

Examining Faculty Motivations for Engagement in Service-Learning at a Faith-Based Institution: A Comparison of Service-Learning Faculty versus Non-Service-Learning Faculty

**Roxanne Helm-Stevens^{1*}, Mary A. Rawlings², Judy Hutchinson³, Annie Tsai⁴,
Robert Duke⁵, and Catherine Wilde McPhee⁶**

¹ Associate Professor and Director, Management Programs, Azusa Pacific University

² MSW Program Director, Chair and Professor, Department of Social Work, Azusa Pacific University

³ Executive Director for Center for Academic Service-Learning and Research, Azusa Pacific University

⁴ Vice President for Alumni, Vocation, and Innovation and Professor, Department of Psychology, Azusa Pacific University

⁵ Professor and Chair, Department of Biblical and Religious Studies, Azusa Pacific University

⁶ Associate Chair, Undergraduate Professional Programs Director, Azusa Pacific University

*Correspondence: Roxanne Helm-Stevens, DBA, School of Business and Management, Azusa Pacific University, 901 East Alostia Ave, Azusa CA, 91702. Email: rhelmstevens@apu.edu

DOI: 10.12735/ier.v3i3p01

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12735/ier.v3i3p01>

Abstract

Faculty in a faith-based university were examined on motivations and deterrents for engagement in service-learning. Service-learning and non-service-learning faculty were compared based on rank, gender, discipline, and denominational affiliation. Findings suggest motivations and deterrents for faculty engaging in service learning in faith-based universities are similar to those faced by faculty in non-faith-based universities. Although no specific faith-based deterrents emerged from the study, unique faith motivating factors were identified.

Keywords: service-learning, faith-based, faculty, motivating factors, deterrents

1. Introduction

An emerging number of articles examine faculty motivation and deterrents for engagement in service-learning (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007). However, these studies focus on faculty in non-faith-based university settings. Although a number of articles argue for the strong relevance of service-learning in faith-based institutions (Hesser, 2003; Radecke, 2007; Schaffer, 2004), they are primarily theoretical in nature. Faith-based universities emphasize the spiritual growth of students, which is often developed via community service activities (Schaffer, 2004); however, no empirical studies have been published on the motivation of faculty to integrate service-learning as compared to those in non-faith-based institutions.

Utilizing a version of the survey developed by Abes *et al.* (2002), modified to include faith-based items, this study examines faculty motivation and deterrents for engagement in service-learning in a faith-based university. The study was designed to generate and analyze statistical data regarding faculty participation and non-participation in service-learning, based not only on characteristics of gender, rank, discipline, but also on faith perspectives as represented by denominational affiliation.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Faith and Civic Engagement

Faith-based universities—comprise 56% of the 1600 degree-granting college and universities in the United States (2007, U.S. Department of Education, as cited in “*Keeping the Faith*”, 2010), with the majority coming from a Christian tradition. Embedded in the mission of faith-based universities is a call to service as part of their faith-based values and practices. Although some research around a consortium of Protestant institutions suggested limited utilization of this learning model (Schaffer, 2004), a study by O’Meara (2008) notes the number of faculty utilizing service-learning increases in private and faith-based institutions as opposed to faculty at public universities.

As such, faith-based universities and colleges are increasing engagement in formal service-learning activities with many schools instituting community service requirements for students. Integration of faith, central to such universities’ values and beliefs, is often a primary factor attracting faculty and students to these schools (Bower, 2009; “*Faith traditions*”, 2006).

Faith-based education seeks to develop students into engaged professionals who link their faith to action through a lifetime commitment to service. Sikula and Sikula Sr. (2005) call for a move to connect spirituality and service-learning as “personal development and fulfillment are more and more the purview of higher education” (p. 75). A three year study of more than 112,000 freshman enrolled in 236 public and private colleges by Astin, Astin, and Lindholm revealed that “a number of college activities that contribute to students’ spiritual growth. Some of these—study abroad, interdisciplinary studies, and service learning—appear to be effective because they expose students to new and diverse people, cultures, and ideas” (2010, p. 9).

Schaffer (2004) found that service-learning offers an excellent opportunity for faith-based universities to actualize their mission of education and service as it “provides a venue for students to integrate Christian thought and action” (p.129). Service-learning can be a powerful pedagogy for faculty in faith-based institutions; as Schaffer notes, “various components of service-learning provide opportunities for issues of faith to be nurtured in courses that may not typically be faith-related” (p.136).

While there is increasing awareness of service-learning’s relevance to the mission of faith-based institutions, minimal empirical research has contrasted faculty implementation of service-learning in faith-based versus non faith-based institutions. Hesser (2003) argues that his Carnegie colleagues, who direct the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification process, only touch on the topic of religious faith when discussing civic engagement. He identifies religious faith as an “overlooked or minimized variable” in the “research and analysis concerning the sources and consequences of civic engagement” (Hesser, 2003, p. 66).

2.2. Motivators for Service-Learning

The linking of academics, service-learning and faith appear to be an area in which faith -based colleges and universities can provide leadership. Most religious faiths call for engagement that makes a positive difference in the world. However, even though students may desire this integration of academics and faith through meaningful civic engagement and administrators in faith-based

schools may include it in their mission statements, service-learning requires faculty involvement and commitment as well. There is increasing reporting and research about the connections between faith and service-learning as it relates to the student experience (Ackerman, K. Parker, & L. Parker, 2007; Park, Helm, Kipley, & Hancock, 2009; Nagle, 2012; Quezada, 2011; Stevens, Griego, & Faber, 2009; Driscoll, McKee, & Price, 2014). But there is an apparent gap in the literature related to the role of faith in decisions by faculty about the integration of service-learning.

Abes *et al.* (2002), in a study conducted with a broad sample of diverse non-faith-based institutions of higher learning, found that faculty are motivated by a wide range of factors including increased student understanding of course material, improved learning outcomes, student personal development, and student understanding of social problems and systems. Moreover, faculty were motivated by providing useful service in the community and creating university-community partnerships (Abes *et al.*, 2002). Studies by Hammond (1994) and McKay and Rozee (2004) reported curricular outcomes like bringing relevance to course material, encouraging self-directed learning, and providing an effective form of experiential education, to be the strongest motivators for implementing service-learning.

Emerging research suggests faculty intrinsic motivations, defined as stemming from self (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Deci, & Moller, 2005; Gagne & Deci, 2005; Lawler & Hall, 1970; May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004; Ryan & Deci, 2000), may also provide incentive for faculty to engage in service-learning. Austin and Gamson (1983, as cited by O'Meara, 2008) found that for faculty receiving the Ehrlich Award for Service-Learning, intrinsic motivation played a critical role. Yet, this research is incomplete, with intrinsic motivation, of which spirituality is a part, needing further study (O'Meara, 2008).

2.3. Deterrents for Service-Learning

Studies have identified deterrents or disincentives for faculty to engage in service-learning, including competing educational priorities (Mundy, 2004), lack of recognition of service-learning activities in tenure and promotion decisions (O'Meara & Braskamp, 2005; Vogel, Seifer, & Gelmon, 2010), and uncertainty over the academic value of service-learning (Zlotkowski, 1998). Abes *et al.* (2002) list other deterrents, such as faculty concerns over adding to already heavy workloads, lack of logistical support and release time for course development, difficulty coordinating the community service component, lack of knowledge on how to effectively use service-learning, and lack of evidence that service-learning will increase student learning.

2.4. Demographics

Faculty characteristics of rank, gender, and discipline have also been studied as they relate to faculty engagement in service-learning. Abes *et al.* (2002) found adjunct and assistant professor faculty were more likely to incorporate service-learning as a pedagogy than their fellow faculty in the ranks of lecturers, instructors and full professors. In examining gender, Wade and Demb (2009) found female faculty more likely than male faculty to embed service-learning opportunities into their courses. Additionally, faculty in the social sciences, health professions, education and social work are typically more likely to engage in service activity than faculty in physical sciences and humanities (Abes *et al.*, 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 1997).

2.5. Faith Traditions

The role of denominational affiliation of faculty in faith-based universities has not been examined in the literature as either a motivator or deterrent to service-learning integration. The range of nuanced views by various Christian denominations regarding the relationship of faith, service and civic engagement to students' academic experience can influence faculty integration of service-learning.

Broadly speaking, all Christian traditions have some concept of interaction with and service for a local community, yet traditions have developed based on historical, theological, and liturgical realities. For example, Catholic tradition emphasized Catholic Social Teaching, with a major focus on “social justice,” or Christians’ responsibility for service to and advocacy for the poor and underprivileged. Vogel *et al.* (2010) found that Catholic institutions integrating Jesuit beliefs and traditions were motivated to produce “service-oriented” graduates and “develop a sense of social responsibility in students” (p. 62-63). Christian denominations that develop from a Protestant Wesleyan tradition have historically stressed service and involvement with the issues of society. For example, many from the Wesleyan tradition were influential voices in the abolition and suffrage movements. Faith traditions among those categorized as non-denominational, are harder to categorize, having a broad spectrum of goals as well as a wide variety of approaches to the relationship of community service to faith. Given these examples, while no research currently exists, it is theorized that one’s intrinsic faith values and beliefs may influence one’s pedagogy in the classroom.

To summarize, while service-learning is increasing in faith-based institutions, little is known about what motivates faculty in these institutions as compared to faculty in non-faith-based settings. Faith-based universities often articulate a distinctly faith/value based motivation for service and civic engagement, yet, whether this provides a unique incentive for faculty motivation for service-learning remains unclear. This study seeks to explore motivations and deterrents for faculty participating in service-learning, as compared to those that do not participate in service-learning in a faith-based university setting.

3. Methods

3.1. Research Question

Research questions for this study: Is there a linkage between faith and the integration of service-learning: What are the motivations and deterrents for participation in service-learning of faculty in a faith-based university? More specifically, are there unique faith-based motivations or deterrents that impact participation in service-learning? Do these motivators or deterrents differ based on demographic characteristics, rank, discipline and gender as demonstrated in other studies, and, for this study, on faculty faith and denominational affiliation? What might this mean for the promotion and support of service-learning among faculty at both faith and non-faith-based schools?

3.2. Design and Instrumentation

This research, a replication study, utilized survey instrumentation developed by Abes *et al.* (2002) as the foundation for the development of the questionnaire. Minor modifications were made to the instrument, including additional questions related to possible faith motivators for service-learning such as possible increase in students’ understanding of the Christian value of service and whether service-learning provides opportunity for student faith development. Lastly, demographic questions were tailored to institution-specific factors, such as, substitution of extended contract classification for tenure. Demographic questions included: gender, race, academic discipline, faculty rank and denomination as related to church affiliation.

The final questionnaire comprised two logic tree tracks, one for those teaching or having taught a course that included a service-learning component and one track for those never having used service-learning. The electronic survey, sent via e-mail to all full time undergraduate faculty (N=235), included variables measuring motivation and deterrents using Likert interval scales.

The university, a mid-sized Christian non-denominational faith-based university was the setting for this research. An initial response rate of 115 was reduced to a final sample size of 99 after

eliminating responses from graduate, part-time, and adjunct faculty. The final sample reflects university demographics (See Table 1), and represents a response rate of 42 percent.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Study Participants (n=99) and Total Population of Faculty

Characteristic	Study Participants		Total Faculty	
	n	%	n	%
Gender				
Male	48	51	136	57.9
Female	50	48	99	42.1
Missing	1	1		
Race				
Asian/Pacific Islander	5	5.1	22	9.4
Black African American	4	4.1	11	4.7
Hispanic	8	8.2	14	6.0
Native American	1	1.0	2	1.1
White Caucasian	69	70.4	168	71.5
Other	11	11.2	18	7.7
Missing	1	1.0		
Rank				
Professor	29	29.3		
Associate Professor	28	28.3		
Assistant Professor	37	37.4		
Instructor	5	5.1		
Missing	1	1.0		
Denomination Affiliation				
Protestant Wesleyan	22	22.2		
Protestant Non-Wesleyan	40	40.4		
High Church	8	8.1		
Other	29	29.3		

Note: No data available for comparison on rank and denominational affiliation.

4. Results

4.1. Data Reduction and Analysis

After data collection the variable of denominational affiliation was collapsed from 50 categories to 4. The goal was to combine the various denominations in a meaningful way taking into account the development of various denominations including theological and historical connections. To this end, the following categories were used to group survey participants: Protestant Wesleyan, Protestant non-Wesleyan, High Church, and Other (c.f. Mead, Hill, & Atwood, 2010). The umbrella category Protestant Wesleyan included denominations that are part of the Methodist, Holiness, Friends, Brethren, and Pentecostal denominations. The category Protestant non-Wesleyan included

denominations that are part of the Lutheran, Reformed, Congregationalist, Presbyterian, and Baptist denominations. The category High Church included Catholic, Anglican, and Episcopal denominations. The final category “Other” was reserved for the survey participants that marked non-denominational or the “Other” option on the survey.

Affiliation by university department was also collapsed, due to small cell sizes into the following categories: social and behavioral sciences, business and leadership, health professions, math and science, humanities, and art and music. Gender, rank, department affiliation and denomination variables were used in analysis of responses from faculty participating in service-learning as compared to faculty not participating.

4.2. Demographic and Professional Characteristics of Faculty

Service-learning and non-service-learning faculty were compared on variables of gender, race, rank, denomination, and discipline. A chi-square test of independence was conducted on women’s participation as compared to men’s. A significant interaction was found ($\chi^2 (1) = 7.90, p = .01$), with women participating more frequently in service-learning (70%) than men (42%). Chi-square was also used to compare participation of discipline in service-learning, with a significant interaction found between disciplines ($\chi^2 (6) = 13.47, p = .04$). The social and behavioral sciences (100%) along with the health professions (75%) were more likely to participate in service-learning. Although business (40%), theology (53%), humanities (48%), and art and music (56%) were fairly evenly distributed between participating in service-learning, faculty in the math and sciences (25%) were less likely to participate in service-learning. Using chi-square, no significant difference for race, rank, or denomination was found.

4.2.1. Professional Responsibilities

In keeping with the original study by Abes *et al.* (2002), faculty were asked to rate perceived personal importance and perceived institutional importance of the following professional responsibilities: teaching undergraduates, advising students, research and publication, and professional service. ANOVA was calculated examining the effect of faculty participation in service-learning and their rating of the personal importance on the above listed variables. Results ($F (1,98) = 4.36, p = .012$) indicated that service-learning faculty perceived the personal importance of professional service ($m = 3.33, sd = .75$) as significantly more important than non-service-learning faculty ($m = 2.91, sd = .88$). This result was significant even while controlling for gender and discipline. No statistical differences between groups on teaching, advising, or research publications were found for personal importance.

In regard to perceived institutional priorities, another ANOVA was conducted comparing service-learning participation and the variables of teaching undergraduates, advising students, research and publication, and professional service. Results ($F (1,92) = 7.198, p = .004$) found service-learning faculty ($m = 3.37, sd = .93$) significantly more likely to perceive research and publication higher as an institutional priority than non-service-learning faculty ($m = 2.71, sd = .84$). There were no other between-group differences on institutional priorities.

4.2.2. Encouragement for Service-Learning and Instructional Support

In keeping with prior research, faculty participating in service-learning ($n = 55$) were asked to report who encouraged them to use service-learning (ie. dean, department chair, fellow faculty member) and also rate the importance of that encouragement. Faculty most frequently cited encouragement from their department chair (64%) and faculty in their departments (64%), followed by students at their institution (44%), and then faculty in other departments (43%). Service-learning faculty then rated the importance of sources of instructional support. For this variable, the service-learning office was rated most frequently by faculty as a source of instructional support (69%), followed by colleagues (47%), and then professional organizations and conferences (29%).

4.3. Motivators for Faculty Engaged in Service-Learning

4.3.1. Outcome Motivators

Similar to Abe's et al (2002) study, service-learning faculty (n=55) were asked to rate motivation for service-learning on two separate scales. First participants rated three broad general service-learning outcomes as motivators: student learning outcomes, community based outcomes, and faith integration outcomes. On these items, faculty rated student learning outcomes as the highest outcome motivator ($m=3.25$, $sd=.91$), followed by community-based outcomes ($m=2.93$, $sd=.93$), and faith integration outcomes ($m=2.92$, $sd=.99$).

To test for differences between groups, ANOVA and independent samples t-test were calculated examining gender, discipline, rank, and denomination. Using an independent samples t-test, equal variances not assumed, a significant effect ($t(25) = 2.57$, $p=.01$) was found for gender, with women ($m=3.52$, $sd=.61$) more likely to report student learning outcomes as a motivation than men ($m=2.80$, $sd=1.15$). ANOVA was used to test between group effects for discipline. A significant effect was found ($F(2, 6) = 3.19$, $p=.011$) with the social and behavioral sciences ($m=4.00$, $sd=.00$) and health professions ($m=3.62$, $sd=.51$) rating the highest on student learning outcomes with theology ($m=2.75$, $sd=.88$) and art and music ($m=2.5$, $sd=1.31$) rating the lowest. There were no significant effects for gender, rank, discipline, or denomination for importance of community or faith outcomes as motivators.

4.3.2. Specific Motivators

Service-learning faculty then rated a second set of twenty more specific factors, including the additional items on faith outcomes. Respondents were asked to indicate "the extent to which you agree that each of the following statements describes why you use service-learning", on a scale of 1=strongly disagree and 5= strongly agree. Using mean scores the top five motivating factors are reported in Table 2. Noteworthy, a faith-based item, "Service-learning increases students' understanding of the Christian value of service", is included in the top five. The lowest mean reported was related to the item "Service-learning contributes to my research agenda" ($m=2.81$, $sd=1.01$).

Table 2. Top Five Motivating Factors of Perceived Consequences for Engaging in Service-learning (n=55)

Motivating Factor of Perceived Consequence sd	Mean
1. Service-learning creates university-community partnerships. .78	4.27
2. Service-learning increases students' personal development. .59	4.25
3. Service-learning increases students' understanding of Christian. .73 values of service.	4.19
4. Service-learning provides useful service to the community. .66	4.19
5. Service-learning increases students' civic participation. .76	4.12

Note: Scale rated 1=strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree.

ANOVA was used to test for effects for gender, discipline, rank, and denomination on the top listed motivators. Findings found a significant interaction effect ($F(2,19)=5.87, p=.007$) between gender and denomination and between gender and rank ($F(2,19)=4.767, p=.007$) on the item “service-learning provides useful service to the community”. These results are inconclusive as further analysis was prohibited, however, due to small cell size.

4.4. Faculty Deterrents

4.4.1. Deterrents for Service-Learning Faculty

Service-learning faculty ($n=55$) were asked to also select three reasons from 11 factors that might deter them from using service-learning in the future. The two most frequently cited reasons were “difficulty establishing partnerships in the community” (31%) and “service-learning courses are time intensive and therefore difficult to balance with my other professional responsibilities” (29%).

4.4.2. Deterrents for Non-Service-Learning Faculty

Non-service-learning faculty ($n=44$) were asked to rate 19 possible deterrents for their participation in service-learning (See Table 3). The items added regarding faith deterrents “I’m already investing a significant amount of time in civic engagement through my faith community/other community organization” ($m=2.58, sd=.93$) and “community service is the mission of the local church congregation” ($m=1.93, sd=.83$) did not rank in the top five listed deterrents, nor did faculty concern regarding “unlikely that I will be rewarded in my performance review and/or tenure and promotion decisions” ($m=2.44, sd=1.01$).

ANOVA and an independent t-test were used to test for any difference among groups. No significant effects were found for gender, rank, discipline, or denomination on any of the top deterrents.

Table 3. Top Five Deterring Factors of Perceived Consequences for Not Engaging in Service-Learning ($n=44$)

Deterring Factor of Perceived Consequence sd	Mean
1. I anticipate having logistical problems. 1.02	3.52
2. Doing so will take away class time for teaching critical content. 1.31	3.42
3. Service-learning courses are time-intensive and would be difficult. 1.22 to balance with my other professional responsibilities.	3.40
4. I do not know how to do so effectively. 1.05	3.16
5. I anticipate having (or have had) difficulty establishing community. .10	3.07

Note: Scale rated 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

4.4.3. Increasing Likelihood for Service-Learning

Finally, non-service-learning faculty were asked to rate the likelihood of incorporating service-learning in the future. Forty percent stated very unlikely or unlikely, 36% were undecided, and only

18% indicated likely or very likely (n=44). When asked to select the top three factors that might increase the likelihood of participation in the future, 64% of non-service-learning faculty indicated “find more time to balance teaching a service-learning course with my other professional responsibilities”, with 27% also selecting “secure release time to develop service-learning courses”, “convinced that my students will benefit from a service-learning course”, and “assisted in establishing partnerships in the community.”

4.5. Impact of Personal Faith

Three additional exploratory questions were asked of service-learning faculty regarding the role of religious faith in their service-learning experiences. The first question asked faculty to rate on a scale of very insignificant (1) to very significant (4), “How significant a role did your personal faith plays in your decision to incorporate service-learning.” Responses resulted in an overall mean score of 2.49 ($sd=.84$, $n=49$). Results from the second question, “I expect service-learning to provide spiritually significant moments for my students,” rated on a four point scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4) found a mean of 3.02 ($sd=.64$, $n=51$). The third question, “In your previously taught service-learning courses, the projects provide opportunity to reflect on your own faith journey” resulted in a mean of 2.70 ($sd=.68$, $n=49$) similarly rated on a four point scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4).

ANOVA was used to test differences between groups on each of these items. Results found a significant main effect for denomination on question one regarding significant role of personal faith ($F(3,42)=3.05$, $p=.04$). Post hoc comparison found significant differences ($p=.01$) between Protestant Wesleyan ($m=3.00$, $sd=.25$) and Other ($m=2.0$, $sd=1.09$), and a trend ($p=.07$) between Protestant Wesleyan and Protestant non-Wesleyan ($m=2.43$, $sd=.79$). There was no significant difference between Protestant Wesleyan and High Church ($m=2.8$, $sd=.45$). For question 2 on service-learning providing spiritually significant moments for students, there was a significant main effect for gender ($F(1,42)=4.43$, $p=.04$), with women ($m=3.20$) more likely to expect spiritually significant moments than men ($m=2.69$). There were no significant differences between groups for question 3, opportunity to reflect on own faith journey.

5. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the motivations and deterrents to engagement in service-learning for faculty working in a Christian faith-based university in order to determine if any unique factors emerged that could assist in supporting service-learning both in faith-based and non faith-based schools. Additionally, given the importance that many Christian denominations place on community service, our goal was to also explore whether faith tradition influences faculty participation in service-learning.

In examining the demographics of faculty participating in service-learning, findings support earlier research, suggesting that in some ways faculty engaging in service-learning in faith-based settings are comparable to those in non faith-based settings, such as: women are more likely to participate in service-learning (Abes *et al.*, 2002; Banerjee & Hausafas, 2007), as are faculty in the social and behavioral sciences (Abes *et al.*, 2002). Similarly there were low percentages in our study reported by math and the sciences. However, there was a higher percentage of faculty in the health professions engaging in service-learning in our study as compared to findings by Abes *et al.* (2002). One possibility is that at this institution the leadership of the School of Nursing has demonstrated an on-going commitment to the integration of service-learning across the curriculum. As indicated in the literature, support from higher administration has been correlated with higher levels of participation in service-learning with lack of such support a strong deterrent (Furco & Moely, 2012; N. Harris, 2008).

Similar to Abes *et al.* (2002) faculty engaged in service-learning placed more personal importance on professional service as compared to non service-learning faculty. In the area of research, in contrast to the study by Abes *et al.*, where non-service-learning faculty perceived research as significantly more important than service-learning faculty, in our study there was no difference between service-learning and non-service-learning faculty in their rating of the personal importance of research and publication with both groups equally rating research and publication as important. In our study, service-learning faculty also perceived the institutional importance of research significantly higher than non-service-learning faculty. Yet in spite of this importance, service-learning faculty did not see service-learning as a motivating factor for their own research agenda. These findings suggest that service-learning faculty perceive research and publication as important, especially at the university level, regardless of reward structure and possibly independent of whether or not they utilize service-learning in their own research. These findings may be specific to this university which has an active service-learning department that has made the study and research of service-learning a priority. Additionally, the university itself has been placing an increasing emphasis on research, which may increase the importance for faculty as they seek promotion and/or extended contracts.

While faculty do not get specific rewards for engaging in service-learning, the promotion structure of the university does allow teaching to be weighted as to increase its impact for promotion decisions. This unique structure may provide support for faculty wanting to integrate service-learning in their courses without fear of jeopardizing promotion or tenure. While further study is needed, universities seeking to promote service-learning may consider simultaneously promoting scholarship focusing on educational outcomes as tied to service-learning.

5.1. Faith and Motivation

Faith-based items were included as possible motivators for engagement in service-learning, both as an additional generalized outcome motivator and as specific motivating factors. Again faculty were not unique in terms of what broadly motivates engagement in service-learning. Similar to prior research, student learning outcomes were cited as the most important outcome for engagement, suggesting that while faith integration outcomes might be a consideration, their importance ranked behind that of student learning. However, in terms of specific motivating factors for faculty engagement in service-learning, one faith item, “Service-learning increases students’ understanding of the Christian value of service,” did rank in the top five. Interestingly, this item is a student outcome. Faculty appear to see service-learning as a means for attaining faith-based outcomes for their students specific to the course or university mission. Evaluation data from students participating in service-learning courses at this university overwhelmingly supports the influence of service-learning experiences on their faith development with over 90% across all disciplines reporting that their faith had played a role in their service to the community and over 92% indicating the their faith had been strengthened through service-learning (“*Service-learning*”, 2013). These findings have particular relevance for faith-based universities who seek to develop this value of service in students. Further research across the academy is needed to examine under what circumstances engaging in service-learning actually enhances spiritual development. For non-faith-based universities, research examining the impact of service on student faith values could provide useful information, as a focus on supporting the spirituality of all college students is emerging in the literature (A. Astin, H. Astin & Lindholm, 2011; HERI, 2011; Lindholm, 2007).

For faculty in a faith-based setting, similar factors influence participation in service-learning. For example, in comparison to the Banerjee and Hausafus (2007) study, three of their top five factors were also found in our study: “creates university-community partnerships”, “increases students’ personal development”, and “useful service to the community”. In our study, “increases civic engagement” also ranked in the top five. Although “increase students’ understanding of the

material,” the top ranked factor for both Abes *et al.* (2002) and Banerjee and Hausafus, had a high ranking in our study, it did not rank within the top five factors.

Gender also played a role in our study. Similar to prior research, women were more likely to see “provide useful service to the community” as a motivator. In this study, there was, however, an interaction effect with gender and denomination. While the nature of the relationship could not be determined, it is important to note that the role of women in various denominational backgrounds varies significantly. It may be that faith traditions influence the roles women play in community engagement, and thus in service-learning. This may be an important area for future research, not only in other faith-based institutions. In reality non-faith-based schools may be in a unique position to study the variable of faith and women, as female faculty will come from more diverse faith backgrounds than in our study.

In questions added to the survey to gain additional data on the role of personal faith, denomination did affect findings for how significant a role one’s personal faith plays in the decision to incorporate service-learning. Faculty from Protestant Wesleyan denominations rated personal faith higher than those from Protestant non-Wesleyan or other categories, but responses were comparable to those in High Church traditions. This finding is consistent with the historical emphasis that both of these traditions place on service to community. While further study is needed, this suggests that personal values of engagement are informed by faith traditional values of engagement.

5.2. Faith and Deterrents

In our study items related to faith and spirituality were added to the list of possible deterrents. It was hypothesized that faculty may perceive “service” or “value development” as something relegated to the role of the church or faith community, outside the role of the university. Or, faculty service commitments in their faith communities may take precedence over engaging in service in their place of work. However, none of these additional items were listed in the top five deterrents.

Parallel to the Abes *et al.* (2002) study, faculty ranked the top deterrent as “Anticipate logistical problems”. Additional top deterrents were related to workload and management stressors indicating that while faculty in faith-based and non faith-based universities are similarly influenced by workload constraints. Our research suggests that while faith values may contribute to engagement, they do not seem to be related to deterrents. Our research was not able to determine whether faith might lead to participation in spite of would-be deterrents.

5.3. Limitations

Limitations of the study influence generalizability of results. First, the size of the sample, though representative, is small. The data is from a single institution with a strong service-learning infrastructure.

6. Practical Implications

The strength of this study is that it builds directly on former research, making a direct comparison between faculty in faith-based and non faith-based universities. Several key implications follow. First, faculty engaging in service-learning in faith-based universities are, in many ways, like their counterparts in non faith-based settings. Faculty at faith-based institutions face similar challenges as faculty teaching in non faith-based settings, such as, a lack of awareness and training, and faculty, student, community partners’ involvement (Russell-Stamp, 2015; Ward, 1998), administrative support, funding (Demb & Wade, 2012; Lambright & Alden, 2012; Russell-Stamp, 2015; Ward, 1998), and rewards (Ward, 2003).

Administrators or those seeking to build service-learning programs at their faith-based universities can look to literature (Kezar & Rhoads, 2001; McKay & Rozee, 2004; Pribbenow, 2005; Ward, 2003) on faculty characteristics to assist them in seeking faculty who may have an interest in partnering to develop service-learning opportunities. Developing service-learning programs that emphasize scholarship and research may also serve to support both the research goals of the faculty member and of the university.

Second, for universities with missions to build students' value for and commitment to faith-driven service, service-learning may provide a strategy for attaining that outcome. Done well, the classroom can help students develop ideas (R. Harris, 2004; Park *et al.*, 2009; Anderson, Griego, Helm & Smith, 2010) on how they can integrate their faith values in the context of community engagement. Careful delineation of academic objectives is needed, so as not to mis-identify volunteer or "ministry" activity as academic service-learning; the emphasis of academic service-learning is not limited to doing good to others, but rather on increased learning through practical experience that involves mutual learning and reciprocal exchange with the community (N. Harris, 2008).

Finally, addressing issues of workload (Demb & Wade, 2012; Lambright & Alden, 2012; O'Meara & Braskamp, 2005; Russell-Stamp, 2015; Ward, 1998; Ward, 2003) and aligning faculty reward systems (O'Meara & Braskamp, 2005) are paramount in reducing barriers for engagement in service-learning both in faith and non-faith-based institutions. Faculty must be given support logistically and in terms of workload. The reality of work demands impacts faculty across settings and can be a deterrent, even for those with a strong faith-based motivation.

7. Conclusion

Faculty motivators and deterrents have engendered recent interest for universities trying to increase support for future engagement of faculty in furthering service-learning objectives. Hence, both intrinsic and extrinsic factors are gaining attention as important variables in understanding what motivates faculty to engage in service-learning. Further, these findings can inform non faith-based schools of the possibility of recruiting as service-learning professors, faculty who may be seeking to integrate faith or spiritual growth in their role as educators.

Acknowledgements

This research was conducted as part of the Service-Learning Faculty Fellows program at Azusa Pacific University.

Thank-you to Elisa Abes, Golden Jackson, and Susan Jones (2002) for their support and permission to utilize their survey for this study.

References

- [1] Abes, E. S., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9(1), 5-17.
- [2] Ackerman, B. E., Parker, K. L., & Parker, L. W. (2007). Enhancing christian school field experiences through academic coaching in a service-learning partnership. *Faculty Publications and Presentations*, Paper 131. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/educ_fac_pubs/131.
- [3] Anderson, P. V., Griego, O. V., Helm, R., & Smith, D. (2010). Building a learning model for high-level motivation and goal attainment: An empirical assessment of support and self-

- efficacy among undergraduate christian students. *International Journal of Global Business and Economics*, 3(2).
- [4] Astin, A. W., Astin, H. S., & Lindholm, J. A. (2010). *Cultivating the spirit: How college can enhance students' inner lives*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Wiley.
- [5] Banerjee, M., & Hausafus, C. O. (2007). Faculty use of service-learning: Perceptions, motivations, and impediments for the human sciences. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 14(1), 32-45.
- [6] Bower, L. (2009). Faith-learning interaction in graphic design courses in protestant evangelical colleges and universities. *Christian Higher Education*, 9(1), 5-27.
- [7] Deci, E. L., & Moller, A. C. (2005). The concept of competence: A starting place for understanding intrinsic motivation and self-determined extrinsic motivation. In A. J. Elliot, & C. S. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 579-597). New York, NY: Guilford Publications.
- [8] Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York, NY: Springer Science & Business Media.
- [9] Demb, A., & Wade, A. (2012). Reality check: Faculty involvement in outreach & engagement. *Journal of Higher Education*, 83(3), 337-366.
- [10] Driscoll, C., McKee, M., & Price, S. (2014). Community-based service-learning: Serving student and community engagement. *Workplace Review*, Oct, 34-44. Retrieved from <http://www.smu.ca/webfiles/CathyDriscollMargaretMcKeeShelleyPrice.pdf>.
- [11] *Faith traditions and service-learning: Survey report*. (2006, June). Paper presented at Spirituality, Social Justice, and Service Learning Biannual Conference, Messiah College, Grantham, Pennsylvania.
- [12] Furco, A., & Moely, B. E. (2012). Using learning communities to build faculty support for pedagogical innovation: A multi-campus study. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 83(1), 128-153.
- [13] Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational behavior*, 26(4), 331-362.
- [14] Hammond, C. (1994). Integrating service and academic study: Faculty motivation and satisfaction in Michigan higher education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1(1), 21-28.
- [15] Harris, N. (2008). Faculty community service: At the intersection of campus and community. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 143, 101-108.
- [16] Harris, R. A. (2004). *The integration of faith and learning: A worldview approach*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.
- [17] HERI (Higher Education Research Institute). (2011). Attending to student's inner lives: A call to higher education. Los Angeles: University of California. Retrieved from <http://spirituality.ucla.edu/docs/white%20paper/white%20paper%20final.pdf>.
- [18] Hesser, G. (2003). Review essay: Faith-based service-learning: Back to the future. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 10(1), 59-69.
- [19] *Keeping the faith: An insider's perspective of enrollment and retention strategies that drive results at faith-based institutions*. (2010). Education Dynamics (<http://www.educationdynamics.com>).

- [20] Kezar, A., & Rhoads, R. A. (2001). The dynamic tensions of service learning in higher education: A philosophical perspective. *Journal of higher education*, 72(2), 148-171.
- [21] Lambright, K. T., Alden, A. F. (2012). Voices from the trenches: Faculty perspectives on support for sustaining service-learning. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach & Engagement*, 16(2), 9-45.
- [22] Lawler, E. E., & Hall, D. T. (1970). Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 54(4), 305-312.
- [23] Lindholm, J. A. (2007). Spirituality in the academy: Reintegrating our lives and the lives of our students. *About Campus*, 12(4), 10-17.
- [24] May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 77(1), 11-37.
- [25] McKay, V. C., & Rozee, P. D. (2004). Characteristics of faculty who adopt community service learning pedagogy. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 10(2), 21-33.
- [26] Mead, F. S., Hill, S. S., & Atwood, C. D. (2010). *Handbook of denominations in the United States* (12th ed.). Nashville: Abington Press.
- [27] Mundy, M. E. (2004). Faculty engagement in service-learning: Individual and organizational factors at distinct institutional types. In M. Welch, & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *New perspectives in service-learning: Research to advance the field* (pp. 169-193). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- [28] Nagle, B. (2012). Christian learner: Wisdom and gaining knowledge equals joy. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED535392>.
- [29] O'Meara, K. (2008). Motivation for faculty community engagement: Learning from exemplars. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(1), 7-29.
- [30] O'Meara, K., & Braskamp, L. (2005). Aligning faculty reward systems and development to promote faculty and student growth. *NASPA Journal*, 42(2), 223-240.
- [31] Park, D., Helm, R., Kipley, D., & Hancock, D. (2009). Connecting faith and personal values with the service learning experience to create more effective service learning. *Business Renaissance Quarterly*, 4(3).
- [32] Pribbenow, D. A. (2005). The impact of service-learning pedagogy on faculty teaching and learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 11(2), 25-38.
- [33] Quezada, R. L. (2011). Global student teacher transformation experiences: Living the faith through the shared Christian praxis learning process. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 14(4), 417-440.
- [34] Radecke, M. W. (2007). Service-learning and faith formation. *Journal of College & Character*, 8(5), 1-28.
- [35] Russell-Stamp, M. (2015). Faculty use of community-based learning: What factors really matter? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 21(2).
- [36] Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78.
- [37] Schaffer, R. H. (2004). Service-learning in christian higher education: Bringing our mission to life. *Christian Higher Education*, 3(2), 127-145.

- [38] *Service-learning student evaluation, annual report* (2013). Unpublished raw data.
- [39] Sikula, J., & Sikula Sr., A. (2005). Spirituality and service-learning. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, 104, 75-81.
- [40] Stevens, R., Griego, O., & Faber, C. (2009). Service learning: Undergraduate student perceptions of confidence in skill and personal ability in a business service learning experience. *Journal of Business and Behavioral Sciences*, 20(1), 122-132.
- [41] Vogel, A., L.Siefer, S. D., & Gelmon, S. B. (2010). What influences the long-term sustainability of service-learning? Lessons from early adopters. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 17(1), 59-76.
- [42] Wade, A., & Demb, A. (2009). A conceptual model to explore faculty community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 15(2), 5-16.
- [43] Ward, K. (1998). Addressing academic culture: Service learning, organizations, and faculty work. *New Directions in Teaching and Learning*, 73, 73-80.
- [44] Ward, K. (2003). Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, 29(5). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [45] Zlotkowski, E. (1998). A service learning approach to faculty development. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, 73, 81-89.

Copyrights



Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

