© Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, Volume 27, Number 3, p. 5, (2023)
 eISSN 2164-8212

Toward a Transformative GSL Ethics: How Global Service-Learning Faculty Reconcile Clashing Personal and Institutional Values Surrounding GSL

Kathleen Sexsmith and Richard Kiely

Abstract

Global service-learning (GSL) course offerings have expanded rapidly in the last decade at U.S. universities and colleges, yet faculty are not always prepared for the ethical challenges of development work with disadvantaged communities in international settings. Based on a qualitative study of 25 GSL faculty across a range of higher education institutions in the United States, this article describes what drives faculty members to participate in GSL, analyzes the community engagement principles that guide their GSL work, and assesses how they cope with the dissonance that arises when striving to meet the sometimes-conflicting needs of students, communities, and educational institutions. We find that these faculty employ a "transformative GSL ethics" to realize their motivations and visions for a counter-normative approach to community engagement. We argue that higher education institutions must shift their norms, values, and practices with respect to professional development and pedagogy if they are to continue promoting the GSL agenda.

Keywords: global service-learning, counter-normative pedagogy, international education

What's not a conversation point often is . . . the impact on the community in the global setting.

—Director of engaged learning center at private U.S. university

Global service-learning (GSL) course offerings have expanded rapidly in the last decade at U.S. universities and colleges, as part of a nationwide push to create global engagement opportunities for students (Whitehead, 2015). GSL can be referred to by a variety of terms, including international service-learning (ISL), global learning, community-based global learning, and international voluntourism. GSL refers to a mode of instruction in which students in a college or university course engage cross-culturally, often with socially or economically marginalized communities, by working together, conducting research, or providing a service (Hartman & Kiely, 2014, 2017). GSL courses are usually designed and led by faculty members, who must balance student needs, both learning-related and personal, against community needs, priorities, and sentiments (Bringle & Hatcher, 2011). Meeting ethical responsibilities toward both students and communities is challenging, and sometimes next to impossible to achieve (Crabtree, 2013; Larsen, 2015; Taylor, 2009). In particular, if faculty are not well prepared for the ethical challenges of development work with disadvantaged communities in international settings, the needs of communities are likely to be deprioritized relative to the needs of students (Crabtree, 2008; McMillan & Stanton, 2014). GSL courses thus may risk poor outcomes

and even negative impacts for community members and students alike (Crabtree, 2013; Hartman et al., 2018; Hawes et al., 2021).

Based on the results of a qualitative study of 25 GSL faculty across a range of higher education institutions in the United States, this article focuses on the roles, risks, and responsibilities vis-à-vis community partners of faculty members leading GSL courses. Our aim is to describe what drives faculty members to participate in GSL, analyze the community engagement principles that guide their GSL work, and assess how they cope with the dissonance that arises when striving to meet the sometimes conflicting needs of students and communities. In so doing, we make several contributions to the literatures on service-learning and on GSL. First, we add to existing literature on faculty motivation and experiences with service-learning in domestic settings (O'Meara, 2013) by reviewing faculty motivations for participating in GSL. We highlight the contingent nature of GSL work, in terms of how it depends on myriad institutional, cultural, and professional factors and personal relationships developed between faculty and communities over time, and how programs often arise from unanticipated opportunities. The contingent character of some GSL programs and the related risks underscore the need for institutions to invest in preparing faculty for the challenges of international engagement (Kiely & Sexsmith, 2018). Second, we analyze the principles or values that guide faculty members' engagement with communities when implementing their GSL programs. We show that, in the cases of our interview participants, these principles reflect a deep commitment to a nonhierarchical partnership with community organizations. However, and finally, we argue that these principles often clash with institutional norms and values toward faculty professional development, which tend to prioritize individualistic research achievements like publishing and recognition, and toward pedagogy, which tend to prioritize student over community needs (Abes et al., 2002; Cooper, 2014; Ma & Mun, 2019; O'Meara 2011). These conflicting expectations cause faculty to experience cognitive dissonance, which they deal with through the development of a counternormative approach to GSL (Clayton & Ash, 2004; Hartman et al., 2018) that we call a "transformative GSL ethics." We argue that higher education institutions must shift their norms, values, and practices with respect to professional development and to pedagogy if they are to continue promoting the GSL agenda as part of their internationalization efforts (Hartman & Chaire, 2014; Kiely & Sexsmith, 2018; Tiessen & Huish, 2014).

The article proceeds as follows. First, we situate our study in GSL scholarship and explain how it contributes to the growing literature on faculty members' understandings, roles, and motivations for service-learning. The second section describes our qualitative research methodology and details characteristics of our participants and their GSL programs. Third, we present our findings from original qualitative research on faculty members' motivations, guiding principles, and ethical challenges implementing GSL programs. Fourth, the discussion section synthesizes our findings, highlights contributions to the GSL literature, and explains the study limitations. In the concluding section, to address faculty concerns highlighted in our study and support high quality GSL, we provide recommendations for faculty and higher education institutions engaging in this work.

Conceptualizing "Global" Service-Learning

The U.S. contemporary service-learning movement in higher education can be traced to the 1960s and 1970s (Kendell & Associates, 1990). This movement generated several scholarly frameworks for understanding who benefits and how from the service-learning activities. Furco's (1996) "balance beam" provided a useful heuristic for distinguishing the academic and public value of service-learning from other diverse types of educational activities. According to this framework, volunteering and cocurricular community service could be distinguished from field study and internships according to a continuum that identifies whether the "balance" of benefits is tipped toward the recipient (i.e., community partner) or the service provider (i.e., the student; Furco, 1996). In addition to the "balance beam," Hill (1996) and Tapia (2007) offer "quadrants" to visually depict high versus low levels of learning on a horizontal axis, and high versus low levels of service on a vertical axis, where high quality learning and service sits in the upper right quadrant (See Furco & Norvell 2019 for a more detailed description). These conceptual frameworks were intended to distinguish service-learning as a more impactful form of innovative pedagogy

in terms of both pedagogy and service goals, as compared to other outside-of-classroom learning experiences, such as internships and field study (which tend to focus on student learning) and volunteer and community service activities (which tend to focus more on the student's contribution to the community organization). Thanks in part to these contributions, educators and scholars began to see the benefits of service-learning in comparison to other experiential learning activities, which were often not well integrated into university curricula, did not typically earn students academic credit, and very rarely incorporated various forms of structured reflection on the service-learning experience (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Furco & Norvell, 2019; Simpson, 2004; Tapia, 2007).

The early scholarship on service-learning in the U.S. context had a broad influence on the theory and practice of service-learning in other regions of the world (Aramburuzabala et al., 2019; Erasmus, 2011; Kiely & Ma, 2021). One of the earliest conceptualizations of international service-learning (ISL) was offered by Bringle and Hatcher (2011), who described ISL as the integration of study abroad, international education, and service-learning. Consistent with these three dimensions, Bringle and Hatcher offered the following definition of ISL as a

> *structured academic experience in another country* in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that addresses identified community needs; (b) *learn from direct interaction and cross-cultural dialogue with others*; and (c) reflect on the *experience* in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a deeper understanding of *global and intercultural issues*, a broader appreciation of the *host country* and the discipline, and an enhanced sense of their own responsibilities as citizens, locally and *globally*. (p. 19)

Although faculty development, community impact, and reciprocity with partners are included as implicit indicators of successful ISL throughout *International Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Research* (Bringle et al., 2011), this volume (which includes Bringle and Hatcher's chapter) centers on the student from the perspective of the academe and offers a limited view of research on community capacity building and faculty development in ISL. Scholars soon worked to rectify these gaps. Bringle et al. (2009) made a foundational contribution with the SOFAR model, which conceptualizes a more nuanced and authentic representation of a campus–community partnership as dyadic relationships among students, community organizations, faculty, administrators, and community residents (hence the acronym SOFAR). In their model, campus–community partnerships become less exploitive and transactional and more transformational relative to the level of "closeness, equity and integrity" of the relationships or interactions among the dyads (p. 4).

Another shift in the literature that has helped widen the lens beyond the student and university experience has been the change in the language of ISL to that of global service-learning (GSL). This change in terminology helped to expand the borders across which intercultural dimensions of service-learning can occur to include domestic (students' home country) contexts (Hartman & Kiely, 2014). Landorf and Dosher (2015) described "global learning as the process of diverse people collaboratively analyzing and addressing complex problems that transcend borders" (p. 24). Their definition marked a notable shift in how study abroad is defined, by (1) focusing on "people" (rather than students), who are (2) "engaged globally" (which can include not only international but also domestic engagement between diverse people), in (3) a "collaborative" relational process with community stakeholders to solve "complex problems" (facing communities, not just students) that "transcend" borders (such as regional, cultural, racial, or other borders; (Landorf & Dosher, 2015, p. 24).

In concert with this conceptual shift, special sections in two issues of the *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* focused on the move from ISL to GSL in research and knowledge sharing (Hartman & Kiely, 2014; Kiely & Hartman, 2015). This scholarship offered an opportunity for scholar–practitioners to delineate the parameters of an alternative conceptual framing that moves from student- and faculty-centric theories and practices to a community-driven approach. This work, along with scholarship in the related field of development studies (Epprecht, 2004; Langdon & Agyeyomah, 2014; Simpson, 2004; Tiessen & Heron, 2012; Tiessen & Huish, 2014), challenges the dominant discourse of "service" and

classroom-based pedagogy and attempts to facilitate a theoretically and ethically informed counterhegemonic discourse that addresses how higher education institutions and other stakeholders might serve communities across multiple, sometimes ill-defined borders and boundaries (see also more recent work by Hawes et al., 2021).

Building on their ongoing work and dialogues with GSL colleagues, and to move away from the language of "service," Hartman et al. (2018) offered the concept of community-based global learning (CBGL) as

> a community-driven learning and/or experience that employs structured, critically reflective practice to better understand global citizenship; positionality; power, structure, and social responsibility in global contexts. It is a learning methodology *and* a community-driven development philosophy that cultivates a critically reflective disposition among all participants. (pp. 203–204)

Hartman et al.'s definition integrates three main dimensions: (1) a community-driven learning methodology that aspires to be equitable, participatory, democratic, and inclusive; (2) a community needs–oriented experience that cultivates a critically reflective disposition and social responsibility in all stakeholders; *and*, importantly, (3) a development philosophy that recognizes the global interdependencies of both domestic and international social and environmental problems (Hartman et al., 2018, p. 21). Our theorization of a transformative GSL ethics below engages with and builds on this approach.

Faculty Motivations for Service-Learning

Although research on faculty experiences with global forms of service-learning is limited, scholars have shown a growing interest in studying faculty participation, motivation, learning, and professional development in service-learning writ broadly (Berkey et al., 2018; Britt, 2012; Clayton et al., 2013; Demb & Wade, 2012; Hou, Su-I & Wilder, S. 2015; O'Meara, 2013). Understanding why faculty undertake service-learning, how they hone their service-learning knowledge and skills, the common challenges and barriers they face, as well as how institutions might support their ongoing professional development in the area of service-learning, are all essential to maximizing benefits and averting negative impact on students and communities (Berkey et al., 2018; Chism et al., 2013; Ma & Mun, 2019). Such research is essential in the context of GSL, where sensitive issues of cultural and other forms of difference must be well-managed to prevent harm to marginalized communities.

O'Meara's (2013) extensive review of research on factors that influence faculty motivation for engaging in service-learning found a number of studies (Abes et al., 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009) that focused on individual variables such as "teaching goals, gender, race, ethnicity, experiences growing up working class, epistemology or orientation to knowledge, a desire for learning and a desire to enact commitments to specific community organizations and issues" (p. 216). O'Meara's review also indicated that institutional environment and culture are important influences; according to her, "discipline, institution type, perception of institutional support, type of appointment all act as motivating forces" (p. 216; O'Meara's Table 3.2.1 offers a useful summary of research on individual, institutional, and environmental factors that influence faculty motivation to undertake service-learning). Demb and Wade's (2012) research indicated that the level of faculty engagement and motivation to incorporate service-learning into their teaching and research is influenced by the complex interrelationship among diverse factors in four dimensions: personal, communal, institutional, and professional. Ma and Mun's (2019) more recent study added a dimension related to student factors that affect faculty motivation. They found that students' academic and personal development were among the "most significant motivators" for faculty in Hong Kong to engage in service-learning teaching (p. 48). Although research results are mixed in terms of the relationship of faculty engagement in service-learning and faculty ranks and tenure status (O'Meara, 2013; Wade & Demb, 2009), overall, much of the research confirms that faculty feel that the value of service-learning is not recognized in terms of institutional support (i.e., funding, promotion and tenure policies), which has implications for the time and effort they put into building relationships with community partners vis-à-vis their investments in scholarly publication (Abes et al., 2002;

Barreneche et al., 2018; Demb & Wade, 2012; Ma & Mun, 2019; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009). Competing priorities between campuses and communities continue to present ethical dilemmas for faculty, especially when the time commitment required for responsible GSL practice is extensive and when institutional support for addressing funding and logistical challenges is lacking (Crabtree, 2008, 2013; O'Meara, 2011, 2013; Stoecker & Tryon, 2009).

According to Clayton et al. (2013), faculty learning "is an underdeveloped yet ripe arena for research in service-learning" (p. 266). Indeed, much of the research on faculty learning in service-learning assesses the impact of faculty development programs on faculty learning outcomes and competencies (Berkey et al., 2018; Blanchard et al., 2012; Katz Jameson et al., 2012; see also reviews by Chism et al., 2013; Clayton et al., 2013; and Welch & Plaxton-Moore, 2017), collaborative inquiry or communities of practice (Miller-Young et al., 2015), and autoethnography (Tilley-Lubbs, 2009). However, a review of scholarship in GSL reveals very few empirical studies examining faculty learning experiences in this field (Miller-Young et al., 2015; Morrison, 2015; Taylor, 2009; Tiessen & Huish, 2014; Tonkin, 2004, 2011). For example, a few qualitative studies have focused on how faculty learn important "threshold concepts" such as reciprocity or critical reflection (Miller-Young et al., 2015; Tilley-Lubbs, 2009) or "reflexivity" in research (Morrison, 2015) in developing quality relationships that benefit both students and community partners (Kiely & Sexsmith, 2018). A pattern in each of these studies was the recognition that GSL, when not planned well in collaboration with community partners, particularly with a robust understanding of what constitutes reciprocity (Barreneche et al., 2018; Larsen, 2015; Miller-Young, 2015; Tilley-Lubbs, 2009), can potentially cause harm or damage the nature of the relationship with community partners (Hartman et al., 2018).

Given the paucity of research specific to faculty learning in GSL, and the potential harm to vulnerable communities that can come from poorly designed GSL programs (Hartman & Kiely, 2014; Hartman et al., 2018; Huish & Tiessen, 2014; Larsen, 2015), understanding faculty members' experiences with GSL, as well as the factors that motivate them to stay involved in GSL, can have important implications for how institutions structure professional development activities and provide faculty support. To that end, in this article we pose three questions: (1) What motivates faculty to lead GSL courses? (2) What principles guide faculty members' engagement with communities in their GSL courses? (3) Do faculty members' community engagement principles align with the dominant norms and values of institutions of higher education?

Methods

Research Design

For this qualitative study, 25 faculty members, including 15 women and 10 men, were recruited to participate in semistructured interviews. IRB approval was obtained at Cornell University. The interviews addressed six main topics: (1) motivations for participating in GSL, (2) philosophies and ethical considerations toward community partnerships, (3) GSL pedagogies, (4) the institutional environment at the faculty member's home institution, (5) research and its relationship to GSL teaching, and (6) projections and hopes for the future of the GSL field. The semistructured nature of the interview questions allowed us to develop in-depth insights into faculty members' motivations for particular behaviors, their reflections on best and worst practices in GSL, and their opinions of available theoretical models for GSL. Interviews were conducted by Kiely, Sexsmith, and two research assistants. An interview guide was developed and used by all four interviewers to ensure consistency in the interviewing approach and comparability of results across interview participants. The interview guide was designed to yield interviews of approximately one hour, but some interviews lasted only 45 minutes and others several hours. Interviews were conducted primarily by telephone or Zoom, audiorecorded, and transcribed by the authors.

The interviews were semistructured and designed to probe faculty experiences in GSL according to the four lenses of the Kiely (2007) reflective framework. Kiely's four-lens model conceptualizes service-learning as a transformative practice that engages students and faculty in critical reflection on their (1) teaching and learning, (2) institutional change, (3) knowledge generation and application, and (4) community partnerships and capacity-building (Kiely & Sexsmith, 2018; Swords & Kiely, 2011). Another sec-

tion of the interview inquired about faculty members' motivations to pursue GSL work. Thus, the interviews integrated Kiely's (2007) model to create five main lines of inquiry: (1) What motivated participants to teach GSL and/or conduct research in GSL? (2) How do participants approach pedagogy and program models in GSL? (3) In what ways do participants engage with their academic institutions to support GSL? (4) In what ways do participants include research in their GSL work? (5) How do participants develop and maintain relationships with community partners?

We then used an iterative approach to identify and refine codes for data analysis (Patton, 2002; Ryan & Bernard, 2000). Metacodes were developed for each of the main lines of inquiry (faculty motivations, pedagogy, institutional environment, professional development, community partnerships), as well as for emergent themes (definitions of GSL, ethical dilemmas, future of GSL). Each of these metacodes was refined to second and sometimes third levels using an iterative process and according to themes emerging in the interviews (Patton, 2002). This article focuses on findings related to faculty motivations and community partnerships, including as they relate to and intersect with the other topics. A full coding scheme is available upon request to the authors. Transcripts were coded using NVivo software in order to identify patterns across participants. The results below include participant numbers, gender, and rank to help provide a sense of the range of opinions presented while still protecting participant confidentiality.

Interview participants were selected using purposive sampling methods, to maximize heterogeneity across four factors: gender, type of postsecondary institution (community college, private, state, or Research One [R1] university [per the Carnegie Classifications of Institutions of Higher Education]), progress toward or beyond tenure, and major academic field of training (Patton, 2002). In this way, we used theoretical sampling to aim to capture the range of possible explanations for our qualitative, interview-based study (Gerson & Damaske, 2020). Prospective participants were identified from within the authors' professional networks of faculty conducting GSL work and at scholarly events and conferences in the GSL field. Participants were recruited through in-person or email requests to participate in the study. The research was conducted over several years between 2012 and 2015 to help ensure that the sample captured a range of participant experiences according to the four purposive sampling criteria described above. Capturing a diverse sample was important to examine trends regarding community partnerships that cut across institutions regardless of size, available resources, and major fields of study. Moreover, we were able to explore with both new and seasoned faculty how time and accumulated experience with GSL has shaped their approaches to community partnerships. Analysis of results and preparation of the manuscript took place over several years as the first author completed a doctoral dissertation and transferred to a new institution. Interview participants were not recontacted for additional interviews, since they had been sampled according to their career stage and years of experience doing GSL work and at their institutions at the time of interview.

Participant Characteristics

Table 1 demonstrates that participants were distributed across type of institution and rank, although the largest share of participants (11 interviewees) were employed at private colleges or universities. Participants represented a range of disciplinary backgrounds, including education (5), social sciences (8), humanities (6), agricultural and physical sciences (4), and health and human development (2).

Participants ran programs in multiple countries across several continents, including (in alphabetical order) Belize, Bolivia, Cambodia, China, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ghana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Jamaica, Libya, Malaysia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Northern Ireland, Peru, Poland, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Tanzania, U.S.A. (Navajo Nation), and Zambia. Their service-learning programs ranged from one week in length to a full summer or semester, with most having a duration of 1 to 3 weeks.

Table 2 summarizes our participants' GSL programs. A handful of participants had extensive multiyear experience developing service-learning programs across countries and sectors, and their full range of experience could not be summarized here. Moreover, some programs involved multiple activities that are listed in different categories.

Table 1. Breakdown of Research Participants by Institutional Classification

	Community college	State university	Research university	Private college/ university	Total
Assistant professor/Senior lecturer		2	2	2	6
Associate professor		1	1	4	6
Professor or professor emeriti	2	1	2	3	8
Director or administrator		1	2	2	5
Total	2	5	7	11	25

Note. Blank cells represent an absence of applicable data.

Findings

Faculty Motivations for GSL

Table 3 categorizes our findings regarding faculty members' motivations for participating in GSL work into five broad categories: pedagogical impact, development ethics, personal growth and identity, professional development, and unanticipated opportunity. Most of these broad categories are subdivided to capture the rich variation in faculty member GSL motivations, and each subcategory includes a representative quote. Respondents sometimes gave several motivations for participating in GSL work, and individuals may straddle categories.

Those motivated by pedagogy described two major ways that GSL has impacted their teaching. The first, and the most common motivation overall for participating in GSL, was to provide students with an experiential learning opportunity. Many of our participants expressed the value of GSL as experiential learning—that is, learning through doing (rather than reading about) international development work. In these responses, several participants explicitly noted the potential of GSL as a means of effecting personal transformation in students, referring to the "eye-opening," "awareness-raising," or "transformational learning" value of GSL. The other pedagogical motivation participants mentioned was to build and improve student–teacher relationships. The closeness created by traveling internationally and facing challenges together was described by Participant 19, a male associate professor, as generating "excitement" about students through "really seeing their human side." Although this data speaks to pedagogical motivations to engage in GSL, our interviews generated a larger data set about the specific pedagogical practices and techniques of GSL instructors that lies beyond the scope of this article.

Motivations for GSL that fell into our development ethics category included engagement in international development and improving or further developing existing relationships with a community. Those who saw GSL as a vehicle for international development often framed their interest explicitly in terms of a desire to achieve "social justice" through their community partnerships. Participant 13, a male professor emeritus, spoke in particular about GSL as a "grassroots" way to "disrupt the traditional structure of global power," both in terms of its "transformational" impacts on students and its capacity to "show our hosts that people from the rich portion of the world can be interested in what is often denigrated as . . . 'poor countries without economic resources.'" Another related motivation for GSL work was the opportunity to improve or develop relationships with communities in an explicitly nonresearch setting. Several faculty members told us about their desire to engage with marginalized communities in a way that did not feel self-serving, as research sometimes does.

Personal growth and identity were the third major category we identified as a motivation for GSL work. Many of our faculty respondents said they had a personally transformative experience during their youth or university career that instilled a personal interest in international or cross-cultural work, and then explained that they are now using GSL as a vehicle to pursue this interest. A common sentiment among faculty was the desire to recreate these transformative

Table 2. Classification of Research Participants' GSL Programs

Support to community organizations	• Hold workshops and analyze workplans for a center for breast cancer survivors. • Work in community garden. • Volunteer at health clinic, after-school program, and sports complex. • Assist with implementation of a design for a park and community center. • Volunteer at center for children with disabilities. • Run a summer day camp for local students. • Volunteer at health clinic organizing patient records and collecting and monitoring data to assist with grant writing. • Help design water plants to bring clean water to communities.
Teaching, training, and curriculum development in schools and communities	• Provide feedback on local doctoral students' dissertation proposals. • Educational projects in schools on sanitation, water, and personal hygiene. • Help school-aged children apply for private schools outside a low-income community. • Work with special needs children from low-resource families. • Bilingual writing workshop for students and local women around difficult moments in women's lives. • English language classes. • Develop standards and curriculum for local school. • Create fact sheets to disseminate to local community members. • Develop classroom activities for student nurses. • Training health care providers in preventive education.
Physical labor	• Pouring and moving concrete to assist with building homes. • Carrying blocks to help build playground. • Construction of a forest management station for an Indigenous community. • Help construct a hospital. • Help build classrooms for rural community. • Build playground and swing sets and maintain sports field. • Help build wind turbine. • Turn school rooftop into an income-generating café. • Plant trees in a nursery. • Paint traffic signs. • Pick up garbage.
Independent research	• Research on impacts of local tourism industry. • Evaluation research for a women's rights organization to help them obtain grants. • Research for a health clinic under supervision of lead doctor. • Community photography project on peace and justice. • Soil experiments and interviewing farmers to propose solutions to small farmers' agronomics concerns. • Research project together with a local student partner.
Interpersonal relationship development	• Share meals with locals and play with young children. • Interview local women informally to listen to their stories and coproduce a bilingual publication. • Interview women about difficulties in their lives for a legal rights organization.
Observation of life and work in communities	• Visit health clinics and migrant aid organizations to talk with organizers and watch activities. • Spend a day in a fishing village and go on boats with fishermen. • Shadow nurses at a health clinic. • Visit apparel factories to observe labor conditions.
Financial support	• Bring funds raised in the U.S. to construct sanitation and water collection infrastructure.

Table 3. Faculty Motivations for GSL Work

Category	Motivation	Representative Quote
Pedagogical impact	Experiential learning	"I wanted to bring other students to the field to realize that it's not enough to just sit and imagine and theorize about development. I think that it's important to interact with people and see it up close; see the struggles. . . . I didn't want them leaving and thinking that they need to save Ghana, that they could save Ghana."—*Participant 18, female professor*
	Closer teacher–student relationships	"And I think that breaking down that boundary and those types of relationships allows for us, for me to challenge them in ways, to be quite honest. I think that I can say things sometimes that maybe they would get more offended by. But if they feel like it's a space where they could talk about it rather than shutting down, and why it's making them uncomfortable, we can get someplace."—*Participant 2, female assistant professor*
Development ethics	Engage in international development	"I was too much of a critical thinker to dive right into the humanitarian industry. But this seemed like a good way to bridge those values and interests for me. I could still engage with humanitarianism, but from the perspective of a critical thinker. . . . I could help [students] to reflect critically about their engagements in that field in a way that hopefully would indirectly contribute to improving some of those services and their approaches."—*Participant 14, male assistant professor*
	Build nonresearch relationships with communities	"Part of the reason I built the school was because I knew I wanted to study development and I'm starting with a debt, and this was my repayment of the debt upfront."—*Participant 18, female professor*
Personal growth & identity	Formative international experience during youth	"I guess what I'm saying is that the motivations as well as the structure of the program flowed out of my own autobiography and personal experiences. That no one could convince me out of. It wasn't just one good book against another. It was, wait a sec, this is a decade of interacting deeply intimately with people and you're gonna tell me that their experiences and perspectives are not legit? They are!"—*Participant 20, male professor*
	Spirituality	"You know there is a spiritual teaching that all is one. And I think that people experience that in a different way when they are deeply immersed in another culture."—*Participant 4, female senior lecturer*
	Travel and exploration	"When I was on sabbatical, I wanted to do something, anything: go somewhere for the first time in my life outside of places that are connected to the United States, like Canada, Mexico or perhaps the Bahamas. So, this was really a great opportunity insofar as the availability of getting involved in an adventure. I think that I was in a situation where any adventure would have sufficed."—*Participant 9, female professor*

Table continued on next page

Table 3. Continued

Category	Motivation	Representative Quote
Professional development	Natural extension of scholarly identity	"As an anthropologist, I'm interested in participant observation and I believe, I believed I guess, that I could learn a lot from studying development from the inside out."—Participant 18, female professor
	Transformational learning	"I have learned an awful lot of important lessons about how not to be the arrogant outsider; how not to make assumptions; how not to ask the wrong questions; to say the wrong things, in terms of local experiences—would be totally different from my so-called 'good intentions.'"—*Participant 6, female professor emerita*
	Utilize existing community connection	"So, I developed it as a result of many years of me thinking, how can I use my research connections, my personal interests, and my desire to share my country with the rest of the world? All three."—*Participant 25, female associate professor*
Unanticipated opportunity	Unanticipated opportunity	"But then, actually, getting involved taking students to [country] just happened through a series of kind of surprising contingencies and connections. . . . It all happened in about a month. The doctor called in May, and we were on the plane in June. . . . In retrospect, thinking back to that first summer I'm just amazed at how we jumped into this."—*Participant 14, male assistant professor*

moments for their students, or "return the favor" of being introduced to other cultures, as Participant 13 put it. Another, less common personal reason for participating in GSL was spiritual. Two respondents (Participant 7, a male administrator, and Participant 20, a male professor) spoke of Christian values, and Participant 4 noted that cross-cultural communication and friendship offered the "spiritual teaching that all is one." Participant 9 shared an uncommon view among participants that she was drawn to GSL as a means of traveling and experiencing places she considered "exotic," signaling the importance of critical self-reflection and better institutional preparation for GSL work, as discussed further below.

The fourth overarching category we distilled from our findings was professional development. Several faculty members noted that GSL created transformational learning moments that helped them become more reflexive about their teaching and research, which in turn enhanced their relationships in the field and ultimately their work as academic researchers. Some participants explained that GSL was a natural extension of their professional identity, either because of its epistemological focus on grassroots perspectives, or because it provided a logical new branch for their globally engaged scholarship. Several faculty noted that they saw an opportunity to engage in GSL in order to build on prior professional or personal relationships.

Finally, several respondents described their GSL experience as a totally unanticipated opportunity. Some described their personal concern at leading a trip on short notice without adequate preparation or having no prior knowledge of the destination country. These cases do not represent GSL best practices; in fact, they represent circumstances that can undermine the strength of community relationships, or even reinscribe university–community hierarchies. The finding that some faculty do not actually have a longer standing interest in—and thus lack a personal preparation for—GSL work relates to our finding below that faculty often did not feel supported by their academic institutions. Although they had meaningful community engagement intentions, these faculty felt "thrown into" GSL work without having received sufficient resources, time, or opportunities for necessary self-preparation from their institutions. Together, these findings point to the need for greater institutional support to prepare faculty for GSL work, including critical self-reflection at all stages.

Community Engagement Principles

Participants described several common principles that guide their engagement with community members in their GSL work. Table 4 presents a synthesis of our findings with respect to community engagement principles, including representative quotes that we felt best express the meaning of each principle.

The most commonly expressed community engagement principle was partnership, well-defined by one participant in terms of "mutuality" of effort and benefit between the university and the community. Faculty members described the principle of partnership in a careful way that implicitly or explicitly differed from the principle of reciprocity, a more common referent in the literature. That is, faculty recognized that the efforts made, and the benefits gained by the university and the community partners, do not have to (and almost never will) be equal. Rather, they were sensitive to the fact that community partners put in whatever resources they have available, even if limited, to develop what Participant 24, a male senior lecturer, called a "strong sense of

Table 4. Faculty's Community Engagement Principles for GSL

Community engagement principle	Representative quote
Partnership	"I call what I do 'civic engagement.' . . . what I try to promote in my study abroad class really focuses on mutual benefit and relationships that have a lot of equity in them, between our university group and the various community partners. . . . what we're trying to do is a lot richer, much more involved, and strives for mutuality between the two sides so that it's not . . . it tries to overcome the traditional relationship in which the university is the domain of the answers, and the community is the domain of the problem."—*Participant 13, male professor emeritus*
Community needs–driven	"And we do listen to what they want. It's not just coming in and saying, 'Okay, we've got this great idea, we've got the students from [university name].' We had multiple meetings with the school, the principal and chairman, all the gamut all the way up. And decided what they wanted."—*Participant 12, female administrator*
Long-term relationships	"We talk about how even though this is a sort of a one-shot deal for the students; that is, they're going one time, [but] our project is long-term. . . . So that's really important that they not have a sense of just sort of landing there, working, and going away."—*Participant 4, female senior lecturer*
Student–student collaboration	"[Ideally] students from the host country are with the American students as peers rather than everything being 'our' students interacting with the kids. . . . having college students with college students can be really powerful. . . . to have cross-cultural understanding develop, people should have similar status and shared goals."—*Participant 3, female administrator*
Communication	"So, the fact that we've been able to communicate our ideas and their ideas back and forth so that everybody has an understanding of what's going to happen next, I think has really helped out a lot for us."—*Participant 5, female Professor*
Student–community relationships	"So, their service is always going to be communicating with others. And the service that we're providing really is that sense of being there in the moment. And helping with education, being role-models. Being, you know, friends of the Cambodians."—*Participant 9, female professor*
Nonpaternalistic	"We work really hard to set boundaries for them so that they don't abuse White privilege in the settings in which they find themselves. Sometimes their host, partners, or clients confer more authority to them than they should. We really work with them on that in advance."—*Participant 22, female administrator*
Cultural humility	"So, I always like to make very clear to the students that they're not going down for a week to transform the lives of Nicaraguans. As a matter of fact, they will barely change their lives, if at all. And that's not the point, right? . . . the reason why my trip works and has values is because they're working with an organization that is doing that."—*Participant 8, male assistant professor*

ownership" over the project. They also communicated that the benefits to each partner will necessarily vary; the spirit of the partnership is that each person involved gets out of the partnership what they expected and desired. As Participant 22 put it,

> In the service-learning literature, the word that is used is "reciprocity." I'm not as fond of that word because to me, the metaphor is like a mirror image. I speak and think in terms of finding the points of mutual reward. I need to be really clear about "this is what I want out of this partnership." These are the rewards for me. What are the rewards for you? And these rewards don't have to be the same.

However, participants also mentioned many different constraints on the feasibility of implementing the principle of partnership. Participant 1, a female professor emerita, outright questioned the idea that community should be involved in program planning, observing that in some contexts the lives of locals are so "strenuous" that they cannot be expected to have the time or resources to contribute to GSL planning. This case illustrated a lack of critical self-reflection and need for better institutional support for GSL best practices. Others underscored the difficulty of doing GSL work in a way that does not reinforce the more powerful position of universities vis-à-vis communities. For example, some commented on the difficulty of coordination between a bureaucratic organization, like a university, and an informal and grassroots organization, like many of their Southern NGO partners. As Participant 10, a male assistant professor, succinctly stated: "Community-driven processes typically do not function in the form of large bureaucracies." In fact, sometimes the informality of the Southern partner organizations lies in stark contrast to the heaviness of university bureaucracy. For example, Participant 23, a female associate professor, said a partner organization "didn't even have a bank account." Another type of problem emerges when the dependence of the organization on the university partner is too strong. In some cases, a perceived absence of strong input and coordination from the partner organization led faculty to believe that the community was not sufficiently invested, raising questions for them about whether the project was being imposed by outsiders and/or about the project's sustainability over the long term. As Participant 18 said, "It should be something the community is so wedded to that they're willing to support it, and that has its own way of sustaining itself. It shouldn't be one person; it needs to be an institution, which is nonprofit." These faculty members were concerned about the intrinsic power dynamic that exists between Western universities and the marginalized communities they worked with, and they struggled to articulate solutions to these concerns.

Another common guiding principle for community engagement in GSL work was that programming be driven by stated community needs. For example, Participant 4 explained how her students had helped a community partner to self-publish a children's book about gardening after realizing that the available books were from the United States and depicted only American children, possibly leading to a sense of disconnection or alienation. This community-needs-driven approach represents a GSL best practice and relates closely to another frequently cited community engagement principle, namely longevity of the partnership. Participants described the importance of long-term commitment to relationship-building and the quality of the experience for the university and community partners, which speaks to the transformational relationship qualities of the SOFAR model (Bringle et al., 2009). As Participant 6 said, with long-term presence comes "the development of mutual trust, and that's really to me the toughest part of all of this." Participant 11, a female associate professor, explained that this trust helps prevent the perception of the program as "tourism of poverty." And as Participant 9 pointed out, long-term relationships with individuals help prevent the collapse of a program if institutions change or disappear, but the individual and the community they are tied to maintain interest in the GSL program. She recalled that "We ended up learning [that] long-term relationships really have to be in there; when the NGOs and the structures fail you should still have a relational tie." Regularity of communication is a closely related community engagement principle that many of our participants expressed. With reliable and regular interaction, a space can be created for community members to honestly reflect on their experiences in the program. Participant 21, a male administrator, described holding "quarterly forums" with the community NGO partners year round, including when students are

not engaged in the service component of the program, in order to "meet each other and talk about their experiences . . . they've appreciated that."

Student–student collaboration was an integral element to a handful of the programs our faculty participants were involved with. These collaborations sometimes took the form of Fair Trade Learning (Hartman et al., 2018), in which local university students are equally engaged in the learning component of the GSL project. Faculty described how this helped address an underlying inequality in GSL programs, whereby Western university students see their own careers boosted by the international experience, thus reinforcing global inequalities between the student participants and participating marginalized communities. As Participant 6 commented, "Often times we forget that the local folks also are interested in resume building." This faculty member was pointing out that many education-based GSL projects fail to take the professional development of local students into account.

Several faculty provided evidence from the student–community interactions they had observed to redefine conventional notions of "service." That is, the closeness of the relationship between students and community partners was, for some, a service in itself, in the sense of creating friendships and the effort to connect. Participant 22 described how she struggled with the local community organization's emphasis on relationships as service, whereas she and her students had a much more traditional notion of service as an activity with a more tangible impact. She said, "So, is it service to be a guest in somebody's home? That's what's so hard for our students to conceive of . . . but [community organization director's] conception of service and I think where that program is headed is that service isn't a thing that you do by 'now I'm doing it, now I'm not.' It's much more a disposition, or an attitude, or an intention."

For faculty members whose GSL program included a research component, efforts were often made to avoid the replication of conventional research methodologies in which data is extracted from communities and efforts are not necessarily made to use findings in a mutually beneficial way. Participant 21 clearly described the capacity to "contribute to the information deficit" in the host country as an overarching objective of his program. This nonextractive approach to research is related to the principle of nonpaternalism, expressed by several faculty members. Participants were aware and reflective about the detrimental impacts of assuming the natural right to be present and intervene in a marginalized community. For example, several participants were critical of the notion of "charity," with Participant 9 particularly concerned about the risk of an "uneven, patron–client relationship" developing through the provision of financial or in-kind gifts. A faculty member whose students engaged in support work at a remote clinic in an African country lamented the "colonial" behavior of doctors who believed they had the right to conduct natural experiments on the population, and said he worked hard to prevent his students from replicating a model of "cowboy doctors." A faculty member working with Native American communities works hard to incorporate local authors into her syllabus to undermine the conventional notion that descendants of White Europeans hold more valid knowledge.

Finally, faculty members were keen to instill humility in their students, in the sense of having them recognize the limited impact they could themselves have directly on the community partner organization and its members. Several emphasized their efforts to show students that the project existed before and will continue to exist after their short-term stay in the host community. This lesson was not intended to make students feel disempowered, but rather to learn to appreciate the sustainability of the community organization and the partnership.

Clashing Institutional and GSL Norms

What becomes apparent from the above discussion of faculty members' community engagement principles is that they do not always mesh with common values held by institutions of higher education toward faculty professional development or toward pedagogy. Indeed, faculty members (particularly those at research-focused institutions) usually face significant pressure to "publish or perish" and to produce quantifiable measures of the impacts of their teaching that deprivilege the interpersonal, transformative, ethical, and critical learning achieved through GSL courses. As a male pretenure faculty member told us, "You can't do global engagement because you can't get tenure that way." When faculty members' motivations to participate in GSL and their community engagement principles

are counternormative vis-à-vis institutional values, they experience dissonance—defined here by the authors as an inconsistency between the institutional values to which faculty are expected to adhere and the principles they value more and seek to promote through their GSL work.

Although several of our participants described that their department or college was supportive of GSL work, or held a service-oriented attitude, or believed their institutions were moving in a progressive direction toward promoting GSL learning experiences, not all enjoyed a supportive environment. Participant 25 said that her department head had advised her not to continue pursuing her international work after returning from a GSL trip abroad. Even though as an individual the administrator understood and supported her cause, she described his intentions as "protecting me from naysayers and people who would say that I wasn't doing what I was 'supposed to be doing.'"

Faculty perspectives on whether their GSL programs could contribute to their ability to get tenure were mixed and depended on a series of factors such as discipline, subjective aspects of the institutional environment, and the characteristics of their individual tenure case. One faculty member who developed his program as a postdoc felt that the experience gave him a leg up on the increasingly competitive academic job market. He felt that his GSL work had given him an "added layer of professional and institutional skills and know-how." However, more commonly, faculty described how they were admonished during their pretenure period or otherwise reluctant to pursue work that appeared to defy the bounds of "traditional scholarship," as several put it. Likely as a result of this lack of support, faculty described feeling without a mentor, guidance, or support in their work. As Participant 2 said, "I am kind of winging it right now. . . . It's not really grounded in best practices, you know?" Another who had run a GSL course for 8 years said, "I'm in a position where I could still use mentors. . . . Especially 7 years back, if I had had a mentor of my own, it would have been helpful and instructive."

The institutional clash is also sometimes ideological, as several faculty described. A long-term advocate and practitioner of GSL said that his programs "move outside of ideological precommitments" such as neoliberal capitalism and American exceptionalism, and thus inevitably meet up with an unspoken but strong resistance. He described his GSL work as "a different idea of a preferred future" to the university's own vision. The value clash between GSL and institutions of higher education is sometimes more fine-grained. For example, a faculty member whose GSL course integrated his teaching with his international research portfolio was critiqued by his college for the appearance of seeking institutional resources for his research when they argued he should have been seeking external grants instead. In this way, the entire teaching element of his program held very little visibility and was deprioritized by the institution. The lack of institutional support led some faculty to despondence over the future of their programs, which often rest on them as individuals. Participant 24 said, with respect to his GSL course, "If I didn't teach it, it would die." This problem is exacerbated by the fact that faculty time often goes uncompensated, particularly at R1 universities in the United States, where summer teaching sometimes goes unpaid.

Overcoming Dissonance Arising From Clashing Values

We also highlight another, understudied dimension of dissonance arising from clashing values, namely, that many faculty lack awareness of theoretical frameworks to guide their actions in both GSL teaching and research when they encounter ethical dilemmas while attempting to pursue the community engagement principles described above. Several faculty expressed difficulty finding a theoretical framework that could guide a reconciliation of these forms of dissonance. Participant 14 said, "I have no theories I draw on; I'm a novice at this." Participant 22 said, "I have to confess I'm not a theory-driven practitioner. And I don't think about theories. I think about my experience. I'm much more inductive in my work." These comments further point to the need for institutions to provide not only practical but theoretical orientation for faculty engaging in GSL work. Nevertheless, although unable to transform the barriers embedded in conventional institutional norms, values, and structures, faculty participants expressed a deep commitment to a set of GSL principles and were intrinsically motivated to devise strategies to overcome these barriers in their research and teaching. We find that they are building a new, emergent, transformative theory of GSL

ethics that forms the new set of values and principles with which they can realize their motivations and vision for a transformative approach to community engagement.

The strategies that emerged from this transformative theory of GSL ethics are listed in the second column of Table 5 and juxtaposed against the conventional institutional norms listed in the first column.

Table 5 illustrates the strategies that our faculty participants have adopted to overcome the dissonance they experience as a clash between institutional and GSL values and norms with respect to their teaching and research. The strategies also reflect their deep commitment to the principles described in Table 4.

With respect to pedagogy, several strategies are particularly innovative and merit further discussion. One is the decentralization of instructional authority with students. Participant 11 said, "I followed the idea of learning being reciprocal, and being a give and take between professor and student. And that you're learning from your students." Participant 24 said, "One of my phrases is, 'it's a short walk to the edge of knowledge.' And so, students realize that they are part of [a] knowledge generation cycle. Right away, in my class." Similarly, the director of a student learning exchange program in which U.S. and African students work together on a research project said, "There was this blurring of lines between who's learning, who's teaching, who's the program for, who's serving who in a fantastic way." In this way, faculty members promote the principle of mutuality in their pedagogy, similar to how it informs their community engagement.

Another interesting pedagogical innovation these instructors offer was a radical new form of reflection. Critical reflection methods were central to a significant number of the faculty members' pedagogies. This critical approach included reflection on the right to hold knowledge about others. A professor whose GSL work engages with the Indigenous communities said, "Even

Table 5. Transformative GSL Ethics

	Conventional institutional norms	Transformative GSL ethics
Research	• Intellectual property • Sole-authored publications • Right to "discover" all worldly data	• Public knowledge generation • Student/community coauthors • Critiques the "right to knowledge" and to reflect • Embraces researcher subjectivity • Participatory research methods • Students as research subjects (SOTL*) • Studying GSL as development process as well as pedagogy • Publishing outside disciplinary journals
Teaching	• Single discipline • Centralized classroom authority • Student at center of reflection practice • Course impact evaluated within semester	• Interdisciplinary • Decentralization of instructional authority with students • Program design and facilitation shared with communities • Deeply critical and reflective • Long-term learning objectives and evaluation methods • Transformational learning

Note. *Scholarship of teaching and learning.

knowledge itself can't just always be had for the sake of knowledge being a good thing. Some knowledge is not appropriate for everybody. And some knowledge you simply don't have the right to." In this way their pedagogy promoted the community engagement principles of community partnership, nonpaternalism, and humility.

Finally, their pedagogy promoted transformational learning, which requires a longer term timeframe than most approaches to student learning assessment and evaluation. GSL faculty expressed awareness that their learning objectives were incongruent with conventional pedagogy. Participant 3 said,

> If you're a faculty member who really cares about teaching and about students having an empowering, transformational learning [experience], then [throughout] your journey as an educator you're constantly experimenting . . . you're looking for the best way for students to not only learn the material but also to grow and to become people who care about the world and who feel empowered to act in that world.

She went on to say that this form of learning is often not manifest until long after the course has been completed. Faculty participants face obvious logistical constraints in measuring transformational learning both contemporaneously and into the future after the students have completed the course. Some techniques they cited during interviews included reentry courses, alumni clubs, and peer evaluation, although most expressed dissatisfaction with their capacity (i.e., time and level of resources) to carry out these different forms of evaluation.

Faculty also developed strategies to overcome the dissonance caused by clashing values between institutional research expectations and GSL work. A solution to the lack of mentorship was to develop on-campus networks built on strong interpersonal connections to pursue GSL work. Participant 14 said that GSL faculty and administrators "find each other and connect . . . organically and informally. And they really have depended on all of us taking the initiative to connect with each other, as needed, both for advice and to work out some of these concrete details." Another constructs a document synthesizing students' reflective writing and circulates it around the university (as well as to the community partner organization abroad). This helps garner support and build new relationships.

Another strategy faculty use to overcome the clash between institutional preference for "traditional scholarship" in the promotion and tenure process has been to integrate GSL work into their research agenda. Several described the scholarship of GSL teaching and learning as an emergent research stream that contributes to their broader scholarly portfolio. Some disciplines are more amenable to this approach than others. For example, Participant 14 was able to "make a research project about the [GSL] project—about the teaching project, about experiential learning, about what happened to the students, about these ethical dilemmas and engagements and controversies that happened in the course of our collaboration with these institutions." Another faculty member whose college pushed him to keep his research and teaching as separate as possible said he persisted despite the lack of institutional support and now feels that his research program is "incredibly rich" and "has grown substantially." Some, however, face difficulty overcoming this boundary, such as a faculty member in the humanities who says that his main professional priority is to publish his own poetry, which has no clear relationship to a GSL course. Some faculty work around this problem when it arises by simply publishing their GSL work in the disciplinary journals of the GSL field, which more than one participant had begun to pursue. This approach comes with its own challenges, principally feeling like an "outsider" in the field, as Participant 2 described; yet learning a new literature is a surmountable obstacle that many faculty were willing to undertake. Participant 22 described mastering the literature on GSL, which felt "totally outside of [her] comfort zone," through which she succeeded in obtaining a large grant that supported her GSL.

Discussion

We found that faculty participants in our study bring to their GSL work a rich array of motivations that fall under the dimensions of pedagogical impact, development ethics, personal growth and identity, professional development, and even unanticipated opportunity. The five dimensions emerging from our study are consistent with previous research, in that faculty motivations to adopt and sustain GSL teaching and

research depend on complex relationships between various factors, including personal, institutional, professional, communal, and student (Demb & Wade, 2012; Ma & Mun, 2019). Importantly, our study contributes a nuanced and textured understanding of how faculty respond to the factors that motivate them to engage in GSL; we found that faculty responded to dissonance in order to *transform* their teaching, research, and *relationships* with students, colleagues, and community partners. This transformative relational thread was informed and guided by a set of principles and strategies for teaching and research that we represent here as an emergent theory of "transformative GSL ethics." Under the aegis of principles reflected in the transformative GSL ethics, faculty sought to develop relationships with students and community members that were mutually beneficial, community-needs driven, longer term, nonpaternalistic, communicative, and characterized by cultural humility. However, as noted in the findings, we also identified times when faculty members did not pursue or embody the transformative GSL ethics, often due to a lack of personal preparation and sufficient institutional support to embark on GSL work. These quotes and examples illustrate shortcomings and missteps that can potentially harm communities, students, faculty themselves, and other partners when a transformative GSL ethics is not pursued in moments of ethical dilemma and dissonance.

Consistent with literature in GSL (Hartman et al., 2018; Hawes et al., 2021), findings from this study indicate that faculty maintain deep community engagement principles that reflect how intrinsically important this work is for their values and belief systems and provide a compelling rationale for how they understand their teaching and research roles within higher education. However, because this deep commitment to GSL often clashes with institutional structures, norms, and expectations, they experience a tremendous amount of dissonance that leads to personal isolation and professional ethical dilemmas that are difficult to reconcile and often put them in conflict with deeply ingrained institutional or departmental traditions. Notably, even with the dissonance, they continue to search for ways to enhance their knowledge of GSL and connect with like-minded faculty or senior colleagues who might support what is looked upon as counternormative and distracting from the "real" rigorous teaching and research work expected of them.

These concerns are also shared more widely by GSL scholars and practitioners who value both the transformative potential and promise of GSL pedagogy while problematizing and explicitly identifying the potential harm to students, staff, and community members if the pedagogy and practice are not theoretically informed, well planned, and adequately resourced (Bringle et al., 2011; Crabtree, 2008, 2013; Hartman & Kiely, 2014; Hartman & Chaire, 2014; Hartman & Kiely, 2014, 2017; Hartman et al., 2018; Hawes et al., 2021; Kiely 2004, 2005; Kiely & Sexsmith, 2018; Larsen, 2015; Simpson, 2004; Tiessen & Huish, 2014). Given the clash between the norms and expectations that have historically driven the professionalization of disciplines in higher education, the counternormative nature of GSL (Clayton & Ash, 2004; Hartman et al., 2018) makes it a risky educational innovation for faculty to pursue. Such tensions can be intensified by the dissonance caused by unfamiliarity with international contexts (Bringle & Hatcher, 2011; Kiely, 2005). The faculty in our study experience distinct forms of dissonance, as they reconcile their commitment to both students and community partners in their GSL teaching and research as well as their beliefs and principles that are often in conflict with institutional norms and policies. Importantly, and in light of Bringle and Hatcher's (2011) bold contention that "subsequent [ISL] research will demonstrate an *intensification effect*—that ISL will have the capacity to intensify any previously documented outcome from study abroad, service-learning, and international education in isolation" (p. 22), our study would suggest that the same "intensification effect" is pertinent to faculty who are engaged in GSL as well.

The principles and strategies that emerged from our study, albeit aspirationally transformational, hold parallels to other approaches and models in the literature on engaged pedagogies, including Two-Eyed Seeing, Indigenizing pedagogies, the SOFAR model, and potentially others. Although a full comparison is beyond the scope of this article (see recommendations for further study below), some parallels merit mention. The Two-Eyed Seeing approach to science education—the teaching of Western and Indigenous approaches to science in tandem without comparing or using one view to critique the other—shares with the trans-

formative GSL ethics an inherent critique of, and challenge to, the pedagogical norms and conventions of Western higher education (Hatcher et al., 2009). Furthermore, this approach similarly employs these challenges to colonial Western educational conventions with the aim of achieving transformative education, or the holistic academic and personal development of students (Hatcher et al., 2009). Parallels to the transformative GSL ethics also appear in the decolonizing approach of the Indigenizing pedagogies suggested by Louie et al. (2017), which include the negotiation of and efforts to minimize power hierarchies between faculty and students, as well as reflective exercises that support students in identifying and connecting to their own positionalities vis-à-vis the colonial experience. We see the transformative GSL ethics as a set of guiding principles emerging through praxis by GSL scholars at a critical moment for the field, which is reckoning with the Whiteness and coloniality of historical and extractive forms of this work (Macdonald & Vorstermans, 2022; Macdonald et al., 2022). We encourage GSL scholars to continue pursuing and seeking guidance from these decolonizing and Indigenizing strategies, yet wish to reiterate Tuck and Yang's (2012) call to move forward with this work through critical pedagogies that avoid the recolonizing effects of the "metaphorization of decolonization."

Our findings also share elements of the SOFAR model conceptualized by Bringle et al. (2009). This study adds to this literature by contributing to our understanding of the intrinsic motivations, challenges, and strategies faculty undertake to create and maintain transformational relationships with students and community members as a response to dissonance between their guiding principles and institutional norms and values. This dissonance underscores the need for institutional change, thereby affirming Bringle et al.'s (2009, p. 15) recommended extension of the SOFAR model from dyadic partnerships to social networks. More specifically, Bringle et al. recommended the model be applied to better understand the development of social networks capable of influencing culture change in institutions with norms, values, and policies supportive of transformative partnerships that are in alignment with GSL ethics. We expand on this recommendation in our conclusions below by highlighting existing and desired future social networks for GSL instructors.

Given the findings of this study, higher education institutions, centers for community engagement, and community engagement professionals who offer programs and training opportunities for faculty to adopt GSL should take into consideration the dissonance that faculty experience when confronted with institutional norms and values that conflict with their deeply held principles (Kiely & Sexsmith, 2018). Given the principles underpinning a transformative GSL ethics and the potential suggested by this study that faculty motivated to engage in GSL will experience dissonance vis-à-vis institutional norms and structures, the design of faculty development programs would have to go beyond service-learning course design, teaching, and research. Rather, such programs should support cohorts of GSL faculty, particularly those with a social justice perspective, in becoming change agents who critically reflect on their dissonance and learn to work together to develop strategies to address and transform the institutional norms, policies, and structures that run counter to their transformative GSL ethics (Kiely & Sexsmith, 2018; O'Meara, 2013). The practical implications for faculty development programs and community engagement professionals who choose to approach the learning process from a transformative GSL ethic—one that may in fact challenge institutional culture, norms, and values guiding teaching and research—are profound (Kiely & Sexsmith, 2018).

Recommendations for Future Research

Several future research directions stem from this research. We believe that research with university and college administrators analyzing their own value systems regarding community engagement, and whether and how they fit or clash with dominant institutional values, would be essential for better understanding how, when, and in what circumstances the dissonance we found between faculty and their institutions emerges. Second, we recommend cross-national research on faculty experiences in GSL and their potential incongruence with institutional values and expectations as a means of better assessing how these factors interact, and to improve our understanding of the potential uniqueness of the U.S. context described here (see, for example, Ma & Mun, 2019). Third, to complement a growing body of research on faculty motivation and learning (Clayton et al., 2013),

there is a need for research and theory development on how GSL faculty learn to address and transform institutional barriers (i.e., policies, norms, structures) in ways informed by transformative, critical, and decolonial perspectives. In particular, recent scholarship on decolonial, Indigenous, and Two-Eyed pedagogies (e.g., Bartlett et al., 2012; Hatcher et al., 2009; Louie et al., 2017; Pratt & Danyluk, 2017) highlights promising disruptive decolonial practices and spaces within institutions of higher education that have potential to support and be supported by transformative GSL ethics. Finally, we propose that researchers systematically investigate how race and ethnicity may shape faculty members' pursuit of GSL work, given barriers to professional advancement for faculty members from BIPOC communities.

Study Limitations

This study faces several limitations. As with other qualitative studies using purposive sampling methods, the views expressed by our participants should not be taken as representative of or generalizable to a broader group of faculty who perform GSL work. Rather, our study was designed using theoretical sampling to capture the potential variation of responses according to gender, institution type, stage of academic progress, and field of study (cf. Gerson & Damaske, 2020). Other social factors such as race or ethnicity were not systematically captured in our sample, and how they shape responses to the research questions may not be fully assessed here. Moreover, our study was limited to university or college professors based at U.S. institutions. Our findings, particularly related to clashes between personal and institutional values, are shaped by professional environments and trends in U.S. academia and are not representative of the experiences of faculty in other Western and Global South contexts. Finally, our data should be interpreted as a consistent representation of prepandemic conditions for faculty GSL work and does not reflect the disruptions to global engagement imposed by the COVID pandemic.

Conclusion

Given these legitimate concerns affirmed by this study, there is a nascent movement in GSL that holds promise for building networks of faculty and practitioners in support of more robust GSL teaching, research, and interinstitutional structures to address these concerns. For example, apart from the necessary support and resources from individual higher education institutions and professional associations such as the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement, the Engagement Scholarship Consortium, the Forum on Education Abroad, NAFSA (Association of International Educators), and AAC&U (American Association of Colleges and Universities), we see the continued gathering of colleagues in the Global North and South who support initiatives to strengthen faculty and practitioners' ability to design and facilitate high quality GSL as a positive development for the field and as a longer term approach to addressing faculty concerns raised in our study.

Networks that promote knowledge sharing, professional development activities, and convenings that explicitly address the complex, collaborative, and community-driven development approach to serving communities and addressing problems (human rights, health care, oppression, immigration, climate change, etc.) across an expanded view of geographic, structural, and contextual borders are avenues to positively influence the quality of learning and relationships developed through GSL (Hartman et al., 2018; Kiely & Ma, 2021). Examples of such networks include the Community-Based Global Learning Collaborative, the Talloires Network, and the Global University Network for Innovation. In addition, the principles of Fair Trade Learning (Hartman & Chaire, 2014) provide GSL faculty, practitioners, administrators, students, and community partners a set of ethical guidelines for the coconstruction of learning outcomes focused on critical approaches to reflection, global citizenship, intercultural learning, and cultural humility (Hartman et al., 2018). These principles focus reflection explicitly on exploring, negotiating, and transforming positionalities, privilege, and relations of power with GSL participants and partners to build more equitable relationships grounded in mutual understanding, respect, and trust in a healthy and safe environment in order to achieve high quality learning and community impact (Hartman et al., 2018; Tiessen & Heron, 2012; Tiessen & Huish, 2014).

Given that GSL faculty and practitioners in higher education institutions are often tasked with planning and implementing GSL programs in isolation, with little background

and training in international development, such a community of practice with guiding principles is essential. Such networks can work together to share knowledge and provide resources to support faculty development, common standards, data collection, convenings, and knowledge networks, to help navigate the inevitable tensions that come with GSL work in higher education. However, the capacity of these networks to generate valued resources rests on the strengths of individual faculty members to engage in critical self-reflection on their motivations, preparation, and underlying principles for performing community-engaged work. Moreover, the collective success of the field requires that both faculty and their institutions make sufficient time and resources available to invest in learning and emulating GSL best practices, such as Fair Trade Learning. It is our hope that the development of a GSL network will help ensure benefits to students and community partners and assist faculty in reconciling the various forms of dissonance they confront in their home institutions and the communities they work with.

About the Authors

Kathleen Sexsmith *is assistant professor of rural sociology and women's, gender, and sexuality studies at Penn State University. Her research focuses on occupational justice concerns in U.S. agricultural industries, gender and sustainable agricultural development in Latin America, and community-engaged pedagogy and research. She received her PhD from Cornell University in 2017.*

Richard Kiely *is associate vice provost for engagement and land-grant affairs and the director of academic initiatives in the David M. Einhorn Center for Community Engagement. Richard's research focuses on institutional models that foster sustainable campus–community partnerships, faculty development in community engagement, and the learning processes and outcomes that result from participation in community-engaged learning and research. In 2002, Richard received his PhD from Cornell University.*

References

Abes, E. S., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 9*(1), 5–17. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0009.101

Aramburuzabala, P., Mcllrath, L., & Opazo, H. (Eds.). (2019). *Embedding service learning in European higher education: Developing a culture of civic engagement*. Routledge.

Banerjee, M., & Hausafus, C. O. (2007). Faculty use of service-learning: Perceptions, motivations, and impediments for the human sciences. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 14*(1), 32–45. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0014.103

Barreneche, G., Meyer, M., & Gross, S. (2018). Reciprocity and partnership: How do we know it is working? In B. Berkey, C. Meixner, P. Green, & E. Eddins (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing faculty development in service-learning/community engagement: Exploring intersections, frameworks, and models of practice* (pp. 241–261). Stylus.

Bartlett, C., Marshall, M., & Marshall, A. (2012). Two-Eyed Seeing and other lessons learned within a co-learning journey of bringing together Indigenous and mainstream knowledges and ways of knowing. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences, 2*(4), 331–340. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13412-012-0086-8

Berkey, B., Meixner, C., Green, P. M., & Eddins, E. A. (2018). *Reconceptualizing faculty development in service-learning/community engagement: Exploring intersections, frameworks, and models of practice* (1st ed.). Stylus Publishing.

Blanchard, L. W., Strauss, R. P., & Webb, L. (2012). Engaged scholarship at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: Campus integration and faculty development. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 16*(1), 97–128. https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/919/918

Bringle, R., Clayton, P., & Price, M. (2009). Partnerships in service learning and civic engagement. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service Learning & Civic Engagement, 1*(1), 1–20. https://hdl.handle.net/1805/4580

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2011). International service learning. In R. Bringle, J. A. Hatcher, & S. G. Jones (Eds.), *International service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research* (pp. 3–28). Stylus Publications.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., & Jones, S. G. (Eds.). (2011). *International service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research*. Stylus Publications.

Britt, L. L. (2012). Why we use service-learning: A report outlining a typology of three approaches to this form of communication pedagogy. *Communication Education, 61*(1), 80–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2011.632017

Chism, M., Palmer, M., & Price, M. (2013). Investigating faculty development for service learning. In P. Clayton, R. Bringle, & J. Hatcher (Eds.), *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment: Vol. 2A. Students and faculty* (pp. 187–214). Stylus.

Clayton, P., & Ash, S. (2004). Shifts in perspective: Capitalizing on the counter-normative nature of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 11*(1), 59–70. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0011.106

Clayton, P. H., Hess, G. R., Jaeger, A. J., Jameson, J. K., & McGuire, L. E. (2013). Theoretical perspectives and research on faculty learning in service learning. In P. Clayton, R. Bringle, & J. Hatcher (Eds.), *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment: Vol. 2A. Students and faculty* (pp. 245–278). Stylus.

Cooper, J. R. (2014). Ten years in the trenches: Faculty perspectives on sustaining service-learning. *Journal of Experiential Education, 37*(4), 415–428. https://doi.org/10.1177/1053825913513721

Crabtree, R. D. (2008). Theoretical foundations for international service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 15*(1), 18–36. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0015.102

Crabtree, R. D. (2013). The intended and unintended consequences of international service-learning. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 17*(2), 43–66. https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1042

Demb, A., & Wade, A. (2012). Reality check: Faculty involvement in outreach and engagement. *Journal of Higher Education, 83*(3), 337–366. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2012.11777247

Epprecht, M. (2004). Work–study abroad courses in international and development studies: Some ethical and pedagogical issues. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies, 25*(4), 687–706. https://doi.org/10.1080/02255189.2004.9669009

Erasmus, M. (2011). A South African perspective on North American service-learning. In R. Bringle, J. Hatcher, & S. Jones (Eds.), *Research perspectives in international service-learning* (Vol. 1, pp. 347–371). Stylus.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D. (1999). Where's the learning in service-learning? Jossey-Bass.

Furco, A. (1996). Service-learning: A balanced approach to experiential education. In *Expanding boundaries: Serving and learning* (pp. 2–6). Corporation for National Service.

Furco, A., & Norvell, K. (2019). What is service learning? Making sense of the pedagogy and practice. In P. Aramburuzabala, L. Mcllrath, & H. Opazo (Eds.), *Embedding service learning in European higher education: Developing a culture of civic engagement* (pp. 13–35). Routledge.

Gerson, K., & Damaske, S. (2020). *The science and art of interviewing*. Oxford University Press.

Hartman, E., & Chaire, C. (2014). Market incentives and international volunteers: The development and evaluation of fair trade learning. *Journal of Public Scholarship in Higher Education, 4*, 31–56.

Hartman, E., & Kiely, R. (2014). A critical global citizenship. In P. M. Green & M. Johnson (Eds.), *Crossing boundaries: Tension and transformation in international service-learning* (1st ed., pp. 215-242). Stylus Publishing.

Hartman, E., & Kiely, R. (2014). Pushing boundaries: Introduction to the global service-learning special section. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 21*(1), 55–63. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0021.105

Hartman, E., & Kiely, R. (2017). Global service learning: Definition, theoretical lineages, and application efforts. In C. Dolgon, T. D. Mitchell, & T. K. Eatman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of service learning and community engagement* (Cambridge Handbooks in Psychology; pp. 321–334). Cambridge University Press.

Hartman, E., Kiely, R., Friedrichs, J., & Boettcher, C. (2018). *Community-based global learning: The theory and practice of ethical engagement at home and abroad*. Stylus Publishing.

Hatcher, A., Bartlett, C., Marshall, A., & Marshall, M. (2009). Two-Eyed Seeing in the classroom environment: Concepts, approaches, and challenges. *Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 9*(3), 141–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/14926150903118342

Hawes, J. K., Johnson, R., Payne, L., Ley, C., Grady, C. A., Domenech, J., Evich, C. D., Kanach, A., Koeppen, A., Roe, K., Caprio, A., Puente Castro, J., LeMaster, P., & Blatchley, E. R. (2021). Global service-learning: A systematic review of principles and practices. *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement, 9*(1). https://doi.org/10.37333/001c.31383

Hou, Su-I., & Wilder, S. (2015). Changing pedagogy: Faculty adoption of service-learning: Motivations, barriers, and strategies among service-learning faculty at a public research institution. *SAGE Open, 5*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015572283

Huish, R., & Tiessen, R. (2013). Afterword. There should be nothing experimental about experiential learning: From globetrotting to global citizenship. In R. Tiessen & R. Huish (Eds.), *Globetrotting or global citizenship? Perils and potential of international experiential learning* (pp. 280–287). University of Toronto Press. https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442616707-016

Katz Jameson, J. K., Clayton, P. H., Jaeger, A. J., & Bringle, R. G. (2012). Investigating faculty learning in the context of community-engaged scholarship. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 18*(2), 40–55. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0018.204

Kendell, J. C., & Associates. (1990). *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service* (Vol. II). National Society for Internships and Experiential Education

Kiely, R. (2004). A chameleon with a complex: Searching for transformation in international service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 10*(2), 5-20. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0010.201

Kiely, R. (2005). A transformative learning model for service-learning: A longitudinal case study. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 12*(1), 5–22. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0012.101

Kiely, R. (2007). Service learning as reflective practice: A faculty development model. In P. Horrigan (Ed.), *Extending our reach: Voices of service-learning* (pp. 64–71). Cornell University.

Kiely, R., & Hartman, E. (2015). Introduction: Special section on global service-learning: Reflexivity in research: Reflecting on the borders and boundaries of the GSL field. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning, 22*(1), 48–51. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0022.104

Kiely, R., & Ma Hok Ka, C. (2021). Serving communities through internationalization. In D. Deardorff, H. De Wit, B. Leask, & H. Charles (Eds.). *The Sage handbook of international higher education* (2nd ed., pp. 360-375). Stylus Publishing.

Kiely, R., & Sexsmith, K. (2018). Innovative considerations in faculty development in service-learning and community engagement: New perspectives for the future. In B. Berkey, C. Meixner, P. Green, & E. Eddins (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing faculty development in service-learning/community engagement: Exploring intersections, frameworks and models of practice* (pp. 283–314). Stylus.

Landorf, H., & Doscher, S. P. (2015). Defining global learning at Florida International University. *Diversity and Democracy 18*(3), 24-25. https://goglobal.fiu.edu/_assets/docs/doscher--landorf-2015_definition-of-global-learning.pdf

Langdon, J., & Agyeyomah, C. (2014). Critical hyper-reflexivity and challenging power: Pushing past the dichotomy of employability and good global citizenship in development studies experiential learning contexts. In R. Tiessen & R. Huish (Eds.). *Globetrotting or global citizenship? Perils and potential of international experiential learning* (pp. 43–70). University of Toronto Press.

Larsen, M. A. (Ed.). (2015). *International service learning: Engaging host communities*. Routledge.

Louie, D. W., Poitras-Pratt, Y., Hanson, A. J., & Ottmann, J. (2017). Applying Indigenizing principles of decolonizing methodologies in university classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education/Revue canadienne d'enseignement supérieur, 47*(3), 16–33. https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.v47i3.187948

Macdonald, K., & Vorstermans, J. (2022). Introduction to special section: Inequitable ruptures, rupturing inequity: Theorizing COVID-19 and racial injustice impacts on international service learning pedagogy, frameworks and policies. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 28*(2), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.3998/mjcsl.3209

Macdonald, K., Vorstermans, J., Hartman, E., & Kiely, R. (2022). Reflexivity and relationality in global service learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 28*(2), Article 5. https://doi.org/10.3998/mjcsl.3212

Ma Hok Ka, C., & La Suk Mun, S. (2019). Faculty experience of service-learning pedagogy at a Hong Kong University. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 23*(3), 37–53. https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1519

McMillan, J., & Stanton, T. K. (2014). "Learning service" in international contexts: Partnership-based service-learning and research in Cape Town, South Africa. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 21*(1), 64-78. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0021.106

Miller-Young, J., Dean, Y., Rathburn, M., Pettit, J., Underwood, M., Gleeson, J., Lexier, R., Calvert, V., & Clayton, P. (2015). Decoding ourselves: An inquiry into faculty learning about reciprocity in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 22*(1), 32–47. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0022.103

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. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0022.105

O'Meara, K. (2011). Inside the panopticon: Studying academic reward systems. In J. C. Smart & M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 26, pp. 161–220). Springer.

O'Meara, K. (2013). Research on faculty motivations for service-learning and community engagement. In P. Clayton, R. Bringle, & J. Hatcher (Eds.), *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment: Vol. 2A. Students and faculty* (pp. 215–243). Stylus.

O'Meara, K., & Niehaus, E. (2009). Service-learning is . . . : How faculty explain their practice. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 16*(1), 17–32. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0016.102

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.) Sage Publications.

Pratt, Y. P., & Danyluk, P. J. (2017). Learning what schooling left out: Making an Indigenous case for critical service-learning and reconciliatory pedagogy within teacher education. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue canadienne de l'éducation, 40*(1), 1–29. https://journals.sfu.ca/cje/index.php/cje-rce/article/view/2349

Ryan, G. W., & Bernard, H. R. (2000). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed., pp. 769–802). Sage Publications.

Service-Learning 2000 Center. (1996). *The service-learning 2000 quadrant*. Stanford University.

Simpson, K. (2004). "Doing development": The gap year, volunteer tourists and a popular practice of development. *Journal of International Development, 16*(5), 681–692. https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.1120

Stoecker, R., & Tryon, E. A. (2009). *The unheard voices: Community organizations and service learning*. Temple University Press.

Swords, A., & Kiely, R. (2010). Beyond pedagogy: Service learning as movement building in higher education. *Journal of Community Practice, 18*(2–3), 148–170. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705422.2010.487253

Tapia, M. N. (2007). La pedagogia aprendizaje-servicio, un estado de la cuestion. In D. Filmus, I. Hernaiz, M. N. Tapia, & P. J. Elicegui (Eds.), *Antologia 1997–2007: Seminarios interNaciónales: Aprendizaje y Servicio Solidario* (pp. 74–79). Ministerio de Educación, Ciencia y Tecnología.

Taylor, M. J. (2009). Student learning in Guatemala: An untenured faculty perspective on international service learning and public good. *Journal of Geography, 108*(3), 132–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221340903133323

Tiessen, R., & Heron, B. (2012). Volunteering in the developing world: The perceived impacts of Canadian youth. *Development in Practice, 22*(1), 444–456. https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2012.630982

Tiessen, R., & Huish, R. (Eds.). (2014). *Globetrotting or global citizenship? Perils and potential of international experiential learning*. University of Toronto Press.

Tilley-Lubbs, G. A. (2009). Good intentions pave the way to hierarchy: A retrospective autoethnographic approach. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 16*(1), 59–68. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0016.105

Tonkin, H. (Ed.). (2004). *Service-learning across cultures: Promise and achievement*. International Partnership for Service-Learning and Leadership.

Tonkin, H. (2011). A research agenda for international service learning. In R. G. Bringle, J. A. Hatcher, & S. G. Jones (Eds.), *International service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research* (pp. 191–224). Stylus.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 1*(1), 1–40. https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/18630

Wade, A., & Demb, A. (2009). A conceptual model to explore faculty community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *15*(2), 5–16. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0015.201

Welch, M., & Plaxton-Moore, S. (2017). Faculty development for advancing community engagement in higher education: Current trends and future directions. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *21*(2), 131–166. https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/1333

Whitehead, D. (2015). Global service learning: Addressing the big challenges. *Diversity and Democracy*, *18*(3), 8–11.