships developed in this learning process facilitated student learning about the importance service-learning had on the community. Participants felt that this was the biggest piece of service-learning, the partnerships and learning skills associated with a profession. In Celia’s experience, the students felt that concepts that they learned in the classroom were more solidified after teaching in the community. One participant felt that experiential components benefit the community by providing much-needed help. That is, the community needs the support of service-learning students. Five participants noted the importance of partnerships in gaining life skills, successful learning, and community engagement.

Faculty participants noted that the reflection piece of service-learning indicated that students did value the experience at the completion of their projects. Students demonstrated deeper learning of course material and became more involved in the community and in social justice. Participants noticed that students who participated in the reflection piece reported back that it was a positive experience that encouraged them to become more involved.

Students reported back that it was a good experience for them. They pay more attention to the news. They talk about politics, not as an abstract thing out there. It’s how we engage with each other in everyday life. So, they came back with a really good experience from it. (Jasmine)

Faculty participants noted that service-learning provided a service to the community that not only helped the community but also helped the student gain practical knowledge and skills.
Within the interviews eight participants noted that service-learning helps the community while helping the students, and two participants thought that the interaction within the service-learning projects aligned with best practices that empowered students.

**Theme: Connecting theory to practice.** When asked about key experiences in service-learning, faculty participants noted that their involvement with service-learning demonstrated that the student experience was enhanced for all of the faculty participants. Faculty participants felt that service-learning provided an opportunity to practically apply knowledge and engage with the information and community as part of their academic course. Participants also noted that service-learning encourages understanding by practically applying theories that are discussed in class. In addition to enhanced learning for students, faculty participants noted that service-learning allowed them to remain relevant in their fields, connect to their students, revise, and improve coursework, and assess their core values.

Four participants noted that a key benefit of service-learning is the practical experience that students gain through the process. Participants highlighted practical experiences such as soft-skill development, professional behavior, application of theory to reality, and understanding social problems.

I think it’s very useful for students to have some practical understanding of social problems. They have a deeper understanding of social problems. They have a notion of agency, that there is something that they can do about a social problem. I do really see it as an important tool and perhaps tool isn’t a correct word, maybe educational strategy for students to deepen their understanding of course material. I really do. (Jasmine)

Faculty participants emphasized that service-learning was an important and positive experience that gives the students a richer learning environment. In one participant’s account, student experiences were not initially what was intended in the service-learning project, but
students gained even more practical experience in a real-life setting. “It’s really good after to talk about what went wrong and what we did about it and analyze the situation, and you have those practical experiences” (Arya). One participant even felt the advantage of service-learning experience is that it is great to get students out into the field to do service and have those hours counted toward community service that is recognized on their college transcripts. This participant felt that service-learning also gives the students a wider range of experiences to help explore career options and try different contexts to decide their future paths.

Faculty participants noted that their experience, although not all positive, helped develop their teaching theory, improve course content, improve core values, and connect with local business while remaining relevant in their field of expertise. One participant stated it was a beneficial process for both teaching and best practices.

I think I’ve been a nontraditional philosopher, so I’ve always been involved in experiential events. A service-learning project was definitely an experience where I got to experience. I got to be part of projects that involved collective groups of people. So, in that sense, it gave me the sense of being able to fuse theory with practice and become more collaborative and creative. It made me more creative thinking about partnerships and projects and how those projects relate to social theory and philosophy. So, in that sense, I benefited from the experience. (Joseph)

When asked how service-learning experiences informed participants about educational issues, faculty participants reported that not all faculty at their community college are aware of what service-learning is and how beneficial the process can be. One participant felt that misinformation on service-learning or a lack of knowledge of service-learning dominates many college campuses and faculty experiences. Another participant stated that, based on their experience with service-learning, many faculty members do not see the benefits of service-learning
and do not value the experience. Joseph felt that the more exposure and experience faculty members has with service-learning, the more they will understand and learn about the importance of service-learning, how to infuse it, and how to have a successful project.

**Opportunity to engage.** Six faculty participants felt that service-learning provided an opportunity for both students and faculty to engage with the community. One participant felt it was a good opportunity for students to become actively involved in addressing common social problems.

In fact, there are some social problems that seem overwhelming, and students report often feeling powerless afterward and depressed about it. So, I thought, well, here’s a great opportunity where students could take an active role in making things better. (Jasmine)

Another participant felt it was a teaching opportunity to get students engaged in something with visual results within the community. Service-learning was noted by participants as an opportunity to gain practical experience and do something for the community while better learning the discipline of study.

One participant stated that through community partnerships and the service-learning project students had the opportunity to become engaged and give back, thus creating relationships with those that are also willing to reciprocate. Joseph noted that service-learning allows for a better understanding of the theory in practice:

Service-learning created an environment where students were able to truly engage praxis, reflecting on how the theory applies to practice. So, they had that notion of praxis pretty well, within the service-learning projects that they were involved in.

One participant noted that about 85% of their students did the service-learning project and reported that it was a good experience that encouraged them to pay more attention to the news, to talk about politics, and made the theory more tangible and less abstract of a concept.
service-learning improves understanding. Of the participants interviewed and surveyed, seven thought that service-learning improves student understanding of course theory. When asked how service-learning experiences are transferred to their teaching, participants felt that incorporating service-learning helps improve student understanding. This understanding is further defined as understanding of course theory, viable career options, professional attributes, social problems, diversity, socioeconomic differences, patience, and the value of service. One participant felt that service-learning is a part of the education process that deepens understanding of concepts, ideas, and other course subject material.

I think as instructors we struggle with how we know when students really understand a subject. There’s all this literature about a student can spit back material on a test, but if you go six months later and you ask them again, they may not be applying what they learned. They learned it for this short amount of time, and you hope that it’s something that they grasp. I do think service-learning gives an opportunity to develop a lesson that will continue after the fact. (Jasmine)

One participant thought service-learning provided an opportunity to work with people and businesses within the community to better understand some of the challenges that are faced by local companies. In addition, service-learning allowed local companies an opportunity to experience the college learning environment and showcase what the students could do.

According to one participant, service-learning allows faculty to shift traditional teaching from understanding to explain and apply to enhance subject material that may not be as engaging. This process was highlighted by participants as allowing students to gain deeper learning in that area or theory. As Joseph explained,

It’s experiential, it’s collaborative, it’s praxis, hands-on reflecting on how theory is applied in real life, everyday life, making that connection between theory and practice. It gives
students a chance to go outside of their comfort zone, meet new people, and work with new people. In that sense, it is truly a John Dewey experiential component of any class.

**Theme: Service-learning challenges.** Although all participants felt service-learning was a positive experience, none of the participants experienced service-learning without challenges. When asked to describe some of the successes and challenges faced in their service-learning project, challenges that were most common among that participants were a lack of time for faculty or students, increased faculty workload, resistance to service-learning or group work, and a lack of institutional support.

It takes a lot of time and planning to incorporate a service-learning project in advance as well as throughout the semester. Although this is a high-impact practice, it feels very isolating as there is no institutional support, or time made available to do this planning. It’s more work, which is difficult is you’re expected to attend division meetings, department meetings, serve on multiple committees, etc. (Ryan)

When asked about the advantages and disadvantages of service-learning, faculty participants consistently reported that they and/or their students lacked the time to complete tasks associated with service-learning in addition to their regular work. Student resistance to either the service-learning project itself or the group work associated with it was an issue in six participant experiences. Seven participants also experienced a lack of support from the institution, administrators, or their peers. Nine faculty participants experienced an increase in workload while implementing and utilizing service-learning pedagogy.

**Time.** In the initial one-on-one interviews, faculty participants found that implementing service-learning was challenging in that they had difficulty finding time to fit the project in with all the content that has to be covered. All participants experienced time constraints in their service-learning that manifested as either student inability or unwillingness to invest the time required or
as a lack of time for the faculty member to implement the project and keep up with the additional work. The follow-up survey confirmed this challenge, as all faculty participants confirmed having a lack of time in their experiences with service-learning. One participant felt that service-learning tasks were an addition to normal tasks and required more time for activities such as completing forms, and engaging in email communications, and scheduling time for a service-learning coordinator to visit the classroom. Three participants felt that students in service-learning were unable to commit to additional hours in the field, as many needed to work to support their families.

I know that the lack of time is often fueled by the student commuter experience. They’re not students in the traditional sense. They all have full-time jobs and they have very limited time. They have families. So, time is always a challenge with our students. (Joseph)

Six faculty participants found that they had trouble getting students to invest time because of family obligations, childcare, caring for adult parents, providing food, and working multiple jobs full- and part-time. In contrast, Ryan felt that occasionally the disadvantage for some students was that the service-learning somehow becomes more important than the class they are supposed to attend, and that service-learning takes more time than may be available.

Faculty participants experienced a lack of time for implementation of all requirements that are associated with service-learning pedagogy. Julia allowed class time for students to collaborate, which in turn meant changes to lectures and other planned classroom activities. Another participant felt that even trying to find community placements takes a “fair amount of time and energy,” and that the college’s administration did not address this extra effort. Specifically, this work did not get included in required college service. This participant felt that teaching a class infused with service-learning was beyond regular job responsibilities, yet it reduced the time that faculty have available for other responsibilities. Two participants felt that the tasks involved with clearing students for participation in service-learning were numerous and took extra time:
preparing paperwork, CORI and SORI checks, fingerprints, partner matches, hour logs, pre- and post- surveys, checking of projects, and reading of reflection papers. Faculty participants felt they want to participate fully in service-learning, but it would take more time.

I provide essays, and my students are encouraged to reflect on their service-learning experience in their essays. It takes me time. I mean, once finals and midterms are complete, I take a lot of time reading essays, and it drives me nuts. But I know that it’s good. I think that’s apparent and I think a lot of faculty are reluctant because they are overburdened by the number of classes they teach, and maybe they have grown accustomed to the paths of least resistance, the easy way out, getting done with finals in an hour. So, the traditional education, it’s—I call them sadistic, sadistic strategies—tend to trivialize experience.

(Joseph)

Amanda faced challenges with client (community partner) schedules’ not fitting into scheduled class times, which posed a problem for finishing the service-learning projects. To contend with a similar challenge, Julia had to change class time and let go of the strict topic-focused syllabus schedule for each class to allow for a more inclusive service-learning infusion. Julia also found that discussing the service-learning component took up more time than expected because there would be follow up with students beyond the allotted time for reflective discussions.

Service-learning also included more administrative work than two participants expected. Mack felt that service-learning was time-consuming and included a lot of work outside the course schedule. This outside work, paired with the other responsibilities within the course, is often initially viewed as very overwhelming to the students.

Just like the students, faculty may also have misconceptions of service-learning being something extra that they will need to invest more effort, and energy, and time. And perhaps it is true. You need to invest more time and effort. But, in the long run, it benefits
your students; it benefits your teaching, based on what we discussed earlier. It is a useful part of experiential learning, but they don’t see that benefit of experience. (Joseph)

**Workload increase.** The workload increase that accompanies teaching a service-learning course was a challenge that nine participants experienced while implementing and utilizing service-learning pedagogy. According to Amanda, it is more work to bring a service-learning project into the classroom. Increased work is the result of paperwork associated with the projects, selecting projects and partners, connecting to partners, reviewing projects, adding new assignments, and any follow-up items that the projects require as they progress. Celia felt that bringing a service-learning project into a course increases workload because faculty assume the role of a liaison between students and the community partner. It is important to understand the perceptions community partners have and what they are looking for in a project, which requires meetings with partners and properly defined framework within the class. The reflective and explorative nature of service-learning pedagogy was noted by a participant as contributing to the workloads of already overburdened faculty.

Through my experience, I have this perception, I’m going to call it perception, not an observation, but perception. But I think faculty are overburdened. They teach a lot of classes. They teach extra classes, and service-learning requires more work than just providing death by PowerPoint bullets and assessment through scantron midterms and quizzes. You cannot assess a service-learning project with multiple choice questions and be done with your grading for the entire semester in an hour. (Joseph)

Julia also felt that experience informs the faculty that an activity like service-learning takes a lot more work and thought. In this regard, it gives faculty more anxiety than appears to be needed. Faculty can teach a course and can download presentation slides from a publisher, can have multiple-choice exams, and still have an acceptable class. That such diverse approaches are both
acceptable also raises the question of how to determine whether a course is being taught correctly or well. Julia also felt that service-learning requires a high amount of preparation, but it is worth the work because high-impact practices like service-learning work well and give students a better experience. Amanda also felt the pressure of the increased workload in the review of the projects that students produced:

Then to be honest, the projects that I’ve gotten, while they’re good quality projects, I cannot just hand over what the students do and just give them to the clients. There’s some tweaking that comes on the side of the faculty, and it comes from your own experience. So, in this case it is more work for the faculty.

Joseph and Arya felt that many faculty members do not want to participate in service-learning pedagogy because it appears to require more work, and they focus more on the additional work and less on the benefits that students experience through service-learning. Joseph did not know if it encourages other faculty members to engage in that particular high impact practice.

Resistance. Four faculty participants experienced resistance to service-learning. This resistance was described as students’ unwillingness to participate in service-learning, lack of time to participate, lack of interest, backlash on controversial topics, or lack of desire to participate in any group work. Celia and Joseph noted that students did not want to partake in service-learning or could not participate in the out-of-class activities. Julia faced student resistance to group work, and within the group projects students had difficulty coming to consensus on project topics and meeting times. Jasmine indicated that she anticipated service-learning would have more of an appeal to students, and she expected to have less resistance from what they presented.

So, the resistance came around—I don’t have time for this—and there were no other sections without service-learning of my course being taught around the same time. So, I think some students stayed because there were no other options available to them. While
some students took to it, I really had to be sensitive that I had some hostility going in and was not as punitive when it came around to why the student didn’t do the assignment.

(Jasmine)

Julia’s students faced economic or physical limitations and family obligations that keep them from actively participating in service-learning. She suggested that faculty need to be aware of time limitations, family obligations, physical challenges, and even language barriers that exist for students. Joseph experienced resistance and pushback on controversial topics within service-learning projects. These controversial topics involved sensitive political issues, and Joseph noted resistance or emotional response to discussion of these matters:

There’s always a backlash when you discuss real, controversial issues, and it’s not that prominent in this region, to be honest with you. I’ve taught issues of diversity in different contexts, and those were more hostile, especially within context that are highly mainstream and very homogenous. Over here there’s a good diverse student body, in that sense. I don’t really experience a lot of backlash, and yet there’s always denial and dismissal, and politics is a sensitive issue, especially during these times. Students do get caught up in some emotionally charged discussions.

Within the follow-up survey six faculty participants stated they experienced student resistance to service-learning, and five participants stated they experienced resistance to group work. Within the focus group three faculty members discussed their experience with the college’s service hour tracking program. The participants agreed that although the tracking program functioned to allow the institution to view student hours, it was not user-friendly and was time-consuming for the students to use and for faculty to monitor. This cumbersome program led to student resistance.
Within the focus group, two participants felt that a lack of institutional support directly impacted student resistance. Julia experienced difficulty with the institution not coding the class correctly, which meant that students registered unaware that they were in a service-learning course. There was a lack of alternative courses at that campus location, so students had no choice but to take the service-learning course. They then showed resistance to the service-learning component. In the focus group, Amanda described students buying their own supplies for their community project with an elementary school. They received no compensation, which again led to resistance.

**Lack of institutional support.** When asked about how their experiences in implementing service-learning pedagogy influence their perceptions and support of service-learning, participants felt institutional support had a direct connection to how faculty more generally perceive service-learning. Participants associated institutional support with lack of funding, lack of administrative support, lack of peer support, lack of time, lack of appropriate technology, and lack of education on service-learning pedagogy. Participants felt that these issues directly influence other faculty members’ willingness to try something new like service-learning. During the interviews, five participants reported that they experienced a lack of institutional support while implementing or utilizing service-learning pedagogy. In the follow-up survey, seven participants stated they had experienced a time where support from the institution was limited. During the focus group, three of four participants noted a lack of institutional support for this activity. Within the interviews and focus group, institutional support manifested as a lack of communication, lack of allotted time, lack of funding, lack of space, technology issues, administrative support problems, unsatisfactory training, institutional culture, and experience perceptions.

**Communication.** Communication support problems were common in the participant reports. Joseph felt that exposure and experience with service-learning will “educate the faculty,
and also then the faculty can talk about it to the importance of it in how to infuse it in a course and how to have a successful project.’’

Julia proposed that having a designated time to hold reflective practice groups would allow for better communication and would encourage faculty to meet with other faculty who use service-learning and share what they have done. Julia felt that teaching at the institution is like working in a vacuum, and faculty do not know other faculty members who are using service-learning. Participants Ryan, Jamie, and Dawn felt they did not have enough time to talk with colleagues or share experiences in service-learning.

As far as faculty goes, I’m part-time adjunct, and so I really don’t have a lot of time talking with my colleagues considering service-learning. I just don’t have a lot of colleagues that I talk with on a regular basis about what I do in my classroom. There is a disconnect. (Jamie)

Four participants felt that, if given the opportunity to experience service-learning, faculty colleagues may have a different perspective on it. Jasmine felt perceptions of service-learning would depend on whether the faculty had a positive or negative experience. If faculty identify service-learning a negative experience and focus on what did not work, rather than on what could be done to improve the project, more faculty may engage in the pedagogy. Celia felt that if faculty have a positive experience, they need an opportunity to bring it up in different forums, which is currently not a focus of the institution. Julia felt that once faculty experience service-learning and learn how valuable the pedagogy is the more a faculty becomes an advocate and need an opening to share. In addition to sharing how successful service-learning is it should also be a “learning experience of what not to do next time, or how to prevent certain issues from happening. So, I think we sit down, and we rethink things and reorg things” (Celia). Dawn described a lack of communication opportunities:
Well, I don’t think I’ve had enough opportunity to talk about it and to share my experiences. I think, you know, we’re always talking about ways to . . . I think we’re doing great stuff here, but nobody knows anyone’s doing anything. What’s the experience of Service-learning? How hard was it? Was it great? Sharing these designs that people are doing and the ways they’re doing it and collaborating more. There’s no place to put it. You get it. You learn from it. You’re excited about it and then it ends there. It’s all in your own silo. I feel like what we do as a whole individually, we never put it together. It’d be great to learn as much as we could, I think.

When asked how service-learning experiences informed him about educational issues for faculty, Ryan felt that another aspect of communication, training on service-learning, was rushed and was more action-focused than detail-oriented. Ryan stated that it seemed that the administrator did not have enough time to provide explanations, which directly impacts faculty buy-in of service-learning. Ryan also felt institutional support needs to extend beyond an initial orientation and include reassigned time or a reduction in office hours. Two participants encountered difficulty with hour tracking software, broken links, and multiple forms to complete, all of which increased the difficulty of implementing service-learning. Jasmine’s issues with the college scheduler software, which did not designate her class correctly, increased student resistance to the service-learning project. Ryan found that although help was given in service-learning planning and management, it was rushed and often incomplete. Ryan expected more support than what was received for his particular course.

**Time.** Ryan suggested that if there were resources available for faculty who wanted to participate in service-learning, they may improve the experience and encourage more participation. Ryan also felt that if the work faculty put in for service-learning counted toward college service (contractually required faculty hours), it would improve the use of service-learning. Julia also felt
that time in professional development days would allow for more improvement and work with service-learning projects.

Every time that you adjust and apply and try to improve, and I’m going to ask you for a bit of money, but even just time to be able to prepare for that. Like, you know, maybe keep it a time and assessment day or in a professional development day that we can have an active workshop that we can develop some of this work. And I just feel that if there are faculty members that go above, over, and beyond to try to create as like, why isn’t there a bit more for us? (Julia)

**Funding.** Faculty participants noted that the lack of funding from the institution had a direct impact on faculty and student engagement in service-learning. In the focus group, Amanda reported that students had purchased their own project supplies, and Julia shared that she had used a personal credit card to purchase project supplies and felt there is a huge lack in institutional support for getting materials.

High-impact practices are important for our students and deepen our students, and we know this from research. It’s a little discouraging that there’s not more institutional commitment to supporting those faculty members that are eager and willing and wanting to do this. There’s some, sure, but it’s like the first time that you infuse it into your class, you get a small stipend, and then there’s sort of this expectation that you keep it going, but you also want to keep it fresh, and you’re reaching out to different partners, and every project is different. And every timeline and frame of when your course takes place is different. (Julia)

**Space.** In addition to funding, faculty participants indicated that there was a lack of space to prepare for service-learning. Joseph also felt that there is lack of a sense that classrooms are safe spaces, lack of inclusion, and lack of pedagogies that are empowering. In contrast, Joseph suggested that there exists an abundance of students being ridiculed, dismissed, and subjected to
microaggressions by faculty and staff. Julia noted the lack of institutional support for a proven high-impact practice:

There is a lack of institutional support for something that is deemed to be high impact practice that I know is impactful to what I teach and that there was no money, time, or space for us to be able to do more of this.

Julia also felt that when faculty want to adjust and improve their service-learning pedagogies, time and space are not available to do so. She suggested that the college could designate space and time during professional days to facilitate discussions about this important mode of learning. Celia echoed this suggestion during the focus group, offering that, to change the culture, more people need to talk about their experiences and have a time and space to share how well service-learning works.

**Administrative and peer support.** Five faculty participants experienced a lack of administrative support in service-learning. If faculty members go above, over, and beyond institutional expectations to create service-learning successes, Julia asserted, the college should provide more to support them. Julia experienced a lack of support from her dean and department chair (peer):

I felt there was a lack of support from the deans or department chair. And not that I’m looking for a pat on the back or anything like that, but I know that, again, in my discipline, having a real client to work with your students and having done this now for several semesters and see the impact that it’s had, the fact that they not taking this and running with it and saying it is a retention tool. This is something that is keeping students engaged; just helping them get connected to each other. That lack of support is discouraging.

Celia felt that peer support is often lacking for colleagues who want to engage in high-impact practices, and she has noticed a group of faculty members who actively refuse to participate in
service-learning. Similarly, Ryan felt that faculty are not supporting service-learning as much as they should. Ryan, the only participant who is an adjunct instructor, also shared his perception that faculty are less actively involved at the college than he believes they should be. Jamie sensed that a lack of support from fellow faculty members contributes to students’ not knowing about these opportunities and results in a lack of engagement by students. Service-learning was shown to help students succeed but within this study institutional support was indicated as the primary obstacle that faculty need to overcome when using service-learning pedagogy.

I feel like the culture of the college, does not foster this type of teaching-learning paradigm. I think it’s still stuck in the classic traditional learning paradigm, where you sit, and you just passively receive. It opened my eyes. I feel like I’m against the tide right now. This service-learning helps facilitate that understanding of how significant that change and that paradigm and that empowerment of students can really foster those competencies that they need of that. (Dawn)

**Chapter 4 Summary**

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore community college faculty experiences with service-learning to understand the challenges and successes faculty have experienced within their experience with this pedagogical practice. These results will assist in understanding why many faculty members are not engaging in service-learning at the community college level despite evidence of many successful initiatives in higher education. The data for this study were collected from 10 community college faculty participants in one-on-one interviews, a Qualtrics follow-up survey, and a final focus group (with four participants).

According to the findings of this research study of how faculty experience service-learning, all the faculty participants reported that service-learning was beneficial in some way to student
understanding and experience. In addition, all the faculty participants experienced challenges within the service-learning implementation or utilization process.

The framework for this study was social constructivist theory. Concepts identified within the literature reviewed for this study (Chapter 2) involved key features of emotion and social experience, which evolve into need, communication, perception, and resistance. Following this framework, data collection and analysis focused on faculty participants’ perspectives on service-learning and experiences with need, communication, perceptions, and resistance. Three main themes were identified through concept mapping: community, experience, and challenges within the service-learning process.

The participants’ experiences with service-learning had numerous layers: general lack of knowledge of the basic principles of service-learning, an increased workload, and post-utilization reflection. Interview results and thematic analysis showed that service-learning is a positive and beneficial experience for the students, but faculty often face challenges in integrating this pedagogy into their courses. These challenges include increased workloads for faculty, a lack of time for both faculty and students, a lack of institutional support for pedagogy infusion, and student resistance to service-learning or group work.
Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

Introduction

The purpose of this interpretative phenomenological study was to explore faculty experience with service-learning to identify common successes and challenges within service-learning to better prepare institutions to implement new or revitalized service-learning programs. Service-learning has a significant effect on student success but is not used as frequently in community colleges as it is in 4-year institutions. Barriers to implementation have been identified in prior research, but the focus has been on the student success perspective rather than the faculty perspective. Faculty work directly with students and are responsible for the implementation of critical high-impact educational practices within the classroom, but the faculty voice is rarely sought to address the barriers that exist to prevent implementation. Chapter 5 presents a discussion of the findings in the context of the current literature; this study’s theoretical framework; and policy, practice, and theory. This concluding chapter also identifies limitations of the study, implications of the study, and recommendations for further research.

This study used a conceptual framework based on the theory of emotional intelligence and social constructivism. The pedagogical importance of high-impact practices, including service-learning, and critical areas in high-impact practice implementation were established in the literature review (Chapter 2), and the findings (Chapter 4) demonstrate that, despite enthusiasm for service-learning because of its positive impact on students, faculty face challenges that influence their use of the pedagogy. The study design (Chapter 3) included purposeful sampling, diversified sample selection, surveys, semistructured interviews, focus group, data checking, and transcription confirmation (Wheeldon & Faubert, 2009). Interpretive phenomenological analysis was the method used to analyze the data collected in these various ways. The study participants were
volunteers, kept confidential, and free to withdraw at any time. Informed consent was received from each participant; consent forms were signed and are secured in a private location.

All actions of the research study were written about in a research journal and transcriptions were checked consistently to ensure the data are dependable and trustworthy. These methods allowed the researcher to develop a feel for the participant experience of the phenomenon of service-learning, after which follow-up questions and focus group questions were adjusted to further explore each participants’ experience until no new information was obtained (Sutton & Austin, 2015).

The literature review (Chapter 2) also explored service-learning in the community college setting by first reviewing what high-impact practices are, what service-learning is and its importance in the college context, and what barriers and perceptions exist around the implementation of service-learning. Prior research shows that service-learning has a significant effect on student success but is underutilized in the community college setting. Barriers and perceptions to implementation have been identified in the literature, but they have been mainly reviewed from a researcher or administrative perspective—not at the faculty level. Through the review of relevant literatures, there was sufficient evidence to support a study that would explore faculty experiences with service-learning and generate socially significant findings. The literature review provided solid support for this study to answer the primary research question: How do community college faculty experience service-learning pedagogical practices?

Summary of the Results

This phenomenological study was designed to explore community college faculty experiences with service-learning to better understand the challenges and successes faculty have encountered. The findings of this study are intended to provide administrators and faculty members with a better understanding why many faculty members are not engaging in service-
learning despite evidence that it is a successful high-impact practice in higher education. The data for this study were collected from 10 community college faculty participants using in-depth individual interviews, a Qualtrics follow-up survey, and a final focus group with four participants. The findings of this research study on faculty experiences with service-learning pedagogy, indicate that faculty believe that service-learning is beneficial in some way to student understanding of course theory and experience. In addition, the findings show that faculty members experience challenges in the service-learning implementation or utilization process.

The conceptual framework of this study used social constructivist theory and the theory of emotional intelligence. The interpretive phenomenological analysis of the data collected through surveys, interviews, and a focus group shed insight on faculty participants’ perspectives of service-learning and experiences with need, communication, perceptions, and resistance. Areas of concern for service-learning that were identified within the literature review addressed key features of emotion and social experience in service-learning pedagogical practices, focusing on faculty need, communication, perception, and resistance. These areas of concern in the literature manifested as challenges within service-learning practices, one of the themes of this research. The major themes of this research study were then identified through concept mapping: community connections, connecting theory to practice, and challenges within the service-learning process.

The faculty participants’ experiences with service-learning were layered (see Figure 1): a general lack of knowledge of the basic principles of service-learning, an increased workload, and post-implementation and utilization reflection. Study findings indicate that faculty feel service-learning is a positive and beneficial experience for the students and faculty, but faculty often encounter challenges in the implementation and utilization of service-learning pedagogy. Faculty described service-learning as a vital component in their program curricula, an enriched learning environment for the students, and a high-impact practice that transforms course theory into
practical work experience. They described the process of combining service to benefit a community with enhanced learning of an aspect of the course content as essential to student success. All faculty participants stated they believed service-learning was an integral part of enhanced learning and student success.

Service-learning challenges identified by faculty included increased workloads, a lack of time for both faculty and students, a lack of institutional support for pedagogy infusion, and resistance to group work by students. While data collection and analysis were taking place for this study, new research was published by Sandmann and Jones (2019), which shows that common faculty implementation obstacles are a lack of time, a lack of common understanding of the language of public service, a lack of confidence, and issues in institutional and administrative leadership. Study results demonstrated similar implementation obstacles, including a lack of faculty knowledge of service-learning pedagogy, lack of time, and lack of institutional support.

**Discussion of the Results**

The core principle within the theory of emotional intelligence is abstract reasoning (Mayer et al., 2001). In this theory, abstract reasoning focuses on the need to see key similarities and differences while analyzing individual pieces to understand the idea in its entirety to determine validity. There must be a route of delivery of the information, and the mind must process and connect it to an individual’s experience within a social setting. In this study, faculty described their experiences with service-learning, and this theory supported exploration of the faculty experience with abstract reasoning in a social setting (the community college).

This study demonstrates that service-learning is an important component in the curriculum, a high-impact practice that provides an enriched learning environment for students. Service-learning was shown to be a process of combining service to benefit a community with enhanced learning of course content. The experience itself was described as experiential education and
practical work experience. All faculty participants stated they believed service-learning was an integral part of enhanced learning and student success. Results also showed that service-learning facilitates connections for faculty and students with the community while allowing for the development of students’ self-confidence and empowerment in their learning. Service-learning was shown to help students gain practical experience in a real-life setting. Results also showed that service-learning provides a service to the community that not only helped the community but also helped the student gain practical knowledge and skills.

Findings of this study demonstrate that service-learning is a unique experience for both faculty and students. Faculty participants noted that their involvement with service-learning enhanced student learning experiences. Faculty participants felt that service-learning provided an opportunity to apply knowledge practically and engage with the information and community as part of their academic course.

It was also demonstrated that service-learning encourages understanding by practically applying theory. In addition to enhanced learning for students, faculty participants noted that service-learning allowed them to remain relevant in their fields, connect to their students, revise, and improve coursework, and assess their core values of service-learning. The results demonstrated that service-learning is an important and positive experience that gives the students a richer learning environment. In addition, this study shows that faculty engagement in service-learning, although not all positive, helped them to remain relevant in their field, develop their teaching theory, improve course content, improve core values, and connect with local businesses.

Social constructivist theory suggests that faculty, as learners, construct knowledge from their social dealings, interpretation, and understanding (Adams, 2006). Results of this study show that not all faculty members on this community college campus are aware of what service-learning is and how beneficial the process, meaning that they may be constructing knowledge from a
limited amount of information. According to Jasmine, misinformation on service-learning or the lack of knowledge of service-learning dominates faculty experiences on this college campus. Results showed that, according to participant experience with service-learning, many faculty members do not see the benefits of the pedagogy and do not value the experience. Participants suggested that the more exposure and experience faculty members have with service-learning—such as through faculty discussions on the importance of service-learning, how to infuse it, and how to have a successful project—the more likely their colleagues would be to adopt the practice.

Study results also suggested that although service-learning was noted to be a positive and learning enhancing experience, challenges often arose in the implementation and utilization of service-learning. These challenges connect to the theories of emotional intelligence and social constructivism in that the faculty experience in the community college (social setting) can directly impact how successful a service-learning project is and how faculty in general perceive service-learning. The most common challenges presented by study participants were limited time for faculty and students to participate in service-learning activities, increased faculty workload, resistance to service-learning or group work, and lack of institutional support.

Faculty participants reported that they and their students frequently lacked the time to complete tasks associated with service-learning in addition to their regular work. Student resistance to either the service-learning project itself or the group work associated with it presented issues in participant experiences. A lack of support from the institution, administrators, or peers was dominant among participants. Institutional support manifested as lack of communication, lack of allotted time, lack of funding, lack of space, technology issues, administrative support problems, unsatisfactory training, institutional culture, and experience perceptions.

The results of this study suggest that an increase in institutional support with better communication, collaboration, and education could fuel more or improved service-learning
projects. The results show a desire for more exposure and experience with service-learning that would educate the faculty, as in social constructivism, by changing how their social setting influences their experience. It was also suggested that, if given the opportunity to experience service-learning, faculty would have a different perspective on it, thus connecting to the theory of abstract reasoning. Faculty participants believed that a lack of support from fellow faculty members, due to their own perceptions of it, contributed to students’ not engaging in service-learning. To change the culture created by the social setting, faculty members need to talk about their experiences and have time and space to share how well service-learning works.

Discussion of the Results in Relation to the Literature

In this section the findings of this study are compared to the findings of the literature presented in Chapter 2. Chapter 2 offered an analysis of literature related to high-impact practices, service-learning, and challenges with high-impact practices. This study of the faculty experience of service-learning in a public community college demonstrated common challenges and successes in service-learning pedagogy. Exploring how faculty members experience service-learning revealed areas that are problematic to the service-learning process. This information is important for developing new service-learning programs. As faculty members are the core of service-learning pedagogy, further isolation of problematic areas within service-learning implementation and utilization at the community college level can help improve the practice in this context.

The themes identified through concept mapping were community connections, connecting theory to practice, and challenges within the service-learning process. The themes of community connection and connecting theory to practice are consistent with extant literature on service-learning and challenges within service-learning utilization. In these areas faculty felt that students connect and relate to the community in a positive way while serving a need in the community. Faculty participants noted that student experiences with learning are enhanced. For example,
service-learning provides an opportunity for students to practically apply knowledge and engage with the information and community. Faculty participants agreed that it was a positive experience for both faculty and students. Prior research also shows that faculty value service-learning as an enhancement of student learning and community support (Lambert & Neely, 2018). Like Lambert and Neely (2018), this study also demonstrated that this positive experience is the major reason why faculty opt to engage in service-learning.

Faculty participants in this study described service-learning as an important component of the curriculum, an enriched learning environment for the students, and a high-impact practice. During interviews and the focus group, participants asserted that service-learning has a profound effect on student success, experience, and engagement levels. These findings are consistent with the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 that describes service-learning as a high-impact practice that integrates community service with instruction and reflection (Voss et al., 2015). The study participants also all viewed service-learning positively, describing the process of combining service to benefit a community with enhanced learning of the course content. This finding is consistent the literature presented in Chapters 2 and 3—the belief that service-learning is a combination of service and learning that facilitates active learning in a meaningful way while fostering a sense of civic responsibility (Groh et al., 2011).

Study participants described experiential education at its best as an opportunity for students to obtain practical work experience. Faculty participants found that service-learning facilitated connections for faculty and students with the community, and as faculty first explored service-learning and were allowed to reflect on the process, they identified areas that challenged them and areas upon which they could improve. The reflection process allowed faculty and students to come to understand the connection and importance service-learning brings to the community. This finding further supports the literature’s definition of service-learning as including engaging
activities that serve a particular need within the community and connect the students to the population they serve with a reflective process to allow students to complete experiential learning (Voss et al., 2015). Participants felt that using service-learning helped students develop skills they will need in the professional world to maintain these connections. Faculty participants found that students connected to the community partners and became more aware of the community they were in while also advancing learning and solidifying the importance service-learning had on the community. Knecht and Ficsher (2015) interviewed nursing students who had participated in service-learning, and the students described new and meaningful experiences that are useful in developing future programs.

Within this study, some participant results were expected as many of the participants had utilized service-learning for many years and many courses which allowed these particular participants a unique and involved view of service-learning. Faculty participants implemented, utilized, reflected, and improved their projects to allow for improved student outcomes and a true view of the service-learning project, giving them an advantage over faculty that had not experienced service-learning. The literature presented in Chapter 2 demonstrated minimal scholarship on faculty impact on students, and many community college professors do not have any incentive to engage in professional development or in learning new teaching strategies (Goldrick-Rab, 2010).

A meta-analysis of studies of service-learning programs reported that students participating in service-learning programs demonstrated important gains in their self-confidence, attitudes toward their ability in education, civic learning, social skills, and scholastic performance (Celio et al., 2011). Data results within this study also demonstrated that service-learning is a unique experience for both faculty and students. Faculty participants felt that their involvement with student learning in service-learning classrooms was superior to their courses without a service-
learning component. The main quality of service-learning is that the learning itself must be experiential in nature, requiring the student to lead the learning process and experience it firsthand (Voss et al., 2015). Within this study, faculty participants felt that service-learning provided an opportunity to apply knowledge practically and engage with the information and community as part of their academic course. In addition to enhanced learning for students, faculty participants noted that service-learning allowed them to remain relevant in their fields, connect to their students, revise, improve coursework, and assess their core values of service-learning.

Findings of this study also suggest that not all faculty on this community college campus are aware of what service-learning is and how beneficial the process can be. The literature review in Chapter 2 regarding challenges in service-learning included a study that evaluated faculty perceptions of general education following a LEAP program with high-impact educational practices embedded in the curriculum (Paulson, 2012). Faculty perceptions were collected via a survey to which 87% of target faculty responded. Underlying assumptions regarding the high-impact practice project were analyzed, and Paulson (2012) found that many faculty members indicated that they have not encountered data that show the impact of high-impact practices. In the current study, participants reported that many faculty peers do not understand what service-learning is, and suggested that the college does not offer sufficient education and discussions of projects to encourage understanding.

Prior studies’ findings regarding the value of service-learning were corroborated by the findings of this study. This study found that service-learning allows faculty to shift teaching from understanding to explaining and applying knowledge and enhancing subject material that may not be as engaging. This process was noted by participants to allow students to gain deeper learning in that area or theory. To reiterate Joseph’s observation, “It’s experiential, it’s collaborative, and it’s
praxis, hands-on reflecting on how theory is applied in real life, everyday life, making that connection between theory and practice.”

The discussion in Chapter 2 included a survey of 2- and 4-year colleges in which 41% of the 4-year colleges surveyed reported as having service-learning experience and 69% reported high performance in service-learning and retention (Habley & McClanahan, 2004). In contrast, in a 2018 survey of community college students, 73% of respondents had never participated in a service-learning project as part of a regular academic course (CCSSE, 2018). The literature supports the use of service-learning pedagogy but demonstrates a lack of usage.

This study further investigated challenges within service-learning by unpacking faculty experience with service-learning. Although service-learning has obvious benefits, it is not without challenges. In this study faculty participants noted that faculty and students lacked time to complete tasks; students resisted the pedagogy or group work; faculty workload increased; and there was a lack of support from the institution, administrators, and peers—all of which is consistent with prior research.

The challenges in service-learning that were most common among study participants were a lack of time, and increased faculty workload, resistance to service-learning or group work, and a lack of institutional support. Chapter 2 presented a 10-year follow-up study (Englund, Olofsson, & Price, 2017) of participating faculty in service-learning to show their experience in service-learning, from barriers to benefits. Some of the challenges presented in this study included the amount of time needed for faculty and students, the lack of institutional support or the support of colleagues, limited financial resources, and minimal reward procedures.

Faculty members who use service-learning pedagogy are supported by their own dedication to social justice and by the significant effect the practice can have on others (Cooper, 2014). In this study faculty participants consistently reported that they and/or their students lacked the time to
complete tasks associated with service-learning in addition to their regular commitments. Student resistance to either the service-learning project itself or the group work associated with it presented issues in participant experiences, and participants also experienced a lack of support from the institution, administrators, or their peers. It was also found that most faculty participants experienced an increase in workload while implementing and utilizing service-learning pedagogy.

Prior research presents time as one of the major roadblocks to any change process, as is demonstrated in a survey study of teachers (Collinson & Cook, 2001). In this 2001 survey, it was discovered that there was no consistent perception or definition of time. Time was given, but no improvement had been noticed in performance outcomes. In Collinson and Cook’s study (2001), teachers were looking for time to work with fellow instructors, uninterrupted time, time to learn recent technology, time to renew, and time to plan. The current study also demonstrated that faculty participants found that implementing service-learning was challenging in that they had difficulty finding time to fit the project in with the content and procedural obligations. All study participants experienced time constraints in their service-learning as students were unable (or unwilling) to invest the time required, and/or faculty lacked the time it took to implement and keep up with the additional work. In the follow-up survey administered in this study, faculty participants all reported encountering a lack of time in their experiences with service-learning.

Similarly, in a 2017 study, Serdyukov noted that in evaluating a team-teaching approach in developing an introductory course, one of the most challenging aspects of the project was time. Time was an issue in the course preparation, and the course suffered from the need for additional development time. The teachers needed more time for themselves, more autonomy, and more self-organization (Serdyukov, 2017). Faculty participants all felt that they want to participate in service-learning, but it would take more time than the traditional teaching methodology most instructors are accustomed to. One participant noted this and felt that “a lot of faculty are reluctant
because they are overburdened by the number of classes they teach, and maybe they have grown accustomed to the paths of least resistance, the easy way out, getting done with finals in an hour.” (Joseph). The increased workload was a challenge that most participants experienced while implementing and utilizing service-learning pedagogy. Increased work consisted of paperwork associated with the projects, selecting projects and partners, connecting to partners, reviewing projects, adding new assignments, and any follow-up items that the projects require as the progress.

Literature noted in Chapter 2 raised concerns regarding how the adoption of service-learning may impact faculty members’ performance in research and professional service areas (Lambert & Neely, 2018). Participants in the current study felt that many faculty members do not want to participate in service-learning pedagogy because it appears to require more work, focusing more on the additional work and less on the benefits students that experience through service-learning. Participants were unsure if this perception encourages or discourages other faculty members from engaging in that particular high-impact practice.

In this study, some faculty participants experienced student resistance to service-learning. This resistance was described as either unwillingness to participate in service-learning, a lack of time to participate, a lack of interest, backlash on controversial topics, or a lack of desire to participate in any group work. Faculty participants in the present study found that they had trouble getting students to invest time because of family obligations, childcare, caring for adult parents, providing food, and working multiple jobs full- and part-time. Within the focus group, two participants felt that a lack of institutional support directly impacted student resistance. As noted in Chapter 2, King and Boyatt (2015) demonstrated that an innovation supported internally at an organization is more likely to succeed than one which is externally backed. In this study, participants experienced a lack of institutional support while implementing or utilizing service-
learning pedagogy, and a majority of participants stated they had experienced a time when support from the institution was limited. Analysis of interview and focus group data found that institutional support manifested as a lack of communication, lack of allotted time, lack of funding, lack of space, technology issues, administrative support problems, unsatisfactory training, institutional culture, and experience perceptions. King and Boyatt (2015), through faculty focus groups and individual interviews, also found that the disjointed availability of technologies for the whole institution was a barrier to institutional adoption of innovation.

Communication support problems were frequently reported in participant interviews for this study. Chapter 2 included discussion of a 2016 study that profiled each way a faculty member perceived what innovation is in regard to teaching and technology (Kopcha et al., 2016). When evaluating the data, most faculty showed attitudes that acknowledged the value of technology in teaching, but one of the four groups of faculty members showed a careful attitude and doubted the merit of using this teaching method (Kopcha et al., 2016). Faculty perception is a primary motivation in any initiative and can often color not only the individual creating the perception but those with whom the individual has contact as well. Participants in this study felt that teaching at the institution was like living in a vacuum in that faculty members did not know other faculty that are using service-learning. In addition, they did not have enough time to talk with colleagues or share experiences in service-learning.

In this study, participants experienced a lack of administrative support in service-learning, and some experienced a lack of peer support for their projects. Chapter 2 reported on a survey of 77 community college presidents who were asked about issues such as the effect of “curmudgeons” on the institution (O’Banion, 2015). In this survey, 97% of respondents had encountered a curmudgeon at their college, and the primary classification of this person was full-time faculty (O’Banion, 2015). These curmudgeons were shown to resist change and dwell on past
failures; they were classified as the ultimate contrarian. Curmudgeons can influence others within the college population and be detrimental to any innovation, functioning as the CAVE, or colleagues against virtually everything (O’Banion, 2015). The curmudgeon can slow or stop change, create a culture that is negative and hostile, undermine respect and trust, create adversarial relationships, and even take their vitriol to the outside community (O’Banion, 2015).

Some participants in the current study felt that peer support is often lacking for high-impact practices and have noticed a core group of faculty members who refuse to consider using service-learning pedagogy. Some participants felt that a lack of support of fellow faculty members had contributed to students’ not knowing about it, which then resulted in a lack of support from the students. In addition, participants felt these particular faculty are less involved at the college.

Chapter 2 presented a 10-year study in which the researchers examined educators’ perceptions, teaching methods with technology, and student learning with technology (Englund et al., 2017). The results demonstrated differences between beginner and veteran teachers. Although then newer teachers held more perceptions focused on teaching and teacher-centric problems, they demonstrated a better ability to embrace innovations than their more seasoned colleagues. Experienced educators tended to express stagnant and solid conceptions. The respondents that demonstrated no change give the impression of pedagogical inaction; their assumption is that their teaching approach is more than adequate, and they do not need to change (Englund et al., 2017).

**Limitations**

This qualitative phenomenological study, although successful in shedding light on the challenges of using service-learning pedagogy in a community college, had a number of limitations. The first limitation concerns my status as a novice researcher. Due to my lack of experience, I spent an unexpectedly long time on data analysis of the 100 pages of transcripts which could result in loss of data.
A limitation of the study comes from the difficulty of recruiting participants who reflected the faculty demographics at the college. Initial recruits were predominantly female, and there was a lack of racial diversity. When additional participants were recruited, faculty members who were more consistent with the college’s diversity were secured.

An additional limitation within this study is the low number of participants in the focus group. Initially, there was difficulty recruiting participants and only four participants of 10 were able to participate in a focus group which limited the participants voices and data may not be as rich as it may have been. There was also difficulty finding time within the faculty schedules and my schedule to hold a focus group on campus.

The interview protocol for the semistructured one-on-one interviews also posed a potential limitation. The interview script was long, and some questions distracted from the initial intent of the interview, veering away from service-learning and toward conversations about diversity and student collaboration. These topics are part of the service-learning process, but in this context, these discussions provided no information of value to this research, although I still had to analyze the interview transcripts.

The study site and participant group were also a limitation of this study, as I am very familiar with the institution and have worked closely with many of the participants. Although I tried to bracket my own perceptions and experience, future studies at a different college would provide a different perspective and would limit any potential peer influence.

Another limitation associated with the research site is the current climate of the college. Recent changes in administration have led to restructuring of departments and a loss in personnel, which in turn have created a climate of caution and trepidation. This context could be perceived as a limitation because, despite my efforts to put them at ease, participants may not have felt free to
be honest in their interview responses out of concern for self-preservation and the desire to not make waves.

**Implication of the Results for Practice, Policy, and Theory**

As illustrated in the literature review, prior research has shown service-learning to have a significant effect on student success, but there is little evidence that this teaching technique is utilized frequently within the community college context. Previous research has identified barriers and perceptions to implementation, but these studies have primarily approached service-learning from a student success, researcher, or administrative perspective instead of at the faculty level, in the perceived “trenches” (Cooper, 2014). Faculty work directly with students and are primarily responsible for the implementation of critical high-impact educational practices such as service-learning within the classroom, but the faculty voice is rarely sought to address barriers to implementation. In this study, faculty voice was sought directly, and their experiences demonstrated challenges to service-learning at a community college that were expected.

**Practice.** Findings from this study indicate that service-learning is a positive and beneficial experience for students and faculty, but it often presents challenges. Thematic analysis of the data identified community and experience as positive experiences related to service-learning. Faculty participants confirmed that service-learning is a successful high-impact practice that engages students in an experience that allows for an opportunity for a deeper understanding of theory in the classroom while connecting to the community in a practical application of course theory. In this study, participant interviews, surveys, and a focus group revealed the challenges to engagement in service-learning as increased workloads for faculty, a lack of time for both faculty and students, a lack of institutional support for pedagogy infusion, and resistance to service-learning or group work.
Each of the identified themes—community, experience, and challenges—gives rise to opportunities to improve service-learning implementation and utilization at the community college level. Faculty participants felt that institutional support was at the head of all the challenges encountered in service-learning utilization, and creating a better support system would allow for a more expansive approach to service-learning pedagogy. The opportunity lies in policy and theory to give rise to supportive service-learning programs that facilitate a college community approach to the pedagogy while engaging all levels of administration, faculty, staff, and students in the planning and execution process.

**Policy.** The results of this study may impact policies within community colleges and on student experience. Three major themes emerged in this study: community, experience, and challenges. It is clear from the data that service-learning pedagogy is an asset to student success and, by extension, graduation rates. The need to support this pedagogical practice is imperative to providing advanced learning at the community college level. Community colleges should develop comprehensive and funded policies that support service-learning implementation and utilization. In developing these policies, a descriptive procedure that includes faculty education, designated time for service-learning research or work, reflective groups, project sharing, and project review should be employed.

The findings of a 2019 study (Makki Alamdari, Hahn, Price, & Studer, 2019) indicate that faculty who had participated with service-learning benefited from resources and services such as workshops, consultations, materials, and service-learning scholarships. Resources helped departments implement changes, increased faculty mentorships and partnerships, assisted in funding increases, and broadened perspectives of service-learning. These efforts resulted in a campus culture to support community partnerships through service-learning practice.
Instituting policy that incorporates the experience and community connection while making efforts to minimize the challenges encountered within service-learning will improve community college campus success with service-learning. Supporting faculty in this process, while encouraging student involvement, with a public commitment to support this three-way partnership between the community, the faculty and the students will improve upon the experience for all involved and encourage faculty satisfaction and student success.

To these ends, service-learning should be publicly acknowledged as a beneficial experiential process that gives students an opportunity to connect to theory and community in a practical way. Service-learning pedagogy should become required in all institutions. To support this, institutions should maintain a public repository, blog, or webpage that documents service-learning projects that include community, student, and faculty testimonials sharing their experience with service-learning. Communication between faculty members should be encouraged, and portions of office hours or advising hours should be allocated by the institution to allow faculty the time to collaborate, implement, revise, and manage the additional work that service-learning requires. Time and communication presented as subthemes within this study, and faculty felt that they lacked time to implement, improve upon, or grade service-learning projects.

Participants also sensed a gap in communication between other faculty and felt that it would be beneficial to have meetings to engage in reflective practice—with faculty who do and do not use service-learning pedagogy. Allotting time to collaborate would allow for the sharing of successes and failures to improve and encourage the use of service-learning pedagogy. Technology training, support staff, educational training, and space should also be included in this policy. Institutions should have a dedicated space for service-learning collaboration, resources, and support staff sufficient enough to support the programmatic requirements of service-learning to promote student success.
Theory. Major concepts identified within the literature reviewed for this study involve key features of emotion and social experience, and they evolve into need, communication, perception, and resistance. Each of these concepts falls under the idea of abstract reasoning and delivery methods. Mayer and associates (2001) discussed the theory of emotional intelligence and defined a core principle of intelligence as abstract reasoning. Abstract reasoning stresses the need to see key similarities and differences while analyzing individual pieces to understand the idea in its entirety to determine validity. In this theory, abstract reasoning does not occur without an input function, as it requires delivery of the information while processing and connecting it to their experience within a social setting. Social constructivism suggests that faculty, as learners, construct knowledge from their social dealings, interpretation, and understanding (Adams, 2006). Faculty needs within the literature theory manifested as the need for understanding of high impact practices like service-learning, the need for educational enhancement, the need for personal advancement, the need for peer and administrative support, and the need for financial support. It is well established that high impact educational practices are innovative strategies and projects that have been noted to have an influence on student success and retention (O’Banion et al., 2010).

In one study, the commitment of institutional leadership was a leading cause of sustainable development or innovation (Lozano et al., 2015). Using social constructivist theory, it can be construed that a supportive environment can facilitate a social structure, or reality, that nurtures change and development. Acknowledging the need and desired support for faculty in areas such as time and financial resources can promote service-learning development. This need for support was demonstrated in this study as a need for time, good and consistent communication, administrative support, peer support, and financial support, again contributing to the faculty reality in innovation, or in this case implementation of high-impact practices.
According to social constructivist theory, if communication with faculty is disjointed, incomplete, or inaccurate, the reality created will not be true reality and can influence perceptions and resistance to service-learning implementation. In fact, in one survey faculty members indicated that they had not seen any data on successful institutional high-impact practices, thus creating an environment that seemingly has none (Paulson, 2012). The present study corroborates prior research findings that among faculty members who engage in service-learning, there is a perception of lack of support, an increased workload, and a lack of time at the study site. Faculty participants also confirmed they were more likely to use service-learning now that they have experienced it, but they also recognize they chose to implement it despite this lack of support.

Participants felt that other faculty at the community college did not value service-learning and had a perception that it would require too much work and time. Perceptions of difficulty can create a reality that distorts the true ease of service-learning pedagogical practices and create a common trend of faculty resistance because the notion of difficulty is too pervasive. Often the individuals who exhibit the most resistance are established intellectual stakeholders, more specifically professors (Deneen & Boud, 2014). Other perceptions can be influenced by a deficiency in administrative or peer support, incomplete funding, professional development, interference with preparation time for tenure or promotion, required college service, teaching, grading, advising, no compensation for time, and only a diminutive advantage to tenure or promotion (Sutton & DeSantis, 2017). Abstract reasoning and social constructivist theory account for the faculty view of service-learning and utilization. In this study, communication and support of faculty were disjointed, incomplete, or inaccurate, and the reality that was created influenced their perceptions of service-learning.
**Recommendations for Further Research**

The success of a community college is determined by various factors, including graduation and attrition rates. These rates are related to student success and, in turn, may be related to the use of service-learning. Further research is needed to explore the relation between service-learning and graduation rates to determine a direct connection between this high-impact practice and student success.

This study was designed to investigate faculty experience with service-learning to better understand successes and challenges. The initial intent of this study was to explore reasons why faculty members resist engagement in service-learning, but participant reports provided insights into the challenges that they face in practicing service-learning. These challenges, in turn, provide insight into why other faculty members may resist the use of this pedagogy. A qualitative case study designed to unpack this resistance by engaging faculty who have resisted service-learning previously would allow for direct analysis of the sources of faculty resistance. Such exploration would allow institutions to better understand why faculty resist service-learning so that they could develop better policies to support this pedagogy.

Lastly, a study could be conducted on a larger scale by encompassing multiple community colleges across the state, or in additional states, to gather a broader outlook on state vs. institutional policies on service-learning. The faculty perspective is incredibly valuable and crucial to improving institutional procedures and the success of community college students.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore community college faculty experiences of service-learning pedagogical practices. Service-learning has been shown to have a significant effect on student success, but it is not utilized frequently within the community college setting. Prior research has identified barriers and perceptions to implementation, but they
approached the topic from a student success perspective instead of at the faculty level. Faculty work directly with students and are responsible for the implementation of critical high-impact education practices within the classroom, but the faculty voice is rarely sought to address the barriers that prevent implementation.

Using a conceptual framework that focuses on the importance of high-impact practices, service-learning, and critical areas in high-impact practice implementation helps understand the challenges and perceptions that exist from a faculty perspective. The design of this study included purposeful sampling, diversified sample selection, semistructured interviews, a follow-up survey, a focus group, data checking, and transcription confirmation. The data were analyzed through interpretive phenomenological analysis. Study participants were voluntary, kept confidential, and free to withdraw at any time. Informed consent was obtained, and consent forms were signed and stored. All actions within this study were maintained in a research journal, and transcriptions were checked to ensure the validity of the data.

This study’s literature review focused on service-learning in the community college setting by reviewing what high-impact practices are, what service-learning is, why high-impact practices are important, and what barriers and perceptions exist to implementation. Within this literature review, service-learning was shown to have a significant effect on student success but was also not shown to be utilized in the community college context. Based on this review of literatures, there was sufficient evidence that an investigation exploring the faculty experiences with service-learning would generate socially significant findings. The literature review provided a solid support for research to answer this research question: How do community college faculty experience service-learning pedagogical practices? In addition, this research also investigated how community college faculty describe how their experiences formed perceptions of service-learning
pedagogy and how they describe their experience in service-learning implementation at the course level.

This study was designed to shed light upon faculty experiences with implementation of service-learning and how these experiences have shaped their own perceptions of this phenomenon. The results of this study will assist our understanding of why many faculty members are not engaging in service-learning despite evidence of its success in other higher education settings. The data for this study were collected from 10 community college faculty participants in one-on-one interviews, a Qualtrics follow-up survey, and a final focus group.

All the faculty participants in this study reported that service-learning was beneficial in some way to student understanding and experience. In addition, all the faculty participants experienced challenges within the service-learning implementation or utilization process. The framework for this study was social constructivist theory, and concepts identified within the literature reviewed for this study involve key features of emotion and social experience, which evolve into need, communication, perception, and resistance. Following this framework, the presentation of the data and results is led by faculty participants’ perspectives of service-learning and experiences with need, communication, perceptions, and resistance. The themes that were identified through concept mapping were: community connections, connecting theory to practice, and challenges within the service-learning process.

The participants’ experiences with service-learning can be described as a layered experience: general lack of knowledge of the basic principles of service-learning, an increased workload, and post-utilization reflection. Findings indicated that service-learning is a positive and beneficial experience for students and faculty, but it often has challenges. These challenges presented as increased workloads for faculty, a lack of time for both faculty and students, a lack of institutional support for pedagogy infusion, and resistance to service-learning or group work.
Data collected in this study compared to the theories of emotional intelligence and social constructivism demonstrated faulty experience with service-learning forms perceptions that are influenced by the success and challenges within the implementation and utilization process. Faculty want to use service-learning but need institutional support. They need time and connection while working to implement and improve their service-learning curricula. They need an incentive or recognition, technology, education, communication, administrative and peer support, and they need financial support. Implications of this study are the need to understand the theory of emotional intelligence and social constructivist theory to better implement policies and procedures that provide a service-learning program framework and support system. Policies should include time to collaborate would allow for the sharing of successes and failures to improve and encourage the use of service-learning pedagogy. Technology training, support staff, and educational training should be provided through this policy, along with a dedicated space for service-learning collaboration, resources, and support staff sufficient enough to support service-learning programmatic increases to promote student success.

The findings of this study support service-learning as a high-impact practice, and participant reports demonstrate their belief that it is an essential learning experience that allows students an opportunity to connect to the community while practically applying the theories learned in the classroom. Faculty members want to use service-learning, but challenges in the process of adopting this pedagogy hinder their efforts and deter faculty. Institutional support would lighten these challenges, and this study sheds light on possible areas for policy reform and improved connections. One research participant made a profound statement that supports the very focus of this study, not only the positive experience that service-learning is but also the desire for more institutional support. She stated, “High impact practices are important for our students and deepen our students’ understanding, and we know this from research. It’s a little discouraging that
there’s not more institutional commitment to supporting those faculty members that are eager and willing and wanting to do this.”
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Appendix A: Concept Map

Faculty Experience with Service-learning Concept Map
# Appendix B: Semistructured Interview Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Question</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Prior Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What were some key experiences you came away with from service-learning?</td>
<td>How do community college faculty members describe service-learning implementation at the course level?</td>
<td>(Baldwin, Buchanan, &amp; Rudisill, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were your expectations before adopting service-learning?</td>
<td>How do community college faculty members describe service-learning implementation at the course level?</td>
<td>(Baldwin, Buchanan, &amp; Rudisill, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe some of the successes and challenges you faced in your SL project.</td>
<td>How do community college faculty members describe their experiences with service-learning pedagogy?</td>
<td>(Harfitt, &amp; Chow, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has the SL project contributed to your personal, social, and intellectual development?</td>
<td>How do community college faculty members describe their experiences with service-learning pedagogy?</td>
<td>(Harfitt, &amp; Chow, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can the SL experiences be transferred to your teaching?</td>
<td>How do community college faculty members describe their experiences with service-learning pedagogy?</td>
<td>(Harfitt, &amp; Chow, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have your SL experiences informed you about educational issues for faculty?</td>
<td>How do community college faculty members describe their experiences with service-learning pedagogy?</td>
<td>(Carrington, Mercer, Iyer, &amp; Selva, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What experiences of teaching for diversity (disability, learning difficulties, cultural differences, etc.) have you had since you completed the service-learning program?</td>
<td>How do community college faculty members describe their experiences with service-learning pedagogy?</td>
<td>(Carrington, Mercer, Iyer, &amp; Selva, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did the service-learning experience influence your teaching approach?</td>
<td>How do community college faculty members describe their experiences with service-learning pedagogy?</td>
<td>(Carrington, Mercer, Iyer, &amp; Selva, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What values do you uphold as most important for service-learning?</td>
<td>How do community college faculty members describe their experiences with service-learning pedagogy?</td>
<td>(Carrington, Mercer, Iyer, &amp; Selva, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you fine-tune those values during your service-learning experience?</td>
<td>How do community college faculty members describe their experiences with service-learning pedagogy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do experiences in implementing service-learning pedagogy influence community college faculty perception of service-learning?</td>
<td>How do community college faculty experience service-learning pedagogical practices?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you believe Service-learning is?</td>
<td>How do community college faculty experience service-learning pedagogical practices?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you learn about Service-learning?</td>
<td>How do community college faculty experience service-learning pedagogical practices?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the advantages of service-learning? Disadvantages?</td>
<td>How do community college faculty experience service-learning pedagogical practices?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Follow-up Survey

Q1 - Common challenges to service-learning pedagogy were identified in the interview process. They presented as time constraints, workload increase, student resistance, and institutional support. Do you agree with this statement?

Yes

Maybe

No

Q3 - Did time challenges for students or faculty arise in your service-learning project experience?

Yes

No
Q4 - Did your workload as a faculty member increase while preparing for service-learning?

Q5 - Did you experience student resistance to the service-learning project?

Q6 - Did you experience problems with group work in the service-learning projects?
Q7 - Did you experience a time where support from the institution was limited or absent?

Yes

No

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Q8 - Are there any common challenges to service-learning you feel were missed? If so please describe:

Are there any common challenges to service-learning you feel were missed? If so please describe:

Some students see it as one more thing they need to do for a course. Others find it useful to their degree program, but may have to work when the Service-Learning activity is scheduled.

No - I think that above describes them all very well

What to do with “Down Time” when students are waiting for responses from community partners, for example

Some students have work challenges and they cannot participate during the selected activity. Then I would have to find an alternate activity, which demanded more of my time. I do the service-learning activities to help students understand what they are getting into. I never get paid for my time, but it is good for the students, so I do it. I just roll it into my release time.
Q9 - Does a positive or negative experience with service-learning cause resistance to service-learning?

Q10 - Does hearing about negative experiences with service-learning deter faculty from utilizing service-learning?
Q11 - Do negative perceptions of service-learning cause faculty to not utilize service-learning pedagogy?
Appendix D: Focus Group Guide Questions

The focus group was guided by the following questions (Arbelo Marrero, 2013).

- Are some themes more important than others?
- Are these themes (Time, resistance, support, workload) representative of your negative experiences with service-learning?
- How do these themes come together to explain the lack of use of service-learning?
- In what ways, if any, do these themes influence each other?
- Do some themes come before others (are they hierarchical) or are they equal?
- Are some themes more important than others?
- What can we do in the future?
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