

## Service-Learning Is... How Faculty Explain Their Practice

**KerryAnn O'Meara and Elizabeth Niehaus**  
*University of Maryland, College Park*

*Many researchers have explored faculty engagement in service-learning. However, scholarship rarely considers ways in which the discourses used by faculty to describe service-learning—the stories they tell about what it is they are doing and why—construct images of subject positions, problems, and solutions that inform our beliefs about service-learning and our practice. The purpose of this study was to understand the dominant discourses used by faculty to explain service-learning. The nomination files of 109 exemplary faculty nominated for the Thomas Ehrlich Award were analyzed. Findings indicate that faculty use four dominant discourses regarding the purposes and significance of service-learning: (a) a model of teaching and learning; (b) an expression of personal identity; (c) an expression of institutional context and mission; or (d) or embedded in a specific community partnership. These findings affirm those of previous studies regarding faculty attraction to and motivation for involvement in service-learning, but also point to continuing challenges in institutionalizing service-learning in higher education.*

**A**s a child of civil rights activists in the 1970s, I learned that responsible people take thoughtful and caring action to bring about changes in the world...I believe that those early sensibilities explain my deep connection with service-learning.

In fact, service-learning was a concept that seemed to be a natural outgrowth of what I had to teach my students—how to communicate with the video medium. It was so natural for me that it drove me to academics from a career as a video producer.

I have always felt my strengths were in the practice of social work and my contributions tend to be more in my ability to link practice to theory.

I watched these students develop, literally within a day, feelings of political efficacy that will stay with them into adulthood. That feeling of satisfaction is why I teach political science, why I teach at [my] college, and why I use Service Learning as an option in all of my classes.

I have the privilege of teaching at an institution where the faculty and administration understand the important role our university plays in not only improving the academic skills of our students but the important role the university plays in solving the many issues we face as a community...there exists an indomitable spirit that invigorates our university and our community and propels us to work together to improve the lives of all who live here. We know that what we do together makes a difference and it is through this spirit of contribution

and cooperation, that I have been able and, in fact, encouraged to maximize service-learning opportunities for my students.

These five quotes, offered by five different nominees for the Campus Compact Thomas Ehrlich Faculty Award for Service-Learning, present a set of assumptions regarding the purposes of service-learning and its connection to the faculty member involved in it. As an explanation of his/her work, each discourse is embedded in a specific social context and a set of values, beliefs, and social practices. While one faculty member's discourse identified his service-learning as deriving from his own family history and role models growing up, another represented her service-learning as the natural extension of disciplinary goals—the desire to teach a specific subject well. A third faculty member explained her work as an experiential educator committed to providing theory to practice opportunities, while a fourth discussed the power of service-learning to enhance political self-efficacy. Finally, a fifth nominee explained how service-learning is a natural outgrowth of working and living in an institutional culture that values and promotes this kind of work. In every case, these faculty members explained their work in ways that suggest different sets of problems that service-learning helps them solve and different ways in which they are themselves positioned within the service, with different implications for practice.

Many researchers have explored faculty engagement in service-learning. However, scholarship rarely considers the ways in which the discourses used by faculty to describe service-learning—that is, the sto-

ries they tell about what it is they are doing and why—construct images of subject positions, problems, and solutions that inform our beliefs about and practice of service-learning. Identifying dominant discourses used by faculty to describe service-learning can provide another lens on how to support faculty in this work, as well as what beliefs may be working against its acceptance in different academic cultures. It may also help service-learning advocates to consider the strengths and limitations of using different dominant discourses in any particular college or university environment or national policy-making arena (Allan, Gordon, & Iverson, 2006). The purpose of this study was to understand the dominant discourses used by faculty to explain service-learning and the dominant images of participants, problems, and solutions these discourses present.

In this study, we examine the narrative essays of faculty nominated for their “thick” (Geertz, quoted in Morton, 1995) in contrast to “thin” service-learning practice. Morton identified thick service as expressions of service that have integrity and depth (p. 21), and for the purposes of this research, we add a commitment over a significant period of time. Thin service lacks integrity and depth, and is not integrated with academic study over a sustained period of time. The faculty whose voices were cited above were nominated by their institutions and the field of service-learning for their exemplary integration of service with academic study over a sustained period of time. As such, we believe they offer a unique window into the beliefs, values, social identities, and experiences of faculty who are similarly involved in the “thick” of service-learning.

Exposing the dominant discourses that influence service-learning faculty reveals differences between the meanings faculty ascribe to their work and that of the rhetoric of the service-learning movement. We focus on discourse about service-learning as a way of critically examining the relationships between faculty purposes and service-learning impacts on students, institutions, and communities.

As such, the research questions that guided this analysis were: (a) What do faculty describe as the purposes and significance of service-learning? What kinds of problems does it address and how and why is service-learning a solution to those problems?, and (b) What are the predominant images of the faculty members themselves, and of their students, communities, or institutions? That is, how do faculty position these players in relationship to each other in the work?

### Conceptual Framework

This study was grounded in a conceptual understanding of discourse and discourse analysis and its application to public rhetoric about service-learning in higher

education. It was also guided by previous research on faculty motivation and interest in service-learning.

### *Discourse*

Several concepts in the larger world of discourse theory were particularly helpful for this study. These included the concepts of discourse and discourse analysis, dominant discourses, subjectivity and subject positions. By discourse we refer to “both spoken and written language use” (Allan, 2003, p. 47). We were guided by the process of discourse analysis, which involves the examination of talk and text and “its relationship to the social context in which it is constructed” (p. 47). This perspective holds that rather than being separate from reality, discourse in fact actively produces and legitimates a given reality (Hicks, 1995; Mills, 1997). Rather than being neutral, discourses are invested in and reflect a person’s identity, beliefs and values, and social practices (Hicks, p. 53). Through a series of statements, individuals and groups reflect and sometimes reproduce certain points of view (Allan, Gordon, & Iverson, 2006). Discourse analysis provides a focused examination of language to understand how such an individual or group orders social relations and enacts identities through what they say and how they say it (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). Discourse analysis has been used recently in higher education research to understand the framing of the status of women (Allan), higher education leadership (Allan, Gordon, & Iverson), international students in U.S. universities (Rhee & Sagaria, 2004), and in the study of schooling (Allan). Rhee and Sagaria make the point that while discourse can be used strategically, most people are unaware of the social and cultural assumptions guiding our discourse.

Researchers have observed that dominant discourses are those that are employed more readily than others, become institutionalized, and become seen as natural, normal, or assumed (Allan, 2003; Allan, Gordon, & Iverson, 2006; Coates, 1996). These authors further pointed out that dominant discourses tend to mark boundaries around what is considered legitimate and relevant, thereby sometimes drowning out alternative discourses and setting them aside as exceptions or deviant.

There have been several dominant public discourses in service-learning. College presidents often describe service-learning through a discourse of either the development of civic engagement in students or of the improvement of town-gown relationships (Campus Compact, 1999). Service-learning has been commonly discussed as a form of experiential learning (Giles & Eyler, 1994) and a way to acquire disciplinary knowledge, skills, professional values, and ethics (Zlotkowski, 2000). These are dominant public dis-

courses on the purposes of service-learning. Less common in the public sphere are discourses about faculty living out their own religious or political convictions, both because these discourses would make the service-learning activity seem more disconnected from institutional purposes (at least in non-religiously affiliated institutions) and because of norms of academic freedom, assumed objectivity, and neutrality, and a sense that these are more private and/or self-serving purposes. In this study we were interested in the dominant discourses of faculty exemplars around the purposes of their own service-learning practice.

The concept of subjectivity and subject positions also are central to theories of discourse that inform this study. In discourse, individuals or groups take on “subject positions” or social identities that describe interactions within a given story (Allan, Gordon, & Iverson, 2006; Weedon, 1997). For example, in a story of one’s childhood, an individual can portray her/himself as a victim of a difficult father, a hero who saves the family from disaster, or as somewhat of an outsider to a close-knit family. In each case the individual casts her or himself with a particular position vis-a-vis other actors in the narrative. In this investigation, we were interested in how faculty members positioned themselves, their institutions, their students, and their community partners in their discourse about service-learning.

Several researchers and theorists who study discourse and subjectivity have observed that in our speech and written word we often order our social world, revealing our perceptions regarding hierarchy, power, and the world as it is and should be (Allan, 2004; Fairclough, 1995; Hicks, 1995; Hodder, 1994). One shortcoming of much of the rhetoric, research, and faculty development efforts around service-learning is the failure to explicitly acknowledge how faculty service-learning practice is inherently value-laden and perspective-driven (Butin, 2006). There is, behind the work, a rationale that may or may not be connected to discipline or institutional goals. For example, over the past three decades, at least three national Wingspread declarations and many national associations and groups of faculty have offered rhetoric suggesting service-learning is a way to enhance student civic responsibility and political consciousness, as well as enhance democracy. Service-learning has been considered the main higher education response to the claim that higher education institutions have become ivory towers, self-absorbed and isolated from the world (Hollander & Hartley, 2005). National Campus Compact, a presidential coalition that grew from three members in 1985 to more than 1,100 institutions in 2009, has been at the forefront of these efforts to offer service-learning as one key panacea to the problems of stu-

dent political disengagement and public distrust of higher education. Whether it be to improve the quality of undergraduate education, connect universities with communities, or develop student civic agency, the national rhetoric is replete with the virtuous benefits and purposes of service-learning. But are these the same ways faculty actually doing service-learning explain their work?

Butin (2006) argued that efforts to institutionalize service-learning across higher education institutions assume that service-learning is “a politics to transform higher education...a universal, coherent, cohesive, amelioristic and liberatory practice” (p. 478). He went on to suggest that much of the rhetoric assumes that service-learning is not already part of the institutional practices and norms it is attempting to modify and overcome. Butin argued furthermore that service-learning “embodies a liberal agenda under the guise of universalistic garb” (p. 485). Yet again we ask, what do faculty engaged in the work say about all of this?

### *Faculty and Service-Learning*

We also were guided by more than two decades of research on service-learning faculty and the types of factors that have been found to motivate faculty involvement. For example, several recent meta-analyses of research on service-learning and community engaged faculty (Colbeck & Michael, 2006; O’Meara, 2008; O’Meara, Sandmann, Saltmarsh, & Giles, 2009) identified the following potential sources of influence and motivation: demographics, identity and life experiences (Aguirre, 2000; Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000; Baez, 2000; Neumann & Peterson, 1997); epistemology and personal goals (Colbeck & Michael); institutional contexts (Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, & Staples, 2006; Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Clark, 1987; Holland, 1999; O’Meara, 2005; Ward, 2003), disciplinary and department contexts (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Bland et al; Zlotkowski, 2000), and faculty relationships with community partners (Colbeck & Janke, 2006). Those who have studied service-learning faculty pointed strongly to the motivation to teach well and ignite student learning (Abes, Jackson, & Jones; Bringle, Hatcher, & Games, 1997; Hammond, 1994; O’Meara). This research, with which the authors were very familiar, provided a critical backdrop to the analysis of faculty discourse around service-learning. It assisted in the recognition of major themes in faculty rationales for the work and provided an awareness of alternative rationales that might have been present but unarticulated.

### *Methods*

This paper takes a discourse analysis approach to understanding how exemplary faculty conceive of and represent their service-learning. The primary source of

data for this study were the personal narratives of 109 faculty nominated for the Thomas Ehrlich Faculty Award for Service-Learning from 2002 to 2005. The Ehrlich award is an annual national award for service-learning administered by Campus Compact. The Ehrlich award is given to one faculty member each year who has (a) excelled in innovative ways in connecting community and public service experiences with academic study; (b) demonstrated scholarship on the pedagogy of service-learning, published community-based action research, or conducted research on the impacts of service-learning on students, campuses, or communities; and (c) shown leadership that promoted service-learning and engagement on their campus, in their discipline, and throughout higher education. Each Campus Compact member institution may nominate only one engaged scholar each year (occasionally exceptions were made for two) (see [www.campuscompact.org](http://www.campuscompact.org)).

There are many precedents for examining exemplars or “exceptional individuals” in educational research and in the study of faculty specifically. Whether it be to study excellence in teaching within research cultures (Huber, 2004; Terrosky, 2005), the careers and practices of prolific research scholars (Creamer, 1998), women scholars who established the field of feminist scholarship (Gumport, 2002), faculty who work to instill student civic agency despite institutional reward structures (Boyte, 2004), or the careers of public scholars in the agricultural sciences in land-grant universities (Peters, Jordon, Adamek, & Alter, 2005), exemplar studies can illuminate the structures, cultures, and practices helping to shape desired behaviors and practices. In this study, the exemplar approach had the advantage of painting a portrait of the discourse among the “leading edge of service-learning faculty” in Campus Compact institutions. Such discourse is likely to have a significant impact on other faculty, policy-making on campus, and in the nominee’s discipline given the nomination criteria required both campus leadership and scholarship or publication.

A critical part of document analysis is determining the authenticity and accuracy of the documents and interrogating them for their origins, why they were written, and for what purpose (Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Merriam & Associates, 2002). As such it is important to discuss what these documents are and how they were obtained and handled. Merriam (2001) observed that personal documents are “a reliable source of data concerning a person’s attitudes, beliefs, and view of the world” (p. 116).

Each narrative essay was written as a conceptualization of the nominee’s own community engagement work, why it was important to the nominee, and the impact it had on his/her own professional life and work as faculty, his/her institution, and the public.

Each nominee was notified by his or her college president that he or she was to be nominated and asked to submit an essay describing his/her community engagement work. The instructions given to nominees in this regard were rather broad; they were asked to describe their work and why they do it. Most of the nominees seem to have had in mind the criteria of evidence of service-learning teaching, engaged scholarship, and impact when writing their essays as most cover each of these points. These materials were collected by Campus Compact and filed and stored at their office.

Because these documents were written for an awards committee they not only are personal but also “public” narratives for an intended and known audience. As such, the essays examined for this study are subjective, and not objective accounts of what may have occurred in this person’s career; rather the essays reflect the Award nominees’ perspectives. However, as qualitative theorists Merriam (2002) and Burgess (1982) pointed out, perspective is the object of qualitative research. Such documents provide “reconstruction of a part of life...based on the author’s experience” (Burgess, p. 132). This was what we as researchers were interested in—the engaged faculty members’ best explanations of the why, the how, and the significance of their service-learning work in their professional lives.

In partnership with National Campus Compact, the lead author requested permission (informed consent) from faculty nominated for the Ehrlich Award between 2002 and 2005 to access their nomination files. The request went from the lead author and a staff member at Campus Compact to nominees in two ways—by a hard copy letter mailing and by email. Files of the nominees who responded positively to the request to have researchers review their files for this project were copied by the researchers. These files included faculty narrative essays (usually 3-4 pages long), nomination letters written by institution presidents, and additional supporting documents. For this study we analyzed only faculty narrative essays.

### *Sample*

A second critical step in document analysis involves preparing documents, coding them, and creating a database to be analyzed. A database was created from the nominee files. Of the 109 faculty in the sample, 58 (53.21%) were at public institutions, while 51 (46.79%) were at private institutions (at the time of their nomination). (See Tables I-V for a breakdown of the institutions in the sample by 2007 Carnegie classifications for enrollment, size/setting and institutional type, by gender, race/ethnicity, career stage, and discipline.) These tables reveal that a majority of the participants were on the tenure track

in non-research university settings. The sample has more women than men (67% to 33%), and has more faculty in the social sciences, humanities, and professional fields and fewer in the sciences.

When we collected informed consent we found that the earlier the nomination the more likely the person may have retired or moved institutions. Also, as we went from informed consent to flag files, we realized that for one reason or another about 5% of the Ehrlich files for which we had consent forms were missing. For this study the majority of files were from 2002-2004, with only one from 2005. Excluding the one

2005 nomination, we reviewed 108 of the 276 nominations submitted to Campus Compact for the award from 2002-2004. As such the 109 files represent the nominee files for those faculty of whom we were able to (a) contact effectively, (b) receive written documentation of informed consent, (c) locate their nominee file at the Campus Compact office, and (d) obtain a narrative essay from the file. An additional side note is that we analyzed 109 nominees; however, 8 of those 109 faculty were nominated more than once. In these cases, each person was counted only once but we used all materials available on that person. We also observe

Table 1  
*Nominations by Year*

Year	Number of Nominations	Number Reviewed	Percentage Reviewed
2002	63	21	33%
2003	141	58	41%
2004	72	29	40%
2005	90*	1	1%

*Note.* When nominated more than once, nominee's most recent nomination year is used.

\* Campus Compact records had 92 nominations but only 90 were on file

Table 2  
*Nominee Field*

Field	Number	Percentage
Social Sciences	30	27.52%
Humanities	22	20.18%
Natural and Physical Sciences	2	1.83%
Social Work	3	2.75%
Health Sciences	17	15.60%
Education	9	8.26%
Art	3	2.75%
Engineering	2	1.83%
Business	6	5.50%
Leadership, Service-Learning and Civic Engagement	7	6.42%
Communication/ Journalism	8	7.34%

*Note.* Nominee field was determined based on the department stated on the application.

Table 3  
*Nominee Rank*

Rank	Number	Percentage
Professor	38	34.86%
Associate	35	32.11%
Assistant	20	18.35%
FT non-tenure track	11	10.10%
Adjunct	4	3.37%
Unknown	1	0.92%

*Note.* Nominee rank was determined based on the rank indicated on the nominee's CV.

Table 4  
*Institution Information*

Control	Number	Percentage
Public	58	53%
Private Not-for-Profit	51	47%

Enrollment	Number	Percentage
0-4,999	36	33%
5,000-9,999	24	22%
10,000-14,999	17	15%
15,000-19,999	13	12%
20,000-24,999	10	9%
25,000-29,999	1	1%
30,000-34,999	3	3%
35,000-39,999	2	2%
40,000-44,999	2	2%
45,000-49,999	1	1%
>50,000	0	0%

*Note.* Institutions were counted by nominee – if an institution nominated more than one individual over the course of the years included, they are counted more than once.

Data from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2007 classifications <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=782>

Table 5  
*Institution Type*

Type	Number	Percentage
Associate's	10	9%
Associate's/Bachelor's	1	1%
Bachelor's	18	17%
Master's	44	40%
Doctoral/Research	12	11%
Research (high)	12	11%
Research (very high)	11	10%
Specialty/Health	1	1%

that while our sample is made up of nominees, a smaller sample of the total ( $n = 4$ , 3.67%) were actually award winners. We did not treat these files differently than the others.

#### *Data Analysis*

We examined the data through established methods of qualitative inquiry and discourse analysis and engaged in data coding (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1984; Patton, 1990) to respond to the research questions, as well as to allow divergent themes to emerge. Specifically, we analyzed the discourse of faculty in their written materials and connecting it to the social context in which it was constructed (Allan, 2003; van Dijk, 1997). We wanted to understand the dominant discourses faculty used to describe the problems service-learning addressed, the images of players involved, and how they viewed the significance of the work. Given our previous review of the community engagement literature on the impact of institutional type/mission, discipline, and individual faculty demographics on faculty work (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Colbeck & Michael, 2006; O'Meara, 2008) and on the potential role of commitments to specific causes and issues and community partners (Colbeck & Janke, 2006), we held these ideas in our minds and were cued to notice them in our review of the essays. Our review of the literature on the importance of organizational locations and types of faculty work also cued our attention to faculty positioning of community engagement as teaching-based, research-oriented, disciplinary- or institutionally-grounded. However, we also remained open to other "explanations" and positionings of the work that have not appeared in previous literature.

Guided by this method, we read each of the nominee files several times, making notes that identified explanations for and locations and significance of service-learning. We then coded the narrative essays and other documentation using words and phrases from the nominees that described different representations of the work (Merriam, 2001). We then created categories that (a) reflected the extant research and/or could be interpreted using extant research, (b) were exhaustive in holding all available data, (c) were mutually exclusive, even if related to each other, (d) were close in phrasing to what the participants actually said, and (e) were conceptually congruent (Merriam).

In describing dominant discourse, we observe that every nominee was coded as having multiple discourses or explanations of their work. We did not identify primary and secondary discourses even when we saw that coming through, but rather noted each representation as equal. For this reason, percentages provided in Table VI and in the findings section when

added together do not sum to 100%; rather, they give an impression of the extent to which nominees as a group weaved this kind of explanation into their essays.

We used several strategies to ensure trustworthiness (Merriam, 2001; Yin, 2003). First, an audit trail was maintained by keeping detailed records of all nominee files, our notes, and coding throughout the project. Second, both authors read files, identified dominant discourses, and summed the extent to which each discourse existed across the files. The findings were strengthened by our having done this individually and together to confirm coding and ratings. Third, theory triangulation occurred as we relied on multiple perspectives from studies of service-learning, faculty motivation and behavior, institutionalization of community engagement, and discourse analysis to interpret and contextualize the data.

In document analysis, as in other interpretative research, "the search is not for abstract universals arrived at by statistical generalizations from a sample to a population" (Merriam, 2001, p. 130), but for concrete universals arrived at by studying specific cases in great detail. Merriam pointed out that while generalization as traditionally defined is not the goal of qualitative research, generalizability as concrete universals can be enhanced through rich, thick description so that "readers will be able to determine how closely their situations match the research situation and hence, whether findings can be transferred" (p. 211). Thus, efforts were made through rich description to make the voices of faculty specific enough to be recognizable and relevant to other settings.

There were several limitations to this research design. First, the nominees were writing their essays to present the most flattering picture possible of themselves and their work. As such, there is a clear "halo effect" of both retrospective reflections and a presentation for an awards committee. Second, we present these faculty members as exemplars in service-learning purely by virtue of their nomination for this award; however, there could have been political or other reasons a president nominated one faculty member over another engaged faculty member on a particular campus for the award. While our reading of the files does suggest they are distinctive for both the quantity and quality of their work, they should be considered exemplary by virtue of this narrow definition of having been nominated for a single annual award by their college presidents rather than any additional layer of assessment. Additionally, we note that Campus Compact institutions are institutions that have already made a public commitment to community engagement, as opposed to non-Campus Compact institutions, so these faculty need to be considered as those on campuses with such a commitment.

Furthermore, the Ehrlich award emphasizes service-learning as a form of community engagement over other forms of community engagement. As such, our participants are those we know have been involved in service-learning, but we do not know about other forms of community engagement unless they specifically refer to it in their essays. Finally, the essays and nomination letters were not written to directly answer our research questions but were intended to tell the overall story of an individual's service-learning work throughout his or her career.

On the other hand, the nomination files required additional documentation of service-learning (such as syllabi and project descriptions) which, while not directly analyzed here, gave additional credence to the faculty member's exemplary service-learning record. The fact that each campus could only nominate one person each year created a vetting process for the title (albeit narrowly defined) as exemplary. Given that each nomination file is in itself a "story" or form of "narrative" regarding each engaged faculty member's work, the discourse analysis exploration of these files was deemed appropriate.

An initial exploratory analysis of 68 Ehrlich nomination files from 2005-2006 was conducted (O'Meara, 2008). The current study is distinct from that previous work in two ways. First, this article reviews findings from 2002-2005 with only one 2005 file which was not analyzed in the O'Meara study. Thus, they are primarily distinct databases (though some participants were nominated across multiple years and therefore appear in both studies). Second,

while both articles draw on literature on faculty community engagement, this article takes a discourse analysis approach.

We additionally recognize the possibility of researcher bias. As two individuals who have engaged in service-learning and advocated for greater faculty involvement in service-learning, we both have interest in service-learning "showing well." However, recognizing this we tried to be attentive to assumptions or bias, checking each other throughout the analysis to provide a rigorous examination of the data.

## Findings

In this section we present the answer to the first research question regarding the dominant discourses found in faculty explanations of the purposes and meaning of teaching with service-learning. We found four dominant discourses or conversations. These dominant discourses positioned service-learning as a model of teaching and learning, an expression of personal identity, an expression of institutional context and mission, or embedded in a specific community partnership. Within the discourse of service-learning as a form of teaching and learning there were four different subthemes, while within the discourse of identity there were three subthemes. In this section, each of the discourses we read is explored. At the end of this section, we explore the predominant images of the faculty members themselves, and of their students, communities, or institutions vis-a-vis service-learning (the second research question).

Table 6  
*Summary of Dominant Faculty Discourses about the Purposes of Service-Learning*

Type of Discourse	Discourse	Percent and Number of Faculty Using this Discourse to Explain Service-Learning
Teaching and Learning	Service-learning as a strategy to learn disciplinary knowledge and skills	89% (97/109)
	Service-learning as experiential learning	90% (99/109)
	Service-learning as a way to shape civic and moral dispositions	53% (58/109)
	Service-learning as exposure to diversity	32% (35/109)
Personal Identity	Service-learning as an outgrowth of personal experiences	45% (49/109)
	Service-learning emanating from personal commitment to a social cause	29% (32/109)
	Service-learning stemming from religious experience and identity	3% (3/109)
Institutional	Service-learning as embedded in institutional mission and context	36% (39/109)
Community Partner	Service-learning as originating from and embedded in, a specific community partnership or partner need	18% (20/109)

*Service-learning as a strategy to learn disciplinary knowledge and skills.*

I am a scientist, and thus am committed to train my students in the skills of the discipline. Because I am a geochemist, I have become involved in local efforts to monitor pollution and convince various bodies to do something about this pollution.

As a Spanish Applied Linguist, I take much interest in students' language learning process as well as the retention of their classroom learning. Scholarship of engagement is particularly relevant for foreign language curriculum development...I have argued that service-learning promotes a high-quality, authentic learning environment for practicing Spanish language skills, strengthening cultural knowledge, and enhancing course content acquisition and retention.

The decision, in 1992, to integrate community service into one of my classes arose out of my dissatisfaction with the popular approach to teaching applied ethics...It reinforced students' pre-existing tendency to view ethics as a purely subjective enterprise, wherein attempts to change someone's opinion are mostly futile. In addition, students tended to define ethical behavior primarily in negative terms—do not violate others' rights. My goal was to transform this limited view of ethics into an understanding of ethics as encompassing how one lives one's life. Service-learning seemed well-suited to this goal.

Findings suggest, as reflected in the faculty quotes above, that for about 89% (97/109) of the faculty, the purpose of service-learning is to help them to achieve certain disciplinary goals. Specifically, these goals had to do with knowledge and skills within their field and discipline. This discourse had a story that proceeded as follows. As a faculty member of a specific discipline, the faculty member had realized that they had a certain set of goals for their classes and their majors. They also realized that both in their own classes and their majors overall, students had deficits or blind spots in their learning, and these were in critical areas. Service-learning became the natural, "organic" and as described by these faculty, extremely effective method for responding to these deficits.

The positioning within this dominant explanation of service-learning was more obvious than most. It involved identifying oneself as someone unambiguously in a specific discipline and then noting how service-learning related to their educational goals as a

teacher in that discipline. Common phrases in this discourse, therefore, began with "as a dancer," "as a teacher," and "as a sociologist." Second, there were action words that service-learning was going to help their students achieve, such as to "see," "understand," and "develop." These words were almost always tied to specific disciplinary knowledge, skills, or professional orientation. For example, one faculty member in Psychology explained his service-learning was the result of his desire to have students "see the potential destructiveness of labeling people with terms like schizophrenia and borderline personality disorder..." The faculty in the quotes that began this section similarly explained service-learning as a method to learn the skills of geochemists who monitor pollution, an opportunity to practice language learning skills and acquire cultural knowledge, and a better vehicle toward understanding ethics than had previously been available. In this discourse, the problem is the need to learn knowledge, skills, and the frame of reference or perspectives of a discipline or field—and service-learning is the solution.

*Service-learning as experiential learning.*

I became involved with service-learning out of a desire to find a way for students to see more relevance in some of the abstract concepts they encounter in a typical Introduction to Sociology course.

Kolb's model made me conclude that a lot of our school learning is partial because knowledge is not applied at that time. Indeed, I now believe that experience is needed for full, deeper learning to occur...As a teacher of English as a Second Language, and a bilingual speaker myself, I found that Kolb's ideas rang so true in the case of language acquisition. A second language cannot really be learned in the abstract. It is only in applying the language in a meaningful, communicative way that it is truly acquired.

On the other hand, my involvement in the academy demonstrated that theory, teaching, and learning can be irrelevant and even misleading if not tested and informed by application.

Given the deep roots of the early service-learning movement in experiential learning, it is not surprising that a dominant discourse was the value of service-learning as experiential learning and theory to practice application. Among the participants, 90% (99/109) of faculty explained that they needed ways to show students the relevance of theory in practice. Common repeated phrases in this discourse were that service-learning helped students to see the "relevance" or "significance" of theory and in-class learning in the real world, to prove its worth to them in a



way. For example, one faculty member said, "I have always felt my strengths were in the practice of social work and my contributions tend to be more in my ability to link practice to theory." Common words and phrases used in this discourse were "practice," "apply," and "engage in real world settings." Participants repeatedly explained that their students could better understand the material that they wanted them to learn through experience than through other methods. Theory and content devoid of real world application was the problem, and service-learning as a concrete form of experiential learning and application was the solution.

Given recent critiques of the tendency for higher education to be technocratic (Boyte, 2008) and to emphasize the application of student and faculty knowledge in communities, it is interesting to note that in about half of these cases where the discourse of experiential learning was used to explain the purpose of service-learning, the language used was technocratic and in the other half it was not. That is, in half of the cases, the discourse involved students learning knowledge experientially in communities and simultaneously applying their knowledge to community problems, sharing this knowledge. In such cases, a win-win was presented as students gained from hands on, real world experience while communities gained knowledge that came out of universities. Silent in this positioning was the flow of knowledge in the other direction, wherein learning experientially meant students were gaining knowledge coming entirely from community sources.

*Service-learning as a way to shape civic and moral dispositions.*

Transformational learning must be the central purpose of education. The times we live in and the evolution of pedagogy do not permit us to settle for a lesser educational purpose; students—my students—who participate in service-learning courses emerge from these experiences dedicated to a larger social purpose; and I can't think of any more important educational principle than learning for a lifetime of service.

More than half the participants (53%, 58/109) explained that service-learning helped them to form or shape very real and important student civic and moral values and dispositions. Among these civic and moral values were a sense of civic agency, compassion, civic responsibility, civic mindedness, a sense of the impact of their behavior on others, a sense of social justice, an appreciation for the dignity of human life, an appreciation for the environment, and a commitment to lifelong service. Faculty described service-learning as a way to "wake" students from a perceived lethargy or lack

of awareness of these virtues or habits of mind and into a sort of apprenticeship to practice them. In this discourse the problem was less clearly identified as in the previous two sections; however, it seemed to be a world that needed citizens and human beings with civic and moral dispositions to address important social problems. Service-learning became an apprenticeship or playing field wherein they could be exposed to these dispositions and be shaped as individuals possessing them. Service-learning, in this discourse, was the landscape wherein one either acquired or enhanced these dispositions.

*Service-learning as exposure to diversity.*

Because the X university student population is a very traditional private college population of 18-22 year olds, most of whom live on campus with other 18-22 year olds, and most of whom are European-American and from economically privileged backgrounds, their understanding of other age groups and the development of people from other backgrounds could be limited.

This is particularly significant for the educational process at my institution because of the background of students I teach...The Southeast campus, where I teach, is located in a suburban area; the typical student enrolled in my classes is 19-28 years old, White, middle class and early in the college experience. Many of these students have had little experience with members of racial/ethnic groups or social classes outside their own, other than superficial interaction at school with children based from other neighborhoods.

For almost a third of faculty (32%, 35/109), service-learning was an intentional strategy to develop multicultural understanding and skills working in diverse environments. The discourse here began the same way in almost every case. Faculty explained that at their institution, the student body is very homogeneous and the students sheltered. They wanted to expose students to "the real world" which they represented as more racially and socio-economically diverse than their typical classes. Common phrases used to describe student knowledge of people and cultures different than their own was "limited," "sheltered," "superficial," and "uninformed." As one faculty wrote, "What better way to inculcate this spirit than to get the students out of the sheltered classroom and to work in inner-city X?" This discourse assumed a homogeneous, somewhat privileged student body which would not have been the case had the participants been primarily from two- and four-year public institutions.

By engaging students in service-learning with

diverse communities, faculty intended to dispel myths and stereotypes, "reveal" the real world to them, and enhance skills in communication across difference. They furthermore wanted students to feel more comfortable in these settings and seek out diversity in the future.

As evident in the quotes above, the educational problem identified by faculty is that their students have no knowledge of cultures other than their own. Service-learning is positioned as a way that faculty can help students gain knowledge of different cultures, skills in communicating across cultures, and appreciation of diversity.

### *Personal Identity*

#### *Service-learning as an outgrowth of personal experiences.*

As a child of civil rights activists in the 1970s, I learned that responsible people take thoughtful and caring action to bring about changes in the world.... I believe that those early sensibilities explain my deep connection with service-learning.

Findings suggest that for about 45% (49/109) of the faculty, their service-learning work was very much viewed as embedded in their individual identity and experiences, i.e., their autobiography. These past personal experiences were strong formative and shaping experiences, which faculty explained, caused them to develop a service ethic they are living out by engaging their students in service-learning. Examples were faculty who grounded their opening lines of explanation of their service-learning by saying, "As a high school studies and special education teacher in the early 1980s," and, "As a former Peace Corps volunteer."

Faculty provided rich descriptions of their past experiences and located their current service-learning work as directly related to those experiences. Such experiences included serving on the staff of the MLK Jr. civil rights organizations in Chicago, teaching philosophy to prisoners, and spending time in a local prosecutors' office and with community organizing. In this discourse, service-learning practice in courses today was directly related to their own individual past and present experiences. Rather than a solution to a problem, service-learning was related to fulfilling an autobiography. Faculty positioned themselves at the center of the work with students following. Community partners were only situated in the picture to the degree that faculty mentioned how the former experiences had formed a lifelong commitment to a particular partner. However, this was rare, as in most cases the professional experiences were set in another time and place and the current service-

learning practice was not tied to the same experience, just explained as originating from it.

#### *Service-learning emanating from a personal commitment to a social cause.*

I am supporting the struggle of Cape Verdeans to reduce the impact of gentrification and displacement.

My personal goal is to provide a safe, accessible playground to every child in public school in the city of X.

Findings suggest that for about 29% (32/109) of the faculty, service-learning enables them to express a commitment to a specific social cause. Faculty identify a problem locally, regionally, nationally, or internationally, and service-learning is one way they hope to address it.

Faculty frequently explained their commitment to service-learning through their frustration with injustice abroad and in the U.S. and a desire to be a part of positive change. For example, one nominee mentioned a desire "to use social scientific knowledge and techniques for progressive social change," and another "a devotion to children, families, and underserved populations in our culture." One nominee mentioned a "personal mission to cultivate the connections between language and peace across disciplines," and another wrote about a "personal commitment to getting more people into politics." A final illustration was a faculty member who explained their service-learning through the rationale of a "long-term commitment in the Chicano/a and Latino/a community." In each case, faculty rationales for service-learning related to their personal commitment to respond to a social need or situation.

#### *Service-learning stemming from religious experience and identity.*

In only three cases, faculty explained their service-learning from an explicitly religious perspective. One faculty member explained that as a child she had grown up understanding from her religious tradition that she had an obligation to go forth and "repair the world." Two others mentioned their faith and linked service-learning to a desire to heal or contribute good things to the world. In these cases, faculty positioned themselves as stewards and service-learning as the way to lead and serve others.

#### *Service-Learning as Grounded in Institutional Mission*

Service-learning suits the general mission of X College as well as my personal teaching mission and philosophy...[service-learning addresses] X's goal of educating students through inte-

grating the liberal arts and professions within a values sensitive environment. I know of no better way to accomplish this type of education than through service-learning.

“Knowledge in the service of others” is valued at X College. Through these four service projects, professional communication processes enhanced the learning processes for each participant, extending the boundaries of my classroom, and allowing for each student to live the mission of the school.

X College’s longstanding commitment to supporting student civic engagement is legendary... This call to social justice work along with X colleges’ longstanding emphasis on experiential and holistic approaches to learning, has provided a supportive environment for my approach to teaching.

Findings suggest that for about 36% (39/109) of the faculty, service-learning was part of the way they contribute to their institutional mission. For these faculty, service-learning is a response to a set of goals and ideals. This played out in several different ways in participants’ discourse. There were those who very directly stated their institutional mission and context and explained how service-learning helped them to satisfy that mission. Examples included faculty who described Jesuit missions, land-grant missions, urban metropolitan missions, and humanistic liberal arts missions. One faculty member noted his institutional mission was “to enhance student’s abilities to examine themselves, their societies, and the broader world,” and service-learning allowed him to help make that happen. A number of faculty mentioned institutional missions stipulating each student have an experiential, intercultural, international, or interdisciplinary experience. Participants connected their work to excerpts and taglines of institutional mission statements.

There were also participants that explained their service-learning as an outgrowth of a supportive institutional environment. In such examples, the institution was posed as an incubator where it was natural and likely service-learning would grow. Some faculty explained that service-learning was expected and rewarded at their institution; it was considered a normal part of faculty work and that is why they do it. Other faculty explained their service-learning work as something going on at a place that had a long history of service-learning, and that their work springs out of that institutional “encouragement and support.” Still other faculty mentioned that their campus had been integrating service-learning into majors, general education, or graduation requirements so they were doing service-learning because it was now part of what had to be done in those classes.

### *Service-Learning as Originating From, and Embedded In, a Specific Community Partnership or Community Partner Need*

Findings suggest that for about 18% (20/109) of the faculty, their work was very much viewed as embedded in their commitment to a specific community partner. In these cases, faculty described their work as arising from a call from the community to which they and their class responded. Some in this group discussed their work in terms of how it responded to various partners’ needs. For example, as one faculty member described, “We work with [a community service or nonprofit organization in our local area] to understand the consumer they are trying to reach, study the consumer in in-depth interviewing or observation in context...” Another faculty member explained that his service-learning work began “as a consequence of a simple conversation with the CEO of a local home for the elderly who described the isolation of many of the residents.” It was clear that the depth of the partnerships varied greatly, as did their length. However, the constant in this discourse was the idea that the faculty engaged in service-learning because of a specific community partner need or because of the nature of the relationship between a faculty member and a community partner. That is, instead of starting with pedagogy or students, this discourse started with the community.

### *Discussion: Images and Positioning in Discourses about Service-Learning*

In Allan’s (2003) analysis of 21 university women’s commission reports, she found dominant discourses of femininity, access, and professionalism. In each case, the dominant discourse produced subject positions. For example, these discourses situated women as vulnerable and dependent on the university administration to provide for them, positioned women as on the outside of organizations, and set up successful women as “outstanding.” In other words, women were positioned as either victims, outsiders, or unusual and thus policies and strategies were suggested to address these problems or situations, whether by identifying and disenfranchising oppressors, inviting women into power circles, or providing professional development to make more women unusually successful. Similarly, through discourse analysis of 103 opinion pieces and articles in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Allan, Gordon, and Iverson (2006) found four predominant discourses shaping images of leaders: autonomy, relatedness, masculinity, and professionalism. The authors found that these discourses constructed images of leaders as experts, beneficiaries, heroes, tyrants, negotiators, and facilitators. In identifying these discourses, the point was not that

they were in and of themselves unimportant or ineffective. Rather, the point was to suggest that readers consider the limitations of these discourses in that they may obscure other important, alternative, and more empowering discourses in either women's policy reports or discussions about leadership.

In this study, the two most prevalent discourses had to do with service-learning as experiential learning and disciplinary learning. Two other teaching and learning discourses—the development of civic and moral dispositions and multicultural learning—were present among a third and half of participants. Each of these four discourses frame service-learning as a pedagogy to achieve specific learning outcomes. In the ways in which faculty explained the problems that service-learning solved, they positioned themselves as the person in charge, as responsible for providing that education that was sorely needed by students—whether it be disciplinary, theory to practice, diversity, or civic and moral dispositions. It was faculty who provided the knowledge, developed the skills, and shaped the moral and civic values of their students through the vehicle of service-learning. It was faculty who open up doors to the community for students to explore diverse cultures. There was an assumption faculty were already exposed to these ideas. Even in the cases where faculty described service-learning as something that facilitated students sense of self-efficacy and civic agency, there was a sense that faculty were the ones who “light the fire” rather than direction coming from within or from community partners. In fact the educator discourse seemed to quiet, if not forget, the major role community partners play in student education, or recognize the entire “students as colleagues” movement (Zlotkowski, Longo, & Williams, 2006).

On the one hand, the image that emerges from these narratives of faculty as teacher, and service-learning as the most effective tool in his or her tool-belt, is consistent with findings from previous research on faculty attraction and motivation for service-learning (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Colbeck & Michael, 2006; Hammond, 1994; Holland, 1999; O'Meara, 2008). It is also consistent with more traditional paradigms of teaching and learning and the autonomy of teachers to craft their syllabus, determine pedagogy, and evaluate students. Yet it also seems like a dated, if not partially incomplete discourse. Barr and Tagg's (1995) pivotal work on moving our paradigm from teaching to learning, Freire's (1970) foundational work on moving toward transformational learning as opposed to banking education, and much educational research on service-learning, have created awareness of the role of students at the center of the service-learning experience, empowered to conduct their own learning, and in fact providing learning opportunities

for faculty. Eyler and Giles' (1999) research on the critical role of community partner voice in student learning suggests a direct relationship between the community partner on site and classroom learning, not necessarily mediated by faculty expertise.

As is the case in Allan's (2003) analysis of dominant discourses regarding the status of women, the issue is not so much that the educator discourse is wrong—and in fact, it serves to recruit faculty toward service-learning in many centers for teaching and learning and offices of service-learning. Rather, it makes sense to consider what alternative discourses it quiets. In this case, it may be quieting alternative discourses of faculty as learners and colleagues who are not so much opening doors to rooms they have been in before but to which they themselves have never visited.

The dominant discourse of service-learning faculty as an outgrowth of identity, whether through past experiences, religious commitments, or commitments to a social cause, also seemed to situate faculty at the center of the service-learning, although in a different way. There was silence regarding the role of the institution, discipline, or educational philosophy in these cases; the emphasis was on the faculty member and their past inspirations and current commitments. Faculty positioned students and courses as vehicles through which a faculty member lived out ideas and commitments and/or connected with professional networks. In many ways this seemed to privatize the work, albeit unintentionally. In other words, the discourse of service-learning as a conduit through which a faculty member lived out personal concerns—whether they be moral, political, cultural, or social justice oriented—could silence a discourse of service-learning as a department commitment, as the result of a community-initiated university partnership, or the result of students or alumni who pushed a department or institution toward such engagement.

The dominant discourse of service-learning as an outgrowth of institutional mission had quite the opposite subject position. In fact, in most of these cases the dominant discourse seemed to position faculty themselves as simply a vehicle through which their institution was meeting their educational goals of developing students or serving the community in certain ways. In the cases where the educational mission of institutions was emphasized, the institution was the major player, the faculty the medium, and the students the end goal. In cases where the service mission of the institution was emphasized, the discourse seemed to situate the institution as the major player and the community as the recipient of its gifts. The focus was mostly one-directional. Whether it be to fulfill a service mission or help students learn gener-

al education goals, the emphasis is more on what the institution needs or wants to do rather than community partner needs or goals, which may differ from those of the institution. While the discourse and image of an institution living out its mission and goals through service-learning is an important one, it may quiet other stories of communities getting together and making decisions about what they want from their neighbors and their voice and interest in the endeavor. It also tends to ignore or quiet any inherent political tensions between students and communities that may exist, brought on by differences in race/ethnicity, social class, or town-gown history. Having considered some of the predominant discourses and images in faculty discourse on service-learning, the next section considers implications of our findings for recruitment and support of faculty, for how we research service-learning faculty, and for how the experience is framed in public discourse.

### Implications: Reframing Service-Learning in Higher Education Discourse

From a purely faculty development perspective, these findings affirm previous findings regarding faculty attraction to and motivation for involvement in service-learning. At least for this group of exemplars, service-learning is primarily a way to enhance teaching and learning. Advocates of service-learning should continue to develop ways to assist faculty in getting the most out of service-learning experiences in terms of student learning outcomes, helping faculty to be explicit about the kinds of learning they are after (whether disciplinary skill building or content, theory to practice, diversity or civic and moral dispositions), and developing assessment mechanisms that track those outcomes. Given teaching is the central unifying role of the professoriate (Bess, 1977; Fairweather, 1996) and the one that provides significant satisfaction to many faculty (Hagedorn, 2000), if faculty believe service-learning can help them achieve the major goals mentioned above, they are more likely to persist. On the other hand, if their rationale is primarily educational and they find another way to achieve the same learning outcomes, they may leave this pedagogy in favor of a less time-intensive strategy.

A second implication for practice relates to the perhaps unintentional privatization of service-learning in educator and personal experience discourses. For example, the discourse of service-learning related to personal experience and commitments to social issues seems to position service-learning at the individual faculty member's whim, so if he or she leaves the institution or decides to change his or her priorities or commitments, the service-learning is over. Similarly,

in the discourses related to teaching, many of the nominees posed their classes as private enterprises using phrases like "in my class" and isolating the work to something that happens only in the cocoon of this particular class and instructor. This image is one of service-learning as a special project of the faculty member rather than public work, university work, or community work. Clearly this affirms the observation made by many that lone ranger approaches to faculty development (O'Meara, Terosky, & Neumann, 2008) are likely to be much less effective for communities and students than department commitments where curricular coherence and collective responsibility can be achieved and partnerships institutionalized in ways that go well beyond one class, one faculty member, or one semester.

In terms of how academic leaders talk about service-learning and its future role in promoting the best kinds of educational excellence and university-community partnership, these findings suggest there is much work to do. Saltmarsh et al. (in press) considered the application essays of institutions receiving Carnegie classification as most engaged, and even in these applications it was hard to find evidence of truly reciprocal partnerships having been institutionalized into campus policies and practices. The essays reviewed for this analysis were of exemplar faculty and yet the rhetoric rarely brought actual partnerships to the center of the stories, much less students as civic actors as well as learners.

The history and origins of the service-learning movement also provide some explanation for the findings and present state of discourse among faculty about service-learning, particularly the emphasis on service-learning as a vehicle for experiential learning and acquisition of disciplinary knowledge and goals. As Butin (2005) described, the emphasis on the pedagogical usefulness of service-learning, what he termed a "technical conceptualization," is one of the four primary ways that service-learning has been framed. In producing the popular 21 book series, *Service-Learning and the Disciplines*, the former American Association of Higher Education advertised service-learning widely as "supporting learning, in your discipline, what you teach... without sacrificing academic rigor" (AAHE, 1997). For more than 15 years many national associations and disciplinary associations have vociferously argued just this point: service-learning is important because it helps us to learn knowledge and skills in disciplines. This has been the road to institutionalization and widespread acceptance of the practice. Therefore it is not a surprise that we would hear this echoed in the voices of Ehrlich Award nominees.

However, it is interesting to note that these purposes of service-learning may have unintentional nega-

tive consequences related to other potential rationales and explanations of service-learning. For example, Boyte (2008) has argued that a technocratic approach, wherein faculty and students have the expertise and either practice it or learn it in communities, works against genuine university-community partnership and collaboration and against the development of civic agency in students. It does this by emphasizing what faculty and student partners have to give over what they have to learn, and it elevates student learning over the products or purposes of the project for the community or for the public good. By emphasizing the disciplinary over the civic purposes of service-learning, faculty could be accused of disempowering community partners and students simultaneously.

Yet our findings do not suggest faculty have adopted disciplinary over civic purposes for their service-learning wholesale. Understanding of service-learning as a mechanism to develop civic and moral dispositions is present in half of the faculty essays. So while not as dominant a rationale as disciplinary learning and experiential learning, it is there nonetheless. Perhaps the alternative discourses that need to be elevated in public and professional rhetoric around service-learning are ones that place students and community partnerships more as teachers and civic agents, with faculty playing greater supporting roles and engaged in learning themselves. To consider these alternative discourses, though, means recognizing the political reasons why specific institutional types or national associations elevate some discourses over others to better advantage service-learning within that culture or set of stakeholders. For example, are there some more research-oriented campuses where the explicit rationale of service-learning as a way to develop multicultural understanding will not be accepted as legitimate, but where connections made around experiential or disciplinary knowledge will have traction? Are there ways in which service-learning teaching for civic dispositions or being part of a university-community partnership appears to be outside the job description of tenure track faculty, but service-learning to be a good engineer or nurse or geochemist is not? Attempting to transform public rhetoric to acknowledge some of these alternate discourses no doubt means tackling these questions as well as the reasons so few faculty exemplars used the term "politics" in their explanation of their work, and why even in non-research oriented institutions, service-learning explanations were more likely to be grounded in discipline than institutional mission.

In terms of future research on faculty and service-learning, we think discourse analysis strategies and perspectives provide invaluable tools. Weedon (1997) suggests that all discursive practices be analyzed to examine "how they are structured, what

power relations they produce and reproduce, where there are resistances and where we might look for weak points more open to challenge and transformation" (p. 132). Discourse analysis strategies offer a unique window into how faculty conceive of their work and implications for practice. Future research could follow such discourses and rationales into the classroom and community to better understand how they influence actual service-learning activities and outcomes. For example, are faculty who understand service-learning as a disciplinary exercise more or less likely to develop reciprocal partnerships than faculty who view it as the development of civic skills in students or as part of a social cause? Discourse analysis strategies could also be used in the study of institutional policy reports which have been written by numerous task forces and committees on the status of engagement and service-learning on campuses. They would also be useful in understanding how rhetoric on the purposes of service-learning emerging from Campus Compact, Learn and Serve America, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, Imagining America, the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement and other national associations and think-tanks elevates the discourse of service-learning as disciplinary learning, citizenship preparation and/or community partnership, and the implications for practice, such as how it is viewed for faculty reward systems and which kinds of projects are funded. Discourse analysis strategies affirm the idea that how we explain service-learning impacts its practice. Further research is needed to explore how our words, in fact, are shaping our actions and in what ways.

## References

- 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.
- Aquirre, A., Jr. (2000). *Women and minority faculty in the workplace: Recruitment, retention, and academic culture*. (ASHE-ERIC higher education report, no. 27). Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Allan, E. J. (2003). Constructing women's status: Policy discourses of university women's commission reports. *Harvard Educational Review*, 73(1), 44-72.
- Allan, E.J., Gordon, S.P., & Iverson, S.V. (2006). Rethinking practices of power: The discursive framing of leadership in the Chronicle of Higher Education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 30(1), 41-68.
- AAHE (1997). *Service-Learning in the Disciplines*. Edward Zlotkowski, Series Editor. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education.

- Antonio, A. Astin, H., & Cress, C. (2000). Community service in higher education: A Look at the nation's faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 23(4), 373-397.
- Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education*, 39(3), 363-391.
- Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change*, 27(6), 12-25
- Bess, J.L (1977). The motivation to teach. *Journal of Higher Education*, 48(3), 243-258.
- Bland, C., Center, B., Finstad, D., Risbey, K., & Staples, J. (2006). The impact of appointment type on the productivity and commitment of full-time faculty in research and doctoral institutions. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(1), 89-123.
- Boyte, H. C. (2004). *Going public: Academics and public life*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation.
- Boyte, H. C. (2008). Against the current: Developing the civic agency of students. *Change*, 40(3), 8-15.
- Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2000). Institutionalization of service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 71(3), 273-290.
- Burgess, R.G. (Ed.). (1982). *Field research: A source book and field manual*. London: Routledge.
- Butin, D.W. (2005). Service-learning as postmodern pedagogy. In D.W. Butin (Ed.), *Service-learning in higher education: Critical issues and directions* (pp. 89-104). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Butin, D.W. (2006). The limits of service-learning in higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 29(4), 473-498.
- Campus Compact (1999). President's declaration on the civic responsibility of higher education. Retrieved October 20, 2008 from <http://www.compact.org/resources/declaration>.
- Clark, B. R. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Coates, J. (1996). *Women talk*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Colbeck, C., & Janke, E. (2006, November 4). *If not for the rewards... Why? Theory-based research about what motivates faculty to engage in public scholarship*. Symposium presentation at the Annual Conference of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Anaheim, CA.
- Colbeck, C. & Michael, P. (2006). Individual and organizational influences on faculty members' engagement in public scholarship. In R.A. Eberly & J.R. Cohen (Eds.), *A laboratory for public scholarship and democracy* (pp. 17-26). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Creamer, E. G. (1998). *Assessing faculty publication productivity: Issues of equity*. (ASHE-ERIC higher education report, no. 26(2)). Washington, D.C.: George Washington University Graduate School of Education and Human Development.
- Daloz, L. A., Keen, C. H., Keen, J. P., & Parks, S. D. (1996). *Common fire: Lives of commitment in a complex world*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). Introduction. Entering the field of qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1-17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E. (Eds.). (1999). *Making outreach visible: A workbook on documenting professional service and outreach*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.
- Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E., Jr. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. New York: Longman.
- Fairweather, J. S. (1996). *Faculty work and public trust: Restoring the value of teaching and public service in American academic life*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Giles, D.E. & Eyler, J. (1994). The theoretical roots of service-learning in John Dewey: Toward a theory of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1, 77-85.
- Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1981). *Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Gumport, P. J. (2002). *Academic pathfinders: Knowledge creation and feminist scholarship*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Hagedorn, L.S. (2000). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes. In L.S. Hagedorn (Ed.), *What contributes to job satisfaction among faculty and staff* (pp. 5-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hammond, C. (1994). Integrating service and academic study: Faculty motivation and satisfaction in Michigan higher education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1, 21-28.
- Hicks, D. (1995). Discourse, learning and teaching. *Review of Research in Education*, 21, 49-95.
- Hodder, I. (1994). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 393-402). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holland, B. A. (1999). Factors and strategies that influence faculty involvement in public service. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 4(1), 37-43.
- Hartley, M. & Hollander, E. (2005). The elusive ideal: Civic learning and higher education. In S. Fuhrman & M. Lazerson (Eds.), *Institutions of democracy: The public schools* (pp. 252-276). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hollander, E., & Hartley, M. (2000). Civic renewal in higher education: The state of the movement and the need for a natural network. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Higher education and civic responsibility* (pp. 345-366). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Huber, M. T. (2004). *Balancing acts: The scholarship of teaching and learning in academic careers*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Merriam, S. (2001). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. & Associates. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M.G. & Huberman, A.M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Mills, S. (1997). *Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Morton, K. (1995). The irony of service: Charity, project and social change in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2, 19-32.
- Neumann, A., & Peterson, P. (1997). *Learning from our lives: Women, research, and autobiography in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- O'Meara, K.A. (2005). Effects of encouraging multiple forms of scholarship nationwide and across institutional types. In K.A. O'Meara & R.E. Rice (Eds.), *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship* (pp. 77-95). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- O'Meara, K. (2008) Motivation for public scholarship and engagement: Listening to exemplars. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(1), 7-29.
- O'Meara, K., Sandmann, L., Saltmarsh, J., & Giles, D. (2009). *Studying the professional lives and work of faculty involved in community engagement*. Unpublished manuscript.
- O'Meara, K., Terosky, A.L., & Neumann, A. (2009). Faculty careers and work lives: A professional growth perspective. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 34(3). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Peters, S. J., Jordan, N. R., Adamek, M., & Alter, T. (Eds.). (2005). *Engaging campus and community: The practice of public scholarship in the state and land-grant university system*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.
- Rhee, J. & Sagaria, M.A. D. (2004). International students: Constructions of imperialism in the Chronicle of Higher Education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 28(1), 77-96.
- Saltmarsh, J., Giles D. E., Jr., O'Meara, K., Sandmann, L., Ward, E., & Buglione, S. M. (in press). The institutional home for faculty engagement: An investigation of reward policies at engaged campuses. In B.E. Moely, S.H. Billig, & B.A. Holland (Eds.), *Advances in service-learning research: Creating our identities in service-learning and civic engagement*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Saltmarsh, J., & Hartley, M. (2008). *Democratic civic engagement: Higher education and democracy: The future of engagement*. Boston: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.
- Stanton, T.K., Giles, D.E., & Cruz, N.I. (1999). *Service-learning: A movement's pioneers reflect on its origin, practice, and future*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Terosky, A. L. (2005). *Taking teaching seriously: A study of university professors and their undergraduate teaching*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Van Dijk, T. (Ed). (1997). *Discourse as structure and process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ward, K. (2003). *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement*. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 29(5)), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory* (3rd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zlotkowski, E. (2000). Civic engagement and the academic disciplines. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education* (pp. 309-322). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Zlotkowski, E., Longo, N.V., & Williams, J.R. (Eds.). (2006). *Students as colleagues: Expanding the circle of service-learning leadership*. Boston: Campus Compact.

## Authors

KERRYANN O'MEARA (komeara@umd.edu) is an associate professor of Higher Education in the College of Education, University of Maryland, College Park. Her research explores the individual and organizational contexts around faculty community engagement including academic reward systems and cultures, the origins of faculty civic agency, and faculty professional growth and learning.

ELISABETH NIEHAUS (eniehaus@umd.edu) is a doctoral student in the College Student Personnel program at the University of Maryland, College Park where she serves as the graduate coordinator for the Minor in Leadership Studies. Her research interests include service-learning and short-term immersion programs.