

Faculty Use of Community-Based Learning: What Factors Really Matter?

Melinda Russell-Stamp

Weber State University

The purpose of this study was to determine what factors really matter to faculty at a teaching institution in deciding whether or not to use community-based learning (CBL) in their classrooms. The Web-based Faculty Service Learning Beliefs Inventory (wFSLBI), developed and used with faculty at a research university, was administered to faculty at a teaching institution. Analyses of 142 respondents revealed that faculty involved in CBL perceived fewer classroom barriers than non-CBL faculty. Faculty with more CBL experience perceived more classroom benefits for CBL and reported having more administrators, colleagues, and community members that supported them compared to less experienced CBL faculty. Contingent faculty were less aware of services and resources supporting CBL than tenured/tenure track faculty.

The 1999 Kellogg Commission Report, *Returning to Our Roots*, proposed educational reforms to successfully move higher education into the 21st century, including the movement toward an “engaged institution” committed to building mutual, reciprocal partnerships between communities and higher education. This movement has prompted many colleges and universities to establish formal centers for community engagement, service-learning courses, and administrative positions to support this work.

Because community-based learning (CBL) is largely a curricular endeavor, faculty investment is critical to the institutionalization and sustainability of this practice (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995, 2000). While numerous institutions of higher education are placing renewed emphasis on civic engagement and community service, Ward (1998) notes that attaining significant faculty participation in the engagement movement is the most important and significant challenge. Understanding the factors that motivate and deter faculty use of community-based learning is critical if the engagement movement is to continue to flourish. Unfortunately, there is a paucity of research on faculty perceptions of community-based learning, though some studies have considered factors motivating faculty to use CBL.

Wade and Demb (2009) postulate that these motivating factors can be institutional, professional, and/or personal. Studies have begun to explore the interplay between these factors and how they guide faculty decision-making regarding the use of CBL.

Institutional factors. Administrative and departmental support for CBL (Hinck & Brandell, 2000) and the establishment of a centralized office to support engagement activities (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000; Vogel, Seifer,

& Gelmon, 2010) are frequently identified as institutional factors that encourage faculty use of community-based learning. Bringle and Hatcher (1996) provide examples of how university service-learning centers can support faculty engagement, such as surveying faculty interest and disseminating information on service-learning; providing initial training, ongoing professional development opportunities, and technical assistance for both new and experienced faculty; developing faculty mentoring programs; and publicizing faculty service-learning accomplishments. In the study by Vogel, Seifer, and Gelmon, directors of service-learning centers also stressed the importance of their offices maintaining community partnerships to facilitate faculty-community partner relationships.

The type of higher education institution (research vs. teaching) also has been connected to level of faculty involvement in CBL. At research institutions, high expectations for research productivity combined with traditional definitions of scholarship may discourage faculty participation in community engagement. Moore and Ward (2010) note that the prevalent faculty belief at research institutions is that service and time-consuming pedagogies such as CBL may distract faculty from their primary responsibility—research productivity. In contrast, faculty at teaching institutions, where research productivity is de-emphasized, may have greater freedom and time to pursue community engagement activities. However, the pressure to publish may even extend to faculty at teaching institutions given the trend toward higher expectations for research productivity in teaching settings (Aldersley, 1995).

Professional factors. A faculty member’s academic rank has been hypothesized to influence participation

in CBL. However, research on academic rank has yielded mixed results. Some studies have found that faculty with less status tend to be more service-oriented (Abes et al., 2002; Antonio et al., 2000). In one faculty survey, 38.9% of respondents indicated that incorporating CBL in courses is time-consuming and difficult to balance with their other professional roles and responsibilities (Abes et al.). Since teaching tends to be the primary responsibility of contingent faculty, they may have more time to engage in CBL than tenure-track faculty who must balance multiple professional roles (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006). These workload demands and the tenure "clock" may deter tenure-track faculty from devoting time to CBL, especially when service activities, where CBL tends to be categorized, are the least rewarded aspect of faculty work (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Jaeger & Thornton, 2006; Ward, 2003). When asked what institutional changes would motivate them to increase their CBL involvement, faculty most frequently cited reorganizing the tenure and promotion policies to give more weight to engagement work (Demb & Wade, 2012).

There are factors that also may impede contingent faculty from pursuing CBL. Kezar (2013) interviewed 107 contingent faculty from three different institutions regarding their working conditions and the potential impact of these conditions on their performance. Factors that interfered with adequate class preparation included last minute hiring, lack of orientation, lack of mentoring, lack of access to support staff and resources, and exclusion from department meetings. Part-time contingent faculty members are more likely than full-time contingent faculty to face these challenges (Kezar). Not only can these obstacles hinder effective teaching but they can also decrease the likelihood that contingent faculty will choose to implement an unfamiliar, often time-consuming pedagogy like CBL. The aforementioned factors may also decrease the likelihood that contingent faculty members will be aware of university resources available to support CBL. Including the perspectives of contingent faculty in research studies is important given that in the United States non-tenure-track appointments in higher education have increased from 55% in 1975 to 76% in 2011 (American Association of University Professors Research Office, 2013).

Personal factors. According to the Transtheoretical Model (TTM), behavior change occurs after a person determines that the pros of implementing a new practice outweigh the costs associated with the change (Prochaska & Climente, 1986). Applied to CBL, faculty who adopt CBL should perceive more benefits than barriers to community engagement than non-CBL faculty. Faculty also will consider a behavior

change when they believe that the innovative teaching practice will result in higher self-efficacy and the investment needed to incorporate the change is small (Deci & Ryan, 1982). Teacher self-efficacy involves a faculty members' confidence in their ability to plan, organize, and execute activities that promote desired educational goals (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Thus, faculty are more likely to adopt CBL if they believe that this pedagogy will enhance their teaching ability (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007), and anticipate the costs (time involved, loss of control over course content) to be minimal. Concerns regarding the implementation of CBL may be allayed if faculty are aware of CBL resources and perceive support from their colleagues, administrators, and the community.

To systematically study faculty perceptions regarding the benefits and challenges of CBL, Hou (2010) developed the Web-based Faculty Service-Learning Beliefs Inventory (wFSLBI). Factor analysis confirmed that the inventory items loaded on four factors: classroom benefits (PROS-CLS), community benefits (PROS-COM), classroom barriers (CONS-CLS), and institutional barriers (CONS-INST). Hou administered the on-line survey to 449 faculty members at a major research university. Results indicated that faculty involved with CBL perceived significantly more classroom and community benefits for this practice than faculty without CBL experience. While faculty members with CBL experience recognized fewer classroom barriers than faculty without CBL experience, no significant difference was found between the two groups with regard to perceived institutional barriers.

The current study sought to use the Web-based Faculty Service-Learning Beliefs Inventory (wFSLBI) in a different higher education setting and with a different faculty population than the Hou study. While the Hou study drew primarily tenured/tenure-track faculty from a large research university, the participants in the current study were from a large, regional, open-enrollment teaching institution where 63% of the faculty members are contingent (56% part-time adjuncts, 7% full-time instructors). Such an effort is warranted because type of institution and faculty rank may impact level of CBL involvement among faculty.

While this teaching institution maintains 135 community partnerships in several counties, engagement efforts primarily focus on the urban community where the university is located. According to U.S. Census data, 30% of this community is Hispanic/Latino and 20% of the students are English Language Learners. Challenges faced by the community include access to early childhood education, poverty (21% below poverty level), and unemploy-

ment (15.8%) (2010 US Census). The community was awarded a federal Promise Neighborhood Grant in 2012 to develop a plan for building community resources that foster positive educational and developmental outcomes for youth.

CBL is salient at this institution. Engagement is included in the university mission and the institution has held the Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement since 2008. An on-campus office supporting CBL was formally established five years prior to this study and recently expanded to a second location in the community. Because perceived support from administrators and colleagues as well as access to instructional resources are deemed important (Moore & Ward, 2010; Vogel et al., 2010), faculty were also asked about their awareness of and use of CBL supports, and comparisons were made among faculty based on their CBL experience, rank, and level of involvement with CBL. These findings have potential implications for engagement programming and professional development opportunities for faculty with diverse levels of CBL experience.

Research Questions

This study sought the answers to the following four research questions at a teaching-prioritized university:

- (a) How do faculty at a teaching institution heavily reliant on contingent instructors perceive benefits and barriers of using CBL in their classrooms?
- (b) Is there a difference in perceived benefits and barriers between those faculty using CBL compared to those not using CBL, and between tenured/tenure-track faculty and contingent faculty?
- (c) Is there a difference in awareness and utilization of CBL resources between those faculty using CBL compared to those not using CBL, and between tenured/tenure-track faculty and contingent faculty?
- (d) Is there a correlation between level of involvement with CBL and (1) perceived benefits and barriers (2) perceived supports, and (3) awareness and utilization of campus CBL resources?

Method

Participants

Eight hundred faculty members at a teaching institution in the western half of the United States were eligible to participate in this study by completing the w-FSLBI. A total of 188 faculty members completed the online survey resulting in a response rate of 23.5%. Nineteen of these surveys were incomplete

and excluded from further analysis. Twenty-seven surveys were not analyzed because the respondents indicated that they were unfamiliar with community-based learning (CBL). Therefore, the final sample included a total of 142 participants, 75 of whom had CBL experience while the remaining 67 reported no CBL experience. While a higher percentage of females responded to the survey, no significant gender differences were determined between the CBL and non-CBL groups, $X^2(1, N = 142) = .199, p = .66, phi = .04$. However, there was a significant difference among the groups with regard to faculty rank, $X^2(1, N = 142) = 5.91, p = .01, phi = .21$, with the CBL group having significantly more tenured and tenure-track faculty (54.6%) than the non-CBL group (34.3%). Almost 66% of the faculty in the non-CBL group were considered contingent faculty (instructor, adjunct) compared to 45% of the respondents with CBL experience. In terms of race/ethnicity, this sample displayed a great deal of homogeneity with a total of 91.1% of respondents identifying as European-American. Demographic information from the Institutional Research office at the university revealed that 87% of faculty at the university are European-American, 42% are female, and 37% are tenured/tenure-track. Compared to overall faculty at the university, this sample was more likely to be female (58%) and have a higher percentage of tenured/tenure-track respondents (45%) than the university population as a whole.

Measurement

The research instrument used in the study was an online survey that included four sections. Section I asked faculty whether or not they had experience with community-based learning (CBL). The definition of community-based learning provided for participants was the one adopted by the university: "Community-based learning is a structured approach to learning and teaching that connects meaningful community experience with intellectual development, personal growth, and active citizenship. Community-based learning enriches coursework by encouraging students to apply the knowledge and analytic tools gained in the classroom to the pressing issues affecting local and global communities." After reading this definition, faculty indicated whether or not they had prior experience with community-based learning. Respondents could also indicate if they were uncertain whether or not they had experience with CBL. Faculty with CBL experience were also asked how many CBL courses they had taught.

Section II of the online survey assessed faculty perceptions of the benefits and barriers associated with CBL through the use of the Web-based Faculty Service-Learning Inventory (wFSLBI) (Hou, 2010).

Faculty with and without CBL experience completed this tool which measures four categories of faculty perceptions: 7 items regarding perceived classroom benefits (PROS-CLS), 6 items regarding perceived community benefits (PROS-COM), 5 items regarding perceived classroom barriers (CONS-CLS), and 3 items regarding perceived institutional barriers (CONS-INST). Separate forms were available for CBL and non-CBL faculty. The term *community-based learning* was substituted for *service-learning* on the individual items to better reflect the terminology used at the participants' university. The specific items for each scale can be found in Appendix A. All items in the inventory included a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) to measure agreement with each statement. Each scale yielded a total score that was averaged (1-5 range) so that each scale was on the same metric for statistical analysis. The following Cronbach alpha values were obtained for each scale: PROS-CLS (.83), PROS-COM (.77), CONS-CLS (.76), and CONS-INST (.60). The internal consistency values obtained by Hou (2010) on the wFSLBI scales ranged from .65 to .91 with the Cronbach alpha for CONS-INST yielding the lowest value.

Bivariate correlations were run amongst the four scales of the wFSLBI. Using the Bonferroni approach to control for Type 1 errors across the 12 correlations, a p -value of less than .004 ($.05/12=.004$) was used for significance. The results of the correlational analyses indicated a significant positive relationship between perceived classroom benefits (PROS-CLS) and perceived community benefits (PROS-COMM), $r(140) = .70, p < .001$. Perceived barriers in the classroom (CONS-CLS) were negatively correlated with perceived classroom benefits (PROS-CLS), $r(140) = -.40, p < .001$ as well as with perceived community benefits (PROS-COM), $r(140) = -.43, p < .001$. A weak negative correlation was found between perceived institutional barriers (CONS-INST) and perceived classroom benefits (PROS-CLS), but it failed to reach significance at the .004 level, $r(140) = -.19, p = .023$.

Section III of the survey asked CBL faculty to identify sources of support for their involvement in CBL. One question asked participants to select which people had encouraged their involvement in CBL, and included department chair, college dean, faculty members in their department, a community member, faculty members in other departments, students, the president/senior academic officer, as well as "other." Another question asked participants to indicate which of the following forms of instructional support they had used: advice from colleague, professional organizations/conferences, professional journals/presentations, institutional faculty development activities,

community-based learning campus office, mentoring, faculty teaching handbook, as well as "other." This question included a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not helpful) to 4 (very helpful) to measure how useful faculty members found these instructional supports. Finally, CBL and non-CBL faculty were asked whether they were aware of 19 specific services and programs sponsored by the university's community-based learning office, such as online student training modules, grants for community outreach, a volunteer fair, a community partner database, and a faculty fellows program. Participants were also asked to indicate whether or not they had utilized each of these 19 services and programs in the past year.

Section IV asked participants to indicate their gender, age, race/ethnicity, tenure status, rank, years in academia, and academic college.

Procedure

The campus CBL office sent an e-mail invitation to all faculty members (full-time, part-time, tenured/tenure track, and contingent) who taught in the previous academic year. The first e-mail invitation was sent out in fall 2012. Faculty members were informed that their participation was voluntary and confidential. As a token of appreciation, participants were given the opportunity to enter a drawing for a \$150.00 gift card. Two e-mail reminders were sent to faculty—one reminder was sent a week after the first invitation and the second was sent one week prior to the survey closing. The period in which faculty could access the survey lasted four weeks. Participants completed a consent page and the survey, both of which took approximately 25 minutes. All aspects of this research were approved by the Institutional Review Board at the university where this study took place.

Results

Overall Faculty Perceptions of the Benefits and Barriers of CBL

Overall, faculty members at this teaching institution held very positive views of CBL. Table 1 includes the means and standard deviations for each scale on the wFSLBI. Pairwise comparisons of these scales revealed that faculty ratings on the PROS-COM scale were significantly higher than ratings on the other three scales. In addition, the overall ratings on the PROS-CLS scale were also significantly higher than scores on the institutional and classroom barrier scales, which did not significantly differ from one another. Faculty members perceived the greatest benefit of CBL to be at the community-level rather than in the classroom. However, they were generally positive about CBL given that the ratings on both

Table 1
Pairwise Comparisons of wFSLBI Scales (N = 142)

wFSLBI Scales	Mean	SD
PROS-CLS ^a	3.43	.693
PROS-COM ^b	3.70	.610
CONS-CLS	3.01	.808
CONS-INST	2.90	.730

Notes. PROS-CLS = Classroom Benefits; PROS-COM = Community Benefits; CONS-CLS = Classroom Barriers; CONS-INST = Institutional Barriers.

^a Significantly lower than PROS-COM ($p < .001$); significantly higher than CONS-CLS ($p < .01$) and CONS-INST ($p < .001$). ^b Significantly higher than PROS-CLS, CONS-CLS, CONS-INST ($p < .001$).

benefit scales (community and classroom) were significantly higher than ratings for classroom and institutional barriers.

Faculty Perceptions of Barriers and Benefits based on CBL Experience and Rank

To determine whether faculty perceptions of barriers and benefits differed, a two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine whether CBL involvement (CBL vs. non-CBL) and rank (tenured/tenure-track vs. contingent) impacted scores on the w-FSLBI. Table 2 includes the means and standard deviations for each scale among the four groups. Based on the recommended significance level of $p = .005$ (Huberty & Petoskey, 2000), the Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was deemed non-significant ($p = .006$), indicating that the covariance between the four scales was acceptable across the four groups. No interaction was found between CBL group and rank, Pillai's Trace = .062, $F(4, 135) = 2.25$, $p = .07$, and there was not a significant main effect for academic rank, Pillai's Trace = .054, $F(4, 135) = 1.91$, $p = .11$. However, a significant main effect for CBL group was obtained, Pillai's Trace = .117, $F(4, 135) = 4.47$, $p = .002$. The multivariate effect size was estimated at .114; in other words, 11% of the variance was accounted for by CBL involvement.

The homogeneity of variance assumption was tested for all four subscales and found to be non-significant for the PROS-CLS scale ($p = .519$), PROS-COM scale ($p = .553$), and CONS-CLS scale ($p = .941$). While the Levene test was significant for the CONS-INST scale ($p = .001$), an analysis of the standard deviations (see Table 2) revealed that none of the largest standard deviations were more than four times the size of the smallest, indicating that the ANOVA would be adequately robust (Howell, 2009). Tests of between-subjects effects revealed no significant differences between CBL and non-CBL faculty on the PROS-CLS scale ($p = .061$), PROS-COM scale ($p = .111$), and CONS-INST scale ($p = .537$). The only significant difference found between CBL and non-

CBL faculty was on the CONS-CLS scale, $F(3, 138) = 17.73$, $p = .000$, with faculty in the CBL group perceiving significantly fewer classroom barriers ($M = 2.76$, $SD = .776$) than faculty in the non-CBL group ($M = 3.29$, $SD = .754$).

No significant differences were found between contingent and tenured/tenure-track faculty on the PROS-CLS scale ($p = .830$) or the PROS-COM scale ($p = .649$). Despite potential differences in working conditions, contingent faculty did not significantly differ from tenured/tenure-track faculty in their perceptions of classroom ($p = .116$) and institutional ($p = .089$) barriers.

Differences in Awareness and Utilization of Resources based on CBL Experience and Rank

A 2x2 ANOVA was run to determine whether faculty differed in their awareness of 19 campus-sponsored CBL resources. No interaction was found between CBL experience and academic rank, $F(1, 137) = .001$, $p = .973$; however, significant main effects were found for CBL experience, $F(1, 137) = 31.86$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .19$ and academic rank, $F(1, 137) = 5.49$, $p = .02$, $\eta^2 = .04$. As expected, CBL faculty ($M = 7.05$, $SD = 6.03$) were aware of significantly more university-sponsored CBL resources than non-CBL faculty ($M = 1.85$, $SD = 3.33$). Contingent faculty ($M = 3.22$, $SD = 4.67$) were aware of significantly fewer campus CBL resources than tenured/tenure-track faculty ($M = 6.22$, $SD = 6.12$), a finding likely explained by contingent faculty encountering a more exclusionary environment than tenured/tenure-track faculty.

To ascertain whether faculty differed in utilization of these same 19 campus-sponsored resources, another 2 x 2 ANOVA was run. No interaction between CBL experience and academic rank was detected, $F(1, 137) = .376$, $p = .541$, and no main effect for academic rank was found, $F(1, 137) = .712$, $p = .400$. Not surprisingly, a main effect for CBL experience was obtained, $F(1, 137) = 29.41$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .18$, with faculty members in the CBL group ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 3.70$) utilizing significantly more cam-

Table 2
Analysis of wFSLBI Scales based on CBL Experience and Rank

	Experience	Rank	N	Mean	SD
PROS-CLS	CBL	Tenure	41	3.52	.704
		Contingent	34	3.55	.720
		Total	75	3.53	.707
	Non-CBL	Tenure	23	3.30	.787
		Contingent	44	3.32	.597
		Total	67	3.31	.663
PROS-COM	CBL	Tenure	41	3.87	.622
		Contingent	34	3.67	.620
		Total	75	3.78	.625
	Non-CBL	Tenure	23	3.55	.612
		Contingent	44	3.65	.576
		Total	67	3.62	.586
CONS-CLS*	CBL	Tenure	41	2.92	.785
		Contingent	34	2.57	.732
		Total	75	2.76	.776
	Non-CBL	Tenure	23	3.34	.760
		Contingent	44	3.27	.759
		Total	67	3.29	.754
CONS-INST	CBL	Tenure	41	2.80	.859
		Contingent	34	2.86	.626
		Total	75	2.83	.758
	Non-CBL	Tenure	23	2.72	.875
		Contingent	44	3.10	.550
		Total	67	2.97	.696

Notes. Tenure = Tenured or tenure-track faculty. Contingent = Adjunct or Instructor.

* = The only significant difference between groups was found between CBL and Non-CBL groups on the CONS-CLS scale ($p < .001$).

pus-sponsored CBL resources than non-CBL faculty ($M = .55$, $SD = 1.75$). Although tenured/tenure-track faculty were aware of more campus resources than contingent faculty, this awareness did not result in tenured/tenure-track faculty ($M = 2.63$, $SD = 3.52$) utilizing more of these CBL resources than contingent faculty ($M = 1.62$, $SD = 3.00$). Table 3 summarizes the analysis of faculty awareness and utilization of campus CBL resources.

Level of Involvement with CBL and Perceived Benefits and Barriers, Perceived Supports, and Awareness and Utilization of Campus Resources

Level of involvement with CBL was operationalized as the number of CBL courses taught by a faculty member. Correlations were run between the number of CBL courses taught and the scales on the wFSLBI to determine if there was a relationship between level of involvement and perceptions of barriers and benefits. A p -value of less than .005 was used for significance to control for Type 1 error. A significant positive correlation was found between

the number of CBL courses a faculty member taught and perceived classroom benefits (PROS-CLS), $r(70) = .40$, $p = .001$. The positive correlation obtained between number of CBL courses and PROS-COM, $r(70) = .25$, $p = .04$ and the negative correlation found between number of CBL courses and CONS-CLS, $r(70) = -.26$, $p = .03$ did not reach the .005 level of significance. No correlation was found between number of CBL courses and perceived institutional barriers (CONS-INST), $r(70) = .07$, $p = .57$.

Bivariate correlations were also run to determine if level of involvement with CBL (number of courses taught) was related to awareness of and utilization of resources and supports. Using the Bonferroni approach to control for Type 1 error across the 15 correlations, a p -value of less than .003 ($.05/15 = .0033$) was used for significance. Faculty who taught the most CBL classes reported having more people who support their use of CBL, $r(70) = .38$, $p = .002$. On the survey, CBL faculty members were asked to identify who had encouraged them to use CBL. The most frequently mentioned sources of support were faculty within their own department (46.3%), the department

Table 3
Awareness and Utilization of 19 Campus-Sponsored CBL Resources

	Experience	Rank	N	Mean	SD
Awareness ^a	CBL	Tenure	41	7.93	6.21
		Contingent	33	5.97	5.60
		Total	74	7.05	6.03
	Non-CBL	Tenure	23	3.17	4.68
		Contingent	44	1.16	2.08
		Total	67	1.85	3.33
Utilization ^b	CBL	Tenure	41	3.51	3.72
		Contingent	33	3.39	3.73
		Total	74	3.46	3.70
	Non-CBL	Tenure	23	1.04	2.48
		Contingent	44	.30	1.17
		Total	74	.55	1.75

Notes. Tenure = Tenured or tenure-track faculty. Contingent = Adjunct or Instructor.

^a Significant difference between CBL and Non-CBL groups ($p < .001$); significant difference between tenured/tenure-track and contingent groups ($p < .05$).

^b Significant difference between CBL and Non-CBL groups ($p < .001$).

chair (36.6%), and a community member (36.6%). Higher-level administrators were the least mentioned sources of encouragement.

Faculty members with more CBL experience had greater awareness of campus-sponsored CBL resources, $r(70) = .40, p = .001$, than faculty with less experience. In addition, faculty with more experience utilized more of these campus-sponsored CBL resources, $r(70) = .36, p = .002$ in the past year than faculty with less experience. No significant relationships were found between CBL experience and the utilization and perceived usefulness of instructional supports. Faculty were also asked to rate the usefulness of each on a 4-point Likert scale with higher scores indicating more usefulness. Among CBL faculty the most frequently utilized instructional supports included university faculty development programs (74.7%), and professional organizations/conferences (72%). However, these supports were not rated as very helpful by faculty members (1.84 and 1.87 respectively). The instructional supports rated as most helpful by faculty were the faculty teaching handbook (2.75), professional journals (2.17), and mentoring (2.05).

Discussion

This study sought to understand faculty perceptions of benefits and barriers of CBL at an open-enrollment teaching institution that is heavily reliant on contingent faculty using the w-FSLBI (Hou, 2010). While contingent faculty are considered the “new faculty majority” (Maisto, 2009) at many universities, they continue to be an under-studied demographic with regard to perceptions of CBL.

As a group, faculty at this teaching institution held

optimistic views about the benefits of CBL, as evidenced by significantly higher scores on the benefit scales (PROS-CLS, PROS-COM) of the w-FSLBI compared to the barrier scales (CONS-CLS, CONS-INST). Lower perceptions of institutional barriers were not surprising given that the 2013-2014 Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) faculty survey found that 69.2% of faculty at this institution perceived high institutional priority for civic engagement compared to 34.7% and 23.8% of faculty at comparable universities. A well-established office for CBL and the incorporation of community engagement into the institutional mission likely contributed to faculty perceptions of institutional commitment to CBL.

According to Prochaska and Climente's Transtheoretical Model (1986), behavior change is adopted when the perceived benefits of implementing a new practice outweigh the costs associated with the change (Prochaska & Climente, 1986). Based upon this model, one would expect CBL faculty to perceive significantly more classroom and community benefits for CBL than non-CBL faculty. While this finding was demonstrated by Hou (2010), in the current study CBL and non-CBL faculty did not significantly differ in their perceptions of the classroom and community benefits of CBL. The only significant difference between CBL and non-CBL faculty was found on the CONS-CLS scale, with CBL faculty perceiving significantly fewer classroom barriers than non-CBL faculty. This finding is consistent with the Transtheoretical Model for behavior change; while non-CBL faculty appear to recognize the benefits derived from CBL, the perceived cost at the classroom level may be too large for them to consider incorporating CBL into their teaching repertoire. Faculty may also place a greater emphasis on class-

room barriers because incorporating a new pedagogy has immediate challenges that may outweigh the potential long-term benefits of CBL.

Despite different working conditions, contingent and tenured/tenure-track faculty did not significantly differ in their views of CBL. The finding that contingent faculty were less aware of campus CBL resources than tenured/tenure-track faculty was not surprising given that non-tenure track faculty may be excluded from departmental, college, and institution-wide activities and programs (Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012). Despite differences in awareness, contingent and tenured/tenure-track faculty did not differ in their utilization of campus CBL resources.

Faculty with more CBL experience perceived greater classroom benefits for CBL than faculty with less CBL experience. Positive correlations were also obtained for level of CBL involvement (number of CBL courses taught) and perceived support from other people as well as awareness and utilization of campus-sponsored CBL resources. No relationship was found between level of involvement with CBL and faculty utilization of other instructional supports, such as professional conferences, journals, and the Faculty Teaching Handbook.

Limitations of the Study

A limitation of this study is the low response rate (23.5%) obtained from faculty at this teaching institution. This low response rate resulted in a small sample ($n = 188$), which became even smaller after incomplete surveys ($n = 19$) and faculty unfamiliar with CBL ($n = 27$) were eliminated from the analysis. The four-week period faculty had to complete the survey corresponded with the final weeks of the fall semester, and this may have contributed to the low response rate.

The low response rate also raises questions about whether this sample holds more optimistic views about CBL than the overall faculty population. It is unclear what percentage of faculty at the university implement CBL in their courses. According to university data, approximately 8.6% of faculty have undergone a formal process for designating one of their classes as CBL-focused. (This designation requires that faculty require students to engage in at least 15 hours of service, implement reflection exercises, and fill out a formal application with the campus CBL office.) Not all faculty at the university are aware of this process or choose to apply so the percentage of faculty who implement CBL is likely higher than 8.6%, but it is impossible to know how much higher. Because 52% of the respondents had implemented CBL, this sample likely has a higher representation of CBL experienced faculty than the

university as a whole which may account for the optimistic views held by the respondents.

Demographic information from the Institutional research office at the university revealed that 87% of faculty at the university are European American, 42% are female, and 37% are tenured/tenure-track. Compared to overall faculty at the university, this sample was more likely to be female (58%) and had a higher percentage of tenured/tenure-track respondent (45%) than the university population as a whole. These disparities may have skewed the results such that the findings are not perfectly representative of the faculty at this university.

Finally, the reader is cautioned regarding generalizing the results of this study as the data was gathered from only one higher education institution.

Practical Implications of this Study

While faculty awareness of the benefits of CBL is important, this knowledge alone is not sufficient for faculty to adopt CBL. This study reiterates the importance of campus CBL offices focusing on the practical and logistical concerns associated with the implementation of CBL. Common concerns of faculty include the time involved in preparing for CBL, problems assessing student work, reduced class-time for instruction, and concerns about losing control over the learning environment. Farmer (1990) described five roles that a campus service-learning office may play, including catalyst, solution giver, process helper, resource linker, and confidence builder. While all of these roles are valuable, faculty concerns regarding classroom barriers reinforces the importance of the campus service-learning office paying close attention to faculty development opportunities that address perceived classroom barriers.

Faculty Rank. Contingent faculty perceptions of CBL did not differ from those of tenured/tenure-track faculty; however, contingent faculty were less aware of campus CBL resources. Less awareness of campus resources and supports for CBL may deter many contingent faculty from considering this pedagogy. Because contingent faculty outnumber traditional faculty at many universities, investing in the professional development of contingent faculty would be advised. Campus CBL resources could be introduced to contingent faculty at orientations or other university-wide trainings. Small learning communities and mentoring could support contingent faculty interested in adopting CBL. Furco and Moely (2012) organized semester-long learning communities designed to increase knowledge of service-learning and found that contingent faculty showed a greater treatment effect than tenured/tenure-track faculty. Kezar (2013) found that contingent faculty experiencing an inclusive culture were willing to

engage in professional roles extending beyond their contracted duties without remuneration. Campus CBL centers can assist contingent faculty with time-consuming aspects of adopting CBL, such as identifying potential community partners, assisting with developing syllabi, and creating reflection strategies and assessments.

Limited time for implementing CBL is also a concern for tenured and tenure-track faculty. While tenured faculty are attempting to balance multiple professional roles, tenure-track faculty have the added pressure of the tenure "clock." As a result, tenure-track faculty could also benefit from campus CBL centers providing assistance and training for time-consuming aspects of CBL, similar to those identified above. Pairing tenure-track faculty with CBL-experienced faculty members who have successfully navigated the tenure process may encourage newer faculty to consider CBL.

Faculty Level of Experience. Faculty members who taught the most CBL classes perceived more classroom benefits for CBL and they were aware of and utilized more campus CBL resources than faculty with less experience. Bringle and Hatcher (1996) recommend that faculty be mentored by a more experienced faculty member who can provide encouragement, advice, as well as examples of syllabi, assessments, and reflections that provide practical ideas for implementing CBL. Providing structured opportunities for faculty to be mentored is a recommendation supported by the results of this study; CBL faculty with the most experience reported having more people who supported and encouraged their use of community-based learning than faculty with less experience. Mentoring was also one of the instructional supports for CBL that respondents rated as most helpful (rating 2.05 out of 4), but only 25.3% of respondents had utilized mentoring. While some faculty members may informally acquire mentors through their departments and other campus activities, many faculty members interested in pursuing CBL may need to be formally paired with a mentor.

Future Research Directions

This study expanded the use of the w-FSLBI (Hou, 2010) to faculty members at an open-enrollment teaching institution, obtaining the perspectives of tenured/tenure-track and contingent faculty. Due to the small sample size and surveying faculty at only one institution, future research that expands the w-FSLBI to other teaching institutions as well as multi-institution studies is warranted. In addition to type of institution, other factors that likely influence faculty perceptions of CBL include the extent to which higher education institutions support community engagement as well as faculty perceptions of

community need. The extension of the w-FSLBI to higher education institutions that vary across these two dimensions could augment our understanding of factors contributing to faculty engagement. For example, a survey of faculty in New Orleans following Hurricane Katrina found that faculty cited community need as the primary catalyst for implementing service-learning (Ilustre, Lopez, & Moely, 2012). On campuses where the community is perceived as having fewer needs, faculty motivation for engagement may focus on student learning and effective instruction. An understanding of faculty motivation at various types of institutions may guide campus engagement offices in developing programs and resources that specifically address respective faculty needs and concerns. Future research using the w-FSLBI could also benefit from distinguishing between faculty who utilize CBL because it is a departmental requirement and those who have not been mandated to implement this pedagogy. Perceptions of barriers and benefits may differ among these two groups of faculty.

Due to the trend toward non-tenure-track appointments (American Association of University Professors Research Office, 2013), future studies should continue to explore contingent faculty perceptions regarding CBL. Additional information about the specific working environments encountered by contingent faculty and how these more or less inclusive vs. exclusive environments impact faculty perceptions of CBL is warranted. Because contingent faculty may be interested in engaging in professional activities that extend beyond their contract (Kezar, 2013), the specific resources and supports that contingent faculty believe would assist them in adopting community-based learning should also be explored.

As increasing numbers of higher education institutions have heeded the call to become more engaged (Kellogg Commission Report, 1999), campus resources have been allocated to establish formal centers for community engagement on college campuses. Faculty cannot obtain any benefit from these resources if they lack awareness of these campus-sponsored CBL supports. This study demonstrated that contingent faculty were less aware of campus-sponsored CBL resources than faculty with traditional appointments. Future research should assess how to increase awareness of CBL resources among contingent faculty as well as whether or not there are other factors that contribute to faculty lacking awareness of campus resources that support community engagement.

Note

The author acknowledges the contribution of Brenda Kowalewski for assisting with the development and dis-

semination of the on-line survey used in this research.

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.
- Aldersley, S.F. (1995). Upward drift is alive and well: Research/doctoral model still attractive to institutions. *Change*, 27(5), 50-56.
- American Association of University Professors. (2013). *Trends in instructional staff employment status, 1975-2011*. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/issues/contingent-faculty/resources-contingent-appointments>.
- Antonio, A.L., Astin, H.S. & Cress, C.M. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. *Review of Higher Education*, 23(4), 373-398.
- 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.
- Bringle, R.G. & Hatcher, J.A. (1995). A service-learning curriculum for faculty. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2, 112-122.
- Bringle, R.G. & Hatcher, J.A. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(2), 221-239.
- Bringle, R.G. & Hatcher, J.A. (2000). Institutionalization of service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 71(3), 273-290.
- Colbeck, C.L., & Wharton-Michael, P. (2006). Individual and organizational influences on faculty members' engagement in public scholarship. In R.A. Eberly & J. Cohen, *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 105 (pp. 17-26). Retrieved from <http://www.onlinelibrary.wiley.com>. doi: 10.1002/tl.220
- Deci, E. & Ryan, R. (1982). Intrinsic motivation to teach: Possibilities and obstacles in our colleges and universities. In J. Bess (Ed.), *Motivating professors to teach effectively* (pp. 27-35). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Demb, A. & Wade, A. (2012). Reality check: Faculty involvement in outreach and engagement. *Journal of Higher Education*, 83(3), 337-366.
- Farmer, D.W. (1990) Strategies for change. In D.W. Steeples (Ed.), *Managing change in higher education* (pp. 7-17). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Furco, A & Moely, B.E. (2012). Using learning communities to build faculty support for pedagogical innovation: A multi-campus study. *Journal of Higher Education*, 83(1), 128-153.
- Higher Education Research Institute (2014). *HERI Faculty Survey*. Retrieved from <http://www.heri.publications.php>.
- Hinck, S.S. & Brandell, M.E. (2000). The relationship between institutional support and campus acceptance of academic service learning. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43(5), 868-881.
- Hou, S. (2010). Developing a faculty inventory measuring perceived service-learning benefits and barriers. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 16(2), 78-89.
- Howell, D.C. (2007). *Statistical methods for psychology*. Belmont, CA: Thompson, Wadsworth.
- Huberty, C.J. & Petoskey, M.D. (2000). Multivariate analysis of variance and covariance. In H. Tinsley & S. Brown (Eds.), *Handbook of applied multivariate statistics and mathematical modeling* (pp. 183-208). New York: Academic Press.
- Ilustre, V., Lopez, A.M., & Moely, B.E. (2012). Conceptualizing, building, and evaluating university practices for community engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16 (4), 129-158.
- Jaeger, A.J., & Thornton, C.H. (2006). *Neither honor nor compensation: Faculty and public service*. Educational Policy, 20(2), 345-366. doi: 10.1177/0895904805284050
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities (1999). *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.
- Kezar, A. (2013). Departmental cultures and non-tenure-track faculty: Willingness, capacity, and opportunity to perform at four-year institutions. *Journal of Higher Education*, 84(2), 153-183.
- Maisto, M. (2009, September 10). The adjunct's moment of truth. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2009/09/10/maisto>
- Moore, T.L., & Ward, K. (2010). Institutionalizing faculty engagement through research, teaching, and service at research universities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 16(1), 44-58.
- Prochaska, J.O., & DiClemente, C.C. (1986). Toward a comprehensive model of change. In W.R. Miller & N. Heather (Eds.), *Treating addictive behaviors: Processes of change* (pp. 3-27). New York: Plenum Press.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk-Hoy, A., & Hoy, W.K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: It's meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68, 202-248.
- Vogel, A.L., Seifer, 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*, 16(1), 59-74.
- United States Census Bureau (2010). State and County Quickfacts. Retrieved from <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/index.html#>.
- Wade, A. & Demb, A. (2009). A conceptual model to explore faculty community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 15(2), 5-16.
- Waltman, J., Bergom, I., Hollenshead, C., Miller, J. & August, L. (2012). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among non-tenure-track faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 83(3), 411-434.

Ward, K. (1998). Addressing academic culture: Service learning, organizations and faculty work. In R. Rhoads & J. Howard (Eds.), *Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection* (pp. 73-80). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ward, K. (2003). *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 29(5). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Author

MELINDA RUSSELL-STAMP (melindarussellstamp@weber.edu) is an instructor in the Psychology Department at Weber State University. She teaches courses in child and adolescent development, developmental psychopathology, and resiliency. She has supervised numerous service-learning students at alternative high schools and after-school programs for youth.

Appendix

Items from the wFSLBI (Hou, 2010)

PROS-CLS (Benefits Classroom)

- 1- Community-based learning enriches classroom discussions and lectures in my course.
- 2- I enjoy teaching more when the class involves community-based learning.
- 3- Community-based learning helped me to understand my professional strengths and weaknesses.
- 4- Participating in community-based learning helped me clarify areas of focus for my scholarship.
- 5- Teaching community-based learning courses has resulted in a change in my teaching style(s).
- 6- Participation in community-based learning is an important component of my professional portfolio.
- 7- I was able to develop good relationships with the students in my community-based learning course(s) because of the community work.

PROS-COM (Benefits Community)

- 1- The service my students completed was beneficial to the community.
- 2- I value working with community partners to structure and deliver the community-based learning experience for students.
- 3- I learned something new about the community from my community partners.
- 4- The community members with whom I partner play an active role in the planning or development of my community-based learning course(s).
- 5- The work my students and I performed enhanced my ability to communicate my ideas in the community.
- 6- I can make a difference in the community.

CONS-CLS (Barriers Classroom)

- 1- Time constraints interfere with my ability to teach a community-based learning course.
- 2- I feel that I am giving up control of the learning experience when teaching a community-based learning course.
- 3- I have a harder time assessing student learning and work in a community-based learning course than in a traditional course.
- 4- I experience challenges with the reduced time for classroom instruction in my community-based learning course.
- 5- Using community-based learning required more of my time as a teacher.*

CONS-INST (Barriers Institution)

- 1- Faculty promotion and tenure policies do not support or encourage my service.
- 2- Administrative leaders actively work to make community-based learning a visible and important part of my institutional work.*
- 3- My colleagues understand and value community-based learning in promotion, tenure, and annual evaluation decisions.*

*Item reverse-scored.

** Items for non-CBL faculty measured the same concept but were re-worded. For example, item 1 was reworded as, "I believe community-based learning will enrich classroom discussions and lectures in my course."