

# IDENTIFYING FACTORS INFLUENCING FACULTY MOTIVATION AND SATISFACTION IN TEACHING SERVICE-LEARNING COURSES

**Keh-Wen “Carin” Chuang, Purdue University Northwest**  
**Kuan C. Chen, Purdue University Northwest**

## ABSTRACT

*Service-learning can enhance students’ subject matter learning, understanding and firsthand experiences. Using service-learning as the teaching strategy provides an innovative pedagogical approach to realizing higher education’s civic responsibilities. Despite the known facts to its benefits, service-learning is not thoroughly integrated into the higher education curriculum in all disciplines. Lack of integration is often considered a result of minimal institutional commitment to service-learning, including scarce administrative support, faculty participation, and funding, etc.... Little research has been conducted toward faculty members’ motivation to incorporate service-learning into their teaching. The purpose of this research is to identify and describe the factors that motivate faculty in the state of Indiana integrating the service-learning into their teaching efforts. A survey questionnaire is designed to gather information about motivation factors and faculty satisfaction in terms of the supports for their service-learning activities. The survey contains both closed and open-ended questions and is pilot tested. The survey respondents are the faculty from two-year and four-year higher education institutions in the state of Indiana who have integrated service-learning component into their courses. The survey result will identify and describe the motivation and satisfaction according to institution type, academic discipline, faculty rank, tenure status, gender, and racial identification. The relationships between the related factors will be analyzed and discussed as well. The research results are useful in identifying areas and providing recommendations for faculty members, institutions, research funding sponsors, the field of service-learning and higher education administrators to motivate and encourage more faculty integrating service-learning into their teaching with needed supports.*

Keywords: *service-learning, motivation, satisfaction, supports*

## INTRODUCTION

Service-learning is an effective teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with instructions and reflections to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen community’s relationships. Historically, students have been encouraged to identify social issues, examine and analyze them with the goal of social change (Westheimer & Kahne, 1998). The recent surge of support received from higher education institutions around the country has been instrumental in linking those same universities to the communities in which they reside (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2000). Not only are the best practices of service-learning designed to “enhance the student learning experience to create self-motivated

learners who become civic participants” (Marullo & Edwards, 2000), but ideally offer a visible response to our communities’ changing economic, political, and social needs.

Given this innovative and ideological vision of what service-learning is designed to do, why do only some faculty take advantage of this pedagogical opportunity? Indeed, the literature on service-learning are growing with exhortations for faculty participation in students’ service-learning activities. And yet, little attention has been given to the faculty role in adopting service-learning to their teaching efforts. The faculty motivations are rarely referenced in the service-learning literatures, nor are they utilized to inform service-learning advocacy on campuses. Therefore, this study identifies the faculty who have adopted service-learning and seeks to understand their motivations and satisfactions. The implications of this research are both scholarly and practical. An examination of service-learning faculty motivations enhances our understanding of the scholarly profession by clarifying the circumstances under which faculty may modify their teaching to include a service-learning component. At the same time, a better understanding of the satisfactions of faculty who integrate service-learning and teaching provides a base for extending and improving the quality of higher education.

The purpose of this study is to gather, analyze, describe, and discuss data regarding the factors influencing faculty motivation and satisfaction in teaching service-learning courses. This is intended as a research and assessment study to enrich and improve service-learning in higher education and in the field of service-learning. The goal of this study is to identify directions and provide recommendations for faculty members, institutions, research funding sponsors, the field of service-learning and higher education administrators to motivate and encourage more faculty integrating service-learning into their teaching with needed supports.

## METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

This study was divided into three phases. The phase one of the study is to identify the faculty who may have incorporated service-learning as a component in their courses, and to collect the faculty institution information and their email addresses from any possible sources. The phase two is to develop the questionnaire to answer the research questions. The questionnaire (Appendix A) was designed to assess faculty’s thoughts about and experiences with teaching service-learning courses. A pilot-test of the survey was conducted by several research-experienced senior faculty and the consultants from the Office of Instructional Technology in Purdue University Northwest (PNW) to refine the instrument design prior to official distribution. The IRB (Institutional Review Board) review on the survey was approved during the phase two. The official survey was distributed via emails with a link to the survey on the Qualtrics system. Two survey reminders were emailed to the respondents. The phase three is to clean up and study the collected data using statistical tests, and to summarize the research results and conclusions.

### Research Questions

The study is designed to answer the following four research questions:

- 1) *Who are the faculty that incorporate service-learning in their courses in Indiana higher education?*
- 2) *What motivated the faculty to incorporate service-learning in their teaching efforts?*

- 3) *How are the faculty satisfied with the support for teaching service-learning courses?*  
 4) *Are the faculty inclined to continue and/or expand their involvement in service-learning in the future?*

### **Research Instrument**

To answer the four research questions, an online survey is designed in Qualtrics system. There are four sections and a total of twenty-nine questions in the survey. The first section contains nine demographic questions to have a better understanding of the respondents' professional and academic background. The second section is designed to identify the motivation factors that consisted of three parts, individual factor, institutional factor and outcome factor. The outcome factor includes questions for student learning-related outcome, faculty-related outcome and community-related outcome. The third section is to measure to what extent that faculty are satisfied with the support from their efforts in service-learning education. A five-point Likert scale is used to provide a rating scale. A rating of 5 signified "very satisfied" on the statements while a 1 signified "very dissatisfied" on the statements. The fourth section is designed to understand the relationship between motivation and satisfaction. The last question on the survey is used to collect any additional comments or suggestions. All respondents' comments and suggestions are documented.

### **Data Collection and Response Rate**

The initial faculty data was provided by the research sponsor, Indiana Campus Compact (ICC). The ICC awards faculty members from all over the state of Indiana with teaching, research and service grants supporting their service-learning endeavors. The authors further contacted a few ICC faculty liaisons in several universities/campuses, such as Purdue University-West Lafayette, Purdue University Northwest, Indiana University-Bloomington, Taylor University, Marian University, Butler University, Ball State University, ... etc. to obtain more service-learning faculty data and ask for the assistance to forward the survey invite email to their own faculty on campus.

In total 328 faculty from 37 higher education institutions and 22 departments in Indiana were emailed to request for responses to the survey. After the survey is closed, it collected 120 responses. Out of the 120 responses, there are 96 valid data good for analysis that yields a response rate of 29.3%.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

### **Demographics Characteristics of Service-Learning Faculty**

Data collected for the questions 1 to 9 on the questionnaire is used to answer research question 1: *Who are the faculty that incorporate service-learning in their courses in Indiana higher education?* More than 78% of the respondents were from four-year public institutions and four-year private institutions (16.7%), with the remainder (5.2%) coming from two-year public institutions. Respondents represented 12 disciplinary areas, with the highest concentration (24%) in health profession related fields. Service-learning faculty in the state of Indiana were relatively well established in their institutions. More than a quarter were full professors (32.3%) and 50% were tenured. Most respondents (65.6%) had been teaching for

eleven or more years. Teaching was a high priority for survey respondents. Most (67.7%) ranked teaching as their most important professional responsibility (see Table 1).

Table 1  
*Demographic Characteristics of Service-Learning Faculty*

Demographic Characteristics	Service-Learning Faculty	
<b>Type of Institution</b>	N = 96	%
four-year public college	75	78.1
four-year private college	16	16.7
two-year public college	5	5.2
two-year private college	-	-
<b>Rank</b>	N = 96	%
Professor	31	32.3
Associate Professor	21	21.9
Assistant Professor	15	15.6
Clinical faculty	14	14.6
Lecturer	8	8.3
Graduate student	2	2.1
Staff	5	5.2
<b>Tenure Status</b>	N = 96	%
Tenured	48	50
On tenure track but not tenured	10	10.4
Not on tenure track position, but my institution has a tenure system	32	33.3
No tenure system at my institution	6	6.3
<b>Years of College Teaching</b>	N = 96	%
1 - 5	17	17.7
6 - 10	16	16.7
11 - 15	18	18.8
16 - 20	18	18.8
21+	27	28.0
<b>Academic Discipline Area</b>	N = 96	%
Agriculture and Natural Resources	5	5.2
Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Physical Sciences	2	2
Business	9	9.4
Communications, Media, & Public Relations	9	9.4
Computer Science, Mathematics and Statistics	-	-
Education	9	9.4
Engineering and Technology	6	6.3
Fine and Performing Arts	3	3.1
Health Professions	23	24.0
Humanities	5	5.2
Liberal Arts, General Studies, and Multi/Interdisciplinary Studies	12	12.5
Social Sciences	13	13.5
<b>Major Professional Responsibility</b>	N = 96	%
Administrative	19	19.8
Teaching	65	67.7
Research	8	8.3
Advising	1	1.0
Professional Support or Coordinator	3	3.2

<b># of Service-Learning Courses Taught</b>	N = 96	%
0	8	8.3
1	10	10.4
2	16	16.7
3	8	8.3
4	12	12.5
5 and 5+	42	43.8
<b>Gender</b>	N = 96	%
Female	66	68.8
Male	27	28.1
Prefer not to respond	3	3.1
<b>Race</b>	N = 96	%
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	-
Asian	3	3.1
Black or African American	3	3.1
Hispanic or Latino	1	1.0
Native Hawaiian or another Pacific Islander	-	-
White	85	88.6
Prefer not to respond	4	4.2

There was evidence of a relatively strong commitment over time by the respondents to the incorporation of service-learning and teaching. Fewer than 19% of the respondents reported having utilized service-learning zero or once, and a considerable majority (56.3%) indicated that they had utilized service-learning in their course four or more times. A majority of the service-learning faculty identified in this study are female (68.8%) and the vast majority (88.6%) are white.

### **Faculty Motivations**

The survey questions 10 to 18 are used to answer research question 2: *What motivated the faculty to incorporate service-learning in their teaching efforts?* The survey questionnaire classified three categories of motivation factors: individual, institutional and outcome factors. To identify the individual factors, the respondents were asked to rank their TOP THREE individuals who motivated them to incorporate service-learning in their course(s). If motivated by a college administrator, which administrator (position) was it? To identify the institutional factors, the respondents were asked to rank their TOP THREE institutional factors that would motivate them to incorporate service-learning in their course(s). If motivated by institutional praise or recognition, what type of praise or recognition would motivate them? To identify the outcome factors, the questionnaire separates the outcome factors to student learning-related, faculty-related, and community-related outcome factors. The respondents were asked to rank their TOP THREE outcomes in each of the three outcome factors that would motivate them to incorporate service-learning in their course(s).

Table 2  
*Factors Motivating Faculty to Incorporate Service-Learning in a Course: Weighted Scores*

<b>Top Three Individual Motivation Factors</b>	<b>Weighted Scores (WS)</b>
Personal research, passion & experience	124
Faculty	122
Service-learning director/coordinator	97
<b>Top Three Institutional Motivation Factors</b>	
Grant award	122
Professional development opportunity	111
Stipend or extra-compensation	107
<b>Top Three Outcome Motivation Factors</b>	
Student learning-related outcomes	
Provide students with “real-world” learning experiences or professional (or pre-professional) training	146
Improve students’ understanding of the subject matter	91
Improve students’ application of the course content	91
Improve students’ soft skills (e.g. collaboration, communication, conflict resolution, sociability, work ethic, or leadership)	85
Faculty-related outcomes	
Service is a vital component of my personal and/or professional identity	166
Implement the innovative teaching pedagogy	121
I enjoy working with students in the service-learning project setting	118
Community-related outcomes	
Improve sense of civic responsibility	116
Improve understanding of social issues, places, or people	106
Improve participation in the community to affect social changes	99

Table 2 provides weighted scores for TOP THREE individual, institutional and outcome factors motivating faculty to incorporate service-learning in a course. To answer the survey questions in this motivation factors section, the respondents must enter the scale of 1, 2, 3 with “1” being the most influential position/role or motivating factor. The respondents ranked the choices as their top 1, top 2 and top 3, so the Table 2 scores are weighted based on the rankings. After the comparison of weighted scores, service-learning faculty’s top 1 individual motivation factor is personal research, passion & experience (WS = 124), top 1 institutional motivation factor is grant award (WS = 122). For the outcome-related motivation factors, top 1 student learning-related motivation factor is to provide students with “real-world” learning experiences or professional (or pre-professional) training (WS = 146), top 1 faculty-related motivation factor is because service is an important component of my personal and/or professional identity (WS = 166), top 1 community-related motivation factor is to improve sense of civic responsibility (WS = 116). The top 1 faculty-related outcome factor is consistent with the top 1 individual motivation factor that faculty are mainly motivated by their personal belief, passion and research in the service-learning education.

Table 3  
*Sources of Encouragement by College Administrator and Percentage of Influence on Motivating Faculty to Incorporate Service-Learning in a Course*

<b>Source of Encouragement by College Administrator</b>	<b>Influence (I) %</b>
Dean or Associate Dean	34.6
President/Chancellor, Vice President/Vice Chancellor, or Associate President	23.1
Service-Learning Office/Teaching Center Director	23.1
Department Chair	19.2

If respondents ranked “college administrator” as one of their top three individual factors, the respondents will be prompted on the survey for the follow-up question: If faculty are motivated by a college administrator to incorporate service-learning in your course(s), which administrator was it? The respondents then must choose only a college administrator position/role from the options for the follow-up question. According to the data on Table 3, the encouragement from Dean or Associate Dean is most influential (I = 34.6%) to motivate faculty incorporating service-learning in their course.

Table 4  
*Sources of Type for Institutional Praise/Recognition and Percentage of Influence on Motivating Faculty to Incorporate Service-Learning in a Course*

<b>Source of Type for Institutional Praise/Recognition</b>	<b>Influence (I) %</b>
Letter of commendation from college administrator(s)	22.5
Having it counted toward Promotion and Tenure Evaluation	20.0
Recognition in college newsletter or local newspaper	20.0
Other	15.0
Recognition by certificate from institution	12.5
Recognition by Governing Board or Board of Trustees	10.0

If respondents ranked “institutional praise or recognition” as one of their top three institutional factors, the respondents will be prompted on the survey for the follow-up question: If motivated by institutional praise or recognition to incorporate service-learning in your course(s), what type of praise or recognition would motivate you? The respondents then must choose only a type of institutional praise or recognition from the options for the follow-up question. According to the data on Table 4, the letter of commendation from college administrator(s) is most influential (I = 22.5%) to motivate faculty incorporating service-learning in their course. This result is consistent with the data on Table 3. The Dean or Associate Dean’s encouragement is most influential (I = 34.6%) to motivate faculty. Based on the two findings, Dean or Associate Dean’s encouragement, praise or recognition play the most influential role to motivate faculty incorporating service-learning in a course.

Table 5  
*Volunteered or Assigned to Incorporate Service-Learning in a Course*

<b>Incorporating Service-Learning in a Course</b>	<b>N = 96</b>	<b>%</b>
Volunteered	84	87.5
Assigned	7	7.3
Other	5	5.2

The question 14 is to survey the respondents if they are volunteered or assigned by department to incorporate service-learning in their course. The data on Table 5 shows that more than 87% respondents are volunteered to incorporate service-learning in their course.

Table 6  
*Incorporating Service-Learning in a Course Even Without Any Institutional Support*

<b>Incorporating Service-Learning in a course even without any institutional support</b>	<b>N = 96</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	82	85.4
No	10	10.4
Other	4	4.2

The question 15 is to survey the respondents if they would incorporate service-learning in their course even without any institutional support. The data on Table 6 shows that more than 85% respondents would incorporate service-learning in their course even without any institutional support. The results from Table 5 and Table 6 are aligned with the result from Table 2 that faculty are most motivated by their personal passion, experience and research in service-learning in terms of the individual motivation factors.

### **Faculty Satisfaction**

The survey questions 19 to 26 are used to answer research question 3: *How the faculty are satisfied with the supports for teaching service-learning courses?* The questions survey respondents' level of satisfaction on received support from faculty, Department Chair, Dean/Provost, President/Chancellor, Service-Learning Office/Teaching Center, students or community members. Service-learning faculty were asked to rate their level of satisfaction on a Likert scale ranging from "very dissatisfied" (1) to "very satisfied" (5). The mean scores for level of satisfaction on Table 7 show that community members and students are the most satisfied supports for faculty's efforts in service-learning education (mean of 4.0 and above). The support from President/Chancellor is the least satisfied (neither satisfied nor dissatisfied) with mean of 3.1. Overall, faculty are somewhat satisfied with received supports for their efforts in service-learning education (mean of 3.8, see Table 7).



Table 7  
*Support for Efforts in Service-Learning Education and Level of Satisfaction*

<b>Support for Efforts in Service-Learning Education</b>	<b>Level of Satisfaction (Mean)</b>
Support from Faculty colleagues	3.3
Support from Department Chair	3.4
Support from Dean or Provost	3.2
Support from President/Chancellor	3.1
Support from Service-Learning Office/Teaching Center	3.9
Support from Students	4.0
Support from Community Members	4.3
Overall satisfied with received supports	3.8

*Note.* Level of Satisfaction: 1 = Very Dissatisfied, 2 = Dissatisfied, 3= Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 4 = Satisfied, 5 = Very Satisfied

### **Relationship between Motivation and Satisfaction**

The survey questions 27 to 28 are designed to answer research question 4: *Are the faculty inclined to continue and/or expand their involvement in service-learning in the future??* Service-learning faculty were asked to select their choices on a Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5). The data on Table 8 shows that more than 88.3% of respondents plan to continue the involvement in service-learning education, whereas, about 61.7% of respondents plan to expand their involvement in service-learning education in the future.

Table 8  
*Continue or Expand the Involvement in Service-Learning Education in the Future and Level of Agreement*

<b>Statement</b>	<b>SA %</b>	<b>A %</b>	<b>N %</b>	<b>D %</b>	<b>SD %</b>
I plan to continue the involvement in service-learning education in the future	67.0	21.3	8.5	2.1	1.1
I plan to expand my involvement in service-learning education in the future	37.2	24.5	26.6	10.6	1.1

*Note.* SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, N= Neither Agree nor Disagree, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree

## **CONCLUSION**

Scholars across disciplines are urged to identify how service-learning can enhance subject matter learning. This study is a small step and a contribution to the modest literatures in that direction. Lack of appropriate encouragement, satisfaction and support may inhibit the sustained growth of service-learning in the higher education. Although this survey provides insight about many other facets of the faculty experience to service-learning, the evidence offered in this study is focused on motivation and satisfaction. From the data the study can conclude that faculty involved in service-learning tend to be motivated more by personal passion and experience in service-learning than by student learning concerns or institutional factors.

Furthermore, the faculty in this study are more satisfied with the supports from community members and students. The service-learning faculty reported that they were less satisfied with the support from President or Chancellor. More respondents plan to continue the involvement in service-learning education, whereas, less respondents plan to expand their involvement in service-learning education in the future. Respondents also feedback that the greater time and task requirements of service ventures, needing to be rewarded in the promotion and tenure process, and the course design challenges in different subject areas.

The findings of the research project bring numerous positive impacts on student learning and development, project director's professional advancement, community partners and community issues, and the institutional goals. First, the improved and expanded service-learning course design helps students internalize real-world experience successfully. Students will participate and engage more learning experiences via various service-learning courses to learn more applications and deeper understanding. Students can apply practical civic skills at different levels within the classroom and outside of the classroom. The graduates equipped with strong civic skills and experiences should be able to stand out in the job interviews, succeed in their future career and later feedback to their communities.

Second, this study advanced the project director's research design and research method to conduct a service-learning study independently. The research findings will be helpful to the project director's efforts in service-learning education and professional services. It also strengthens the project director's statistical skills and improve the project director's technical writing in academic journal paper publication. Third, in studying the issues challenging the service-learning education in the state of Indiana, the results of the research will provide clear directions for faculty and higher education administrators in the state of Indiana to motivate more educators and encourage more service-learning courses to the community. Fourth, this research helps fulfill the concurrent higher education strategic goals. The service-learning research aligns with the mission of higher education systems and promotes its partnerships with local community. This is a high priority for the University/College that has committed to advance and expand community engagement to the next level to achieve the goal of becoming the center of excellence for education, information, economic development and culture.

Lastly, the research findings provide clear directions as sustainable solutions for institutions, research funding sponsors, the field of service-learning and higher education administrators to motivate, encourage and satisfy more faculty incorporating service-learning in their teaching with the helpful supports. Continuing to discover faculty motivations and satisfactions from teaching service-learning courses will strengthen the efforts to promote the service-learning education at colleges and universities across the nation.

## 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), 1-17.
- Hammond, C. (1994). Faculty motivation and satisfaction in Michigan higher education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1, 42-49.
- McKay, V. C. & Rozee, P. D. (2004). Characteristics of faculty who adopt community service-learning pedagogy. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 10(2), 21-33.
- Marullo, S., & Edwards, B. (2000). Service-learning pedagogy as universities' response to troubled times. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43(5), 746-755.
- Patel, H. S. (2004). Assessment of the personal and professional attributes of educators who utilize service-learning. (Doctoral Dissertation, Iowa State University, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, DAI-A 65/07, p. 2479
- Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2000). Community-centered service learning. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43(5), 767-780.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (1998). Education for action: Preparing youth for participatory democracy. In W. Ayers, J. Hunt, & T. Quinn (Eds.), *Teaching for social justice* (pp. 1-21). New York: The New Press.

### Appendix A – Survey Questionnaire

#### Demographics Information

Please respond to the following questions in this section as they are related to your demographics.

1. Please select the type of your institution.

four-year public college  
four-year private college  
two-year public college  
two-year private college

2. Please select your current academic rank or position.

Professor  
Associate Professor  
Assistant Professor  
Clinical faculty  
Adjunct (Part-time) faculty  
Graduate student  
Staff

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

3. Please select your tenure status.

Tenured  
On tenure track but not tenured  
Not on tenure track position, but my institution has a tenure system  
No tenure system at my institution  
Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

4. Please select the number of years that you have been teaching in college.

- Not teaching in college
- 1 - 5 years
- 6 - 10 years
- 11 - 15 years
- 16 - 20 years
- 21+ years

5. Please select the response below that most closely matches your academic discipline area.

- Agriculture and Natural Resources
- Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Physical Sciences
- Business
- Communications, Media, & Public Relations
- Computer Science, Mathematics and Statistics
- Education
- Engineering and Technology
- Fine and Performing Arts
- Health Professions
- Humanities
- Liberal Arts, General Studies, and Multi/Interdisciplinary Studies
- Social Sciences
- Other Fields (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

6. Please select your **major** professional responsibilities held (**choose only one answer**).

- Administrative
- Teaching
- Research
- Advising
- Professional Support or Coordinator
- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

7. Please select the number of service-learning courses taught in the past five years.

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 and 5+

8. Please select your gender.

- Female
- Male
- Other
- I prefer not to respond

9. Please select your racial or ethnic identification.

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- White
- Other
- I prefer not to respond

**Motivation Factors**

Please respond to the following questions in this section as they are related to your motivation information.

**A. Individual Factors – Hidden from the Qualtrics survey**

10. Please rank the top THREE individuals who motivated you to incorporate service-learning in your course(s) (enter the scale of 1, 2, 3 with “1” being the most influential).

- College administrator
- Service-learning coordinator/director
- Faculty
- Student
- Community representative
- National speaker
- Personal research & passion
- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

(A follow-up question only if “college administrator” is selected from Q10.)

11. If motivated by a college administrator to incorporate service-learning into your course(s), which administrator was it? (choose only one answer)

- Not motivated by college administrator
- President/Chancellor, Vice President/Vice Chancellor, or Associate President
- Dean or Associate Dean
- Department Chair
- Service-Learning Office/Teaching Center Director
- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**B. Institutional Factors – Hidden from the Qualtrics survey**

12. Please rank the top THREE institutional factors that would motivate you to incorporate service-learning in your course(s) (enter the scale of 1, 2, 3 with “1” being the most motivating factor).

- Course release
- Stipend or extra-compensation
- Institutional praise or recognition
- Professional development opportunity
- Grant award
- Travel to national or local service-learning conferences
- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

(A follow-up question only if institutional praise or recognition is selected from Q12.)

13. If motivated by institutional praise or recognition to incorporate service-learning in your course(s), what type of praise or recognition would motivate you? (**choose only one answer**)

Not motivated by institutional praise or recognition  
 Letter of commendation from college administrator(s)  
 Recognition by Governing Board or Board of Trustees  
 Recognition by certificate from institution  
 Recognition in college newsletter or local newspaper  
 Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

14. Do you voluntarily incorporate service-learning in your course or is it assigned/required by the department?

Voluntarily  
 Assigned  
 Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

15. Would you incorporate service-learning in your course even without any institutional support?

Yes  
 No  
 Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**C. Outcome Factors – Hidden from the Qualtrics survey**

16. Please rank the top THREE **student learning-related** outcomes that would motivate you to incorporate service-learning in your course(s) (**enter the scale of 1, 2, 3 with "1" being the most motivating outcome**).

Improve students' understanding of the subject matter  
 Improve students' learning of core competencies  
 Improve students' application of the course content  
 Improve students' self-confidence  
 Improve students' soft skills (e.g. collaboration, communication, conflict resolution, sociability, work ethic, or leadership)  
 Provide students with "real-world" learning experiences or professional (or pre-professional) training  
 Provide an effective form of experiential education  
 Service-learning course is required for degree or graduation  
 Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

17. Please rank the top THREE **faculty-related** outcomes that would motivate you to incorporate service-learning in your course(s) (**enter the scale of 1, 2, 3 with "1" being the most motivating outcome**).

Implement the innovative teaching pedagogy  
 Improve my course evaluation  
 Achieve my disciplinary goals  
 Bring positive impact to my tenure promotion or annual performance review  
 Service is an important component of my personal and/or professional identity  
 I enjoy working with students in the service-learning project setting  
 I see respected colleagues actively participate in service-learning  
 I was required or assigned to teach the service-learning course as a part of my teaching load  
 Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

18. Please rank the top THREE **community-related** outcomes that would motivate you to incorporate service-learning in your course(s) (**enter the scale of 1, 2, 3 with “1” being the most motivating outcome**).

Improve students' understanding of social issues, places or people  
 Improve students' participation in the community to affect social changes  
 Improve students' commitment to rectify social injustices  
 Improve students' sense of civic responsibility  
 Improve students' volunteerism in the community  
 Improve college-community partnerships  
 Promote multi-cultural understanding  
 Prepare students for employment  
 Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

### **Satisfaction**

Please respond to the following questions in this section as they are related to your satisfaction information.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. (5-Strongly Agree, 4-Agree, 3-Neither Agree nor Disagree, 2-Disagree, 1-Strongly Disagree)

19. I am satisfied with the support that I received from my Faculty colleagues for my efforts in service-learning education.
20. I am satisfied with the support that I received from my Department Chair for my efforts in service-learning education.
21. I am satisfied with the support that I received from my Dean or Provost for my efforts in service-learning education.
22. I am satisfied with the support that I received from the President/Chancellor for my efforts in service-learning education.
23. I am satisfied with the support that I received from the Service-Learning Office/Teaching Center of the institution for my efforts in service-learning education.
24. I am satisfied with the support that I received from students for my efforts in service-learning education.
25. I am satisfied with the support that I received from community members for my efforts in service-learning education.
26. Overall, I am satisfied with the supports that I received for my efforts in service-learning education.

### **The Relationship between Motivation and Satisfaction – Hidden from the survey**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. (5-Strongly Agree, 4-Agree, 3-Neither Agree nor Disagree, 2-Disagree, 1-Strongly Disagree)

27. I plan to continue the involvement in service-learning education in the future.
28. I plan to expand my involvement in service-learning education in the future.
29. Any additional comments:

Please enter any additional comments you may have on service-learning course.