How do International Service-Learning programs attend to linguistic difference? A review of literature

Roger W. Anderson
Central State University

ABSTRACT

To understand how ISL addresses linguistic difference between participants and host communities, a qualitative content analysis of recent peer-reviewed articles in which programs were described as having addressed linguistic difference. Nearly half of the literature did not explicate how language was addressed. Across 25 programs, seven methods were identified. Programs most commonly involved participant language lessons and utilizing participants' extant second language skills. ISL programs were found to value participants' second language skills more than found in previous reviews, contradicting a pattern of general indifference. This review advocates providing participants language lessons and critical linguistic awareness, moving towards a plurilingual reciprocity. Constituting an initial step, this review urges further exploration of cross-linguistic communication and greater critical reflexivity on the topic of linguistic difference in ISL programs.

Reciprocity is accepted as a tenet of ISL (Bamber, Phil, 2011; Bamber, Philip M., 2015; Bartleet et al., 2019; Clayton et al., 2010; Dostilio, Lina D. et al., 2012; Lough & Toms, 2018; Nguyen, 2017; Pisco, 2015; Sherraden et al., 2013). A recent concept review within ISL publications explored the usages of the term, finding three orientations being deployed (Dostilio, L. D. et al., 2012). Some ISL programs (heretofore, "programs") employed an exchange orientation, in which, "reciprocity is the interchange of benefits, resources, or actions" (p. 19).The second orientation sees reciprocity as influence on the process and/or outcomes, in which, "reciprocity is expressed as a relational connection that is informed by personal, social, and environmental contexts" (p. 20). The third orientation is generativity, in which, "participants (who have or develop identities as co-creators) become and/or produce something new together that would not exist otherwise" (p. 20), whereas the term "participants" is inclusive of host community members.

Reciprocity, in whichever orientation(s), depends upon communication. Acknowledging this fact means that the quantity, quality, and distribution of the communication matter. Humans communicate through language, so we must recognize the constitutive role that language plays in reciprocity. Because ISL administers programs that are global and immersive (Hartman & Keily, 2014), communication within programs often transpires across either languages or dialects. Even when sending English-speaking participants to English-speaking host communities, mutual intelligibility is not guaranteed *a priori* (Deterding, D. & Kirkpatrick, 2006; Deterding,

David, 2013; Nelson, 1995; Rajadurai, 2007; van der Walt, 2000). In this view, the term cross-linguistic will be hereto used as encompassing of cross-dialect communication to conserve words, although the two are not synonymous.

Post-structuralist theories of language recognize language as both instrumental and symbolic. Such theories acknowledge that, "language itself is not only a linguistic system of signs and symbols, but also a complex social practice through which relationships are defined, negotiated, and resisted" (Atkinson, 2011, p. 77). Within ISL programs, Nieusma & Riley (2010) posited, "when language is viewed merely as a logistical concern rather than a critical site of power relations, the consequences for process, project, and social justice are likely considerable" (Nieusma & Riley, 2010, p. 53). One clear articulation of this view was made by former United Nations Secretary General Boutros Boutros Ghali. He theorized:

> *"We all know that forcing international civil servants, diplomats or ministers to express themselves in a language that is not theirs amounts to putting them in a situation of inferiority. It deprives them of the capacity for nuance and refinement, which amounts to making concessions to those who speak that language as a mother tongue. Also, we all know that concepts that look similar often differ from one civilization to the next. For instance, the word democracy in English doesn't refer to the same concept as the word démocratie in French. Words express a culture, a way of thinking and a world view. For all these reasons, I think that much in the way democracy within a state is based on pluralism, democracy between states must be based on plurilingualism"* (Barlow & Nadeau, 2006, p. 350-1).

This passage recognizes that language itself can democratize or marginalize people within collaborations. For pedagogies like ISL which bring people together across cultures, issues of communication are of critical importance. Whether programs enact or strive for Ghali's plurilingual ideal, or even acknowledge the power differentials embedded in language, reflects on the reciprocity being practiced on the linguistic level.

Language exerts a constitutive influence on reciprocity within ISL even if ISL programs overlook language's importance. As such, language is a critical space for investigation. Bringing communication out of obscurity reveals previously unasked questions that are salient to reciprocity. Among them are questions of the quantity and quality of communication, but principally, the question of whose linguistic proficiencies are availing the interchange, co-creation, and/or relationship building (i.e. reciprocity) within ISL programs. Also important to pedagogies of critical internationalization like ISL is critical self-awareness, including linguistic self-awareness. Before these questions can be investigated, an initial step is simply to understand how programs addressed issues of linguistic difference between ISL program learners/students who travel abroad (heretofore "participants") and "host community (members)" to whom participants travel.

Previous ISL reviews

Recent reviews of ISL programs depict it as largely indifferent to issues of language. In one recent review of 12 programs, developing participants' language proficiencies were neither program goals nor issues that arose within projects

(RW.ERROR - Unable to find reference:1803). Another review of 41 articles (Dixon, 2015) identified only 3 programs in which increased foreign language skills were recognized as program outcomes (Main et al., 2013; Metcalf, 2010; Urraca et al., 2009). A survey of ISL community of practice found that neither participants' language proficiencies nor issues of linguistic difference were crucial concerns (Lough & Toms, 2018). A review of "global citizenship" programs found that few programs included a foreign language study requirement (Aktas et. Al, 2017, p. 72). What remains to be explored is how programs that acknowledged the existence of linguistic difference between participants and host community members addressed this difference. Only then can an assessment of program's reciprocity -on the linguistic level- become available.

Scope of the Review

Focus Question

To understand ISL programs' method of addressing linguistic difference, the following focus question was investigated: Of programs in which language differences were acknowledged, how were issues of linguistic difference explicitly attended to?

To gain a complete picture of how programs addressed linguistic differences between participants and host community members, research would need to undertake direct examination of all ISL programs globally, were it possible. Conversely, a sample or programs could be reviewed, yet its findings would not reflect ISL as a whole. Instead, reviewing programs as described in recent peer-reviewed, English-language publications avails an initial assessment of a sample of programs with a global reach, since academic journals generally welcome submissions globally. This review of secondary sources followed previous reviews of ISL literature and programs (Dixon, 2015; Mitchell, 2008; Taylor, J., 2002).

Answering this focus question required a multistep process to delimit the data set. To overview, recent ISL articles were gathered then examined to produce a set of articles that focused on individual programs. Secondly, references to methods of addressing linguistic difference were identified. Articles excluding such data were excluded. Thirdly, programs' methods of address linguistic difference were analyzed and categorized. The findings represent counts of discrete programs using each method of addressing linguistic difference. Findings are reported as raw numbers and as percentages of programs addressing linguistic difference.

Delimiting the Data Set

Collecting Articles. Searches were done of peer-reviewed articles published between 2010-2020 using EBSCOHOST's ERIC Database. Article abstracts and titles were searched for the truncated search terms, with and without hyphens: "global service learn*", "international service learn*", "international community service learn*", "global community service learn*", and "service learn* abroad". All yielded articles were treated as ISL literature. Abstracts were read for indications of an ISL program, which was operationally defined as a program 1) that had occurred in the past, and 2) that brought participants physically across international borders relative to the participants' home institution. Included were articles on programs from institutions beyond the U.S./

English-speaking countries. Also included were articles focusing on the host community members within an ISL program, having met these two criteria (Gates et al., 2014; Grain et al., 2019; Maakrun, 2016; O'Sullivan, M. et al., 2019; Reynolds, N. P., 2014).

Searches yielded 83 discrete publications, of which 30 were excluded. The remaining 53 constituted the data set. Seven articles were excluded because details of individual programs were unavailable: two literature reviews (RW.ERROR - Unable to find reference:1803; Dixon, 2015); three sets of aggregated data from multiple universities (Niehaus & Crain, 2013; Soria et al., 2016; Yang et al., 2016), and two sets of data aggregated over 16-20 years (Bamber, Philip M., 2015; Tolar & Gott, 2012). Ten articles' programs did not physically cross international borders (Bamber, Philip M., 2016; Doppen & Tesar, 2012; Hosman & Jacobs, 2018; Konieczny, 2017; Messner et al., 2016; Metcalf, 2010; Sanmiguel et al., 2019), including three programs within indigenous communities in the country of the home institution (Bartleet et al., 2019; Locklin, 2010), or semi-autonomous regions within that country (Weick et al., 2015). Rightly or wrongly, these programs were exclusions to avoid complicated, sensitive issues of national sovereignty. Thirteen articles were not focused on specific past programs (RW.ERROR - Unable to find reference:1875; Aktas et al., 2017; Bamber, Phil, 2011; Crabtree, 2013; Lightfoot & Lee, 2015; Lough & Toms, 2018; Morrison, 2015; Nguyen, 2017; Reynolds, N. R., 2019; Rubin & Matthews, 2013; Sherraden et al., 2013; Streets et al., 2015; Yoder, 2016).

Identifying Programs. A total of 49 discrete programs were identified from the 53 articles. Best efforts were made to identify singular programs. General parameters of a program were set around academic credit, or ISL experience for non-credit bearing programs, rather than by location or recurrence. No article was found to report on multiple programs. Four programs were identified as reported on within two articles: a program to South Africa (Czop Assaf et al., 2019; Lussier et al., 2019) to Malaysia and China (Power, 2013; Power et al., 2017), to Ecuador (Taylor, K. B. et al., 2017; Taylor, K. B. et al., 2018), and Global Studies program requiring a ISL experience (RW.ERROR - Unable to find reference:1841; Garcia & Longo, 2013). Conversely, one author team was found to have published two articles examining distinct programs (O'Sullivan, M. et al., 2019; O'Sullivan, M. W. & Niemczyk, 2014).

A program was counted as a singular program, even if it dispatched participants to multiple locations abroad to perform different service activities, if participants received the same academic credit or programmatically-unified experience, like an internship (Larsen, 2017) or placements for a singular academic requirement (Akhurst, 2016; Power et al., 2017). One program recurred over multiple years in the same host community abroad (Brown, B. G. et al., 2018; Keino et al., 2010), and another recurred in a different host community but belonging to one academic program (O'Sullivan, M. et al., 2019; Reynolds, N. P., 2014). Another program involved undergraduate and graduate students (Taylor, K. B. et al., 2017), while another was jointly run by two institutions of the same country (Luna et al., 2018).

Roughly half of the articles reviewed did not describe the methods by which programs addressed issues of linguistic difference and were excluded from this review. For each of the 25 programs that addressed linguistic difference (hereafter 'programs addressing language'), best efforts were made to generate a program profile. These

profiles, while extraneous to answering the FQ, were provided for practitioners' viewing. See Appendix A for explanation, prior to Appendix B, which includes program profiles within the full analyzed dataset.

Identifying Linguistic Difference Data. The 49 discrete programs were reviewed to survey the ways that programs addressed issues of linguistic difference. In each article, references to language were located using the search terms "language", "lingu* (bilingual, linguistic, etc.), "communicat*", "interpret", "translat*", "broker", "facilitator", "speak*", "spoke" and where applicable, the dominant language of the host country, e.g. "Spanish", "Swahili", etc. Each found usage was read for relevance to this review's interest. In total, 25 discrete programs addressing language were identified.

Disregarded were search terms appearing in articles' literature reviews, references to language as discourse; e.g., "language of the academe" (Jameson et al., 2011, p. 272), and ambiguous or implicit references to language proficiencies (Miller & Gonzalez, 2010, p. 33), or language courses that may have been required (Martinsen et al., 2010). Also excluded were references to language made uniquely by/ about individual participants as reported in reported data (journals, interviews, etc.) (Acquaye & Crewe, 2012, p. 779; Grain et al., 2019, p. 29).

As a study of secondary sources, it was necessary to discern between the references to the research and to the program. In one excluded case, a bilingual author might have served as a program's interpreter (Nickols et al., 2013). Three article explicated the author's role as translator/interpreter in conducting the research, but not a program's implementation (Gates et al., 2014; Reynolds, N. P., 2014; Wu, 2018). One of these studies explained the language proficiencies of student researchers – conducting research with host community members regarding their involvement in a prior ISL program-, but not of the program participants themselves (Gates et al., 2014).

Method of Analysis

Distinguishing Methods of Addressing Linguistic Difference. Identified evidence of a program's addressing linguistic difference were analyzed using qualitative content analyses of the data set (Merriam, 2009, p. 205). In this method of inductive analysis, *a priori* categories guide a study, yet categories are anticipated to emerge from the data. In this review, three such *a priori* categories were utilized: programs that 1) sent participants into host communities that were explicitly identified as English-speaking, 2) developed participants' second language proficiencies in a language of the host community, and 3) did neither. From these a priori categories, a total of seven discrete analytic categories emerged, each representing methods by which programs addressed linguistic difference.

Enumerating each, one method was a program's explicit recognition that host community members spoke English language or the country of the host community was officially English-speaking (1: "HSE"). If, for example, it was not explicated that Kenya is an officially anglophone nation, then the program sending participants to Kenya was not counted as "HSE" because the issue of linguistic difference was marginalized. A program was identified as using "HSE" even if the host community members were identified as non-native speakers of English, and even if participants were from an

institution in a non-native English-speaking country (Hsiung, 2015; Wu, 2018). No program was found to use this method from institutions located in predominantly non-English speaking country, using an alternative language (e.g. a Spanish university sending participants to Mexico, an officially Spanish-speaking country).

A second method was that a primary service activity of a program was teaching 'our' language (2: "PSTL2"). Since Chinese language teaching was found to be a primary service activity in one program, the term "our language" was used to broaden the category beyond English teaching. Whether in English or Chinese, the service performed is singular: native speaker participants teaching language skills to non-native speaker host community members. Questions of membership and ownership of a language are crucial but require separate study.

A third method, distinct from "HSE", were programs' recognition of participants' extant language proficiencies in a language of the host community (3: "PL2"). Monolingualism is not universal, and thus this article uses the indefinite article "a language". To give ISL the benefit of the doubt, this review accepted as PL2 programs with unspecified amounts/ periods of study (Amerson, 2012), any number of participants -even a singular participant (Jones & Ceccucci, 2018), or even hints that participants had relevant language proficiencies (Foster et al., 2015). Programs from institutions in non-native English-speaking countries that utilized participants' extant English proficiencies, to travel to English-speaking host communities, were recognized as "PL2" (Hsiung, 2015; Wu, 2018). "PL2" was distinct from "PSTL2" because the latter indicates that the learners from the host community are at least emergent bilinguals (Rodriguez et al., 2014, p. 17), but does not necessarily implicate any level of proficiency among participants.

A fourth method was programs' inclusion of predeparture language lessons (4: "LLPD"), which differs from "PL2". In "PL2", participants' proficiencies were developed prior to and/or independent of a program's language lessons ("LLPD"/ "LLWA"). Such development could have recognized by a program's language requirement. Here, requirement does not mean requiring participants' attendance at predeparture meetings in which language lessons were offered ("LLPD"), nor (fifthly,) does it mean that programs required or included language lessons while participants were abroad (5: "LLWA"). Rather "requirement" indexed that programs explicitly required of participants a level of language proficiency or completed a period of language study ("PL2") to participate.

For example, programs that required participants to have finished 4 semesters of prior language study was counted as recognizing participants' extant second language proficiencies ("PL2"), but not necessarily including predeparture language lessons ("LLPD") because the four completed semesters of study occurred independently from the ISL. Conversely, one program required applicants to demonstrate their extant second language proficiencies ("PL2 *req") prior to being selected, then required participants to take a language predeparture language course ("LLPD") (Hsiung, 2015). These and other example are identifiable by the label ("PL2 *req") in Tables 3 and 6. For programs including language lessons while participants were abroad ("LLWA"), even general indications of informal language learning being a programmatic element were recognized in this review. Distinct from this method was a sixth method, including

lessons "about" language(s) (6: "LALWA"), in which participants developed critical knowledge about the host community's linguistic landscape, distinct from developing communicative proficiencies in a second language.

The seventh, final method was programs' use of (a/an) translator(s)/ interpreter(s) (hereto, "interpreter(s)"), (7: "T/I"). This category groups together translators, who transfer the content, style, etc. of a written text (not spoken) from the source language into the target language (United Nations, 2020b), together with interpreters, who do so for spoken communication (United Nations, 2020a). "T/I" included only programs using individuals, whether named or unnamed, hired or volunteered, so long as 1) they performed translation/ interpretation and 2) were not participants. Programs in which participants with second language proficiencies acted as translators/ interpreters were categorized not as "T/I", but as "PL2" (Grain et al., 2019, p. 27). It was also noted whether the identities of interpreters were named within the article, a distinction which is noted in the findings but not treated as an eighth category.

When delimiting programs using interpreters, one program utilized the translation skills of both translators/ interpreters ("T/I") and a participant ("PL2") (Jones & Ceccucci, 2018). Another program used groups of individuals (Sharpe & Dear, 2013), and another used a professor/ trip leader/ article author as interpreter for the ISL trip (Reynolds, N. P., 2014). One ambiguous case arose with one program that not clearly identifying the translators/ interpreters, requiring a determination made in view of other linguistic difference data (Luna et al., 2018). Only considered were references to translation in programs that had taken place, and not future iterations (Nickols et al., 2013).

To further understand how programs addressed linguistic difference, once programs' methods were identified, the review also made note of the number of programs using each method as the singular method for addressing linguistic difference. Within the programs incorporating, "language lessons" ("LLPD", "LLWA"), a further distinction emerged over the nature of the language lesson. Two poles became clear around formal language lessons on one hand and informal language lessons on the other. Formal language lessons were identified as a program's self-description of its language study as "formal", indications of a course name or number, or classes that demonstrated they occurred with regularity and were scheduled, not simply incidental, sporadic, or occurring once. Reporting/ alluding to individual participants were keen on language study and had reached an advanced level were not counted as a programmatic commitment to language study, and thus not "formal language lessons".

Assumptions of the Study

Following a prior review of secondary sources in ISL (RW.ERROR - Unable to find reference:1803), this type of review is not without limitations. It reports from publications on programs, not from programs directly. Publications are not mere documentation of past programs, but rather focus on specific aspects of programs. Inconsistent reporting of how programs addressed linguistic difference language is demonstrated through the direct quotes from articles within findings tables. Nonetheless, this review's modest contribution is an initial but useful assessment.

This review made assumptions about the data set. Analysis assumed that programs' methods of addressing linguistic difference are accurately reflected in articles. Locating pertinent information across a diversity of articles required sorting articles' research from the program it reported on. For example, one article mentioned the use of an interpreter, but in a way that was ambiguous if the interpreter was used for the research or during the ISL program (Grain et al., 2019; Maakrun, 2016). This review only took an interest in the latter.

Assuming that communication, and thus language, are crucial to reciprocity, this review presumed that linguistic differences matter, even for programs dispatching participants to English-speaking countries or societies. This review believes that the mutual comprehensibility of English dialects/ varieties cannot be assumed (Kachru, 2008). Moreover, that a country is 'officially' English-speaking often belays linguistic realities, particularly within postcolonial societies which are often multilingual/ multidialectal. Because communication is a cornerstone of reciprocity, no *a priori* presumption should be made about the mutual intelligibility of English dialects, and the intelligibility of English dialects -particularly in a global, immersive context- must be explicated. This review made no assumptions about host communities being English-speaking "HSE" without an article author's explicit identification as such.

Concerning terminologies, "second language" was chosen to align with recent definitions from the field of Second Language Acquisition (Douglas Fir Group, 2016, p. 21-22), a field that acknowledges the inherent shortcomings of all labels. Here, "second language" referred to a language/ dialect that was used by the host community, but not predominantly used by the country in which the ISL institution was located. The term did not encompass all second language proficiencies but only those pertinent to interactions with the host community. For example, the French proficiencies of a U.S. participant within a Spanish-speaking host community were not considered as "second language" in this study (nor did such an example surface in the data, of a second or third+ language.) In the case of non-native English-speaking participants -as identified in the article- traveling to an English-speaking host community -as identified in the article-, English was considered a "second language".

Using this operational definition of "second language", the review did not exclude participants with diverse linguistic backgrounds, such as non-native English-speaking domestic students (Liu & Lee, 2011). Such populations are linguistically-talented, and deserve more, focused scholarly attention. Likewise, this review also used the term, "proficiencies", which is preferable to "fluent", "competent", or "Spanish-speaking", etc. because it encompasses 'fluency', or the ability to produce "(flowing, natural) language" which alone does not guarantee 'accuracy', or the ability to produce "clear, articulate, grammatically and phonologically correct language" (Brown, H. D., 2007). Also, the term "multilingual" in this study refers to people who use more than one language.

Lastly, this review assumed that, because communication is foundational in reciprocity, the programs using multilingual interpreters/ translators were greatly impacted by the subjectivities and credentials of these individuals, knowingly or not. Implicit in this assumption is the expectation that articles reporting on program of ISL, a pedagogy that values reciprocity, should report the names and credentials of interpreters/ translators.

Findings

From 49 identified programs in recent peer-reviewed articles on ISL, it was found that 25 programs addressed linguistic difference. Among the 25 programs, seven methods emerged from the data. See Table 1. The most common of the seven methods was a program's recognition of participants' extant second language proficiencies (10, or 40% of programs addressing language, hereto unrepeated). However, this top ranking is replaced with "language learning lessons" if the two discrete methods of pre-departure and while abroad language lessons ("LLPD", "LLWA") were aggregated into one method, (11, or 44%). See Table B (Appendix B) for the full dataset. Following was a program's use of (a/n) translator(s)/ interpreter(s) (8, or 32%). Within this method, the identities and credentials of interpreters were absent in all but two programs (, or 8% of programs).

Table 1 How Programs Addressed Linguistic Difference

Linguistic difference addressed by…	# of programs	% of programs addressing linguistic difference	# of programs using only this one method	% of programs addressing linguistic difference using only this method	Abbreviation in Table 5
recognizing participants' extant second language proficiencies in a language of the host community	10	40%	3	12%	PL2 /PL2*req
using translator/ interpreter	8	32%	5	20%	T/ I
recognizing host community members' English proficiencies	7	28%	3	12%	HSE
language lessons occurring while abroad	6	24%	2	8%	LLWA
predeparture languages lesson occurring	5	20%	1	4%	LLPD
…the primary service activity was teaching "our" Language	5	20%	2	8%	PSTL2
lessons "about" language(s) occurring while abroad	1	4%	0	0%	LALWA

Analyzing data differently, it was found that 16 of the 25 programs addressing language did so using only one method (64%). Mostly commonly, using an interpreter was the sole method of addressing linguistic difference, found in 5 of the 25 programs (20%). See Table 1 for a reporting of these findings and the abbreviation used to index each method within Table B (Appendix B), which presents the complete, analyzed data set.

Discussion

This review offers a preliminary examination of ISL programs' relation to issues of linguistic difference as described in recent peer-reviewed articles. Within the dataset, it was found that 44% of program actively developed participants' second language proficiencies. This finding contradicts the pattern of general indifference within ISL to participants' second language proficiencies and presents a less clear picture of ISL's relationship to issues of linguistic difference. Previous reviews of programs found that participants' second language proficiencies were rarely programmatic goals (RW.ERROR - Unable to find reference:1803), requirements (Aktas et. Al, 2017, p. 72), outcomes (Dixon, 2015), or even concerns among practitioners (Lough & Toms, 2018). The general disinterest in linguistic difference signals an underappreciation of the role of communication in reciprocity. Conversely, this review found that most programs were not engaged in developing participants' second language proficiencies, which may have been rooted in beliefs that issues of linguistic difference are sufficiently mitigated when programs' 1) utilize interpreters/ translators 2) select English-speaking host communities, or 3) select primary service activities that teach "our language". All three beliefs are problematic vis-à-vis reciprocity.

Taking each in turn, using interpreters/ translators is no panacea to the critical inequalities inherent in cross-linguistic communication. One ISL article posited, "language embodies the intellectual wealth of the people who speak it, and it is used to construct meaning in ways that are natural and relevant to the needs dictated by the local society » (Garcia & Longo, 2013p. 119). In this view, not using one's language represents an impoverishment. Remembering Ghali's problematizing the equivalence of English's *democracy* and French's *démocratie*, translation is not beyond reproach (Barlow & Nadeau, 2006, p. 350-1). Acknowledging the impossibility of a full translation of cultural concepts, one author used untranslated Spanish concepts in an English-language article on one ISL program (Reynolds, N. P., 2014p. 87). Even "international service learning" as a translated, transcultural concept should be problematized (Morrison, 2015; Nguyen, 2017).

Venuti (2012) posited, "the ethically and politically motivated translator cannot fail to see the lack of an equal footing in the translation process, stimulated by an interest in the foreign, but inescapably leaning towards the receptor" (Venuti, 2012, p. 483). In other words, interlocutors *to* whomever language are being translated are privileged relative to interlocutors whose words are being translated *from*. Complications resulting from interpretation were reported within one ISL program (Brown, B. G. et al., 2018, p. 18-19), which suggests that they impacted other programs but went unreported or possibly unrecognized by programs aware of the centrality of communication to reciprocity. However subtle, the shifts that translation produces, within the context of

ISL, cannot but impact reciprocity, particularly the orientation of *co-creation*, which "emphasizes shared voice and power" (Jameson et al., 2011, p. 264). Without the counterbalancing of other methods of addressing linguistic difference, this distortion is unmitigated in a program, which undermines the equality that undergirds "co-creation", the core of the influence orientation of reciprocity.

Singular dependence upon interpreter(s)/ translator(s) to effectuate all cross-linguistic communication across participants and communities, as done in reviewed programs, further disturbs the other orientations of reciprocity. Such dependence limits the amount of possible *interchange* between groups to only communication flowing through interpreters. This limitation cannot but impair *relationship-building* between groups, even setting aside the sociocultural dimensions bound up in language that impact relationship-building. Expecting an omnipresent interpreter to unlock every interaction for every participant is unrealistic (Amerson, 2012).

Notably, all but two programs using interpreters (Grain et al., 2019; Reynolds, N. R., 2019), did not report the identities and credentials of programs' interpreters. Translating and interpreting requires multilingual proficiencies, the development and maintaining of which requires cognitive work (Douglas Fir Group, 2016). In some economically-disadvantaged communities, multilingual proficiencies may constitute one of few means of earning a living. Viewing interpretation as labor, when scholarship excludes the identities of interpreters, it is depriving them some form of income due to them. This should be viewed as an injustice, and an academic malpractice akin to plagiarism, the misattribution of source material. Pedagogically, excluding interpreters' identities and credentials also obscures their impact on the program overall. Going forward, multilingual work- remunerated or not- must be honored within any cross-linguistic initiative that aspires to reciprocity. ISL must not forget the "joint ownership of work processes and products" (Jameson et al., 2011, p. 264). Particularly laudable was one article that recognized the interpreter as co-author (Grain et al., 2019).

Secondly, issues of linguistic difference, and a crucial awareness of language, are not moot within programs dispatching participants to English-speaking host communities, particularly as programs' sole method of addressing linguistic difference. The intelligibility of English worldwide, when closely examined, is quite complex. The belief within this type of program that, "language preparation is not necessary" (Guseh, 2015, p. 84) is presumably rooted in the misconception that a language is a unified, mutually intelligible system. English is far from homogeneous (Kachru, 1992), even within North America (Linguistics Laboratory, University of Pennsylvania, 2020). Nor are 'dialects' of a language necessarily mutually intelligible (Shin, 2013, p. 50). The mutual intelligibility of English dialects, or 'Englishes', cannot be assumed *a priori* (Kirkpatrick, Andy, Deterding, David,Wong, Jennie, 2008). (The author was reminded of this fact while writing this article: a troubled interaction transpired when a solicitor knocked on his Ohio apartment door: the (unmasked) solicitor, presumably a fellow white Ohioan but of a lower socio-economic class, spoke in one of Ohio's three English dialects in which the author is not native; the interaction required multiple repetitions and frustration. The author is multilingual).

Moreover, a country's official policies (e.g. officially bilingual) may misconstrue its linguistic landscape, since such policies often belie a society's linguistic complexity

(Shin, 2013, p. 63-5). That the United States has no official language (Kaur, 2020), does not imply that English is not important, for example. Likewise, society's use of a singular language may employ *diglossia*, or the use of multiple varieties for specific purposes or contexts (Shin, 2013, p. 57). ISL participants in an English-speaking host community may, for example, use formal English during their service within government buildings or schools, yet catching the bus to arrive at the service site requires proficiencies in distinct modes (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2012), or skills (Buyl & Housen, 2015). Unable to use the correct language or the correct register would inevitably impact any of the three orientations of reciprocity.

ISL programs -which are "global" and "immersive"- must adopt a nuanced understanding of *Englishes*' intelligibility, "taking into consideration linguistic ecology, interactional pragmatics, and sociocultural realities" (Kachru, 2008, p. 294). This recommendation extends to all programs, whatever the linguistic landscape of the host community may be. Programs' participants, "…cannot merely be declared competent in communication…the degree of proficiency required to survive as a tourist or as a student is not the same as that required to negotiate treaties" (Hadley, 2001, p. 9). Many programs made such declarations about their participants' linguistic proficiencies. In some, proficiencies are so inadequately or vaguely described that they can only be characterized as lip service to addressing linguistic difference (see Appendix B).

ISL must also recognize that language use is laden with issues of power. A core commitment of ISL is to enable participants to analyze, "political, economic, social, cultural, and historical structures and how they normalize our experiences and assumptions" (RW.ERROR - Unable to find reference:1875). This critical self-awareness overlaps with all orientations of reciprocity and must extend to issues of language (Nieusma & Riley, 2010, p. 53). Programs should consider the ways that participants' language use during sojourns in host communities reinforce linguistic hegemonies, as rare programs currently do (Czop Assaf et al., 2019; Lussier et al., 2019; Wu, 2018). Indeed, learning *about* a/the language of the host community ("LALWA"), learning about the critical issues surrounding it, and participants' place vis-à-vis critical issues, seem to be indispensable to reciprocity's orientation of co-creation, if not all three.

Thirdly, the most critical conversation that appear lacking in programs is that of the global hegemony of English (Harper, 2011), particularly of the American and British dialects (Qiong, 2004). Although such conversation is needed in all programs, it may be most crucial for the programs that addressed linguistic difference by involving participants' teaching 'our' language as the primary service activity ("PSTL2"). Specifically, an ideology exists that English is centered as the language of global citizenship (Aktas et al., 2017, p. 72), an ideology which inevitably privileges English monolinguals over non-native English-speaking people, including multilingual people. Even among *Englishes* critical awareness is needed around extant linguistic hegemonies (Wu, 2018) which prioritize the "Inner Circle" English at the expense of Outer Circle countries (Kachru, 1992). Unlike most world languages which have a governing body to maintain language standards- to decide correct and incorrect language-, English has no such body (Barlow & Nadeau, 2006, p. 392). This means that there no one correct English exists, despite prevailing ideologies.

ISL must be careful to not reinforce participants' ethnocentricities by perpetuating expectations among participants that someone else -other than participants- should (and will) accommodate monolingual English-speakers and do so happily. Such expectations would trouble ISL advocates seeking to problematize Western-centric, hegemonic perspectives (Camacho, 2004; Sharpe & Dear, 2013; Taylor, K. B. et al., 2018; Wu, 2018). Without a critical understanding of language, it is not inconceivable that ISL becomes, "…a recipe for the perpetuation of global ignorance, misunderstanding, and prejudice" (Zemach-Bersin, 2008).

Some ISL practitioners view language an indispensable component of understanding others' worldviews and experiences in a global context (Czop Assaf et al., 2019). Very few programs were reported to trouble linguistic hegemonies or examine language through a critical lens (Czop Assaf et al., 2019; Lussier et al., 2019), and previous studies found participants' deficient linguistic proficiencies created problematic or unequal relationships with the host communities (Baker-Boosamra et al., 2006; O'Sullivan, M. et al., 2019). What's more, some articles' authors even recommended programs select English-speaking host communities because it avoids language barriers (Guseh, 2015; Prins & Webster, 2010). (Underwriting this recommendation is an acknowledgement that issues of language are not of marginal import to ISL).

Alternative Explanations

Alternative explanations of the review's findings could criticize its logistics or assumptions. Critiques of this study, a review of secondary sources, are possible. Moreover, critiques could argue it casted to narrow or too wide a net into the ISL sea. Another critique could argue that findings produced only reflect publications, not programs, because programs did address linguistic difference in ways that subsequent articles did not report. This critique cannot be wholly rejected. It is possible that a program addressed linguistic difference, or did so in multiple ways, that went unreported in its subsequent article. Such a reality however would support the view that ISL, through its scholarship, is imprudently marginalizing issues of linguistic difference, even if programs are not. In any discipline, the publication is a vehicle for ideas' transmission, but also its recordkeeping and a vault for its valuables. If an article excluded such details, it can only be because these details were either nonexistent in a program or devalued during publication.

Some may argue that participants' second language proficiencies are not crucial to reciprocal relationships in a global context for different reasons. One reason may view English's global ubiquity as obviating the need for participants' second language proficiencies. This view would have to contend with the finding that only 19% of programs addressing language cited the host community's English proficiencies. Greater reflexivity may be needed (RW.ERROR - Unable to find reference:1874; Crabtree, 2008) around the issues of linguistic privilege and the structures that enable it. A related contention may hold that the review exaggerates the mutual un-intelligibility of Englishes. Dialects of English spoken in Canada and in India are both spoken "natively" by their citizens, yet they are heterogenous. Within the author's own institution, a public HBCU, sincere learners (who are themselves likely bidialectal English users), whose

comments are not presumably motivated by racism, have expressed their difficulty in understanding some foreign-born, native English-speaking instructors. Given that all orientations of reciprocity, a tenet of ISL, depend upon communication, clear thinking, and reporting on issues of language, including *Englishes*, is imperative.

Other critiques may content that participant 'pick up' the host community's language, as reported in some programs. An ethnographic examination of such programs would likely reveal that a person with the means of cross-linguistic communication, though unrecognized in the article- was contributing to the communication in overlooked ways. Some programs may have involved service activities with minimal spoken interaction between participants and host community members. Appendix B offer a look at the complete set of programs reviewed. Balzer & Heidebrecht (2020)'s critique hit at the relational orientation of reciprocity: "Global North participants rarely speak the languages of the communities they visit, and, when combined with the oft- short- term reality of ISL programs, there are few opportunities to develop relationships of any depth" (Balzer & Heidebrecht, 2020, p. 154). In other words, relationship building in a program is undermined when the linguistic dimension of reciprocity is overlooked or under-accounted for.

Recommendations

ISL must acknowledge that reciprocity is built upon communication between participants and host community members, which may involve the indispensable bilingualism of interpreters and translators. Therefore, as a globally immersive pedagogy, the importance of language cannot be marginalized. This acknowledgement must span programs and subsequent publications thereof. Currently, this is absent in much of the ISL scholarship, given that language is not cited in articles.

Bringing issues of language into view, reciprocity in ISL should move towards plurilingualism. Coined by the Council of Europe, plurilingualism recognizes the importance for multilingualism and language learning across Europe (García & Otheguy, 2020, p. 21). A person with plurilingual competence possesses, a 'repertoire of languages,' and holds values of plurilingual tolerance toward all languages and varieties (Hélot & Cavalli, 2017). In Ghali's plurilingual equality, no speaker is put in a position of inferiority on the basis of their language. Plurilingualism is distinct from multilingualism: the former requires "actively promoting the use of different languages in international institutions" (Barlow & Nadeau, 2006, p. 350) and a pedagogical goal of speakers to, "give equal value to each of the varieties they themselves and other speakers use" (García & Otheguy, 2020, p. 20-21). Ghali's plurilingual ideal may set the bar high for ISL programs, yet to ignore that plurilingualism is the embodiment of reciprocity on the linguistic level does not diminish its veracity, but rather only undercuts the ignorer's formulation of reciprocity. Through this lens, an ISL program or publication that overlooks issues of communication is one that is not thoughtfully tending to or accounting for reciprocity.

Recent programs that (solely) recognize participants' extant second language proficiencies ("PL2") embrace multilingualism, but they are not embracing plurilingualism. Plurilingual pedagogies, "do not need to aim at making students fully competent in a second or third language. Instead, …what is important is that one

acquire competence to communicate to varying degrees" (García & Otheguy, 2020, p. 23). Programs sending participants into cross-linguistic or cross-dialectic collaborations should implement measures to develop among their participants competence in modes (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2012) or skills (Buyl & Housen, 2015) of the host community's language/ dialect. Targeted skills or modes should be selected that will prove useful to participants when interacting with host community members, as determined by programs' service activities or pedagogical goals, etc. A modest plan, for example, could develop participants' abilities to perform greetings, name food, asking for tools, etc.

Beyond linguistic proficiencies, the plurilingual ideal promotes an equal valorization of others' language that can only come through critical (/self-)reflection. Garcia (2017) posited, "Entering a community with an understanding of the native language and cultures facilitates more authentic interactions between participants and community members while fostering greater cultural humility and respect for the linguistic diversity of our world" (Alonso García & Longo, 2017, p. 46). Plurilingualism would mandate that the latter of these two values, humility and respect, be targeted learning outcomes of pedagogy. This is because, as recognized in Europe, "…this awareness (of plurilingualism) should be assisted and structured by schools since it is in no sense automatic" (Council of Europe, 2001). Both language lessons and critical conversations should be sustained before, during, and after the trip to reinforce the permanency of their importance, combatting the short-term nature of programs, which predisposes learning to superficiality (Balzer & Heidebrecht, 2020, p. 154).

Taking such measures could be called embracing a plurilingual reciprocity. This approach most aligns with the Intercultural Communicative Competence Model, in which learners develop knowledge, attitudes, and critical cultural awareness as well as the skills of interaction and interpretation (Byram, 1997). One laudable program to South Africa involved a thoughtful, sustained, critical focus on issues of language (Czop Assaf et al., 2019; Lussier et al., 2019), which may have been intensified through experiential learning of some degree of one of the languages itself. Appendix B, an overview of programs, was included to spark ideation among practitioners.

Within publications on ISL, enacting a plurilingual reciprocity would require reporting how issues of linguistic difference were addressed by a program. If we "say what we mean and mean what we say" (Dostilio, L. D. et al., 2012), we must write with intentionality and transparency. As such, the quantity and quality of information provided on linguistic issues must increase from current levels. To this end, the terms used in this review can serve as more precise instruments. Going forward, peer-reviewed articles must explain how programs addressed linguistic difference and whose proficiencies were utilized. Just as it is unacceptable that articles omit the author's name, so should it be for programs' language brokers. De-marginalizing issues of linguistic difference within programs and publications would move ISL closer towards a plurilingual reciprocity.

Future Directions

In light of this review, more study is needed to understand ISL's mixed relationship to issues of linguistic difference. This review of literature availed an initial assessment but was impaired by the scarcity and inconsistency of data reported on issues of linguistic difference. Future efforts to understand ISL's position on issues of language could avoid such obstacles by drawing closer to primary source data. A gathering of ISL practitioners-scholars could be surveyed (Lough & Toms, 2018) to learn how programs addressed linguistic difference. The closest look, but also the narrowest in scope, would entail ethnographic study of how cross-linguistic communication actually occurs during ISL programs. Doing so could avail insights into the linguistic work being performed during an ISL program.

Unfortunately, it was not possible to discern the proficiency levels of participants in this review due to ambiguous ways that articles reported such information. Using "proficiencies" in future work, rather than semesters, courses, or hours of study would enhance accuracy and transparency, but likely require testing and more planning. Future investigations of a comparative nature could elucidate the role of participants' second language proficiencies, their exact proficiency levels, and the impact on the learning. Host community members' perspectives on the program's successfulness could be explored with this same focus. Other work could examine the ISL experiences of multilingual international students and domestic students with diverse linguistic backgrounds, a group which has gotten little scholarly attention.

Within the ISL community of practice, conversations should explore the role of communication within reciprocity, and relatedly, which model of intercultural competence their pedagogies embrace. For native-English speakers, we must admit our privilege in today's globalized world (Aktas et al., 2017, p. 72), and we must bravely ask ourselves how this privilege structures our practice of ISL. Particularly, if we pedagogues of U.S. institutions, are unwilling to ask ourselves these questions, we should anticipate others' skepticism. If ISL endorses monolingualism as sufficient for reciprocity within cross-cultural, cross-linguistic collaborations, we risk reinforcing participants' ethnocentricities.

Recognizing that, "we cannot predict whether community service learning will perpetuate power differences", (Camacho, 2004, p. 40), even modest enactments of plurilingualism may gradually steer participants away from such outcomes. One proposed model, "Reciprocal Service Learning" (RSL) incorporate all three orientations (Dostilio, L. D. et al., 2012) but seems to make room for a plurilingual reciprocity. An RSL program includes, "an explicit commitment on the part of at least one of the two groups to developing their intercultural competencies (Collopy et al., 2020, p. 23). Remembering that international mobility is a privilege (Camacho, 2004), the commitment to developing intercultural competence must be made by participants who are privileged with international mobility.

Plurilingual reciprocity, and greater attention to issues of linguistic difference, may align with other ISL initiatives and aspirations. It may facilitate problematizing participants' "tourist gaze" (Prins & Webster, 2010), or plant the seeds of transformative learning (Baecher & Chung, 2020; Bamber, Philip M., 2015; Bamber, Philip M., 2016;

Taylor, K. B. et al., 2018; Webster & Arends, 2012). It may overlap with formulations of ISL as an application of anthropology (Simonelli et al., 2004). In yet another, participants can become awareness of the power of language and pursue critical pedagogical virtue (Yoder, 2016), in programs that are, "…unapologetic in its aim to dismantle structures of injustice" (Mitchell, 2008, p. 50).

Thinking reciprocally, ISL scholars and practitioners of English-language scholarship should be aware that ISL as a pedagogy is not proprietary to North American or English-speaking institutions. Multilingual researchers could examine ISL pedagogies as reported in non-English language journals, as suggested by Nguyen (2017). This could enrich an ISL that seems largely confined to English-language articles, using North American-centric conceptions of the pedagogy. Going forward, if ISL collectively omits key aspects from their programs and publications, it offers such a template to peer academes beyond North America and beyond English-language presses. For this reason, North American-based, English-based ISL scholars and practitioners should be conscious of the models they establish for others.

Limitations

As a literature review, the present review constitutes only an initial step to understanding how programs addressed issues of linguistic difference. Only reviewed were articles written in English, which may have excluded ISL programs written about only in other languages. The search terms used to gather articles set parameters around ISL, believing programs indexing the terms "global", "international" or community-/service learning "abroad" described a singular pedagogy. Indeed, this constitutes a small sample of all ISL program that occurred within the decade.

Conclusion

The social tumult of 2020-2021 has forced a reexamination of societies worldwide, opening our eyes to the subtle and overt machinations of power. This should inspire some critical self-reflection within ISL. Indubitably, ISL programs must balance several priorities and operate within numerous constraints. This review was undertaken from the starting point that issues of linguistic difference are epicentral to reciprocity, a fact which has previously gone unappreciated. Attention to them must figure within these priorities and is already being accounted for in many programs. The review found that many programs address linguistic difference through recognizing or developing participants' second language proficiencies. This finding contradicts ISL's general apathy towards the topic, which requires further clarification.

It also found however that most programs did not develop participants' second language proficiencies. It argued that English monolingualism can undercut ISL reciprocity, and that if programs eschew issues of linguistic difference and the critical dimensions embedded in them, we must look askance at the reciprocity claimed to being practiced. Furthermore, if articles erase interpreters' identities, they should be seen as practicing academic misconduct. If ISL marginalizes language, it misses opportunities to facilitate participants' becoming more linguistically aware, tolerant, and critically self-reflexive. Such missed opportunities may in fact reinforce monolingualism and prevailing linguistic hegemonies, which are obstacles to fostering reciprocal

interchanges, relationships, and co-creation. Instead, this review proffered a plurilingual reciprocity as a lodestar for ISL. Some scholars may view the steps involved in it as onerous. ISL was founded upon high principles; as pedagogies advance, the bar must continuously be raised.

Appendix A

Table A Types of ISL Programs

Source	Program Type	abbreviation
Garcia & Longo (2017)'s ISL Program Types	Co-curricular international service trip (non-credit bearing)	st-nc
	Short-term international service learning course (credit-bearing)	st-c
	Course-embedded Spring Break International Service Trip	cesb
	Curricular-embedded Pre- or Post-Course International Service Trip	cepp
Additional ISL Program Types	Service Learning during Study Abroad	SLSA
	Service Learning during Study Abroad -Service Learning not required-	SLSA-NR
	Program labeled only as a "placement"	pl
	Program labeled as credited internship	intern
	Insufficient data to classify	unkn

Appendix B

Table B Complete, Analyzed Data Set of ISL Programs Addressing Linguistic Difference

Program cited in article	Type	Host Country	Field, course, or participants	Service Activity	Service Duration	How?
Akhurst (2016)	pl	South Africa/ Tanzania (from a UK university)	Psychology students	School-based projects	"placement" duration unknown	PSTL2
Amerson (2012)	cesb	Ecuador/ Guatemala	senior-level undergraduates of community health nursing	clinic-based projects, clinic-based teaching	1 week	T/I, LLPD, PL2
Baecher & Chung (2020)	st-c	Costa Rica	10 primary/ secondary in-service teachers of TESOL	English-language teaching	4 days per week in EFL teaching context, 1 month	PSTL2, LLWA
Brown, Chaudhari, Curtis, & Schulz (2018)	st-c	India	undergraduate & graduate students of varying backgrounds depending upon host community needs	projects in dental hygiene, nursing, physician assistant studies, public health, engineering, sustainable communities, forestry, photojournalism, English, & business	Average trip duration unspecified, but one trip: 3 day cultural visit, 7 days (dental hygiene)	T/I
Czop, O'Donnell Lussier, Furness,	st-c	South Africa	undergraduate pre-service teachers at a	school-based, camp-based projects,	4 weeks	LALWA, HSE, PSTL2

& Hoff (2019) and Lussier, Assaf, & Hoff (2019)			Hispanic-Serving Institution	teaching English		
Foster, Cunningham, & Wrightsman (2015)	cepp	Costa Rica	high schoolers	community-based research, service project : soccer game, pig roast, community-based research	2-day research, 3 day service, 2 weeks total	PL2, LLPD
Garcia & Longo (2017) and Garcia & Longo (2013)	cepp	Nicaragua, Mexico	Global Studies-majoring undergraduate students in junior year	Youth literacy/ arts education-related projects, cultural learning on language and identity loss	Unspecified short term	PL2*req
Gaugler & Matheus (2019)	cepp	Dominican Republic	Computer Science majoring-students enrolled in a 1-credit elective (46/71) including 5 Heritage Speakers of Spanish, &	design & implement a STEM summer camp curriculum in Spanish for children	2 weeks	PL2*req, LLPD

			Spanish course-enrollees in a 3 credit class who completed at least 4 semesters of Spanish (25/71)			
Guseh (2015)	unkn	Liberia	students in a Master's of Public Administration program	various administrative projects for gov't agencies	2 weeks	HSE
Hsiung (2015)	st-nc	Nepal (from a Taiwanese university)	Early Childhood pre-service teachers, undergraduate students	school-based projects, learning (education), education-based research	30 days	HSE, LLPD, PL2*req
Jones & Ceccucci (2018)	cepp	Guatemala	Info Systems Management students	producing a website for a school	duration unknown	T/I, LLPD, PL2
Luna, Davila, & Reynoso-Morris (2018)	cesb	Dominican Republic	undergraduate students enrolled in courses either on Environmental & Sustainable Design or a first year preview to study abroad-course	community-based research, construction of aquaponics system	1 week	PL2
Martinsen, Baker, Dewey, Brown, & Johnson (2010)	SLSA-NR	Spain	1 male 12 female undergraduate students, taking 200-level Spanish class	Volunteering at schools, orphanages, and homes for the elderly	one semester, with service performed 5-15 hours	LLWA

					per week	
Mogford & Lyons (2019)	SLSA	Kenya	“U.S. students”	women’s school-based projects	Quarter-long	LLWA, HSE
Motley & Sturgill (2013)	cepp	2 un-identified Central American countries	graduate students enrolled in an MA program in Mass Communications	projects with community organizations providing services for people with disabilities (including blindness), a sustainability program, & a waste-management /recycling business	3 week January Intersession course, including 9-10 days abroad	T/I
Nickols, Rothenberg, Moshi, & Tetloff (2013)	st-c	Tanzania	undergraduate & graduate students enrolled in a 3-6 credits of “directed studies (electives tailored to students’ interest)”	projects with a women’s economic cooperative, a girls’ organization, & an agro-forestry project	4 weeks	T/I, LLWA
Oberhauser & Daniels (2017)	st-c	Tanzania	12 undergraduate students of social & physical sciences, humanities, among others; 1 graduate student	gender-related cultural activities, site visits	1 month	LLWA
Power (2013)	pl	Malaysia, China	pre-service teachers of Early	Malaysia: teaching	2 weeks	PSTL2

and Power, Truong, Gray, Downey, Hall, & Jones (2017)		(from an Australian university)	Childhood, Primary, and Secondary Education	math, science, the arts, or English; China: teaching English		
Prins & Webster (2010)	cepp	Belize	undergraduates enrolled in a two-semester rural sociology course	create a community garden & teaching; marine ecology teaching	1 week	HSE
Regalla (2016)	st	Costa Rica	28 teacher candidates (mostly MA TESOL students)	bilingual-school based projects	2 weeks	PSTL2, LLWA, PL2
Reynolds (2014)	unkn	Nicaragua	undergraduate students from the College of Engineering	engineer clean water, electricity; aid in health care services	unspecified	T/I
Robinson, Robinson, & Foran (2019)	cepp, intern	Belize (from a Canadian university)	in-service teachers who were part-time graduate students	teaching	2 weeks	HSE
Sharpe & Dear (2013)	cepp	Cuba (from a Canadian university)	senior level undergraduates of Recreation & Leisure Studies	Garden-based, camp-based projects	18 days	T/I

Taylor, Jones, Massey, Mickey, Reynolds, & Jackson (2017) and Taylor, Jones, Massey, Mickey, & Reynolds (2018)	cepp	Ecuador	mixed undergraduate & graduate students (MA of Higher Education) enrolled in a course in education, from many majors	cultural learning, school-based projects	3 weeks	PL2
Wu (2018)	st-c	Phillipines (from a Taiwanese university)	undergraduate English majors, one graduate student of English, all Taiwanese non-native English speakers; ISL fulfilling 40 required service hours to graduate	« volunteers' major task was to teach local high school children how to address social issues in their lives» (p. 518)	2 weeks	HSE, PL2

References

Acquaye, L. A., & Crewe, S. E. (2012). International Programs: Advancing Human Rights and Social Justice for African American Students. *Journal of Social Work Education, 48*(4), 763-784.

Akhurst, J. (2016). International Community-Based Service Learning: Two Comparative Case Studies of Benefits and Tensions. *Psychology Teaching Review, 22*(2), 18-29.

Aktas, F., Pitts, K., Richards, J. C., & Silova, I. (2017). *Institutionalizing Global Citizenship: A Critical Analysis of Higher Education Programs and Curricula*. Journal of Studies in International Education.

Alonso García, N., & Longo, N. V. (2017). Doing More with Less: Civic Practices for Longer-Term Impact in Global Service-Learning. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 29*(2), 35-50.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2012). *Performance Descriptors for Language Learners.* Retrieved Jan. 1, 2023, from https://www.actfl.org/resources/actfl-performance-descriptors-language-learners

Amerson, R. (2012). The Influence of International Service-Learning on Transcultural Self-Efficacy in Baccalaureate Nursing Graduates and Their Subsequent Practice. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 24*(1), 6-15.

Atkinson, D. (2011). *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition*. Routledge.

Baecher, L., & Chung, S. (2020). *Transformative Professional Development for In-Service Teachers through International Service Learning*. Teacher Development.

Baker-Boosamra, M., Guevara, J. A., & Balfour, D. L. (2006). From Service to Solidarity: Evaluation and Recommendations for International Service Learning. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 12*(4), 479-500.

Balzer, G., & Heidebrecht, L. (2020). Decolonial Experimentations in International Service Learning Research and Practice: Learning from Mayan Indigenous Host Communities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 26*(1), 143-160.

Bamber, P. (2011). The Transformative Potential of International Service-Learning at a University with a Christian Foundation in the UK. *Journal of Beliefs & Values, 32*(3), 343-357.

Bamber, P. M. (2015). Becoming Other-Wise: Transforming International Service-Learning through Nurturing Cosmopolitanism. *Journal of Transformative Education, 13*(1), 26-45.

Bamber, P. M. (2016). *Transformative Education through International Service--Learning: Realising an Ethical Ecology of Learning. Routledge Research in International and Comparative Education*. Routledge Research in International and Comparative Education.

Barlow, J., & Nadeau, J. B. (2006). *The Story of French*. St. Martin's Griffin.

Bartleet, B., Bennett, D., Power, A., & Sunderland, N. (2019). Service Learning with First Peoples: A Framework to Support Respectful and Reciprocal Learning. *Intercultural Education, 30*(1), 15-30.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by Principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd ed.). Pearson Longman.

Brown, B. G., Chaudhari, L. S., Curtis, E. K., & Schulz, L. (2018). Service-Learning with Tibetan Refugees in India: A Small University's Experience. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 22*(1), 7-34.

Buyl, A., & Housen, A. (2015). Developmental Stages in Receptive Grammar Acquisition: A Processability Theory Account. *Second Language Research, 31*(4), 523-550.

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Multilingual Matters.

Camacho, M. M. (2004). Power and Privilege: Community Service Learning in Tijuana. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, Summer*, 31-42.

Clayton, P. H., Bringle, R. G., Senor, B., Huq, J., & Morrison, M. (2010). *Differentiating and Assessing Relationships in Service-Learning and Civic Engagement: Exploitative, Transactional, or Transformational*. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning.

Collopy, R. M. B., Tjaden-Glass, S., & McIntosh, N. A. (2020). Attending to conditions that facilitate Intercultural Competence: A reciprocal service-learning approach. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 26*(1), 19-38.

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, and Assessment.* Council of Europe. Retrieved Jan. 1, 2023, from https://rm.coe.int/1680459f97

Crabtree, R. D. (2008). *Theoretical Foundations for International Service-Learning*. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning.

Crabtree, R. D. (2013). *The Intended and Unintended Consequences of International Service-Learning*. Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement.

Czop Assaf, L., O'Donnell Lussier, K., Furness, S., & Hoff, M. (2019). Exploring How a Study Abroad and International Service-Learning Project Shaped Preservice Teachers' Understanding of Humanizing Pedagogy. *Teacher Educator, 54*(2), 105-124.

Deterding, D., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2006). Emerging South-East Asian Englishes and intelligibility. *World Englishes, 25*(3-4), 391-409.

Deterding, D. (2013). A Review of “Intelligibility in world Englishes: theory and applications”. *Language & Education: An International Journal, 27*(1)

Dixon, B. (2015). *International Service Learning: Analytical Review of Published Research Literature*. Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad.

Doppen, F. H., & Tesar, J. (2012). *The Mwanje Project: Engaging Preservice Teachers in Global Service Learning*. Journal of International Social Studies.

Dostilio, L. D., Brackmann, S. M., Edwards, K. E., Harrison, B., Kliewer, B. W., & Clayton, P. H. (2012). Reciprocity: Saying What We Mean and Meaning What We Say. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 19*(1), 17-32.

Dostilio, L. D., Brackmann, S. M., Edwards, K. E., Harrison, B., Kliewer, B. W., & Clayton, P. H. (2012). *Reciprocity: Saying What We Mean and Meaning What We Say*. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning.

Douglas Fir Group. (2016). A Transdisciplinary Framework for SLA in a Multilingual World. *MODL the Modern Language Journal, 100*(S1), 19-47.

Foster, A. A. M., Cunningham, H. B., & Wrightsman, K. R. (2015). Using Service-Learning as a Tool to Develop Intercultural Understanding. *Journal of International Social Studies, 5*(2), 54-68.

García, O., & Otheguy, R. (2020). *Plurilingualism and Translanguaging: Commonalities and Divergences*. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism.

Garcia, N. A., & Longo, N. V. (2013). Going Global: Re-Framing Service-Learning in an Interconnected World. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 17*(2), 111-135.

Gates, A. B., Fletcher, C. V., Ruíz-Tolento, M. G., Goble, L., & Velloso, T. (2014). "A Pesar De Las Fronteras"/"In Spite of the Boundaries": Exploring Solidarity in the Context of International Service Immersion. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 18*(3), 57-82.

Grain, K., Katumba, T., Kirumira, D., Nakasiita, R., Nakayenga, S., Nankya, E., Nteza, V., & Ssegawa, M. (2019). Co-Constructing Knowledge in Uganda: Host Community Conceptions of Relationships in International Service-Learning. *Journal of Experiential Education, 42*(1), 22-36.

Guseh, J. S. (2015). University Service-Learning Partnership with a Foreign Government: A Case Study. *Journal of Public Scholarship in Higher Education, 5*, 79-92.

Hadley, A. O. (2001). *Teaching language in context*. Heinle & Heinle.

Harper, S. M. (2011). Counting the Costs of a Global Anglophonic Hegemony: Examining the Impact of U.S. Language Education Policy on Linguistic Minorities Worldwide. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies, 18*(1), 515-538.

Hélot, C., & Cavalli, M. (2017). Bilingual Education in Europe: Dominant Languages. In O. Garcia, A. Lin & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and Multilingual Education* (pp. 471-488). Springer.

Hosman, L., & Jacobs, G. (2018). *From Active Learning to Taking Action: Incorporating Political Context into Project-Based, Interdisciplinary, International Service Learning Courses*. Journal of Political Science Education.

Hsiung, T. (2015). Learning through Service: Preservice Teachers' Reflections from an International Service-Learning. *New Waves-Educational Research and Development Journal, 18*(1), 52-63.

Jameson, J., Clayton, P., & Jaeger, A. (2011). Community-Engaged Scholarship Through Mutually Transformative Partnerships. In L. Harter, J. Hamel- Lambert & J. Millesen (Eds.), *Participatory partnerships for social action and research* (). Kendall Hunt.

Jones, K., & Ceccucci, W. (2018). International Service Learning in IS Programs: The Next Phase -- An Implementation Experience. *Information Systems Education Journal, 16*(4), 53-62.

Kachru, B. B. (1992). *The Other tongue : English across cultures*. University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. B. (2008). The first step: the Smith paradigm for intelligibility in world Englishes. *World Englishes, 27*(3/4)

Kaur, H. (2020). *FYI: English isn't the official language of the United States.* https://www.cnn.com/2018/05/20/us/english-us-official-language-trnd/index.html

Keino, L. C., Torrie, M. C., Hausafus, C. O., & Trost, B. C. (2010). *Engaging FCS Partners in an International Service Learning Initiative*. Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences.

Kirkpatrick, Andy, Deterding, David,Wong, Jennie,. (2008). The International Intelligibility of Hong Kong English. *World Englishes, 27*(3-4), 359-377.

Konieczny, P. (2017). *Joining the Global Village: Teaching Globalization with Wikipedia*. Teaching Sociology.

Larsen, M. A. (2017). International Service-Learning: Rethinking the Role of Emotions. *Journal of Experiential Education, 40*(3), 279-294.

Lightfoot, E., & Lee, H. Y. (2015). *Professional International Service Learning as an International Service Learning Opportunity Appropriate for Graduate or Professional Students*. International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives.

Linguistics Laboratory, University of Pennsylvania. (2020). *TELSUR Project: Atlas of North American English.* https://www.ling.upenn.edu/phono_atlas/home.html

Liu, R., & Lee, H. (2011). Exploring the Cross-Cultural Experiences of College Students with Diverse Backgrounds Performing International Service-Learning in Myanmar. *New Horizons in Education, 59*(2), 38-50.

Locklin, R. B. (2010). *Weakness, Belonging, and the Intercordia Experience: The Logic and Limits of Dissonance as a Transformative Learning Tool*. Teaching Theology & Religion.

Lough, B. J., & Toms, C. (2018). *Global Service-Learning in Institutions of Higher Education: Concerns from a Community of Practice*. Globalisation, Societies and Education. https://10.1080/14767724.2017.1356705

Luna, J. M., Dávila, E. R., & Reynoso-Morris, A. (2018). Pedagogy of Permaculture and Food Justice. *Educational Foundations, 31*(1-2), 57-85.

Lussier, K. O., Assaf, L. C., & Hoff, M. (2019). A "Literacy Awakening": The Role of Study Abroad and International Service Learning for Preservice Teachers' Literacy Engagement. *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education, 5*(2), 47-65.

Maakrun, J. (2016). International Service Learning: Benefits to African Teachers. *Journal of Service-Learning in Higher Education, 5*(1)

Main, M. E., Garrett-Wright, D., & Kerby, M. (2013). Nursing student voices: Reflections on an
international service learning experience. *Kentucky Nurse, 61*(1), 10-11.

Martinsen, R. A., Baker, W., Dewey, D. P., Bown, J., & Johnson, C. (2010). *Exploring Diverse Settings for Language Acquisition and Use: Comparing Study Abroad, Service Learning Abroad, and Foreign Language Housing*. Applied Language Learning.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research : a guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.

Messner, M., Medina-Messner, V., & Guidry, J. (2016). *Global Health and Social Media: Using Instagram and Twitter in an Open Online Class for Global Service-Learning Projects*. Communication Teacher.

Metcalf, L. E. (2010). Creating International Community Service Learning Experiences in a Capstone Marketing-Projects Course. *Journal of Marketing Education, 32*(2), 155-171.

Miller, K. K., & Gonzalez, A. M. (2010). Domestic and International Service Learning Experiences: A Comparative Study of Pre-Service Teacher Outcomes. *Issues in Educational Research, 20*(1), 29-38.

Mitchell, T. D. (2008). *Traditional vs. Critical Service-Learning: Engaging the Literature to Differentiate Two Models*. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning.

Morrison, E. (2015). How the I Shapes the Eye: The Imperative of Reflexivity in Global Service-Learning Qualitative Research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 22*(1), 52-66.

Nelson, C. L. (1995). Intelligibility and World Englishes in the Classroom. *World Englishes, 14*(2), 273-79.

Nguyen, T. H. N. (2017). *Divergence of Languages as Resources for Theorizing*. Education Sciences.

Nickols, S. Y., Rothenberg, N. J., Moshi, L., & Tetloff, M. (2013). International Service-Learning: Students' Personal Challenges and Intercultural Competence. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 17*(4), 97-124.

Niehaus, E., & Crain, L. K. (2013). Act Local or Global?: Comparing Student Experiences in Domestic and International Service-Learning Programs. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 20*(1), 31-40.

Nieusma, D., & Riley, D. (2010). Designs on development: Engineering, globalization, and social justice. *Engineering Studies, 2*(1), 29-59.

O'Sullivan, M. W., & Niemczyk, E. K. (2014). Mentoring for Global Competence: Teachers Preparing Their Peers for International Service Learning. *Bulgarian Comparative Education Society,*

O'Sullivan, M., Smaller, H., Heidebrecht, L., & Balzer, G. (2019). A Nicaraguan/Guatemalan "Encuentro": Villagers Hosting International Service Learning Groups Reflect on Their Experiences. *Canadian Journal of Education, 42*(3), 635-663.

Pisco, J. (2015). Deepening Service Abroad: A Call for Reciprocal Partnerships and Ongoing Support. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, Fall*, 93-96.

Power, A. (2013). Developing the Music Pre-Service Teacher through International Service Learning. *Australian Journal of Music Education,* (2), 64-70.

Power, A., Truong, S., Gray, T., Downey, G., Hall, T., & Jones, B. (2017). When Outbound Mobility Programs and Service Learning Align in Pre-Service Teacher Education. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 18*(3), 401-412.

Prins, E., & Webster, N. (2010). Student Identities and the Tourist Gaze in International Service-Learning: A University Project in Belize. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 14*(1), 5-32.

Qiong, H. X. (2004). Why China English should stand alongside British, American, and the other 'world Englishes'. *English Today, 20*(2), 26-33.

Rajadurai, J. (2007). Intelligibility studies: a consideration of empirical and ideological issues. *World Englishes, 26*(1), 87-98.

Reynolds, N. P. (2014). What Counts as Outcomes? Community Perspectives of an Engineering Partnership. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 21*(1), 79-90.

Reynolds, N. R. (2019). *Participatory Orientation in GSL Research to Hear the Community: Who and How Matters*. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning.

Rodriguez, D., Carrasquillo, A. & Lee, K. S. (2014). *The bilingual advantage : promoting academic development, biliteracy, and native language in the classroom.*

Rubin, D. L., & Matthews, P. H. (2013). *Learning Outcomes Assessment: Extrapolating from Study Abroad to International Service-Learning*. Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement.

Sanmiguel, E. R., Reyes, A., Burns, D., & Huber, T. (2019). *Local to Global Service-Learning: A Two-Hour Volunteer Experience in Global Citizenship*. Multicultural Education.

Sharpe, E. K., & Dear, S. (2013). Points of Discomfort: Reflections on Power and Partnerships in International Service-Learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 19*(2), 49-57.

Sherraden, M., Lough, B. J., & Bopp, A. (2013). *Students Serving Abroad: A Framework for Inquiry*. Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement.

Shin, S. J. (2013). *Bilingualism in Schools and Society: Language, identity, and policy*. Routledge, Taylor, & Francis Group.

Simonelli, J., Earle, D., & Story, E. (2004). Acompanar Obediciendo: Learning to Help in Collaboration with Zapatista Communities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 10 (Summer)*, 43-56.

Soria, K. M., Lueck, S. M., Hanson, R. E., & Morrow, D. J. (2016). **Service-Learning** Abroad: Undergraduates' Development of Pluralistic Outcomes. In D. M. Velliaris, & D. Coleman-George (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Study Abroad Programs and Outbound Mobility. Advances in Higher Education and Professional Development (AHEPD) Book Series* (pp. Section 3 Chapter 11). IGI Global.

Streets, B. F., Nicolas, G., & Wolford, K. (2015). *Pause...Before Rushing In: Examining Motivations to Help in Trauma Impacted Communities Internationally*. International Research and Review.

Taylor, J. (2002). *Metaphors We Serve By: Investigating the Conceptual Metaphors Framing National and Community Service and Service-Learning*. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning.

Taylor, K. B., Jones, S. R., Massey, R., Mickey, J., Reynolds, D. J., & Jackson, T. (2017). Examining Developmental Readiness in an International Service-Learning Context. *Journal of College Student Development, 58*(5), 685-703.

Taylor, K. B., Jones, S., Massey, R., Mickey, J., & Reynolds, D. J. (2018). 'It Just Had to Settle': A Longitudinal Investigation of Students' Developmental Readiness to Navigate Dissonance and Experience Transformation through International Service Learning. *Journal of Higher Education, 89*(2), 236-260.

Tolar, M. H., & Gott, T. (2012). *What's the DEAL? Program Level Examination of Reflection Design*. Journal of Applied Learning in Higher Education.

United Nations. (2020a). *United Nations Careers: Interpreters.* https://careers.un.org/lbw/home.aspx?viewtype=LCEFD&FId=2

United Nations. (2020b). *United Nations Language Careers: Translators.* https://careers.un.org/lbw/home.aspx?viewtype=LCEFD&FId=7

Urraca, B., Ledoux, M., & Harris III, J. T. (2009). Beyond the Comfort Zone: Lessons of Intercultural Service. *Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 82*(6), 281-289.

van der Walt, C. (2000). The International Comprehensibility of Varieties of South African English. *World Englishes, 19*(2), 139-53.

Venuti, L. (2012). Translation, Community, Utopia. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (2nd ed., pp. 482-502). Routledge.

Webster, N., & Arends, J. H. (2012). *Perspective Transformation and International Service-Learning: An Insider's Look through Stephanie's Story*. Journal of College and Character.

Weick, C. W., Costigan, S. J., Cunningham, L. J., Zeiser, S. R., Camp-Bell, J., Feliz, M. C., Iversen, J. M., Kobayashi, A. L., Matej, M. A., Motoyasu, C. T., Teague, K. E., & Wong, S. A. (2015). *Setting the Standard for Challenge: Teaching English in Dimen, China*. Honors in Practice.

Wu, C. (2018). Intercultural Citizenship through Participation in an International Service-Learning Program: A Case Study from Taiwan. *Language Teaching Research, 22*(5), 517-531.

Yang, M., Luk, L. Y. Y., Webster, B. J., Chau, A. W., & Ma, C. H. K. (2016). The Role of International Service-Learning in Facilitating Undergraduate Students' Self-Exploration. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 20*(5), 416-436.

Yoder, S. D. (2016). Pragmatism, Pedagogy, and Community Service Learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 22*(2), 5-15.

Zemach-Bersin, T. (2008). American students abroad can't be global citizens. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 54*(26), A34.

About the Author

Roger W. Anderson, PhD, is currently an assistant professor of international languages & cultures at Central State University, Ohio's only public historically-black university (HBCU). Roger teaches French, Arabic, and globally-themed courses. He earned a Ph.D. in Foreign/ Second Language Education from Ohio State University, Master's degrees in African Studies and French from Ohio University, and in Teaching Arabic as a Foreign Language from Middlebury College. Email: randerson@centralstate.edu

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge Lauren Borovicka and Dean Schwank, whose energies brought me out of the classroom and into settings where I could learn through service and through “doing”. Experiences they afforded me were invaluable to my education.