Hearts on Our Sleeves: Emotions Experienced by Service-Learning Faculty

Tiesha R. Martin
Carrie W. Lecrom
Virginia Commonwealth University

Jill W. Lassiter
Bridgewater College

Compared to more traditional pedagogical approaches, service-learning has been shown to offer unique experiences for students and faculty. With the growth of service-learning within higher education, it has become increasingly important to understand service-learning faculty, namely faculty emotions, which can impact students in many ways. Utilizing ecological momentary assessment (EMA) and focus groups, the study discussed in this article assessed the emotions of 17 service-learning faculty with varying levels of experience over the course of one semester. Results revealed that service-learning faculty experience a number of emotional highs and lows related to class logistics, community partners, and student engagement. Additionally, more experienced service-learning faculty handled their emotions differently than newer faculty. The authors also highlight implications and opportunities for service-learning faculty and administrators, based on the study results.

Keywords: *service-learning, faculty, emotions*

Service-learning is a pedagogical practice that has the potential for high impact. For over two decades, teachers and researchers have demonstrated that service-learning can help to meet student learning outcomes in powerful and unique ways that cannot be achieved within the traditional classroom (Fitch, Steinke, & Hudson, 2013). Eyler, Giles, and Braxton (1997) showed, for instance, that over the course of just one semester, participation in class-based service-learning impacted students' attitudes, values, skills, and the ways in which they thought about social issues. Eyler et al. also found that students' direct involvement, through service-learning, with the people experiencing the social problem they were studying changed the ways they thought about the issues surrounding the problem. Collectively, participation in service-learning courses encourages cognitive, academic, and civic learning outcomes, which are well researched and documented (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000; Clayton, Bringle, & Hatcher, 2013; Jameson, Clayton, & Bringle, 2008; Novak, Markey, & Allen, 2007).

Similarly, faculty experience positive outcomes as a result of teaching service-learning courses, perhaps because of the pedagogy's community-based approach, which requires continuous learning and adaptation. Transformational learning occurs not only in students, but also in faculty and community members involved in a service-learning experience (Clayton & Ash, 2004; Howard, 1998). Jameson, Clayton, and Jaeger (2011) suggested that service-learning should create a "shared developmental journey" (p. 269) among students and faculty, thus creating a system of co-learning. However, being co-learners with students can create a vulnerability among faculty members that can be tied closely to emotions. Jameson et al. further maintained that students are oftentimes aware of and influenced by teachers' emotions. This is consistent with findings that first-time service-learning faculty experience

emotional contagion, or the idea that emotions are transferred from student to teacher or vice versa (LeCrom, Lassiter, & Pelco, 2016).

The link between faculty emotions and service-learning has yet to be explored in depth but is worthy of further study, particularly within the field of faculty development related to service-learning. Because service-learning can be considered a counter-normative pedagogy, meaning it is fundamentally different from traditional teaching methods, do faculty experience different and/or stronger emotions as a result? Are there ways to capture the emotional aspect of teaching service-learning in an effort to build on it positively in the community? Questions such as these require a baseline study of what emotions faculty experience while teaching service-learning courses, as well as how they manage those emotions throughout a semester. This study attempted to fill that gap in exploring faculty emotions related to service-learning.

Review of the Literature

Emotions of Teaching and Learning

Emotions play an important role in learning. Students experience positive emotions related to their learning more often than negative ones (Noyes, Darby, & Leupold, 2015). Specifically, positive emotions such as enjoyment and the reward of seeing achievement in others have been shown to promote academic engagement (Noyes et al., 2015). Pekrun's (2006) control-value theory further supports the notion that emotional arousal plays a crucial role in the learning process. Achievement emotions are emotions tied directly to achievement activities or outcomes and are central to the learning process. Of particular importance to achievement emotions are (a) subjective control over achievement activities and outcomes and (b) subjective values (both intrinsic and extrinsic) of the activities and outcomes (Pekrun, 2006). Emotions, control, and value appraisals create either positive or negative feedback loops (Pekrun, 2006), reciprocal relationships that can impact the social environment of the classroom and student learning, and vice versa. Emotional regulation can help to increase positive and minimize negative emotions, thus having an overall positive impact on academic achievement emotions and outcomes. The control-value theory implies that emotions, both positive and negative, can impact student interest, engagement, achievement, personality development, and classroom climate (Pekrun, 2006).

Because faculty are learners as well, they experience many of same emotions as students. However, faculty also experience emotions associated with teaching, which may be different than those related to learning. Sutton and Wheatley (2003) demonstrated that teachers' emotions are likely to influence their cognition and motivation, while Quinlan (2016) posited that "education is relational, and emotions are central to relationships" (p. 102), highlighting that emotions and learning are both relational and thus are interconnected. Postareff and Lindblom-Ylanne (2011) identified a range of emotions experienced by university teachers, including enjoyment, enthusiasm, empathy, and respect toward students. Although negative emotions were less common, the most frequent was reluctance to embrace a certain form of teaching or teaching method.

Sutton and Wheatley (2003) found that positive emotions similar to those experienced by students were common among teachers, such as caring, joy, satisfaction, and excitement. Negative emotions most commonly reported were anger, frustration, and anxiety. Just as students' negative emotions are linked to broad social problems, teachers' sadness (for instance) is often tied to students' home lives, which they might feel helpless to change. Similarly, Hargreaves (2000) found that secondary teachers' positive emotions resulted from achieving breakthroughs with individual students and from seeing those students in a different light when interacting with them outside of the classroom. Reflection was associated with more positive emotions and outcomes related to teaching.

Stupinsky and colleagues (2013) investigated new faculty members' emotions around teaching and research and found a wide range of discrete emotions associated with teaching, including the most common, enjoyment, followed by the negative emotions of anxiety and guilt. New faculty members who perceived high levels of control over their teaching expressed more positive emotions about teaching (Stupinsky et al., 2013). Felten, Gilchrist, and Darby (2006) found that faculty tended to want to have

"emotional control" over the classroom environment, a a negative aspect of emotion within the academic environment.

Emotions around Service-Learning

As a unique teaching methodology, service-learning has also been shown to evoke high emotional responses compared to traditional classroom-style pedagogical practices. Noyes and colleagues (2015) found that students experienced significantly more emotional responses in a service setting associated with a service-learning course than they did in the classroom or working on assignments. Eyler and Giles (1999) highlighted students' need for emotional support when they are working in new environments such as service-learning placements in the community. Furthermore, class- and service-related enjoyment were positively correlated, suggesting that positive setting-based experiences can create reciprocal feedback loops that impact the emotional and achievement outcomes of service-learning courses (Noyes et al., 2015). The negative emotions of anger, frustration, and sadness were typically related to an increased awareness and understanding of broad social problems.

Similarly, faculty have reported unique emotions associated with service-learning. Faculty teaching service-learning courses for the first time experience higher levels of emotional arousal in those particular courses than in other courses they teach (LeCrom et al., 2016). In LeCrom et al.'s (2016) study, faculty members' positive emotions included excitement and benevolent satisfaction, which outweighed the negative emotions of burnout and weariness. Additionally, Quinlan (2016) advocated for emotional contagion—or the transfer of emotions from student to faculty or vice versa—emphasizing that teaching is an interaction between humans, who are thinking and feeling beings; thus, it is inherent that faculty bring feelings and emotions into the classroom that can engender both positive or negative emotions in students. Students tend to associate positive emotions with "good teaching" and remember those experiences. The current study sought to determine whether these or other emotions were consistent among faculty teaching service-learning in a variety of disciplines with varying levels of experience, and what factors may have played a role in mediating emotional responses.

Theoretical Framework

We selected Robert Coles' (1993) conceptual model of emotional satisfactions and hazards as the framework for this study. The framework provides a clear definition of the positive emotions (satisfactions) and negative emotions (hazards) associated with service work generally (see Table 1). Some researchers have applied Coles' model to service-learning more specifically, finding that most of the satisfactions and hazards do remain consistent throughout this form of service work (Carson & Domangue, 2013; LeCrom et al., 2016). The current study utilized the satisfactions and hazards posited by Coles to develop reflective weekly prompts, and to conceptualize the research questions.

Table 1. Coles' (1993) Emotional Satisfactions and Hazards

Emotional Satisfactions
1. Something done, someone reached: the pleasure and privilege of completing benevolent service acts that enhance the lives of those involved.
2. Moral purpose: the service encounter is a mutual moral activity; it answers a moral call in the world while strengthening the moral beliefs and values of those volunteering (i.e., providing a sense of purpose in life).
3. Personal affirmation: the service enables one to rediscover the inherent gifts one has to offer the world that are usually taken for granted.
4. Stoic endurance: a mix between being fully committed to the work and those served, yet remaining somewhat detached (i.e., keeping in perspective what can and cannot be accomplished).

5. Boost to success: the service work is also self-serving, providing distinguishing experiences that aid career advancement (e.g., purposefully highlighted in job interviews).

Emotional Hazards

1. Weariness and resignation: service work, over time, proves to be psychologically draining and increasingly disinteresting to providers who begin thinking of doing something else or, at the very at least, taking an extended break.

2. Cynicism: a gloomy doubtfulness about the world, people, and their potential that skeptically overshadows any sense of hope for the service work; results in serious questioning of whether the service work is even impactful.

3. Arrogance, anger, and bitterness: a growing feeling of outrage by the problems the service work is trying to resolve, sometimes enacted on others who are assisting in the work, and becomes embittered with how people in power do nothing; eventually the service provider believes they are the only ones who are doing anything.

4. Despair: a deepening sadness for the impermeable misfortunes of others, making it difficult to notice anything positive from the service work besides the advantages accrued to the service providers.

5. Burnout (depression): a general sense of utter disappointment, hopelessness, or exhaustion that arise with the arduous duties of service work; a depressive condition takes over the spirit and brings with it devastating feelings of "going through the motions" (with nothing left to give) or "terminating the work altogether."

Method

The research questions for this study focused on the emotions experienced by faculty teaching service-learning courses. Specifically, we were interested in the real-time emotional highs and lows that faculty felt throughout the semester as they taught their service-learning courses. Given its purpose, the study adhered to a qualitative, phenomenological approach, whereby we collected and analyzed data related to the lived experiences of faculty, expressed in their own words (Crotty, 1998). In phenomenology, researchers study a phenomenon (in this case, emotions associated with teaching service-learning) from the perspective of those experiencing the phenomenon (i.e., service-learning faculty) as it is being experienced (i.e., during the semester in which the service-learning course was taught) (Allen-Collinson, 2009). The following research questions guided the study:

1. What emotions do service-learning faculty experience throughout the semester?
2. Do the emotions of faculty and students impact one another (emotional contagion)?
3. In what ways are the personal (emotional) and intellectual (academic outcomes) components of teaching through service-learning interconnected, if at all?
4. How does experience (years teaching service-learning) impact how faculty experience emotions?

Participants

Seventeen faculty members at a large, very high research institution located in the eastern United States participated in this study. Initially, all faculty teaching service-learning at the university were sent an email (through the service-learning office) outlining the study and soliciting participants. A follow-up email was sent two weeks later. A total of 20 faculty expressed interest in participating; however, three were deemed ineligible because the service-learning courses they were teaching were not offered in the semester in which the study was taking place. The only criteria for participation was that the faculty

member be teaching a service-learning course in the spring 2016 semester, when data collection would take place.

The fact that all participants belonged to one university was a limitation of the study; however, we made efforts to accurately represent the diversity of the university in terms of discipline, type of service work, experience teaching service-learning, and variety of community partnerships. Table 2 outlines the course topic, course level, and total number of service-learning courses each participant had taught at the time of the study. In total, 11 schools or colleges were represented, with service-learning courses ranging from 100-level (first-year undergraduate) to 700-level (doctoral). Three of the faculty in the sample (17%) were teaching their first service-learning course, while four had taught more than 10 service-learning courses throughout their careers. The average number of service-learning courses taught was 5.88. Additionally, 23% of the participants were male and 77% female.

Table 2. Description of Participants

Course topic	Course level	Total Number of Service-Learning Courses Taught
Communications	400 level	3
Family Health Nursing	400 level	1
Focused Inquiry	100 level	13
Focused Inquiry	100 level	10
Focused Inquiry	200 level	3
Forensic Science	300 level	6
Forensic Science	300 level	5
Homeland Security	600 level	15
Kinesiology	400 level	6
Leadership	600 level	10
Music	400 level	1
Occupational Therapy	600 level	1
Oral Health	700 level	7
Physical Education	300 level	3
Sociology	300 level	5
Strategic Public Relations	400 level	2
Teaching	300 level	9

Data Collection and Analysis

The research team collected data during the spring 2016 semester (January to May), utilizing focus groups as well as weekly reflections using a data collection method called ecological momentary assessment (EMA). Focus groups were held one week prior to the start of the spring semester, and one week after the end of classes. Due to the large sample, three separate focus groups were held at the beginning of the semester, and three were held at the end of the semester. Participants self-selected into focus groups based upon their availability. This division into three groups at each interval ensured that

each faculty member was able to be heard and had ample time to share comments during his or her focus group.

During the semester and between the book-ended focus groups, all participants were asked to respond to weekly prompts that they received via text message or email (depending on their preference). Though the research team sent the prompts weekly, they were not sent at the same time each week; thus, the faculty participants were not able to plan ahead in preparing their responses. Each week a different question was asked (one per week). A full list of the EMA prompts is available in Appendix C. This EMA method, whereby faculty were asked to respond to real-time prompts in a timely manner, allowed true emotions to emerge in a more unscripted way than if more time for reflection was allotted. According to Moskowitz and Young (2006), the EMA method "permits more sensitive assessments and will enable more wide-ranging and detailed measurements of mood and behavior" (p. 13). Because we wanted to capture emotional responses, this method of data collection was appropriate and beneficial. Response rates for the weekly prompts varied from 67% to 100% participation from all 17 faculty participants. The average weekly response rate to the EMA prompts was 85%.

The focus group recordings were transcribed verbatim, and the EMA responses were compiled into a weekly transcript. Two independent researchers coded and analyzed the transcripts individually, utilizing NVivo. Data coding followed a three-step process of analytic coding, categorization, and theme searching (Glesne, 2011). The researchers searched, individually and then as a team, for commonalities and shared understanding related to the emotions experienced by the faculty teaching service-learning courses. Approximately 45 codes emerged through this process. Of these codes, approximately 35 were duplicates, indicating that both researchers identified the code in his or her individual analysis. The two independent researchers then worked together to collapse the 35 codes, resulting in 12 conceptual categories. The categories were generated through the process of analytic induction as the researchers analyzed individual focus groups or EMA prompts, then searched for confirmation of these within other transcripts. The conceptual categories were vetted by the research team, and quotations from the participants' transcripts were pulled to ensure that their own voices were represented accurately.

Finally, the overarching themes were constructed by identifying relationships between conceptual categories. We utilized researcher triangulation by enlisting a multi-member research team (Blaikie, 1991; Fossey, Harvey, McDermott, & Davidson, 2002) and data triangulation by collecting multiple sources of data (i.e., focus groups and EMA weekly prompts). We kept extensive notes throughout data collection and analysis, and we ensured credibility and dependability through member checking and by video-recording the focus groups (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Researchers' Stance

Merriam (1998) advised that researchers attempt to remove biases and prejudices associated with studies they conduct. All three members of the research team had taught service-learning courses either at the institution that served as the study site or at other institutions. All three attempted to refrain from adding personal experiences or context to the focus group conversations, serving merely as moderators who asked the questions and provided the prompts. Each researcher made a concerted effort to remain objective during reporting and dissemination. To account for institutional bias, one member of the research team was brought in from another university to participate in data analysis without the contextual knowledge of the university from which participants were derived. Overall, the researchers remained

confident that the results captured the true themes and viewpoints of the participants, not clouded by assumptions or biases.

Results

The aim of this study was to assess the emotions experienced by faculty while teaching service-learning courses. Results from the EMA and pre- and post-semester focus groups revealed that faculty experienced emotional lows brought on by negative antecedents such as logistical issues, lack of university support, issues with community partners, and issues with student engagement. Faculty also experienced emotional highs as a result of positive antecedents such as doing good in the community and witnessing student growth both inside and outside the classroom. The results also revealed that experience impacted how faculty emotions manifested themselves. Each of these aspects is explained in further detail in the following section.

Faculty Emotional Responses

Emotional lows. Faculty reported experiencing negative emotions such as frustration, anger, anxiety, and disappointment. These emotions were, for the most part, brought on by issues related to the service component of their courses. For example, many faculty noted issues with logistics and the ways in which the unpredictable nature of teaching service-learning impacted their ability to plan. One instructor stated, "There's also the frustration—just what you guys are talking about, too, and things not always going as planned. We plan things out really well." Another instructor added:

> For me, I'm a very type A, organizer type, so to be flexible as well as structured is really hard sometimes … that's really difficult for me personally, to try to go with the flow but still maintain some sort of organization with my classes.

Over half of the faculty in the sample also acknowledged having negative emotional responses to logistical issues related to the weather and its impact on students' ability to complete service and review course material. Specifically, two instructors noted:

- I have been frustrated this semester due to being slow out of the gate to get into our service-learning projects. Both are outdoor-based and the weather has made it frustrating. Our work at one of our sites was cancelled a number of times due to snow and cold.
- I can't help but mention the frustration of having lost a week's worth of classes due to the snow days. I tried to reconfigure the course schedule as best I could, but there are some foundational matters that I feel … I glossed over due to time constraints.

Thus, it was the lack of control over such logistical issues that caused negative emotional responses in the service-learning faculty.

In addition, difficulty collaborating with community partners led to negative emotional responses. Service-learning faculty noted the importance of maintaining a constructive relationship with community partners in order to adequately perform service. When those relationships became strained in some way, instructors felt frustrated. One faculty member stated, "I personally am a little frustrated as my client has continued to be unavailable to talk about some important aspects of the project." Another instructor noted the anxiety experienced due to lack of communication with the community partner:

> I had two really big challenges. One was with my one community partner—the executive director became sick and was out for like six weeks. He was our liaison, so we were slow in getting going. I ended up having to deal with a lot of hassling on the back side, to find another partner.

Service-learning faculty also experienced negative emotional responses as a result of not feeling valued or supported by their department or the university as a whole. One faculty member explained how administrators' lack of understanding of service-learning influenced her emotionally:

> I think for me the majority of any negative response comes from a program administration standpoint, and that the disconnect between the service-learning course and what our faculty at the school understand, and what our administration understands, you know, and I'm tasked with bringing 16 community partner sites into compliance with our presentation standards, etc. But

then, sometimes my decisions are overridden. That's the frustration to me, is the lack of value in the course as perceived by the school.

Other faculty noted feeling as though school administrators and other non-service-learning faculty valued other courses over service-learning courses. As two instructors shared:

- Why can every other class get paid for by the dean's office, and this one can't? That's what I'm saying, to me, when we're saying this is where we want our university to go, why is there not that support? I don't know about other places, other departments, what they have, but I'm not paid. I've got to find my own pay.
- Lack of respect within the department for the service-learning class. Department meetings are scheduled around class times except for service-learning. A class had a make-up day that was scheduled during the same time as the [service-learning course] and the instructor didn't even notice or ask about using the room.

Clearly, lack of university support resulted in negative emotional responses for these service-learning faculty.

Finally, instructors noted feeling frustrated and disappointed as a result of students not being fully engaged in the service. Two faculty members summarized this point:

- I think I get [a] stronger negative emotional reaction to students that aren't following through with what they should be doing, when it's not just their learning and their grade that's being affected, but that it's an outside community partner. I have to just sometimes remind myself that they're 18-year-old freshmen when that happens.
- We have a couple other opportunities besides our weekly activities in case we need extra hours … Anyway, I had students sign up for these opportunities and for two of them, people didn't show up, so I ended up, at the last second, having to do them. That's frustrating and disappointing. It's fun once you get there, because I do enjoy that, but I like it when I can plan it.

It is evident that frustration was the most common negative emotional response expressed by service-learning faculty. Frustration and other emotional lows experienced by faculty were brought on by antecedents related to issues that were out of their control (i.e., logical issues, issues with community partners, lack of university support, and lack of student engagement).

Emotional highs. While service-learning faculty did report having negative emotional responses, they also acknowledged experiencing emotional highs as a result of teaching their service-learning courses. Instructors noted feeling emotions such as joy, pride, and excitement brought on by positive aspects of teaching service-learning. For instance, approximately 40% of the instructors in the sample noted that being able to do something good for their community contributed to their positive emotional responses. Though they expressed a passion for doing good in their community, more common was instructors' positive emotional response to witnessing their students sharing in their passion and helping others in need. One instructor explained, "For me, having students helping the community, and helping to increase access to care, is hugely emotional. I'm very rewarded when I see the students gain the same appreciation." Another added, "I've also been happy to see our students recognizing the challenges that the middle school students have and how we can be a positive part of their learning." In general, it is clear that doing good in the community was a positive antecedent to emotional highs experienced by the service-learning faculty in this study.

Service-learning faculty also experienced positive emotional responses to their students' growth as civically engaged individuals through their service-learning participation. One instructor explained:

To see how my students have transformed, not just in terms of learning course concepts, but also in becoming more civically minded individuals has truly brought me great joy as an instructor.

In addition, many service-learning faculty acknowledged their emotional response to their students learning life skills through their service experience. As one instructor noted, "My students inspire me with their insightful and honest comments which reflect much growth on many levels—teaching,

communication, preparation, consistency, and integrity." Clearly, instructors enjoyed witnessing their students' growth.

Lastly, approximately 75% of faculty in the sample discussed the hands-on nature of service-learning and its application of course content. Witnessing students apply knowledge learned in the classroom to their service experience contributed to the positive emotional responses of service-learning faculty. Two faculty members explained:

- I have observed many of them effectively grasping these concepts and applying them to the process mentees are using to make career decisions. It is very rewarding to see they are able to do this verbally and I am looking forward to seeing how they can apply the theories in writing.
- It has been exciting to listen to my students discuss their observations at the child development center and the connections that they are making to the material discussed in class. They can take what I've modeled and see it in action in a setting with children. Furthermore, they are going to be able to practice it themselves, which will make for a richer learning opportunity.

In summary, service-learning faculty attributed their emotional highs to their students engaging positively in the service component of their courses. They experienced joy, excitement, and happiness as a result of witnessing their students doing good in the community, growing as a result of the service experience, and learning to apply course concepts.

The Role of Experience

The results of this study suggest that experience determines what emotions service-learning faculty experience and how they handle the emotions associated with teaching their courses. Specifically, findings around the impact students' emotions have on service-learning faculty and vice versa were mixed, with experience emerging as a key factor. More experienced faculty (i.e., those who had taught more than three service-learning courses) reported not letting their own or their students' emotions impact them too much. One experienced service-learning faculty member explained, "I don't feel like I get swept up with the students' emotional responses because I see it as my job to bring a realistic point of view to the scope of the service-learning project." To this point, another instructor added:

When students experience negative emotions when getting started in their placement, I try not to let it get to me. I always tell them, "No worries," but I know they experience some anxiety. I used to get really worked up but not anymore, as I know they will get situated and everything will work out fine.

Whereas more experienced service-learning instructors reported not letting their students' emotions get to them, newer faculty seemed to be more engrossed in their students' emotions. One instructor shared, "For me, whatever emotions my students are feeling, I feel it too. That's kind of a roller coaster." Another faculty member commented:

I feel like, and it might be a fault, but I feel like I get really involved with the students. They're like my kids, almost, but not really. When they are really frustrated and they struggle really bad, and they're upset, I automatically get upset. I'm not upset at them. I'm upset that they're upset. Nonsensical, but it's really frustrating, and I feel like that definitely in service-learning, they are frustrated.

Additionally, results indicated that more experienced faculty better anticipated and dealt with their own and their students' emotions. For example, one instructor stated, "I have been teaching this course for so many years now, and with my clinical background I feel very comfortable dealing with the students' emotions." Another experienced service-learning faculty member added:

I have been teaching service-learning for a while, so I expect there to be highs and lows. As a result, I don't feel it as intensely as I once did. This doesn't diminish anything for me, though. I remember well how those feelings run.

Finally, the results revealed that more experienced faculty understood that aspects of the service-learning course might not go as planned, and they were less likely to attach negative emotional responses to issues with logistics and community partners. For example, one experienced service-learning instructor noted:

> I'm a little bit more relaxed in that I understand that things are going to fall through. That sometimes things just won't work out as you envisioned them. I think the people who end up deciding to do service-learning are maybe not optimistic but a little bit more ... have some sort of vision or some sort of idea that they want to implement. They want to see something positive occur.

Evidently, experience plays a large role in how service-learning faculty deal with their emotions.

Discussion

Previous research has indicated that service-learning faculty experience unique emotions as a result of teaching a service-learning course (LeCrom et al., 2016). Indeed, it is important to understand faculty emotions in order to create the best possible experiences for faculty and their students (Pekrun, 2006), and to ensure teacher commitment to service-learning pedagogy (Jo, 2014). The current study highlights the emotional lows and highs experienced by service-learning faculty and found that service-learning faculty's negative emotional responses were brought on largely by logistical issues associated with the course, difficulty dealing with community partners, lack of university support, and lack of student engagement. Conversely, positive emotional responses were attributed to doing good in the community and witnessing student growth both inside and outside of the classroom. Furthermore, experience played a role as more experienced faculty dealt with their emotions differently than less experienced faculty.

The results of this study highlight the specific emotions felt by service-learning faculty and add to the literature on university faculty emotions. Specifically, the emotions identified by service-learning instructors in this study are consistent with findings from the existing literature on faculty emotions (Postareff & Lindblom-Ylanne, 2011; Sutton & Wheatly, 2003). Still, while service-learning instructors and traditional instructors may experience similar emotions (i.e., joy, excitement, anger, frustration, and anxiety), they may be brought on by different antecedents. Many of the negative and positive emotions identified by faculty in this study were in response to antecedents specific to service-learning (e.g., frustrations with community partners, doing good in the community). Moreover, these antecedents were largely logistical and tied to the faculty member feeling a lack of control over particular circumstances; they were not issues that an instructor would likely experience in a non-service-learning course. This suggests that teaching service-learning offers a unique emotional experience for instructors. Future research should seek to confirm this distinction by comparing the emotional responses of service-learning faculty and non-service-learning faculty.

The antecedents highlighted by faculty as triggers for their emotional responses provided insight into why service-learning faculty experience the emotions they do. Particularly noteworthy was the finding that, for many faculty, seeing their students doing good in the community and growing as a result of their service experiences triggered positive emotional responses. This finding aligned with the work of Hargreaves (2000), who found that teachers' positive experiences are related to seeing students in a different light outside of the classroom. This further supports the idea that teaching service-learning offers faculty unique experiences that may influence them emotionally.

The finding that experience played a role in how faculty dealt with their own and their students' emotions was revealing. All instructors in this study noted experiencing both positive and negative emotions while teaching their service-learning coursse. However, the results suggest that more experienced faculty are more likely to remain somewhat detached from their own emotional responses than newer faculty. This relates to Cole's (1993) "stoic endurance" emotional satisfaction, which arises from keeping in perspective what can and cannot be accomplished. Additionally, these findings are consistent with other research on new faculty development suggesting that teachers need time to adapt to

the procedures and emotions associated with teaching. As teachers gain more experience, they become more comfortable (Saunders, 2013). Perhaps with experience comes heightened levels of emotional intelligence, which helps faculty manage their own and others' emotions. This idea warrants further study of emotional intelligence in service-learning faculty, through research that examines relationships between emotional intelligence and how faculty manage student emotions through the highs and lows of service work.

Practical Implications

This study offers several key practical implications for service-learning instructors and administrators. First, this work has implications related to the concept of emotional cognition. Because faculty inevitably bring their emotions into the classroom, understanding service-learning faculty emotions is important since they often relate directly to students' classroom experiences (Oplatka, 2007; Quinlan, 2016). Given that the current study found that service-learning faculty experience both positive and negative emotions that may impact their students, it is important for service-learning faculty and administrators to devise strategies to help instructors productively manage their emotions. One way to accomplish this is through reflection. Research has shown that reflection can help service-learning students better understand their experiences and emotions (Felten et al., 2006; Hargraves, 2000; Hutchings & Wutzorff, 1988). The same could hold true for service-learning faculty. In the current study, faculty expressed that participating in the weekly EMA prompts and focus groups allowed them to reflect on their experiences and their emotional responses. Thus, administrators might find it beneficial to offer structured platforms or opportunities for reflection. This could be especially beneficial for newer service-learning faculty considering this study's findings related to higher emotional responses from less experienced faculty.

In addition to creating opportunities for faculty to reflect on their experiences, administrators should also consider strategies that help to decrease negative and increase positive emotional responses for service-learning faculty. While some of the antecedents to faculty's emotional responses are out of their control, others can be alleviated or enhanced with the assistance of administrators. For example, many faculty in this study highlighted emotional lows brought on by lack of university support. This finding is consistent Vogelsang, Denson, and Jayakumar's (2010) finding that faculty are more likely to teach service-learning if they feel the action is supported by the university. In order to keep faculty engaged in teaching service-learning, university administrators must demonstrate that they support service-learning, through actions rather than just words, and must help faculty to negotiate their negative emotions.

Limitations and Future Research

We acknowledge that there are limitations associated with this study. First, while the sample was diverse in terms of the amount of experience and type of course taught, all instructors came from the same university. This could have an impact on generalizability, as the climate of the university might be unique. Furthermore, data collection took place during the course of one semester, which may have impacted the emotional responses that participants described. For example, many expressed frustration over the impact of snow on their ability to complete service or hold class; however, this probably would not have been an issue in the fall semester. Thus, future researchers might consider conducting a similar study with participants from multiple universities and during different semesters.

The results of this study suggest that faculty experience several emotional highs and lows related to teaching service-learning courses. Thus, this research lays the groundwork for future studies that focus on determining how to best capture the emotional aspect of service-learning in ways that might benefit students, universities, and the communities which service-learning courses serve.

Conclusion

This research highlights the specific emotions that service-learning faculty experience, the causes of those emotions, and the role that service-learning teaching experience has on emotions and how they are managed. As service-learning faculty emotions can influence teaching and student learning, understanding those emotions is critical. The results of this study offer university administrators insight into how to help faculty manage their emotions in order to maximize student experiences and the well-being of instructors.

Author Note

Tiesha R. Martin, Center for Sport Leadership, Virginia Commonwealth University; Carrie W. Lecrom, Center for Sport Leadership, Virginia Commonwealth University; Jill W. Lassiter, Department of Health and Human Sciences, Bridgewater College.

Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Tiesha R. Martin, Center for Sport Leadership, Virginia Commonwealth University, Sports Medicine Building, 1300 West Broad Street, Box 842003, Richmond, VA 23284-2003. E-mail: martintr2@vcu.edu

References

Allen-Collinson, J. (2009). Sporting embodiment: Sports studies and the (continuing) promise of phenomenology. *Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise, 1*, 279-296.

Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. (2000). *How service learning affects students.* Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California.

Blaikie, N. W. H. (1991). A critique of the use of triangulation in social research. *Quality and Quantity, 25,* 115-136.

Carson, R. L., & Domangue, E. A. (2013). The emotional component of service-learning. *Journal of Experiential Education, 36*(2), 139-154.

Clayton, P. H., & Ash, S. L. (2004). Shifts in perspective: Capitalizing on the counter-normative nature of service learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 11*(1), 59-70.

Clayton, P. H., Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2013). *Research on service learning: onceptual frameworks and assessments, Vol. 2A.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Coles, R. (1993). *The call of service: A witness of idealism.* New York: Houghton   Mifflin Company.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process.* Los Angeles: Sage.

Eyler, J., & Giles, Jr., D. E. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eyler, J., Giles, Jr., D. E., & Braxton, J. (1997). The impact of service-learning on college students. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 4,* 5-15.

Felten, P., Gilchrist, L. Z., & Darby, A. (2006). Emotion and learning: Feeling our way toward a new theory of reflection in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 12*, 38-46.

Fitch, P., Steinke, P., & Hudson, T. (2013). Research and theoretical perspectives on cognitive outcomes of service learning. *Research on Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Assessment, 2,* 57-83.

Fossey, E., Harvey, C., McDermott, F., & Davidson, L. (2002). Understanding and evaluating qualitative research. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 36,* 717-732.

Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Hargreaves, A. (2000). Mixed emotions: Teachers' perceptions of their interactions with students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *16*, 811-826.

Howard, J. (1998). Academic service learning: A counter normative pedagogy. *New Directions in Teaching and Learning, 73,* 21-29. doi: 10.1002/tl.7303

Hutchings, P., & Wutzdorff, A. (1988). Experiential learning across the curriculum: Assumptions and principles. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *35*, 5-19.

Jameson, J. K., Clayton, P. H., & Bringle, R. G. (2008). Investigating student learning within and across linked service learning courses. In M. Bowdon, S. Billig, & B. Holland (Eds.), *Scholarship for sustaining service learning and civic engagement* (pp. 3-27). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Jameson, J. K., Clayton, P. H., & Jaeger, A. J. (2011). Community-engaged scholarship through mutually transformative partnerships. In L. Harter, J. Hamel-Lambert, & J. Millesen (Eds.), *Participatory partnerships for social action and research* (pp. 259-278). Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt.

Jo, S. H. (2014). Teacher commitment: Exploring associations with relationships and emotions. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *43*, 120-130.

LeCrom, C. W., Lassiter, J. W., & Pelco, L. (2016). Faculty feel it too: The emotions of teaching through service learning. *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education, 8*(2), 41-56.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry (vol. 75)*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Moskowitz, D. S., & Young, S. N. (2006). Ecological momentary assessment: What it is and why it is a method of the future in clinical psychopharmacology. *Journal of Psychiatry and Neuroscience, 31*(1), 13.

Novak, J. M., Markey, V., & Allen, M. (2007). Evaluating cognitive outcomes of service learning in higher education: A meta-analysis. *Communication Research Reports, 24*(2), 149-157.

Noyes, E., Darby, A., & Leupold, C. (2015). Students' emotions in academic service-learning. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 19*(4), 63-84.

Oplatka, I. (2007). Managing emotions in teaching: Toward an understanding of emotion displays and caring as nonprescribed role elements. *Teachers College Record*, *109*, 1374-1400.

Pekrun, R. (2006). The control-value theory of achievement emotions: Assumptions, corollaries, and implications for educational research and practice. *Educational Psychology Review, 18*(4), 315-341.

Postareff, L., & Lindblom-Ylanne, S. (2011). Emotions and confidence within teaching in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 36*(7), 799-813.

Quinlan, K. M. (2016). How emotion matters in four key relationships in teaching and learning in higher education. *College Teaching, 64*, 1-11.

Saunders, R. (2013). The role of teacher emotions in change: Experiences, patterns and implications for professional development. *Journal of Educational Change*, *14*, 303-333.

Stupinsky, R. H., Perry, R. P., Renaud, R. D., & Hladkyi, S. (2013). Looking beyond grades: Comparing self-esteem and perceived academic control as predictors of first-year college students' well-being. *Learning and Individual Differences, 23,* 151-157.

Sutton, R. E., & Wheatley, K. F. (2003). Teachers' emotions and teaching: A review of the literature and directions for future research. *Educational Psychology Review, 15*(4), 327-358.

Vogelgesang, L. J., Denson, N., & Jayakumar, U. M. (2010). What determines faculty-engaged scholarship? *Review of Higher Education, 33,* 437-472.

Appendix A
Pre-Semester Focus Group Protocol

1. Please briefly describe the nature of your service learning course and your overall feelings about the course as you prepare for it.

2. What would you list as the benefits or positives to teaching service-learning?

3. What would you say are the challenges or struggles with teaching a service-learning course?

4. Please describe the mental or emotional energy that service learning places on you.

5. Please describe the satisfaction or levels of enjoyment fulfillment with your job and teaching that you get from doing service-learning courses?

6. What positive emotional impacts do you experience through your SL course?

7. What negative emotional impacts do you experience through your SL course?

8. What type of emotions (+ or -) do you observe your students experiencing through their SL experience (if any)?
   a. How do those student emotions impact you, if at all?

Secondary:

9. How do you see service learning valued at the University?

10. How has teaching service learning impacted your attitude toward your students?

11. What has your response been to reading student reflections?

12. How have you changed as a teacher as a result of teaching service learning?

13. How have you changed as a learner as a result of teaching service learning?

Appendix B
Post-Semester Focus Group Protocol

1. What have been your greatest 'wins' this semester in regard to service learning?

2. What have been your biggest challenges or struggles this semester in regard to service learning?

3. What positive emotional impacts did you experience through your SL course? Please give specific examples.

4. What negative emotional impacts did you experience through your SL course? Please give specific examples.

5. What type of emotions (+ or -) do you observe your students experiencing through their SL experience (if any)?
   a. How do those student emotions impact you, if at all?

6. How has teaching service learning impacted your attitude toward your students?

7. What has your response been to reading student reflections?

8. How have you changed as a teacher as a result of teaching service learning?

9. How have you changed as a learner as a result of teaching service learning?

Appendix C
EMA Text or Email Prompt Schedule

Week 1	Please reflect/comment on your emotional responses to the first week of your SL course.
Week 2	Describe a recent situation or experience related to your service-learning work in which you felt particularly happy.
Week 3	What was your most recent negative emotional response in regards to SL? Please explain.
Week 4	On a scale of 1 to 10 (with 10 being the highest), how optimistic are you this week that this will be the best service-learning class you've ever taught? Explain why you feel that way.
Week 5	On a scale of 1 to 10 (with 10 being the highest intensity), rate how intensely you have felt yourself being swept along with your students' emotional experiences this semester. Is this more likely to happen when your students experience positive or negative reactions? Has the intensity changed from when you first started teaching with SL (why or why not)?
Week 6	What frustrations have you experienced thus far this semester?
Week 7	What joys/excitements have you experienced thus far this semester?
Week 8	Please list some of your reactions to student reflections thus far.
Week 9	How has your SL experience this semester impacted you as a learner?
Week 10	What was your most recent positive emotional response in regards to SL? Please explain.

Week 11	What was your most recent negative emotional response in regards to SL? Please explain.
Week 12	Open week – reflect on whatever you choose in regard to SL.
Week 13	Have any of your emotional responses to SL this semester surprised you? If so, explain.
Week 14	Reflect on the growth of your students over this semester. In reflecting, how do you feel? What's your reaction?