ORIGINAL ARTICLE

WILEY · ACTFL
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON THE
TEACHING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Shaping the vision for service-learning in language education

Christelle Palpacuer Lee | Jessie H. Curtis | Mary E. Curran

Challenges

Community-based service-learning emphasizes reciprocity, reflective practice, and ethical community engagement through language. How can this emphasis on collaborative participation open innovative paths for the profession and shape public discourse about language and multilingualism in institutions, in the professions, and in local-global communities?

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

Christelle Palpacuer Lee (EdD, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey) is Assistant Professor of Practice in Language Education, Graduate School of Education, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick.

Jessie Hutchison Curtis (PhD, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey) is Part-Time Lecturer in Language Education, Graduate School of Education, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick.

Mary E. Curran (PhD, University of Wisconsin-Madison) is Associate Professor of Practice in Language Education and Director of Local-Global Partnerships, Graduate School of Education, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick.

Language education has mobilized community-based service-learning's (CBSL) experiential paradigm in the United States and in international settings over the past 20 years, with the goal of enhancing the linguistic and communicative competence of language learners and advancing the intercultural competence that is necessary for global citizens to engage with a diverse world. This integration of language learning with local and online community projects has become an area of innovation that critically and reflectively engages diverse language speakers through collaboration. In this article, we take a holistic and critical approach to advance a language education agenda that emphasizes reflective capacity and translingual and transcultural competence, ultimately to build relationships. We begin by contextualizing this progression within the traditions of communal activity and activism for language rights. Since language use is increasingly intertwined with and shaped by migration and immigration, as well as the availability of technology, we also highlight new possibilities for community engagement through

language. We discuss these implementations of CBSL, their convergences with ACTFL initiatives for prioritizing language education, and future directions for research.

1 | INTRODUCTION

Language education has embraced community-based service-learning (CBSL) as an avenue for language and culture learning beyond the classroom, through authentic engagement (Hellebrandt, Arries, Varona, & Klein, 2003; Hellebrandt & Varona, 1999; Perren & Wurr, 2015; Rabin, 2009; Wurr, 2013; Wurr & Hellebrandt, 2007). CBSL is broadly defined as a "form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development" (Jacoby, 1996, p. 5). Overall, the literature has recognized reflection and reciprocity as key tenets of CBSL (Flower, 2002; Meens, 2014; Mitchell, 2008), forming the basis for the ethical and sustained engagement of higher-education institutions with partner organizations and community stakeholders. This perspective on engagement—one that emphasizes reflection and social action—has become central to language education as the field responds to new and emergent forms of communication, flows of global activity, and (re)organization of social networks (Byram, 2008; Kramsch, 2014). CBSL effectively brings communities together, and its complementarity with language education affords opportunities for participants to communicate and collaborate. In this context, language educators "are in a unique position to lead the movement in service-learning" (Caldwell, 2007, p. 464) by emphasizing and problematizing language in service-learning across programs and courses. In this article, we focus on the challenges and possibilities for language learning in CBSL programs that are grounded in community action and examine the discourse of service as another potential platform for action in the direction of equity.

2 | OVERVIEW OF THE FIELD: CBSL AND LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Recent research in journals such as *Foreign Language Annals, Hispania, TESOL Journal, Theory into Practice,* and the *Michigan Journal for Community-Based Learning* has attested to the complementarity of language education with CBSL. Anthologies and reviews of best practices have further cemented its pedagogical force. For instance, *Construyendo Puentes [Building Bridges]: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Spanish* (Hellebrandt & Varona, 1999) highlighted the groundbreaking impact of ACTFL's World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages (National Standards Collaborative Board, 2015) on language education, mobilizing language education beyond the classroom and emphasizing reflection on "working *with* each other as opposed to learning *about* each other" (Hellebrandt & Varona, 1999, p. 6; emphasis in original). In *Learning the Language of*

Global Citizenship, Perren and Wurr (2015) highlighted the development of rigorous CBSL research in the field of TESOL. This continuing and wide-ranging scholarship attests to the benefits and the potential of CBSL in language education. We welcome the opportunity to reflect on this research in our contribution to the 50th anniversary special issue of *Foreign Language Annals.*

Our literature search for this contribution was iterative. First, using the key word *service-learning,* we searched peer-reviewed scholarship (1998 to present) using the ERIC database and conducted a separate search of our university library databases that included Academic Search Premier and the Modern Language Association (MLA) Directory. These searches yielded thousands of articles, revealing the extent to which connections with communities have been sought and taken up across professions and disciplines, nationally and internationally. This initial search also revealed the multiple approaches to service, such as clinics in the health professions, internships for business and NGOs abroad and at home, and instantiations of local and/or global voluntary work. These initiatives, predicated on an ethic of care, are implemented in a number of programmatic formats and with various aims in mind. We interpret the ubiquity of service-learning as a signal that social actors and professionals support the well-being of communities in an era when social safety nets are too often frayed. Adding a second key word, *language,* dramatically narrowed the results to the hundreds. This process confirmed what researchers have found: While the service-learning literature is extensive, language and language issues form a small segment of the research (Abbott & Lear, 2010; Mitchell, 2008; Rabin, 2009). We interpret this gap as an opportunity for language educators to take a leading role in shaping the public discourse about language and multilingualism in institutions, professions, and communities.

Continuing our search, we located articles in published bibliographies and included frequently cited books. We found that this research could be differentiated by (1) the focal language (e.g., English, French, Spanish) and (2) the participants (e.g., high school students, college students, preservice teachers), in relation to (3) the context (e.g., Spanish as a heritage or second language in the United States, English as a foreign language for international students). We located an emerging area, international service-learning, which combines features of study abroad with community service (Larsen & Searle, 2017; Rauschert & Byram, 2017; Smolcic & Katunich, 2017). This literature deserves a review of its own, bridging the conversation between the literature on CBSL and study abroad scholarship (see Marijuan & Sanz, 2018). We also noted a growing interest in the professions in developing intercultural competence: for example, for delivering appropriate health care and ensuring that diverse communities have access to it (American Public Health Association [APHA], 2015). We hope to engage further in these conversations as a result of the publication of this 50th-anniversary issue. For this review, however, while highlighting these possibilities, we decided to focus on studies grounded in language and discourse about language as social action in local communities.

Apart from structural and programmatic findings, we noted a continuum of possibilities in CBSL research whereby language can explicitly be the focus of an investigation, or along with culture it can form the context for developing students' and preservice teachers' capacities for intercultural communication. We also noted within this continuum that projects for heritage language development have long employed CBSL as a strategy to open pathways for intercultural communication and build equitable relationships (illustrated by Hellebrandt & Varona, 1999, for example). As a result, acknowledging this debt, we begin with an exploration of historical models for community activity that have shaped the evolution of CBSL in higher education.

Looking forward, we take the opportunity to reflect deeper and further on our individual and collaborative practices in CBSL programs. In this overview, we focus on a new frontier, where language, culture, and social action intersect through CBSL. We find that this new frontier is articulated around three pivotal concerns—discursive, programmatic, and pedagogical—and that these

concerns are similar across studies and programs that include and address CBSL. The answers that the community of language educators will provide to these three concerns will shape the future of CBSL as well as our continuing engagement as language experts in national and global conversations. Our efforts in writing this article are grounded in what we know and what we are continuously learning, which also contributes to our growth as leaders and practitioners. With this in mind, we frame the next 50 years of research and practice by considering specifically what service-learning affords with regard to (1) linguistic and cultural development for language students and preservice teachers and (2) social action that emphasizes the common ground where languages and communities intersect.

2.1 | Service-learning: History and orientations

Several models of communal activity have been historically entwined with service-learning that emphasize reciprocal social relationships, embrace education and community action (Bocci, 2015; Mitchell, Donahue, & Young-Law, 2012; Stevens, 2003), and advance civil rights struggles for language and culture rights (DuBord & Kimball, 2016; Leeman, Rabin, & Román-Mendoza, 2011; Rabin, 2011). These community models include the exchange networks of families in the Spanish-speaking Southwest (described by Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1992). A key characteristic of these exchanges is their reciprocity, which according to Vélez-Ibáñez (1988) reflects an "attempt to establish a social relationship on an enduring basis. Whether symmetrical or asymmetrical, the exchange expresses and symbolizes human social interdependence" (p. 142, cited in Moll et al., 1992, p. 134). In other words, reciprocal practices entail serious and sustained obligations among social groups. Such reciprocity forms a model for the social interdependence emphasized in service-learning.

African American social thought and collective initiatives, led by educators and writers such as Anna Julia Cooper and W. E. B. DuBois, have long been concerned with merging education theory and social action. These concerns generated the possibility that education could take place outside a formal classroom, in African American communities, and as a result, early templates for service-learning developed at U.S. black colleges. Experiential education associated with John Dewey, social reform movements associated with Jane Addams of Hull House, transformative education articulated by Jack Mezirow, emancipatory education envisioned by Paolo Freire, and U.S. civil rights movements for cultural citizenship are among the influences that have subsequently shaped community-based learning in higher education (Bocci, 2015; Flower, 2002; Meens, 2014).

Research in heritage language learning and teaching has built on models of language rights activism in heritage language and immigrant communities (Leeman et al., 2011; Rabin, 2011). Rabin (2011) illustrated these connections by describing the life and work of Leonard Covello, an educator and activist who, in the early 20th century, promoted heritage language programs in New York City high schools through students' involvement with their communities. These models, and the scholarship they inspire, share the idea that both academic study and community activity are necessary for a democratic society. In higher education, service-learning courses aim for reciprocity, combining education and community activity, and they may act in solidarity with grassroots language rights movements. These aims may overlap, but are differentiated by the emphasis placed on each. Several reviews of the literature usefully illustrate how reflection and reciprocity, central features that distinguish service-learning from volunteerism (see Jacoby, 1996), have been interpreted along a continuum, from "traditional" to "critical" perspectives. CBSL programs that emphasize academic content can be generally viewed as traditional, while those that emphasize academic content, community engagement, and social change generally align with a critical model (Meens, 2014; Mitchell, 2008). A third strand that draws from Freirean inquiry and dialogue emphasizes critical intercultural inquiry as the basis of collaboration and the redistribution of power (Flower, 2002;

Kozma, 2015). Flower argued that community outreach "calls for an intercultural inquiry that not only seeks diverse rival readings, but constructs multivoiced negotiated meanings in practice" (2002, p. 182). Such a stance includes an understanding of the sociopolitical context for community partnerships; the perspectives of university students, preservice teachers, faculty, and community members; and the systematic exploration of "nested interculturalities" (Avineri, 2015) that participants navigate. As Mitchell (2008) noted, understanding participants' social positions, identities, and trajectories within a broader sociopolitical context is fundamental to the process of "re-imagining" roles and redistributing power in critical service-learning (p. 50).

As we reflect on ACTFL's World-Readiness Standards (henceforth the Standards; National Standards Collaborative Board, 2015) and goal areas for language education through the lens of CBSL, we purposefully emphasize a scholarship of inquiry and collaboration *with* communities and with each other, through language. This critical and intercultural orientation toward equity is reflected in the approach to language pedagogy articulated by Glynn, Wesely, and Wassell (2014). Glynn and colleagues emphasized changing the focus, changing the "arc of the pendulum" (p. 567) of language education. The authors advocated for developing skills that are "broader, deeper, and more firmly rooted in the lives of our students and the realities of the world today" (p. 567). Ultimately, we echo these calls and advocate for building on the work that has been done by many thoughtful and socially engaged educators (Glynn et al., 2014).

2.2 | CBSL and language education

Language use is increasingly intertwined with and shaped by processes of migration and immigration, as well as the availability of communication technology. In addition, language both changes and is changed by the nature and scope of community activity. These global flows impact the way that we teach languages and cultures in CBSL settings and how we prepare language educators to work with diverse students and communities (Kramsch, 2014; Phipps & Levine, 2012). Thus pedagogies based on principles of collaboration and equity and grounded in community have been implemented in a variety of ways, including community-based language education and teacher education projects that commit to building critical cultural awareness. We now turn to CBSL and its relationship to linguistic and cultural development.

2.2.1 | CBSL and linguistic and cultural development

Research has found that linguistic and cultural development hinge in part on access to social contexts for language use. CBSL has had a positive role in expanding such contexts, and in turn, the confidence and motivation of language users (Boyle & Overfield, 1999; Hellebrandt & Varona, 1999; Nelson & Scott, 2008; Pak, 2007; Pellettieri, 2011; Wurr & Hellebrandt, 2007). For instance, using the "willingness to communicate" model, Pellettieri (2011) found that "extended participation in community-based learning, even when required, can promote positive linguistic outcomes that contribute to success in second language acquisition" (p. 293). Studies in second language acquisition that focused specifically on the development of communicative competence through CBSL found that affective variables have a significant role. For instance, in Québec, Hummel (2013) found that the volition to interact with English-speaking communities on the part of French-speaking university students was positively affected by increased linguistic self-confidence following service-learning opportunities. Hummel concluded that "social context as well as social psychological variables such as attitudes and motivation" (p. 67) have an impact on the second language learning process and, when language students are active participants, "positive contacts lead to more language use" (p. 69).

Studies of heritage language learning (e.g., DuBord & Kimball, 2016; Pascual y Cabo, Prada, & Louther Pereira, 2017) have emphasized CBSL as an effective means of collaboration among heritage language speakers, Spanish or English learners, and their community partners. For instance, Pascual y Cabo et al. (2017) showed how a Spanish heritage language course that builds on the rich history of language activism in the United States can create a social space in which bilingualism can be practiced and can consolidate participants' positive views on language activism, bilingualism, and biculturalism. As one participant said, "This experience has taught me a lot about myself and all that I can do as a bilingual student; it makes me think and feel beyond only myself" (p. 80). DuBord and Kimball (2016) described their localized adaptation of ACTFL's 5 Cs (National Standards Collaborative Board, 2015) in a community-based project for English that involved heritage language speakers and Spanish-speaking immigrants. The researchers created a "dialogic communication and problem-solving" framework for assessment that considered problem-solving, listening, adapting ideas and messages based on and in response to others' perspectives, relationship-building, and *confianza* (p. 326). The authors defined problem-posing and solving not as an outcome of individual cognition but as collaboration (pp. 309–311), a view also articulated by Cooks and Scharer (2006). Seeking a holistic approach to assessment, the researchers noted that a predetermined definition of skills "limits the possibilities of the other in interaction to contribute to what those skills mean in and to the interaction, their usefulness in coordinating meaning, and the moral outcome of the conversation" (2006, p. 45). In addition, Du Bord and Kimball (2016) found that university students who had no or minimal prior experiences of service-learning, as well as heritage language speakers, scored higher in problem-solving growth than students who had been previously engaged in service-learning. Such findings question what expectations are associated with performing and reporting outcomes in academic and community settings. In developing the rubric and using it as their instrument in their mixed-methods study, DuBord and Kimball (2016) showed that "the community setting teaches skills that are not generally measured in academic settings" (p. 301). Their call for a more localized approach to CBSL aligned with the findings of Barreneche and Ramos-Flores's (2013) study, in which they examined the possibilities for the further integration of CBSL into language programs. Along with Glisan (2012), Lear and Abbott (2008), Magnan (2008), and Rabin (2011), we have found that CBSL places the Communities goal area at the heart of the language curriculum. In addition, and as emphasized by DuBord and Kimball (2016), CBSL positions language users' diverse expertise in and out of academic contexts at the heart of service and at the forefront of the national debates on the role of language in contemporary society.

2.2.2 | CBSL and teacher preparation

In teacher education, as in other professional training areas (e.g., business, health, or the legal professions), CBSL programs can form a context for practice-based approaches to professional preparation in addition to traditional clinical experiences. Practice-based approaches to teaching, like the clinics and rotation frameworks for the preparation of medical practitioners, aim at deconstructing and reconstructing "high-leverage" and "core instructional practices that better prepare equity-minded teachers" (Bowman & Gottesman, 2017, p. 232). Such an approach is highly localized and implemented through the observation of practices, or "representations of practice" (Grossman et al., 2009, p. 2058), and engagement in collective meaning-making processes. Novice teachers socialized into this type of inquiry gradually engage in practice while being mentored by teacher educators. When applied to CBSL, a practice-based approach to teacher preparation invites preservice teachers to discover community contexts and, through engagement and reflection, to develop localized practices that could be implemented in their classrooms (McDonald, Bowman, & Brayko, 2013). Bowman and

Gottesman (2017) argued that such situated approaches to practice in teacher education should also include a reflection on the forces at play in the shaping of contexts and communities. The two scholars suggested that instructional conversations and reflections based on experiences in the community should include discussions of what was said, heard, and seen in context but should also address the unseen, the untold, and the hidden stories shaped by sociohistorical and global forces.

In this view, practice-oriented CBSL programs can form a context to engage language educators with the linguistic and cultural diversity of their future classrooms and communities (Cooper, 2007; Koerner & Abdul-Tawwab, 2006; Smolcic & Katunich, 2017; Wurr, 2013). Such programs may adopt a funds of knowledge (Gonzáles, Moll, & Amanti, 2005) approach. For instance, Grassi and Armon's (2015) "study away in the local community" confirmed the positive impact of a community-based Spanish-English exchange where preservice teachers made weekly visits to Spanish-speaking families living near the university. The authors concluded that the experience had an important impact on preservice teachers' empathy toward families in the community and their involvement in advocacy for community members. The "study away" framework is a powerful programmatic tool for professionals in general as a localized alternative to study abroad. For instance, Lane, Huffman, Brackney, and Cuddy (2017) described a study away program for nursing students in New York City. They argued that engagement in local health care programs fostered critical reflection and practice-based conversations among nursing students and community members, resulting in nursing students' enhanced multicultural awareness and the development of culturally relevant practices.

Innovative programs and initiatives in the health professions are concerned with ways to provide culturally relevant services to communities and use a CBSL approach to achieve these goals (Kulwicki, Miller, & Schim, 2000; Lu & Corbett, 2011; Vora et al., 2017). These studies have acknowledged the importance of delivering culturally appropriate patient care, recognizing that in the absence of cultural competence among service providers, patients in minoritized communities may not receive or even access care. These researchers found that successful work in the community involves more than linguistic competence—rather, it involves intercultural mediation and engagement with community members, their meanings, practices, and discourses. Several studies have described programmatic innovations for providing culturally relevant and culturally appropriate care, such as programs that include community liaisons (Heisler et al., 2014) or at-home services (Yun et al., 2015). In turn, language educators could share their expertise in offering strategies for training culturally competent interlocutors in the health professions and beyond. Such possible dialogue across the professions represents a new frontier, one that has already been explored by scholars and practitioners in translation studies and language for specific purposes courses and that we encourage our profession as a whole to further investigate.

In language teacher preparation programs, community languages and cultures represent not only the context for CBSL programs but also the focus of preservice teachers' engagement. Such localized CBSL programs encourage educators to adopt a multicultural stance. These settings also call for critical reflections on the issues of language and power as they arise and are negotiated in interaction. Through these efforts, educators aim to disrupt the status quo and support the development of teachers who are prepared with the disposition, knowledge, and skills to be intercultural mediators in their communities and classrooms (Phipps & Levine, 2012; Scarino, 2014). Noting the research that has found environments alone does not guarantee intercultural engagement (e.g., Byram, 2008) and that such engagement must be guided and scaffolded, Palpacuer Lee and Curtis (2017) examined what actually happens in intercultural encounters. The authors described collaborative acts of meaning-making as preservice teachers reflected on a story shared by a Mandarin-English bilingual mother whose 10-year-old son came home from school thinking that he had to convert to Christianity to live in the United States. The encounter with the symbolic dimensions of language and culture prompted a series of reflections on the place of religion in public and private worlds: Why and how is religion tied

to public institutions (e.g., government, schools, currency, etc.) in the United States? How are people positioned by others, and how do they negotiate their own position in this conversation? The participants grappled with these questions, yielding rich discussions and shifts in power within the group. As one student reflected, "By sticking to neutral parts of culture such as food and festivals, we had perhaps denied them [emergent bilingual parents] the ability to express the parts of their culture that contradicted with American culture.... The conversation that encompassed deeper issues of culture took place almost while we watched" (Palpacuer Lee & Curtis, 2017, p. 173).

Studies that have considered preservice teachers' positionality as heritage language speakers have noted that CBSL can play a central role in activism for language preservation and preservice teachers' linguistic development. Leeman et al. (2011) found that by providing heritage language and bilingual speakers with contexts in which they could take the role of language experts, a CBSL program in an elementary school allowed the preservice teachers to "resist the subordinating ideologies that devalue their language and language experience" (p. 482). The researchers' analysis of the preservice teachers' reflections located both a sense of loss and a sense of responsibility for preserving Spanish in the community. As one preservice teacher wrote, "I still feel more comfortable reading and writing in English. I really didn't begin taking Spanish for Spanish speakers classes until I was in high school and perhaps it wasn't enough." She continued, "[t]he advancement of the Spanish language is in our hands and it is our responsibility to keep it alive always" (Leeman et al., 2011, p. 489). While this orientation to agency and advocacy illustrates social activism in language education, the authors also found challenges. Because Spanish is often taught as a global language, local varieties are less valued, reinforcing the linguistic hierarchy that privileges the "native speaker" of the standard language (Leeman et al., 2011, p. 491). Leeman and colleagues ultimately argued for opportunities for Spanish language "maintenance and preservation in communities and in public discourse" (p. 492), highlighting the ways that language educators need to find pedagogical solutions for the discursive, identity, and programmatic issues in CBSL.

2.3 | CBSL and interculturality

Critical frameworks, such as education for intercultural citizenship (Byram, 1997, 2008; Porto & Byram, 2015), critical global citizenship (Larsen, 2014; Larsen & Searle, 2017), and critical intercultural inquiry (Flower, 2002), view interculturality as a mode of action. This research, building upon what Hellebrandt and Varona (1999) described as "the ability to see the world from another point of view" (p. 71), responds to the intercultural communication demands of 21st-century life. These frameworks for CBSL expand on intercultural communication and move beyond a focus on linguistic outcomes to include social and political action as programmatic aims, beyond awareness of difference.

Flower (2002) defined critical intercultural inquiry as a practice, "a literate action defined by the open-eyed, against-the-odds, self-conscious attempts to engage in collaborative acts of meaning making that are mutually transformative" (p. 186). In this framework, CBSL participants learn *with* each other, not only about each other, and they learn to address difficult questions together. As Flower (2002) noted, university students come to CBSL "prepared to act; they really need to inquire" (p. 182), and their intercultural inquiry itself becomes action. In this sense, social action is located in the powerful discursive acts of listening and questioning.

The education for intercultural citizenship framework also addresses social action and expands on the notion of citizenship (Byram, 2008; Porto, 2015). Rauschert and Byram (2017) noted that while intercultural citizenship has been developed specifically for language education and has been applied to cross-language collaborations (e.g., Porto, 2014), there is potential for a stronger development of this framework in CBSL (2017, p. 6). They argued that language education may have instrumental force

through CBSL, renegotiating dichotomies of "us" vs. "them" through collaborative projects. One of the researchers' projects with 10th-grade students in Germany and India began with a simple question: "What is happiness to you?" The responses prompted investigations of the contexts for students' responses, and self-reflection exercises "to recognize their own cultural imprint as well as the role that processes of socialization play in the judgement of behaviour, opinions or cultural practices" (2017, p. 9). Palpacuer Lee, Curtis, and Curran (2018) adopted this intercultural citizenship framework to describe a writing project in which preservice language teachers and community members created a booklet of advice for parents new to the U.S. school system, based on the experiences and expertise of families already living in the community. These studies and projects illustrate how collective inquiry can in turn lead to coconstructed knowledge and to social action.

Critical researchers have found that social interaction and systematic reflection that are fundamental to CBSL lead students to deconstruct their cultural assumptions and stereotypes and to (re)negotiate their identities and positionalities in relation to the communities in which they live and work (e.g., Avineri, 2015; Curtis & Curran, 2015; Hartfield-Mendez, 2013; Moreno-Lopez, Ramos-Sellman, Miranda-Aldaco, & Gomis Quinto, 2017). For instance, one student in a CBSL course at our institution emphasized her growing awareness of her positionality as an "enforcer of culture" through which cultural assumptions were reproduced. As she reflected on a conversation about "leisure time" in an English-focused program for adults and her realization that working parents may not view time in the same way as university students, she reflected that the experience "consisted of giving up my former assumptions, understanding where I am coming from linguistically and culturally, and witnessing how learning about other ways of doing things can change our own ways" (Curtis & Curran, 2015, p. 482).

Extending this critical scholarship, Larsen (2014) developed the critical global citizenship framework specifically for international service-learning. A critical global citizen is willing to learn "from those who historically have been marginalized in society" (p. 17). The framework turns attention to the "hidden influences, values and assumptions that often escape conscious detection" (p. 6), located in, e.g., financial, government, and media communications. Such awareness, Larsen proposed, leads to a sense of care and responsibility toward others and action with others to respond to social and ecological injustice. Larsen's study with Canadian students found that 5 months after the students' return from their international service placements (four students had placements in Tanzania, three in Kenya, and two in Rwanda) there was some evidence of student action in the public sphere following the international experience, such as signing petitions, writing letters, and spending time at community centers. In addition, Larsen found greater evidence of action in the quotidian lives of participants. As one student remarked, "[S]o I just think I am more conscious of what potentially could come as a result of my actions usually on a daily basis. So if I am brushing my teeth and I have the water on and am like 'no'" (p. 16). Larsen and Searle (2017) implemented this critical global citizenship framework in study abroad programs for Canadian preservice teachers in Laredo, Texas, and in Lima, Peru. They described findings similar to Larsen's (2014) and suggested that in addition to students needing more opportunities for developing criticality, longitudinal studies are needed to understand the lasting impact of such experiences.

These three critical frameworks for intercultural inquiry, intercultural citizenship, and global citizenship share the view articulated by Gorski (2008) that education for interculturality is a "decolonizing" (p. 521) education, a practice that challenges inequitable distributions of power and recognizes that language plays a central part in constructing/deconstructing both difference and power differentials. We firmly believe that an orientation that emphasizes participation in CBSL as membership and social action across languages, cultures, and national boundaries opens innovative paths for the profession. This emphasis calls for critical service-learning in language programs "that

seek to develop community—university partnerships to address community needs while also engaging students in critical analysis of sociopolitical issues linked to language" (Leeman, 2011, p. 303). This approach must take into account not only geopolitical dynamics that have (re)organized communities and cultures but also how constructions of difference reinforce structural inequality (Kramsch, 2014). Language educators can "challenge, confront, and disrupt misconceptions, untruths, and stereotypes that lead to structural inequality and discrimination based on social and human differences" and "promote critical thinking and agency for social change" (Nieto, 2010, p. 46). Glynn et al. (2014) advised that these ideals could, and should, become "the main goals of world language education" (p. 565). We interpret such calls to include building community partnerships that integrate a critical language education agenda with the goals of professional organizations and communities, such as health and social services, public schools, and parents and families seeking access to language education.

3 | LOOKING FORWARD

As this overview demonstrates, language educators and researchers are actively pursuing innovative teaching and investigative agendas focused on CBSL. Such efforts align with the World-Readiness Standards (National Standards Collaborative Board, 2015), which offer a vision for the teaching and learning of foreign languages in the United States, and with the NCSSFL and ACTFL Can-Do Statements, which include intercultural communication and intercultural reflection (NCSSFL and ACTFL, 2017). The Standards and Can-Do Statements establish language education for intercultural competence across space (diverse perspectives in multilingual communities at home and abroad) and time (lifelong learning). Three reports share ACTFL's vision and contribute to its advocacy initiatives to strengthen language education. The New American Economy (2017) report, *Not Lost in Translation: The Growing Importance of Foreign Languages in the U.S. Job Market,* highlighted the relevance of language education in an American economy that is interdependent with other economies around the globe. In addition, *America's Languages: Investing in Language Education for the 21st Century,* a congressionally commissioned report by the American Academy of Arts & Sciences (AAAS, 2017), promoted improving access to languages for all, at home and abroad. Finally, the 2007 report of the Modern Language Association (MLA, 2007) emphasized that the usefulness of studying languages other than English is no longer contested. In fact, "we expect that more students will continue language study if courses incorporate cultural inquiry at all levels and if advanced courses address more subject areas" (Geisler et al., 2007, n.p.). Together with ACTFL's Lead with Languages initiative (ACTFL, 2017a), professionals and language educators are actively advocating for "improved access to languages for people of every region, ethnicity, and socioeconomic background" (AAAS, 2017, p. viii). ACTFL's Global Engagement Initiative "recognizes outstanding community-engaged learning experiences within the world language curriculum at all levels of instruction" (ACTFL, 2017b, n.p.). As these reports and programs have documented, access to and participation in multilingual and multicultural communities have become national imperatives. CBSL provides a high-leverage pedagogical tool to make this happen.

At the same time, there are challenges. In this review, we have noted three layers of overlapping challenges that shape this new frontier in language education and are related to (1) discourses about service, communities, and learning; (2) programmatic implementations of these discourses in CBSL partnerships; and (3) innovative pedagogies that adopt localized best practices. In this article, we have argued that our possible responses to these three overlapping challenges will shape the future of CBSL and language education. Lear and Abbott (2008) noted that "language issues are rarely problematized

in the research on CSL, even when describing courses and programs involving work with non-English-speaking or limited-English-proficiency communities" (p. 76). Rabin (2009) pointed out that language-focused CBSL may neglect community histories of multilingualism and heritage language activism (p. 48). Our overview of CBSL and language education suggests that if we want to engage in a critical approach to CBSL, we need to take several courses of action. First, we need to take stock of the leadership and innovative practices already in place in our field and beyond. Second, we should expand our agenda to include interdisciplinary partners across the K–16 continuum. Third, we need additional studies on CBSL that could potentially inform our views and practices of language education. Fourth, we must place language and localized practices at the forefront of our professional discourse and research agendas. We expand on these courses of action in the following paragraphs.

First, we must locate our work within the sociopolitical history and context of service-learning in the United States so that our work joins the trajectory of activists who have paved the way to transform our societies and that we avoid falling into the trap of believing that we are sole pioneers. As a result, our students can gain a deeper understanding of the historical struggle for social justice and their active roles as advocates in the fight for democracy. In this overview, we have highlighted the pioneering and ongoing work of activists in urban areas and of heritage language educators (see also Carreira & Kagan, 2018).

At the same time, we need to be careful and intentional regarding the discourse and perspectives guiding our programs and impacting our students. We want our CBSL programs to disrupt existing power dynamics, not reinforce them. Curtis and Curran (2015), for example, analyzed the notion of "help" and its implications in a CBSL program involving diverse undergraduate students. This study found that students struggled with the ideological valences of English and engaged in (re)negotiations of identity that centered on their positioning as "teachers" or "helpers" through their involvement in the service-learning program. While CBSL programs encourage educators to adopt a multicultural stance, such immersive settings also call for critical reflections on the issues of language and power as constitutive of the CBSL discourse (Curtis & Curran, 2015) and as they arise and are negotiated in interaction (Palpacuer Lee & Curtis, 2017). Researchers, CBSL program directors, and language teacher educators have begun to address these practical challenges as they reflect on connections between language, culture, and power in CBSL settings. Through these efforts, they aim to disrupt the status quo and support the development of individuals who are prepared with the dispositions, knowledge, and skills to support community multilingualism and advocate for equity in their future endeavors and workplace.

Second, to design mutually beneficial programs, we must actively seek interdisciplinary partners in our local-global communities that include diverse educational levels across the K–16 continuum and build deep long-term relationships. To develop strong collaborations, we must listen carefully to our partners. This requires moving toward an approach that guides the design of intentional, mutually beneficial CBSL programs. These reciprocal community-based relationships are now required of teacher educators in the CAEP standards and engage our profession further as we deploy an ethic of care and compassion in language education (Levine & Phipps, 2012). Specifically, we identify two areas of growth for these kinds of mutually beneficial CBSL partnerships across the K–16 continuum: (1) interdisciplinary collaborations across content areas and with the professions and (2) collaborations across educational levels. As attested to by research and publications, CBSL can play a critical role in preparing professionals across a range of careers. For example, a number of reports have called attention to the fact that intercultural competence is an increasingly necessary, even mandatory, skill in health care and social services (APHA, 2015; Betancourt, Green, & Carrillo, 2002; Edmunds, Bezold, Fulwood, Johnson, & Tetteh, 2015; Furman, Loya, Jones, & Hugo, 2013). Specifically, Betancourt and colleagues (2002) identified the need for intercultural competence at the systemic, organizational, and clinical levels of health care delivery, citing as a primary concern the language discordance between provider and patient. Lu and Corbett (2011) envisioned health care professionals as intercultural

speakers and provided insights into the ways that culturally competent interlocutors in the health professions can be trained. More recently, the APHA (2015) reported its continued concerns with effectively delivering public health services in various cultural contexts. Partnerships with community-based health care providers, such as the Community Health and Social Services Center in Detroit, therefore deserve further exploration. Interesting projects that include nonphysician volunteer service-learning in the health care field are of note and provide a rich setting to offer students opportunities to develop language, cultural, and intercultural competence (see Heisler et al., 2014; Kulwicki et al., 2000; Vora et al., 2017; Yun et al., 2015).

In an attempt at broadening our agenda to include localized initiatives that implement CBSL frameworks, it is also important to acknowledge the work conducted in translation studies and language for specific purposes (Bugel, 2013; Faszer-McMahon, 2013). These research agendas and best practices actively contribute to shaping this new frontier in language education, where language and culture are the main characters in the new professional stories we create with communities. Another promising agenda involves interdisciplinary collaborations across educational levels. For example, Cardetti, Wagner, and Byram (2015) piloted a one-year project that engaged university faculty and graduate students with a K–12 school with the goal of integrating theories of intercultural competence and social justice with world languages, social studies, and math curricula. The analysis focused on the collaborative process of developing the curriculum units and both reflected and anticipated a transformation in 21st-century education that will rely on interdisciplinary and collaborative skills. We sense that virtual communities and online environments can become both the foci and the contexts for advancing such skills.

Third, we need additional studies that provide insight into the discursive constructions of identity, as well as the negotiation of citizenship and positionality, for preservice language teachers and community members alike. Future studies should address the impact of CBSL programs that include opportunities for social action in both local and global settings on the language development of preservice language teachers. Directions for assessment could include intercultural practice-based interpretations of the 5 Cs in addition to language development (National Standards Collaborative Board, 2015). In addition, we need to expand on the small number of studies that only briefly describe the reciprocity component of CBSL, such as the reciprocity of benefits, the ways that community members and learners negotiate service in such contexts, and what all stakeholders take away from their participation.

Fourth, we must put language as a socially constructed, local practice at the core of our activities to heighten visibility for language learning, heritage language maintenance, and affirmation of multilingualism. CBSL enacted with a critical, metalinguistic focus fosters the development of linguistic and cultural competence, and participants grow as sympathetic interlocutors who can apply linguistic and intercultural knowledge and skills in their interactions with family, friends, and colleagues. Participants in such programs gain a deeper understanding of their participation in the discourse and linguistic landscapes of their communities. In addition, we must work intentionally to reinterpret the world language, ESL/EFL, and heritage language fields in diversifying social milieus.

Finally, to achieve this vision of a critical approach to language use in our society, we need to change the public discourse about language, and to do that we need to retell our linguistic narratives. We share a lived reality of multilingualism in our families and neighborhoods, and we are aware of the linguistic and cultural demands of responding adequately to crises and conflicts as they emerge across the globe. Our work can aid in disrupting the "monolingual American" myth (Matsudo & Duran, 2013). We suggest taking a cue from Pratt (2003) and Adichie (2009), who encouraged readers to tell stories of their multiple affiliations: for example, by sharing that the toasts at a wedding were given through the music of many languages; by modeling their own plurilinguistic competence; by honoring the grandmothers, aunts, and uncles that they listen to in Hindi or Yiddish or Mandarin; and by

celebrating the wild popularity of "Despacito" and Daddy Yankee. In addition to telling our multilingual, multicultural stories, we must (1) share the cognitive benefits of bilingualism, (2) engage heritage communities, and (3) identify intercultural competence as a key goal for language education in school and in our communities. We can link this discourse to learning, advocacy, and action through community-engaged programs.

As we move into the future, we believe that we need critical community-based models for language classes, degree programs in languages, and teacher preparation programs that aim to produce a specific outcome: speakers who can use their pluricultural and plurilingual experiences and expertise in and out of academic settings. Advanced language preparation often seeks to replicate the competence of an educated native speaker, an unrealistic and unnecessary goal that postadolescent learners rarely reach or need. In contrast, as called for in the 2007 MLA report (Geisler et al., 2007), the idea of translingual and transcultural competence places value on the ability to operate between languages as informed and capable interlocutors who are prepared to reflect on the world and themselves through the lens of another language and culture. Through meaningful relationships with diverse members of linguistically and interculturally competent communities, possibilities emerge for engaging in democratic and ethical action.

REFERENCES

Abbott, A., and Lear, D., (2010). The Connections goal area in Spanish community service-learning: Possibilities and limitations. *Foreign Language Annals*, *43*, 231–245.

ACTFL. (2017a). *Lead with Languages campaign launches: Promotes urgent call to action for making language proficiency a national priority*. Retrieved February 27, 2017, from https://www.actfl.org/news/press-releases/

ACTFL. (2017b). *ACTFL's Global Engagement Initiative*. Retrieved November 12, 2017, from https://www.actfl.org/about-the-american-council-for-teaching-foreign-languages/actfl-global-engagement-initiative

Adichie, C. N. (2009). *The danger of a single story*. TED Talk. Retrieved October 9, 2017, from https://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story

American Academy of Arts & Sciences (AAAS). (2017). *America's languages: Investing in language education for the 21st century*. Cambridge, MA: AAAS. Retrieved January 29, 2018, from https://www.amacad.org/content/publications/publication.aspx?d=22474

APHA. (2015). *Better health through equity: Case studies in reframing public health work*. Retrieved November 17, 2017, from https://www.apha.org

Avineri, N. (2015). Nested interculturality, multiple knowledges, and situated identities through service-learning in language education. In J. Perren & A. Wurr (Eds.), *Learning the language of global citizenship: Strengthening service-learning in TESOL* (pp. 197–223). Champaign, IL: Common Ground Publishing.

Barreneche, G. I., & Ramos-Flores, H. (2013). Integrated or isolated experiences? Considering the role of service-learning in the Spanish language curriculum. *Hispania*, *96*, 215–228.

Betancourt, J. Green, A. R., & Carrillo, J. E. (2002). *Cultural competence in health care: Emerging frameworks and practical approaches*. A report by The Commonwealth Fund. Retrieved April 12, 2015, from http://www.cmfw.org

Bocci, M. (2015). Service-learning and white normativity: Racial representation in service-learning's historical narrative. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *22*, 5–17.

Bowman, M., & Gottesman, I. (2017). Making the socio-historical visible: A place-conscious approach to social foundations in practice-centered teacher preparation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *68*, 232–240.

Boyle, J. E., & Overfield, D. M. (1999). Community-based service learning: Integrating language and service. In E. Zlotkowski, J. Hellebrandt & L. T. Varona (Eds.), *Construyendo puentes [Building bridges]: Concepts and models for service-learning in Spanish* (pp. 137–147). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Bugel, T. (2013). Translation as a multilingual, multicultural mirror framed by service-learning. *Hispania*, *96*, 369–382.

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

Byram, M. (2008). *From foreign language education to education for intercultural citizenship: Essays and reflections*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Caldwell, W. (2007). Taking Spanish outside the box: A model for integrating service learning into foreign language study. *Foreign Language Annals*, *40*, 463–471.

Cardetti, F., Wagner, M., & Byram, M. (2015). *Interdisciplinary collaboration to develop intercultural competence by integrating math, languages, and social studies*. NERA Conference Proceedings, Paper 7. Retrieved January 12, 2018, from http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/nera-2015/7

Carreira, M., & Kagan, O. (2018). Heritage language education: A proposal for the next 50 years. *Foreign Language Annals*. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12331

Cooks, L., & Scharer, E. (2006). Assessing learning in community service-learning: A social approach. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *13*, 44–55.

Cooper, J. (2007). Strengthening the case for community-based learning in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *58*, 245–255.

Curtis, J., & Curran, M. (2015). "Who's helping?" Conceptualizing citizenship in a community-based English language program. In J. Perren & A. Wurr (Eds.), *Learning the language of global citizenship: Strengthening service-learning in TESOL*. Champaign, IL: Common Ground.

DuBord, E., & Kimball, E. (2016). Cross-language community engagement: Assessing the strengths of heritage learners. *Heritage Language Journal*, *13*, 298–330. Retrieved January 18, 2018, from http://scholarworks.uni.edu/ll_facpub/1

Edmunds, M., Bezold, C., Fulwood, C. C., Johnson, B., & Tetteh, H. (2015). *The future of diversity and inclusion in health services and policy research*. AcademyHealth. Retrieved November 12, 2017, from https://www.academyhealth.org/files

Faszer-McMahon, D. (2013). Social networking, micro-lending, and translation in the Spanish service-learning classroom. *Hispania*, *96*, 252–263.

Flower, L. (2002). Intercultural inquiry and the transformation of service. *College English*, *65*, 181–201.

Furman, R., Loya, M., Jones, S., & Hugo, R. (2013). The paucity of social workers prepared to work with Latino populations. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, *83*, 174–180.

Geisler, M., Kramsch, C., McGinnis, S., Patrikis, P., Pratt, M. L., Ryding, K., & Saussy, H. (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. *Profession*, 234–245.

Glisan, E. (2012). National standards: Research into practice. *Language Teaching*, *45*, 515–526.

Glynn, C., Wesely, P. M., & Wassell, B. (2014). *Words and actions: Teaching languages through the lens of social justice*. Alexandria, VA: ACTFL.

González, N., Moll, L., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Taylor & Francis.

Gorski, P. (2008). Good intentions are not enough: A decolonizing intercultural education. *Intercultural Education*, *19*, 515–525.

Grassi, E., & Armon, J. (2015). Re-envisioning teacher preparation: The transformative power of teachers studing "abroad" in the neighborhood. In J. Perren & A. Wurr (Eds.), *Learning the language of global citizenship: Strengthening service-learning in TESOL* (pp. 428–467). Champaign, IL: Common Ground.

Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E., & Williams, P. (2009). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teachers College Record*, *111*, 2055–2100.

Hartfield-Mendez, V. (2013). Community-based learning, internationalization of the curriculum, and university engagement with Latino communities. *Hispania*, *96*, 355–368.

Heisler, M., Choi, H., Palmisano, G., Mase, R., Richardson, C., Fagerlin, A., . . . An, L. C. (2014). Comparison of community health worker-led diabetes medication decision-making support for low-income Latino and African American adults with diabetes using e-Health tools versus print materials: A randomized controlled trial. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, *161*. Retrieved November 28, 2017, from http://doi.org/10.7326/M13-3012

Hellebrandt, J., Arries, J., Varona, L., & Klein, C. (2003). *Juntos: Community partnerships in Spanish and Portuguese*. AATSP Professional Development Series Handbook, Vol. 5. Boston: Heinle.

Hellebrandt, J., & Varona, L.T. (1999). *Construyendo puentes [Building Bridges]: Concepts and models for service-learning in Spanish*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Hummel, K. M. (2013). Target language community involvement: Second-language linguistic self-confidence and other perceived benefits. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, *69*, 65–90. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.1152

Jacoby, B. (1996). *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Koerner, M. E., & Abdul-Tawwab, N. (2006). Using community as a resource for teacher education: A case study. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, *39*, 37–46.

Kozma, C. (2015). Intercultural inquiry as a framework for service-learning course design. *Journal for Civic Commitment*, *23*, 1–19.

Kramsch, C. (2014). Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization: Introduction. *Modern Language Journal*, *98*, 296–311.

Kulwicki, A. D., Miller, J., & Schim, S. M. (2000). Collaborative partnership for culture care: Enhancing health services for the Arab community. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, *11*, 31–39.

Lane, S. H., Huffman, C., Brackney, D. E., & Cuddy, A. (2017). Going domestic: Importing the study abroad experience. The development of a multicultural New York City study away program. *Nursing Forum*, *52*, 196–206.

Larsen, M. A. (2014). Critical global citizenship and international service learning: A case study of the intensification effect. *Journal of Global Citizenship and Equity Education*, *4*, 1–43.

Larsen, M. A., & Searle, M. J. (2017). International service learning and critical global citizenship: A cross-case study of Canadian teacher education alternative practicum. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *63*, 196–205.

Lear, D., & Abbott, A. (2008). Foreign language professional standards and CSL: Achieving the 5 C's. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *14*, 76–86.

Leeman, J. (2011). Standards, commodification, and critical service learning in minority language communities. *Modern Language Journal*, *95*, 300–303.

Leeman, J., Rabin, L., & Román-Mendoza, E. (2011). Identity and activism in heritage language education. *Modern Language Journal*, *95*, 481–495. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01237.x

Levine, G., & Phipps, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy*. Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Lu, P. Y., & Corbett, J. (2011). The health care professional as intercultural speaker. In G. Levine & A. Phipps (Eds.), *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy* (pp. 76–94). Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Magnan, S. (2008). Reexamining the priorities of the National Standards for Foreign Language Learning. *Language Teaching*, *41*, 349–366. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444808005041

Marijuan, S., & Sanz, C. (2018). Expanding boundaries: Current and new directions in study abroad research and practice. *Foreign Language Annals*, *51*, 1. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12323

Matsudo, A., & Duran, C. (2013). Problematizing the construction of U.S. Americans as monolingual English speakers. In V. Ramanathan (Ed.), *Language policies and (dis)citizenship: Rights, access, pedagogies* (pp. 35–51). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

McDonald, M., Bowman, K., & Brayko, K. (2013). Learning to see students: Opportunities to develop relational practices of teaching through community-based placements in teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, *115*, 1–35.

Meens, D. (2014). Democratic and social justice goals in service-learning evaluation: Contemporary challenges and conceptual resources. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *21*, 41–54.

Mitchell, T. (2008). Traditional vs. critical service-learning: Engaging the literature to differentiate two models. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *14*, 50–65.

Mitchell, T., Donahue, D., & Young-Law, C. (2012). Service-learning as a pedagogy of whiteness. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, *45*, 612–629.

Modern Language Association (MLA). (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. *Profession*, 234–245.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, *31*, 132–141.

Moreno-Lopez, I., Ramos-Sellman, A., Miranda-Aldaco, C., & Gomis Quinto, M. T. (2017). Transforming ways of enhancing foreign language acquisition in the Spanish classroom: Experiential learning approaches. *Foreign Language Annals*, *50*, 398–409.

National Standards Collaborative Board. (2015). *World-readiness standards for learning languages* (4th ed.). Alexandria, VA: ACTFL.

NCSSFL and ACTFL. (2017). *NCSSFL and ACTFL Can-Do Statements*. Retrieved November 12, 2017, from https://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/ncssfl-actfl-can-do-statements

Nelson, A. L., & Scott, J. L. (2008). Applied Spanish in the university curriculum: A successful model for community-based service-learning. *Hispania*, *91*, 446–460.

New American Economy. (2017). *Not lost in translation: The growing importance of foreign language skills in the U.S. job market*. Retrieved January 29, 2018, from http://www.leadwithlanguages.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/NAE_Bilingual_V6.pdf

Nieto, S. (2010). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Pak, C. S. (2007). The service-learning classroom and motivational strategies for learning Spanish: Discoveries from two interdisciplinary community centered seminars. In A. J. Wurr & J. Hellebrandt (Eds.), *Learning the language of global citizenship: Service-learning in applied linguistics* (pp. 32–57). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Palpacuer Lee, C., & Curtis, J. H. (2017). "Into the realm of the politically incorrect": Intercultural encounters in a service-learning program. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, *19*, 163–181.

Palpacuer Lee, C., Curtis, J. H., & Curran, M. E. (2018). Stories of engagement: Pre-service language teachers negotiate intercultural citizenship in a community-based English language program. *Language Teaching Research*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817718578

Pascual y Cabo, D., Prada, J., & Lowther Pereira, K. (2017). Effects of community service-learning on heritage language learners' attitudes toward their language and culture. *Foreign Language Annals*, *50*, 71–83.

Pellettieri, J. L. (2011). Measuring language-related outcomes of community-based learning in intermediate Spanish courses. *Hispania*, *94*, 285–302.

Perren, J., & Wurr, A. (2015). *Learning the language of global citizenship: Strengthening service-learning in TESOL*. Champaign, IL: Common Ground.

Phipps, A., & Levine, G. (2012). What is language pedagogy for? In G. Levine & A. Phipps (Eds.), *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy* (pp. 1–14). Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Porto, M. (2014). Intercultural citizenship education in an online EFL project in Argentina. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *14*, 245–261.

Porto, M. (2015). Ecological and intercultural citizenship in the primary English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom: An online project in Argentina. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *46*, 395–415. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2015.1064094

Porto, M., & Byram, M. (2015). A curriculum for action in the community and intercultural citizenship in higher education. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *28*, 226–242.

Pratt, M. L. (2003). Building a new public idea about language. *ADFL Bulletin*, *34*, 5–9.

Rabin, L. (2009). Language ideologies and the settlement house movement: A new history for service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *15*, 48–55.

Rabin, L. (2011). Community service and activism in heritage languages, New York City, 1915–1956. *Foreign Language Annals*, *44*, 338–352.

Rauschert, P., & Byram, M. (2017). Service learning and intercultural citizenship in foreign-language education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X2017.1337722

Scarino, A. (2014). Learning as reciprocal, interpretive meaning-making: A view from collaborative research into the professional learning of teachers of languages. *Modern Language Journal*, *98*, 386–401. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2014.12068.x

Smolcic, E., & Katunich, J. (2017). Teachers across borders: A review of the research into cultural immersion field experience for teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *62*, 47–59.

Stevens, C. S. (2003). Unrecognized roots of service-learning in African American social thought and action, 1890–1930. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *9*, 24–34.

Vélez-Ibáñez, C. G. (1988). Networks of exchange among Mexicans in the U.S. and Mexico: Local-level mediating responses to national and international transformations. *Urban Anthropology*, *17*, 27–51.

Vora, S., Lau, J. D., Kim, E., Sim, S., Oster, A., & Pong, P. (2017). Patient navigation program for colorectal cancer screening in Chinese Americans at an urban community health center: Lessons learned. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, *28*, 887–895.

Wurr, A. (2013). Engaged teaching and learning: Service-learning, civic literacy, and TESOL. *TESOL Journal*, *4*, 397–401.

Wurr, A., & Hellebrandt, J. (2007). *Learning the language of global citizenship*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Yun, L., Boles, R. E., Haemer, M. A., Knierim, S., Dickinson, L. M., Mancinas, H., . . . Davidson, A. J. (2015). A randomized, home-based, childhood obesity intervention delivered by patient navigators. *BMC Public Health*, *15*, 506.