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ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores community-based learning (CBL) in university Spanish education. Although Spanish education continues to construct Spanish as a foreign language (Leeman, 2014), recent trends such as changing demographics in the US have led to calls for Spanish education to focus more on US Latinx communities (e.g., Torres, Pascual y Cabo, & Beusterien, 2018). CBL offers the opportunity to do so as students engage with local Latinx communities through service work. While much research has explored students’ language-related and cultural outcomes as a result of Spanish CBL, less attention has been given to other student outcomes as well as community partner outcomes.

Given this, I draw on the perspectives of three key stakeholders–students, instructors, and community partners–to explore the opportunities and challenges related to developing community awareness and addressing community partner needs in Spanish CBL. Taking a qualitative case study approach, I conducted interviews with the instructors, community partners, and students from two focal courses. I also collected data through classroom observations, a student questionnaire, and collection of relevant course documents including students’ reflection essays and course syllabi.

Findings showed that each course took a different approach to CBL as demonstrated by instructors’ and community partners’ goals and motivations as well as the course curriculum and class time. Despite these differences, both instructors and community partners appeared to position the development of students’ community awareness and addressing community partner
needs as important. My analysis also demonstrated that the development of students’ community awareness was fostered and constrained by particular practices and characteristics of service work tasks, ideologies about the place of sociopolitics in the curriculum, and the extent to which the community partner acted as a co-educator. Furthermore, I found that service work, instructor-community partner communication, and students’ continued engagement with community organizations impacted whether and how community partner needs were addressed.

This study has implications for Spanish CBL at the pedagogical, departmental, and institutional levels. As more Spanish departments offer CBL courses, university and community organization stakeholders need to consider why and how they can build relationships that work in solidarity with local Latinx communities.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Spanish is a second national language and culture in the US (Alonso, 2007; Macías 2014). Projections estimate that, currently in 2020, about 13 to 16 percent of the total U.S. population ages 5 and over is a Spanish speaker (Shin & Ortman, 2011). By 2060, 29% of the U.S. population is expected to identify as Hispanic (Colby & Ortman, 2015). These changes create “the responsibility to achieve a better understanding of the underpinnings associated with the Latino experience in the United States and their contributions to its linguistic and cultural fabric” (Torres, Pascual y Cabo, & Beusterien, 2018, p. 271). Nevertheless, Spanish education continues to construct Spanish as a foreign language (Leeman, 2014), and departments continue to focus on preparing students for graduate study in linguistics and literature (Abbott & Martínez, 2018), even though the majority of students will not go on to pursue graduate degrees (Modern Language Association, 2007). Furthermore, although the majority of students who study a language in U.S. universities study Spanish, the percentage has been decreasing since 1998, with Spanish enrollments dropping by 9.8% in 2016 (Looney & Lusin, 2018). These realities have led many scholars to propose reformulations of the structures and goals of university Spanish programs (e.g., Abbott, 2018; Abbott & Martínez, 2018; Alonso, 2007; Bayliss & Rossomondo, 2018; Pascual y Cabo & Prada, 2017; Torres et al., 2018). For example, Abbott (2018) states, “we need to focus much of our curricula on US Latinos, commit to social justice education, and engage with our local Latino communities” (p. 33). In this dissertation, I explore community-based learning (CBL)¹ as a way that university Spanish education can

¹ I have chosen to utilize the term community-based learning (CBL) for my study. However, it important to acknowledge that there are different terms used in the literature in similar ways. The most common term is service-learning. However, this term has received pushback because of the use of service. As Jacoby (2015) discusses, using the term service is sometimes critiqued for its implication of one group serving another. This runs contrary to the aim of forming reciprocal
engage with local Latinx communities while providing space for learning about U.S. Latinx experiences and working towards social justice by addressing community partners’ needs.

The desire to have students engage with communities has led to an interest in CBL in Spanish education. Although various definitions exist, CBL can be 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, 2015, p. 2). CBL aims to place a focus on equally benefitting students and communities as well as on the service and the learning that occurs (Furco, 1996). Studies have found that CBL offers learning across ACTFL’s World Readiness Standards for Learning Languages also known as the five “Cs” (Weldon & Trautmann, 2003). They are Communications, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities. Of particular relevance to CBL is the Communities goal. The Communities goal aims to prepare students to “communicate and interact with cultural competence in order to participate in multilingual communities at home and around the world” (The National Standards Collaborative Board, 2015, p. 1).

Communities has been labeled “the lost C” (Allen, 2010 as cited by Hellebrandt & Jorge, 2013) due to the difficulty teachers face with incorporating the goal in the classroom. Teachers have reported finding the Communities goal “to be nebulous, out of their control, and not relationships. Instead, terms like CBL capture the engagement with the community (Jacoby, 2015). Ultimately, I made the decision to use the term CBL because that was the term used to describe this approach to teaching and learning by the participants in this study. Although many of the studies I review and cite use an alternative term such as service learning, I use CBL throughout this dissertation for consistency and clarity.

2 In this dissertation, I use Latinx as the term to describe people with Latin American origins because of its gender-inclusivity. “Latino,” “Latin@,” or “Hispanic” are used when I am referring to someone else’s words or my words at another point in time.
assessable” (Phillips & Abbott, 2011, p. 11). Despite being perceived to be a difficult goal to incorporate into the classroom, teachers, students, and other stakeholders note its importance. A 2012 survey of members in the American Association for Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese, which includes K-16 instructors, found that out of 805 respondents, 75% thought some form of community engagement such as CBL was an important part of language teaching (Hellebrandt & Jorge, 2013). Additionally, Communities was identified as the most important goal by students (Magnan, Murphy, Sahakyan, & Kim, 2012). Furthermore, the advisory board for the Standards, which included a diverse range of stakeholders, found that many of the individuals from beyond the language teaching profession thought that “participation in multilingual/multicultural communities was the raison d’être for foreign language study” (Phillips, 1998, p. 32; Magnan et al., 2012). As Cutshall (2012) notes, “involvement with target-language and target-culture communities is the culmination of nearly all language learning goals” (p. 32).

Given the importance placed on engaging with communities and the growing interest in CBL in language education (see Palpacuer Lee, Curtis, & Curran, 2017), it is important to consider what it means to become involved with and participate in multilingual communities through CBL. In particular, I argue we pay increased attention to two questions involved in engaging with local Latinx communities: 1) What do we hope students learn? and 2) What do we hope communities gain?

In regards to what we hope students learn, CBL places language in context (Abbott & Martínez, 2018) and can highlight the ways in which “the teaching and learning of Spanish as a foreign or second language in the United States is a complex cultural, social, and political venture in which everyone should participate in conscious, informed, and constructive ways” (Lacorte, 2006, p. 356). Furthermore, Randolph and Johnson (2017) note, “the current political
climate of our nation is often dominated by questions of immigration, diversity, inclusion, multiculturalism, and globalism—all issues that relate to and are informed by language and language study” (p. 99). Participating in multilingual communities involves working within such issues. Therefore, students in CBL courses should develop an understanding of the sociopolitical forces that impact the lived experiences of multilingual community members (see Randolph & Johnson, 2017; Senel, 2020). In this dissertation, I refer to learning about the lived experiences of local Latinx communities as development of community awareness.

Furthermore, with regards to what we hope communities gain, it is important to consider community partners’ experiences. Leeman (2011) notes that “there is a tendency for some programs to commodify local communities as resources for language practice, rather than to start with a consideration of community needs or aspirations” (p. 301). Therefore, it is important to consider how community partner needs are addressed when university Spanish programs and community organizations collaborate through CBL.

1.1 Research questions

In order to better understand what occurs when Spanish courses engage with local Latinx communities through CBL, I explore the following three research questions with respect to two focal courses which I investigate in this dissertation:

1) How is CBL approached in the two focal Spanish CBL courses?

2) What opportunities and challenges related to the development of students’ community awareness exist in the two focal Spanish CBL courses?

3) What opportunities and challenges related to addressing community partner needs exist in the two focal Spanish CBL courses?
To outline how I answer these questions, I provide an overview of the chapters of this dissertation.

1.2 Overview of chapters

In Chapter 2, I discuss the literature and establish the theoretical framework for my study. I review literature pertaining to three key areas in CBL: 1) student outcomes and perspectives, 2) community partner outcomes and perspectives, and 3) instructor perspectives. I argue that the Spanish CBL literature has largely focused on student learning about language and cultural outcomes, while insufficient attention has been paid to student learning about the lived experiences of Latinx communities and to community partner outcomes. Additionally, what facilitates and constrains student and community partner outcomes is underexplored. Overall, I aim to demonstrate the importance of considering the perspectives of students, instructors, and community partners in order to better understand the opportunities and challenges involved with the development of students’ community awareness and addressing community partner needs.

In Chapter 3, I situate my study as a qualitative case study. I describe the methodology, including my process of identifying research sites and recruiting participants as well as my data collection tools. I also introduce the two focal courses and participants. Additionally, I describe my thematic analysis approach and demonstrate how my themes developed. Furthermore, I provide reflections on my role as the researcher of this study and how it shapes this dissertation.

In Chapter 4, I examine the approaches to CBL taken in the two focal courses. In order to do so, I explore three themes, 1) the course curriculum and class time, 2) the instructors’ goals and motivation to implement CBL, and 3) the community partners’ goals and motivation for participation in CBL. The goal of this chapter is to demonstrate the ways in which CBL can be implemented in different ways, for different motives, and with different goals in Spanish.
programs. This chapter also serves to contextualize the two focal courses. Furthermore, I aim to demonstrate a common interest in developing students’ community awareness and addressing community partner needs in both courses despite their different approaches.

In Chapter 5, I focus on the issue of student learning outcomes. In particular, I examine students’ development of community awareness in the two focal courses. Drawing on the experiences of students, instructors, and community partners, I aim to show how three themes, 1) service work, 2) ideologies about the place of sociopolitics in the curriculum, and 3) the community partner as co-educator presented opportunities and challenges involved with developing students’ community awareness in the two focal courses. Overall, I discuss how particular aspects of service work, ideas about what should and should not be part of the curriculum, and interaction with the community partner shape students’ opportunities to learn about the communities they are working with/for through CBL.

In Chapter 6, I turn to the issue of community partner outcomes. Specifically, I examine the opportunities and challenges to addressing community partner needs in the two focal courses by exploring 1) service work, 2) instructor-community partner communication, and 3) continued engagement. In discussing service work, I explore how different aspects related to engaging in service work impact the extent to which community partner needs are addressed. I also explore how communication between instructors and community partners plays an important role and how students’ continued engagement can play a long-term role in addressing community partner needs. Again, I take into account the perspectives of three key stakeholders–community partners, instructors, and students–in order to better understand what impacts addressing community partner needs through CBL.
In Chapter 7, I conclude the dissertation by synthesizing my main findings and discussing their implications. In particular, I discuss the importance of relationship-building and solidarity in Spanish CBL. I also offer recommendations for Spanish courses, departments, and institutions regarding the implementation of CBL as well as directions for future research.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

The research on CBL is robust and spans multiple disciplines. In this chapter, I will specifically focus on the literature that pertains to 1) student outcomes and perspectives, 2) community partner outcomes and perspectives, and 3) instructor perspectives in CBL. My main focus is on the Spanish CBL literature, however there is limited research within the discipline for areas 2 and 3. Therefore, I also turn to the broader CBL literature, which extends beyond language education, when discussing community partner outcomes and perspectives and instructor perspectives in CBL.

By focusing on these three areas of research, I aim to show the importance of expanding the types of outcomes we explore and the stakeholder perspectives that we include in the Spanish CBL literature. In the student outcomes section, I discuss the Spanish CBL literature that has explored student learning outcomes, which makes up the majority of current studies in the field. Through a review of this literature, I aim to demonstrate that there has been a focus on student outcomes specifically related to language and culture. While language learning—whether this be learning grammatical structures or challenging language ideologies—and cultural learning is, of course, of central importance to language education, I argue that Spanish CBL must pay closer attention to learning about the lived experiences of local Latinx communities which students are working in. I refer to this learning as development of community awareness. While past research has found that students develop community awareness in Spanish CBL courses, less is known about what fosters and constrains this type of learning.

In the second section, I review the literature on community partner outcomes and perspectives, which is understudied in comparison to student outcomes and particularly so in the Spanish CBL literature. In the third section, I review the literature on instructor perspectives of
CBL, which has not been thoroughly considered beyond the instructor-researcher perspective in Spanish CBL. Overall, I argue that exploring multiple key stakeholders’ perspectives allows for a better understanding of the opportunities and challenges involved with the development of students’ community awareness and addressing community partners needs in Spanish CBL.

2.1 Student outcomes and perspectives

Student outcomes has been the primary focus of the research on CBL in Spanish programs. Although Spanish CBL studies have found that students develop leadership skills (Nelson & Scott, 2008), professional skills (Bettencourt, 2015), and civic/social responsibility (Plann, 2002) in these courses, the majority of studies focus on language- and culture-related learning. Language-related outcomes reported include increased willingness to communicate in Spanish (Pellettieri, 2011), an increase in confidence in using Spanish (Caldwell, 2007), motivation to continue studying and using Spanish (Nelson & Scott, 2008), useful preparation for going to and returning from study abroad programs (Jorge, 2006), and Spanish language development (Baker, 2018). Cultural outcomes reported include breaking down of cultural barriers and stereotypes (Bloom, 2008), appreciation for Hispanic cultures (Long, 2003), better understanding of Hispanic culture (Nelson & Scott, 2008) more sensitivity to cultural and class differences (Varas, 1999), and an increase in positive attitude towards the target culture (Zapata, 2011).

A number of studies have also explored Spanish CBL courses specifically for heritage speakers. These studies have found that heritage speakers’ experiences in CBL allow them to expand their understanding and experience with bilingualism and their community (Llombart-Huesca & Pulido, 2017) and combat deficit language ideologies about their own language abilities (Leeman, Rabin, Román-Mendoza, 2011). Heritage speakers have also developed a
greater sense of belonging and connection with the Latinx community as well as agency in linguistic choices and an awareness of cultural and linguistic diversity through CBL (Lowther Pereira, 2015). MacGregor-Mendoza and Moreno (2016) found that heritage speakers in a CBL course developed consciousness of self/identity, sociocultural linguistic skills including audience awareness, and formal aspects of the Spanish language. CBL also has been found to give heritage speaker students the opportunity to expand their bilingual range and better understand Spanish language variation (Martínez & Schwartz, 2012). Furthermore, Pascual y Cabo, Prada, and Lowther Pereira (2017) found that heritage speaker students who participated in CBL showed increased confidence in using Spanish outside the home, identified careers in which they could use their Spanish skills to serve the Latinx community, and valued their bilingual and bicultural identity and abilities.

Studies that explore heritage speakers’ experiences in CBL demonstrate the ways in which students can deepen their understanding of language use, users, and ideologies while also developing their own identities as Spanish speakers. Many of these studies take a critical approach to heritage language education emphasizing the political nature of language (Leeman, 2005) and are certainly in the direction in which I argue CBL should move towards, both for heritage speakers and second language learners (see Chapter 3). However, these studies have largely focused on students’ development of their personal language abilities, attitudes, and identities. As a linguist who knows that language is often a proxy for social categories and that social categories mediate people’s experiences with larger societal structures, I argue that it is also important for CBL courses to foster community awareness.

As I discussed above, I define community awareness as learning about the lived experiences of local Latinx communities. This includes learning about the policies and social
issues that impact community members’ lives. Developing community awareness can also include learning about structural and systemic factors that underlie the experiences of local Latinx communities. I chose to use the term community awareness in this study as a way to capture the different levels of learning about local Latinx communities that can occur in courses with diverse foci and goals.

Overall, I position community awareness as related to the development of sociopolitical consciousness. Trujillo (2009) proposed Consciousness as an additional “C” to the language learning standards known as the five “Cs” (see Chapter 1). The Consciousness standard is inspired by Freire’s (1970/1986) conscientização or critical consciousness, and calls for students to “recognize the role of language and culture in systems of privilege and oppression [and]…use language and culture to promote equity and social justice” (Trujillo, 2009, p. 379). I argue that community awareness can be seen as an early step towards students’ development of Consciousness throughout their Spanish education. Community awareness is particularly important in CBL since students engage with community members and community organizations. However, I argue that the development of community awareness is important in language education more largely, given that language is not only about linguistic and cultural elements, but also about the sociopolitical factors in which languages and their users are situated.

Developing community awareness in CBL expands the focus on cultural learning related to perspectives, practices, and products (The National Standards Collaborative Board, 2015) by allowing students to understand how policies and social issues impact the lived experiences of local Latinx communities as well. As Abbott and Martínez (2018) note, “it would be a mistake to attribute all practices and perspectives of Latino communities to “culture,” conceived in an ethnic, religious, or national sense” (p. 393). Furthermore, learning about the lived experiences
of local Latinx communities in CBL courses allows students “to make sense of their experiential learning” (Abbott, 2017, p. 35) and better work with communities by being better informed and aware of the larger sociopolitical context within which their service and learning takes place.

Slimbach (1995, as cited by Hale, 1999) saw an objective of CBL as “expand[ing] students’ awareness and understanding of social problems and their ability to address or personally respond to such problems” (p. 10). Multiple studies have noted students’ increased awareness of community issues through CBL. For example, Lowther Pereira (2015) found that students reported an increased “awareness of social issues affecting the local community” (p. 178). Baker (2018) reported that students’ service work opened their eyes to the Latinx community around them. Jorge (2006) reported that students demonstrated “a more nuanced understanding of many complex contemporary sociocultural and socioeconomic issues” (p. 121). MacGregor-Mendoza and Moreno (2016) found that students developed awareness about the demand for translation and interpretation services and how a lack of these services impacted access for community members. They reported that students learned about community needs based on the topic of the documents they translated. Nelson and Scott (2008) found that 94% of their students reported that they were “more aware of the needs, interests, and abilities of the Hispanic community” (p. 453) after participating in a CBL course. This was attributed to the opportunity to observe and interact with the “Hispanic” community. While a number of Spanish CBL studies have found that students report being more aware of the lived experiences of Latinx communities, and some have reported particular factors that led to increased awareness, my study specifically explores the development of community awareness with a focus on what facilitates and constrains this type of learning.
Baker (2018) found that 44% of students drew connections between their CBL experience and “larger issues in society, such as education funding, urban housing, and political discourse on immigration” (p. 809) in their reflection prompts, although they were not specifically asked to address sociopolitical issues. This finding demonstrates that students are cognizant and curious about the ways in which their service work connects to broader social topics. Based on this finding, Baker recommended the creation of a seminar for students participating in CBL in dual language schools where they could learn about language acquisition and dual language programs, while also addressing sociopolitical issues related to these types of schools (e.g., dual language schools and gentrification; see Valdez, Freire, & Delavan, 2016). This seminar appeared to be positioned as separate from the CBL course students participated in. Alternatively, sociopolitical topics might be included in the CBL course itself. For example, Barreneche (2011) included discussion and readings on immigration issues and immersion education programs, which connected to students’ service work tutoring bilingual students. Although a reported learning goal was to learn about these topics not only in class, but through their service work, if and how specifically that was possible was not discussed. Better understanding what impacts students’ development of community awareness is important in order to support this type of learning through Spanish CBL.

In an effort to expand the current line of research by focusing on what impacts the development of students’ community awareness, I pay particular attention to how service work tasks can mediate learning. While studies have explored CBL courses where students within one class are placed in different organizations for service work (e.g, Bettencourt, 2015; Lowther Pereira, 2018), their experiences are often presented together with no discussion of how different placements may lead to different opportunities for learning. For example, service tasks
performed by students in Bettencourt (2015) included tutoring, providing translation and interpretation services, conducting intake forms and filing at a medical clinic, and other tasks. It is likely that these different experiences led to different opportunities for learning. For example, Abbott and Lear (2010) presented three case studies of students, each of whom participated in different service tasks and demonstrated different degrees of making connections across disciplines and gaining new knowledge that resulted in social action. Similarly, Baker (2018) reported that although students were able to develop their Spanish abilities through service work overall, some students were asked to do more administrative service tasks like making copies and cleaning, which did not require them to use Spanish. In this study, I will explore the opportunities and challenges that service tasks, along with other themes not yet thoroughly explored in the Spanish CBL literature, present for the development of students’ community awareness.

I also extend the methodology used to investigate student outcomes and perspectives by collecting data via interviews in addition to reflection essays. Much of the data in the existing Spanish CBL literature has been collected through questionnaires and reflection essays assigned as class assignments by instructor-researchers conducting action research. Using reflection essays as data has both benefits and drawbacks. The benefits are that students are likely taking their reflections seriously as they know their instructors will be reading it. It is also data that is readily available and does not involve additional data collection since reflection essays are typical components of CBL courses. However, knowing the instructor will read the reflections may also cause students to exaggerate or withhold certain information in an effort to meet what they feel are the instructors’ expectations. For example, MacGregor-Mendoza and Moreno (2016) note that the student narratives they used as data may have been influenced by the fact
that they, the instructors, would be reading the narratives and assigning grades. Knowing their instructor will read the reflections may also cause students to avoid sharing negative experiences (Baker, 2018). Baker, as an outside researcher, noted that her interview data may have been more reliable than the blog entries submitted to the professor that she analyzed for this reason. Students may also avoid sharing negative opinions on questionnaires conducted by instructor-researchers. Students may be more comfortable expressing candid accounts of their experience to an outside researcher. This points to a possible advantage of being an outsider, like myself, in Spanish CBL research. Furthermore, the use of interviews allows for a new point of entry into students’ perspectives on CBL by extending beyond the topics of assigned reflection essays and questionnaires and allowing for follow up and clarification.

2.2 Broadening our understanding: Accounting for multiple stakeholders’ outcomes and perspectives

As I have argued, it is important to extend our understanding of student outcomes beyond language- and culture- related learning by exploring the opportunities and challenges associated with the development of students’ community awareness in Spanish CBL courses. It is also crucial to expand the Spanish CBL literature beyond student outcomes to include more exploration of community partner outcomes as well. Doing so will help scholars and practitioners gain a better understanding of the reciprocity that is possible in Spanish CBL (see section 2.5 for more discussion). In order to accomplish these aims, it is important to consider the perspectives of students as well as community partners and instructors, who as key stakeholders, all play an important role in shaping the CBL experience.
2.3 Community partner outcomes and perspectives

As I have demonstrated above, much of the Spanish CBL literature focuses on how students benefit from participation. Although in general there is a dearth of research in the CBL literature on community impact (Stoecker & Tryon, 2009), a number of scholars in the larger CBL higher education literature have conducted studies that have investigated community partners’ perspectives on CBL. This literature has explored the understandings, motivations, benefits, and challenges to community partner participation in CBL.

Davis, Cronley, Beamon, and Madden (2019) explored community partners’ definitions and understandings of CBL. They found that the amount of experience with CBL was one factor that impacted their understanding. They also found that most community partners focused on the learning aspect of CBL rather than the service aspect. For example, they pointed to service work as real world experience for students that needed to be aligned with coursework. Davis et al. argue that a mutual definition and understanding of CBL is needed in order to build sustainable partnerships. I explore community partners’ understandings of CBL in Chapter 4.

Studies that have explored community partners’ motivations for participating in CBL have found that community partners were motivated by the chance to educate the public and students (Bell & Carlson, 2009; Tryon & Stoecker, 2008) and also to fill their need for personnel with volunteers (Tryon & Stoecker, 2008; Worrall, 2007). In addition to these motives, Bell and Carlson (2009) also found that community partners were motivated to participate in CBL to foster long term support for their work and to foster relationships with universities. Additionally, some programs rely on CBL students to serve as volunteers in order to run their programs (Blouin & Perry, 2009). Furthermore, it has been found that community partners were not only interested in how the community is served, but were also interested in providing meaningful
experiences for students (Sandy & Holland, 2006) and contributing to student learning (Rinaldo, Davis, & Borunda, 2015). Similarly, Worrall (2007) found that community partners saw themselves as playing a role in educating and challenging students’ misconceptions. In fact, community partners may come to see themselves as educational partners (Worrall, 2007), co-instructors (Blouin & Perry, 2009), or co-educators (Darby, Ward-Johnson, & Cobb, 2016).

Given community partners’ interest in student learning, their perspectives may provide a better understanding of student outcomes by indicating to what extent community partners are involved with student learning and how. Additionally, community partners’ motivations for participating can provide an understanding of community partner needs.

Community partners have also reported a number of benefits to participating in CBL. For example, Sandy and Holland (2006) found that community partners saw direct impact, enrichment, and social justice as benefits to being involved with CBL. Participating in CBL gave organizations access to more resources (Worrall, 2007) and volunteers who bring new perspectives and expertise from which the organizations can learn (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Rinaldo et al., 2015; Worrall, 2007). Students also helped community partners complete projects sooner (Bushouse, 2005) and achieve their missions (Rinaldo et al., 2015). Additionally, Goertzen, Greenleaf, and Dougherty (2016) investigated the processes and outcomes involved in the impact made on community partners through CBL. They found that community partners reported that the students helped them spread awareness in the community of their services by developing brochures, newspaper articles, and other tangible products. They also found that students helped strengthen relationships between the organization and other business and civic organizations in the area as well as provided the community partners with access to resources by drawing on their social networks. Furthermore, community partners who played a role in
planning and implementation perceived benefits from the collaboration (Miron & Moley, 2006). For example, community partners can be involved in syllabus design, implementation, and course outcome evaluation (Chupp & Joseph 2010; Martínez & Schwartz, 2012). Community partners might also be incorporated throughout the course to review goals and progress and to attend in-class student presentations (Lowther Pereira, 2016; Martínez & Schwartz, 2012).

Furthermore, community partners have reported some challenges to collaborating with CBL courses. One challenge reported was difficulty communicating with instructors (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Sandy & Holland, 2006). Studies also found that community partners wanted more collaborative relationships including clarification about their role and expectations, more time to speak with instructors, and involvement in the class portion of CBL (Sandy & Holland, 2006; Tryon & Stoecker, 2008). CBL partnerships can also drain organizations of time, energy, and resources, which can be an issue if the community partners do not feel that they are receiving much in return (Blouin & Perry, 2009). Other challenges reported include working with school schedules and instructors’ lack of knowledge about the community partner organization (Worrall, 2007). Community partners also hoped for longer term commitments from students especially in organizations that rely on building trust to provide their services (Martin, SeBlonka, & Tryon, 2009; Tryon & Stoecker, 2008).

The exploration of community partners’ perspectives within Spanish CBL is relatively limited, especially in comparison to work done on student outcomes. A few studies have incorporated community partners’ perspectives on student learning outcomes (Abbott & Lear, 2010; Bettencourt, 2015) and on working with heritage speakers versus second language learners (Isabelli & Muse, 2016). Additionally, Lear and Abbott (2009) investigated the (mis)alignment of expectations of students and community partners in terms of Spanish language proficiency,
cultural knowledge, and professional skills. For example, they found that some community partners assumed students were fluent bilinguals who could translate and interpret, even when students were not trained to do so. They noted that misaligned expectations can cause problems to arise and that instructors should play an active role in mediating. Furthermore, Darias, Gómez, Hellebrandt, Loomis, Orendain, and Quezada (1999) discussed the reactions and reflections of instructors, community partners, and students based on a roundtable discussion on their experiences in a CBL course. Each author was a participant in the roundtable discussion and belonged to one of the three stakeholder groups. However, rather than an empirical study, this book chapter was a reflective piece on what worked well, what challenges they faced, and suggestions for the future. In terms of the community partners, they discussed how they benefitted from the video project and learned about the power of video for youth education, while also experiencing some difficulties working with students who sometimes did not take initiative or provide enough support with technological equipment.

Other studies have explored the benefits and challenges experienced by community members (d’Arlach, Sánchez, and Feuer, 2009; Jorge 2003). For example, d’Arlach et al. (2009) explored the experiences of Spanish-speaking community members who participated in a language exchange program with English-speaking university students in a Spanish class. In addition to language practice, meetings also consisted of discussion about social issues. d’Arlach et al. found that while community members first felt distrust and frustration towards cliquey university students and held stereotypes about them, they came to see university students as more similar to themselves than originally imagined and became empowered to seek solutions for issues they faced through discussions.
Lowther Pereira (2018) investigated community partners’ perspectives of students’ engagement and the impact of CBL on the communities they served. Community partners reported that students impacted local communities by serving as mentors and role models, community building, and raising awareness of community issues. One community partner reported that they spent time educating students about community issues affecting Latinx people, such as DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals) and also explained the purpose behind events the organization hosted. As Lowther Pereira explained, students then spread this knowledge generating awareness and promoting advocacy. Additionally, one community partner pointed to longer-term commitments as a way to have students learn more about the Latinx community and the services and advocacy that the organization offers. These findings suggest an interest on behalf of community partners in fostering students’ community awareness and provides examples of how they do so.

The studies reviewed in this section have provided important insight to community partners’ understandings, motivations, benefits, and challenges in relation to CBL. Expanding on this work, I explore how community partners’ perspectives allow us to better understand the opportunities and challenges to development of community awareness and addressing community partner needs.

2.4 Instructors’ perspectives

Instructors often serve as the creator of CBL courses as well as the liaison between community partners and students. Their implementational choices can impact both student and community partner outcomes. For these reasons, it is particularly important to explore instructors’ perspectives of CBL as well.
Higher education scholars have investigated instructors’ involvement with community engagement such as CBL. For example, Abes, Jackson, & Jones (2002) explored the factors that motivate and deter faculty members from implementing CBL. They surveyed faculty from various disciplines and found that student outcomes were their main motivator. In particular, Abes et al. found that 1) increasing student understanding of course material, 2) increasing student personal development, and 3) increasing students’ understanding of social problems as systemic were identified as the top reasons for implementing CBL. In surveying faculty in the human sciences, Banerjee and Hausafus (2007) found that points 1 and 2 were also the top motivators, while the third highest ranked motivation was creating university-community partnerships. These findings suggest that faculty are considering both student and community outcomes as important.

Studies have also found that instructors are largely driven to become involved in community engagement by personal and career goals and overall internal motivation (Abes et al., 2002; O’Meara, 2008). A supportive culture also appears to play an important role for engaging in CBL (O’Meara, 2008). There is some research that suggests that world/foreign language faculty were amongst the least likely to perform community service, which included implementing CBL in their courses among other actions such as advising community service clubs or providing services to the community (Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000). Antonio et al. suggest that this may be because foreign language graduate programs may not socialize future faculty to value community engagement in the same ways that fields like social work do. This may also suggest that foreign language programs generally do not value community engagement and therefore provide limited support and encouragement to faculty. In discussing disciplines with less community engaged faculty such as foreign language education, Antonio et al.
described them as less “other directed” and “more individualistic” (p. 387). I argue that this does not align with the goals of language education. In fact, the “5 Cs” which include communication, connections, and communities, act as pillars to language educators and indicate an emphasis on connecting with others. Although Antonio et al.’s study did not focus on CBL in particular and was conducted almost 20 years ago, it highlights the need to better understand instructors’ perspectives of CBL in language programs.

Some studies have investigated instructors’ discourse while discussing CBL (e.g., Britt, 2010; O’Meara & Neihaus, 2009). For example, O’Meara and Neihaus (2009) found that instructors drew on discourses such as CBL being a model of teaching and learning or an expression of personal identity. Instructors’ discourse about CBL can provide understanding for how instructors approach CBL. Different approaches to CBL can impact factors such as course content, service work, and outcomes. Based on this understanding, I argue that it is important to understand how instructors’ discourse regarding their goals and motivations for implementing CBL impact the approach they adopt. This, in turn, can inform our understanding of the opportunities and challenges presented for the development of community awareness and addressing community needs.

The exploration of instructors’ perspectives in Spanish CBL as participants in a study is currently virtually absent from the Spanish CBL literature. This is due to the fact that the Spanish CBL literature is largely action research. While the in-depth insider knowledge of the context provided is a valuable asset of action research, the conflation of the instructor-researcher voice does not allow the instructor perspective to be a focal point of analysis. As an outsider to the CBL courses I explore in this study, I have the advantage of seeing the context and its culture with fresh eyes (Davis, 1995). Nevertheless, instructor-researcher reflections present in the
action research that dominates the Spanish CBL literature provides some insight into their perspectives.

Instructor-researchers in the Spanish CBL literature have discussed how CBL implementation can be time and labor intensive for instructors. For example, they need to conduct research and fieldwork about their communities and community partners (Jorge, 2003). In some cases, instructors are assigned to teach a course that already has a CBL component (Petrov, 2013), while others choose to create a new CBL course. Whether or not there is a previously established course may affect the work, time, and commitment involved. Instructors must also manage logistical aspects like transportation, training, and schedules (Barreneche & Ramos-Flores, 2013; Guillén, 2010; Leeman et al., 2011). Additionally, CBL implementation involves meetings and discussions between instructors and possibly department heads and community partners to establish partnerships (Caldwell, 2007; MacGregor-Mendoza & Moreno, 2016). Instructors may also act as intermediaries between community partners and students (Lear & Abbott, 2009). Teamwork and faculty cooperation have been noted as key elements to “prevent individual instructors from feeling overwhelmed with methodological and practical innovations that are inherent in this teaching model” (Guillén, 2010, p. 50). However, in some cases there may be a lack of departmental support (Trujillo, 2009) or an established institutional infrastructure that can help instructors with CBL implementation (Mac-Gregor & Mendoza, 2016). Furthermore, most Spanish instructors are not necessarily trained as CBL practitioners. If not through their departments, instructors may find support through their universities’ office of community engagement or similarly named office, which may provide workshops that assist with CBL implementation (Guillén, 2010). Other instructors who are implementing CBL courses at the university can also serve as a support network (Pribbenow, 2005).
The available action research which includes some instructor-researcher perspectives on the tasks, commitments, and challenges they face in implementing CBL in Spanish programs provide an entry point for a deeper exploration of instructors’ perspectives of Spanish CBL. I explore similar and additional instructor perspectives that have not yet been widely addressed in the Spanish CBL literature, such as their goals and motivations and curricular ideologies, to better understand the development of students’ community awareness and addressing community partner needs.

2.5 Community-based learning relationships

Much of the CBL literature points to the importance of reciprocity in CBL relationships\(^3\). Dostilio, Brackmann, Edwards, Harrison, Kliwer, and Clayton (2012) noted that reciprocity is regularly used but rarely defined in the CBL literature. In this study, I use reciprocity to broadly refer to a process which serves both university stakeholders and community stakeholders, acknowledging that this can range from an exchange of benefits to the co-creation of new knowledge (Dostilio et al., 2012). As Bennett (2018) argues, reciprocity is “rooted in and dependent on the relationships” among stakeholders (p. 4). There are a number of possible relationships in CBL as demonstrated by Bringle, Clayton, and Price’s (2009) SOFAR model, which stands for Students, (community) Organizations, Faculty, Administrators, and (community) Residents. They argue that the nature of relationships can be exploitive, transactional, or transformational. “Transactional relationships are those that are instrumental, designed to complete a task with no greater plan or promise,” while “transformative relationships proceed with less definition, with an openness to unanticipated developments, with a deeper and

---

\(^3\) Although some scholars have differentiated between partnerships and relationships in CBL (see Bringle et al., 2009), many studies do not make this distinction and I use the two terms interchangeably based on the term used in the study being reviewed.
more sustained commitment” (Enos & Morton, 2003, p. 24). In transformational relationships, stakeholders involved learn and grow (Bringle et al., 2009). Enos and Morton propose that ideally, the transformation would occur for both the institution and the community and extend beyond the individuals involved. Furthermore, Bringle et al. describe exploitative relationships as ones that are one-sided or even harmful to a stakeholder or stakeholder group.

Hammersley (2017) notes that concepts like transformational relationships have been positioned as the ideal form of reciprocity in CBL and other community-engaged practices. However, she warns against adopting this mentality given that "characterizing reciprocity as such fails to take into account the diversity of partner relations, commitment levels, activity types, or the context in which relationships take place" (p. 121). Hammersley also points to the importance of considering how community partners want to participate in and benefit from the collaboration. Bushouse (2005) found that community partners preferred transactional relationships because of the direct, tangible results and the low cost-benefit to their organization. Furthermore, Blouin and Perry (2009) found that organizations that have students work in established programs tend to prefer transactional relationships, while organizations that have students work on specific projects prefer and are better prepared for transformative relationships. Importantly, however, exploitative relationships are to be avoided.

In the Spanish CBL literature, Lear and Sánchez (2013) discussed designing, building, and sustaining a CBL relationship between instructor and community partner, which in this case was themselves. They found that their partnership moved from aligned to committed according to Dorado and Giles’s (2003) paths of engagement that ranges from tentative, in which partnerships are new and/or temporary, to aligned, in which stakeholders work together to strengthen the partnership, to committed, in which the partnerships extend past the CBL course.
They also found that students might be better prepared to participate in transactional tasks than transformational tasks at the beginning of the partnership. This is the only study in the Spanish CBL literature, to my knowledge, that explicitly explores stakeholder relationships.

Furthermore, in striving for reciprocity, it is important to avoid paternalistic relationships that do not benefit communities and can perpetuate stereotyping (Barreneche & Ramos-Flores, 2013). For example, Abbott and Lear (2010) described a student who appeared to see the community members she worked with as “poor” and attributed this to mismanagement of money. When students link social problems to individual characteristics, such as in the previous example, they have likely missed the ways in which social issues stem from institutional or societal causes (Marullo & Edwards, 2000). Developing students’ community awareness in addition to addressing community partner needs can prevent such paternalistic relationships. My study will explore how relationships between stakeholders presents opportunities and challenges to achieving these reciprocal aims in the two focal courses.

2.6 Chapter summary

The majority of research in the Spanish CBL literature has focused on students’ language and culture-related learning. Less attention has been paid to examining other types of student outcomes such as community awareness and to community partner outcomes. Importantly, what facilitates and constrains student and community partner outcomes is underexplored, yet crucial for understanding how to establish reciprocal relationships. Although I discussed each stakeholder separately in this chapter, my aim is to bring all three perspectives together in order to better understand the opportunities and challenges associated with the development of students’ community awareness and addressing community partner needs. In the following chapter, I explore how CBL was approached in each focal course.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

In Chapter 2, I established the theoretical framework that guides this dissertation and reviewed the current Spanish CBL literature as well as the broader CBL literature on stakeholders’ outcomes and perspectives. I also discussed how this dissertation expands upon previous work by exploring the opportunities and challenges associated with the development of students’ community awareness and addressing community partner needs through the perspectives of three key stakeholders—community partners, instructors, and students. In this chapter, I describe the study’s methodology and procedures. I do this by providing a description of my research sites, participants, recruitment process, data collection methods, and analysis process. First, however, I turn to the important role of the researcher in qualitative research studies.

3.1 Researcher reflexivity

As Bloomberg and Volpe (2016) state, “it is critical that qualitative researchers be explicit about their frame of reference, philosophical standpoint, and their investment in the research (personal, emotional, conceptual, and/or theoretical) because these factors will in one way or another be used to interpret the study’s findings” (pp. 240-241). Given this, I provide some reflections on how this study is shaped by me as the researcher.

I began this study with an interest in sociolinguistic and sociopolitical learning in Spanish language education. My interest in Spanish language education and language education more broadly stems from my own language learning background and identity. I identify as a White, Hispanic/Latina woman. I am a first-generation American with my mother and father immigrating to the US from Bolivia and Italy, respectively. I consider myself a native speaker of English and Spanish having been raised bilingually in English and Spanish since birth. I also
identify as a heritage speaker of Spanish, seeing this identity as a subgroup of native speakers (see Kupisch & Rothman, 2012). As a heritage speaker, I have been drawn to the research on heritage language education, particularly critical approaches to teaching and learning Spanish as a heritage language. Reflective of this, my curiosity about CBL in Spanish education was grounded in work such as Leeman et al. (2011) and Martínez and Schwartz (2012), which discussed CBL courses taking critical approaches to the teaching of Spanish as a heritage language. Currently, much of the innovative and transformative pedagogies that incorporate sociolinguistics and sociopolitics into the Spanish curriculum have been focused on heritage language classrooms. However, many classes in Spanish language programs are in fact “mixed” courses meaning that students are a mix of heritage speakers and second language learners (Carreira, 2016). I have only taken mixed courses at the high school and university level, none of which I recall adopting a critical approach to the teaching of Spanish.

Learning about critical approaches through my graduate education has given me a better understanding of my own experiences with the Spanish language and has raised my attention to the importance of incorporating discussions of linguistic ideologies, power, and agency in Spanish classrooms. For example, I recall a time where I questioned whether I was speaking Spanish “correctly” when I realized I sometimes conjugated verbs in a way that I did not remember ever being used or discussed in my Spanish classes. Through my own investigation, I came to realize that I was using the second-person singular form vos, a pronoun widely used in the Bolivian variety of Spanish that I was raised with. Teachers do not often include vos in the classroom as it is often viewed as not educated and informal (López López, Martinez Franco, & Yazan, 2019). However, Griffin (2019) notes that many immigrants come to the US from countries that use vos, making it an important part of the sociolinguistic landscape of Spanish in
the US. Including vos in our Spanish classrooms could expose students to linguistic variation and lead to a discussion of why and how certain varieties are privileged over others, thereby combatting standard language ideologies. I have felt empowered by this knowledge and I believe these and similar lessons are important for other heritage speakers and second language learners alike to learn in Spanish classrooms.

Given my interests and experiences, I became interested in exploring CBL as a pedagogy that could push Spanish language education to be more inclusive and responsive to the sociolinguistic and sociopolitical realities of Spanish in the US for all students. This is in line with recent scholarly work proposing reformulations of the foci and intentions of Spanish language programs (Pascual y Cabo & Prada, 2018; Torres, Pascual y Cabo, & Beusterien, 2018). This, in turn, led to my interest in critical approaches to CBL and its emphasis on a social justice orientation (Mitchell, 2008).

Furthermore, my interest in CBL stems from my own participation in community engagement as a student. As a high school student, I participated in a service trip to Pearlington, Mississippi in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. As an undergraduate student, I participated in an Alternative Spring Break trip focused on hunger and homelessness in Washington, DC as well as in a CBL course. All of these service experiences stand out as some of the most memorable and impactful educational experiences I have had. As part of my CBL course on community-based language learning, I served as an English conversation partner to adult English learners at a conversation group in the local community. In my second semester in the course, I continued to serve as a conversation partner while also taking on a leadership role given my experience with the conversation group. I enjoyed getting to connect with local community members and play a role in their English learning journey. However, I also remember how I often felt frustrated by
my lack of preparation to “teach” ESL. Although we were not expected to be teachers, I felt that more preparation on teaching methodologies and practices would help me be a better conversation partner to the community members. Reflecting on this experience now, I wonder to what extent community members benefitted from their participation and what they perceived my and other students’ role to be.

As I identified my focal classrooms and my study developed, I began to expand my understanding of what implementing CBL means and why and how instructors choose to implement CBL. This encouraged me to examine CBL through a wider lens. As I will discuss in section 3.3, I chose two courses as my cases. I refer to them as the Translation course and the Labor Issues course. At first, the Translation course did not fit into what I imagined a CBL course to be, given that it did not take a critical CBL approach (see Chapter 4). The Labor Issues course, while taking more of a critical CBL approach, also did not fit my original conceptions of a Spanish CBL course because there was not a focus on critical language awareness. Both of these early findings point to the influence of the literature I had read on CBL up until that point. Given that I did not specifically focus on identifying courses taking a critical CBL approach for my focal courses, I decided to explore what occurred in these two courses, how so, and why rather than focusing on how the courses did or did not align with critical approaches or other preconceptions I had of Spanish CBL. Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge that my vision of CBL aligns with more critical approaches and this influences my interpretation and analysis of the data. Furthermore, I do not have experience implementing CBL or critical approaches in language education, and feel that I still have much to learn about these topics. Therefore, I approach my exploration of CBL in Spanish education as a learner and an explorer of what is being done and what can be done to improve current practices.
3.2 Qualitative case study approach

Case studies are a popular research methodology in applied linguistics. The case study methodology has been used in qualitative and quantitative studies exploring language learners’ experiences in a variety of contexts and development in a number of factors. For example, Kinginger (2004) explored the identity reconstruction of an American learner of French, while Polat and Kim (2014) investigated the development of complexity and accuracy in the speech of a Turkish learner of English. In this dissertation, I take a qualitative case study approach to better understand opportunities and challenges related to CBL in Spanish education.

Merriam (1998) defines a qualitative case study as “an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a bounded phenomenon such as a program, institution, a person, a process, or a social unit” (p. xiii as cited by Yazan, 2015). While there are many definitions of case study research in the literature, Duff (2008) identified six key principles: “boundedness or singularity, in-depth study, multiple perspectives or triangulation, particularity, contextualization, and interpretation” (p. 23). This dissertation is a multiple case study with two cases; each a Spanish course implementing CBL. A qualitative multiple case study approach allowed me to explore the complexity of multiple perspectives and experiences of Spanish CBL. Importantly, “[case study research’s] goal is not to universalize but to particularize and then yield insights of potentially wider relevance and theoretical significance” (Duff, 2012, p. 96).

3.3 The cases: Two community-based learning courses

More detailed and contextualized information about the participants, courses, and community partner organizations is provided in the analysis chapters of this dissertation (see Chapters 4, 5, and 6). However, the following sections serve as a brief overview to the focal courses.
3.3.1 Translation course

The first focal course, which I will refer to as the Translation course, is an upper-division course in a Spanish department at a private university in the Northeastern US. It is an elective course which students can take after meeting the pre-requisite of two years of college Spanish or equivalent, or with instructor’s permission. In addition to the 3-hour a week class time, students were required to complete 20 hours of service work. Coursework included weekly homework, quizzes, a midterm exam, and a final presentation and reflection paper.

The instructor, Martina (pseudonym), is a professional translator from South America and was in her second year of teaching translation. She had previous experience teaching Spanish during a Master’s program as well as experience teaching English in her home country. There were 18 students in total in the course; 17 undergraduate and one Master’s student. Information on the students’ gender and school year is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Gender and school year of students in the Translation course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sixteen of the 18 students in the class completed the questionnaire, therefore the table represents ~89% of the class.

The students came from a range of majors such as Political Science, Business Administration, Film & Media Arts, and Spanish. Other than English and Spanish students reported knowing Italian (2), French (1), Afrikaans (1), ASL (2), and Latin (1). Four students
reported acquiring Spanish since birth/age 0. Fourteen of the students reported being born in the United States, while one student was born in Colombia and another student in Cambodia. Half of the students who filled out the questionnaire from the Translation course identified as multicultural identifying with American as well as Latin American, African, Asian, and European cultures.

Students had two options for the CBL service work component of the course. One option was to work on an English to Spanish translation for a nonprofit organization. The other option was to participate in direct service at a nonprofit organization. No translation element was required for the direct service, but Martina shared that she wanted students to enjoy what they were doing and so she wanted to offer that option as well. The only requirement for the direct service option was that they use the Spanish language in some way. Three students chose the direct service route. Although I interviewed two students who chose to participate in direct service, I do not examine their CBL experience in this dissertation. The remaining fifteen students chose to work on a translation as their service work. The majority of these students worked on the translation of a resource guide for The Caregivers Coalition (pseudonym). However, the resource guide was not long enough to provide each student with at least 1,000 words to translate over the course of the semester. Therefore, three students worked on a translation for a local community health center.

The Caregivers Coalition served as the main community partner organization for this course. It is a non-profit organization co-founded by director, Elizabeth (pseudonym), two years prior to the start of my research. The organization is made up of a two-person staff and was founded to support relative caregivers, which are family members who take on the responsibility of caring for a child when their parents are unable to. The Caregivers Coalition provides legal
representation, educate caregivers on their rights, assist caregivers with finding healthcare, and provide other services that support families. Elizabeth served as the main community partner for this course.

3.3.2 Labor Issues course

The second focal course, which I will refer to as the Labor Issues course, is an upper-division course in a Spanish department at a private university in the Northeastern US. In addition to the 3-hour a week class time, students were required to complete 20 hours of service work. Coursework included writing assignments, reflection papers, and a final project made up of a group presentation and an individual paper.

The instructor, Valeria (pseudonym), is originally from South America. She has many years of experience teaching courses in Spanish departments both at her current university and others. There were 13 undergraduate students in total in the course. Students’ gender and school year information is shown in Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Nine of thirteen students in the class completed the questionnaire, therefore the table represents ~69% of the class.

The students came from a range of majors such as International Relations, Political Science, Spanish, and Theatre. Other than English and Spanish, students also reported speaking
Italian (1) and Gujarati (1). Three students reported acquiring Spanish since birth/age 0. Eight of the students reported being born in the United States, while one student was born in Chile. Students identified with cultures from the US, Latin American, Africa, and Asia.

Students worked on various tasks as part of their service work. This included tasks such as organizing a fundraiser, brainstorming ideas for workshops, fixing an ID machine, and supporting a theatre group. As Valeria explained in a follow up email, all tasks were based on the needs of the organization and carefully discussed before the semester began.

The community partner organization in the Labor Issues course was Labor Rights for All (pseudonym). Labor Rights for All is a small non-profit organization with two staff members in addition to the director. The organization works with immigrant, migrant, and low-wage workers to advocate for workers’ rights and to educate workers about how to advocate for their own rights. The majority of the workers that the organization works with are from Latin America. Particular issues Labor Rights for All works to combat include wage theft, workplace discrimination, and workplace safety violations. The director of Labor Rights for All, Ramon (pseudonym), served as the main community partner in this course.

3.2 Identifying cases and participants

In identifying my two cases, I used criterion sampling (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016) by specifically searching for CBL courses in Spanish departments. I began by searching universities’ schedule of classes at universities that were accessible to me by car. I searched for Spanish courses that mentioned CBL or service-learning in their title and read the class descriptions to better understand if the course would be a fit for my study. I also used the filtered search allowed by some universities, which allow you to specifically look for courses that have been designated as CBL or service-learning courses. From this search, I identified four classes
and emailed the four instructors of the courses in early March 2019. I briefly introduced myself and my study, asked them to participate in two interviews, and asked for permission to also observe their class. I also let them know about my interest in recruiting students from their course and their community partners for participation in the study as well. Two instructors, Martina and Valeria, responded to my email expressing their interest and ability to participate. Before getting started, I spoke with Valeria on the phone and Martina in person to tell them a bit more about my study and to learn a bit about their courses. We determined a good day for me to visit their classes for the first time to introduce myself to the students and observe the class. They also forwarded me the contact information for their community partners. I contacted the community partners, Elizabeth and Ramon, via email briefly introducing myself and my study and asking them to participate in two interviews with me. Both community partners agreed to participate.

Students could participate in my study in three ways; 1) fill out the questionnaire, 2) share their reflection essays with me, and 3) participate in an interview. On the first day of class observations in both classes, I recruited students for the first two tasks—participating in the questionnaire and sharing their reflection essays. As it was my first time visiting the class, each teacher gave the students a very brief introduction to me before giving me the floor. I greeted and introduced myself in Spanish and then proceeded to switch into English to explain my study and review the consent form. The consent form was on the first page of the electronic questionnaire. Students had four choices to choose from regarding their participation in this part of the study: 1) agree to participate by both completing the questionnaire and sharing their reflection essays with me, 2) only agree to participate in the questionnaire, 3) only agree to share their reflection essays with me, and 4) not agreeing to participate in the study. Students were invited to ask questions
and to take their time in making their decision. Students who agreed to participate in the questionnaire were asked to take a few minutes then to fill out the questionnaire. Students who agreed to share their reflection essays with me were asked to provide their email so that I could follow up with them at a later time. I recruited for the student interviews during my last classroom observation for each class. After telling students a bit about what participation would involve, I reviewed the consent form with them. Students were invited to ask questions and to take their time in making their decision. Since many students who had consented to sharing their reflection essays with me had not provided an email on the questionnaire, I also reminded students to send me their reflection essays at this time.

3.5 Data collection

Drawing from data collection methods typically used in qualitative case study research, I collected data through 1) interviews, 2) documents, 3) classroom observations, and 4) a questionnaire. The collection of data through these different methods from three stakeholder groups allowed for triangulation of my data (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016). I describe each method in more detail below.

3.5.1 Interviews

The main source of data I draw upon in this study comes from interviews. The interviews were semi-structured following a protocol for each stakeholder group, while also following the natural progression of the conversation and asking relevant questions as they arose (Lichtman, 2013). All interviews were conducted in English. My choice to conduct the interviews in English were driven by the fact that I had created my interview questions in English and because English is my dominant language especially for the academic domain. However, in retrospect, I could have asked participants ahead of time which language they preferred, whether English or
Spanish, and conducted the interviews in the language of their choice. This could have allowed participants to choose the language they feel most comfortable expressing their thoughts and opinions in, which could have led to richer data. Importantly, I do not see interviews as merely tools to gather information, but as sites of co-construction (Talmy, 2010). I, therefore, approached the interviews with the knowledge that participants are not merely providing reports, but that factors such as my questions and my known and perceived identities shaped the nature of the interactions. In section 3.6, I discuss how the co-constructed nature of interviews also played a role in my transcription and analysis process. I discuss the details of my interviews with each stakeholder group in more detail below.

3.5.1.1 Student Interviews. I interviewed 15 students in total. Of the 15 students, six students had taken the Labor Issues course (~46% class participation), while nine students were from the Translation course (50% class participation). Each student participated in one interview. Students were given the choice of meeting over the phone, through video-conferencing, or in person. Of the 15 interviews I conducted with students, 12 were conducted over the phone, two were conducted on Skype, and one was conducted on campus in person. As the interviews were conducted over the summer after the semester had ended, most students were no longer on or near campus. Students signed the consent form when I recruited participants during my last classroom observation in each class so I reviewed it with them again prior to starting the interviews. During the interview, I asked students about their opinions, experiences, and ideas about CBL. Interview questions are attached as Appendix A. Interviews ranged from around 20 to 45 minutes. I recorded the interviews using my personal laptop and/or cellphone with the students’ permission. Each student received a $20 Amazon gift card via email for their
participation in the interview. Information on the 15 students who participated in an interview is shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Student interview participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Cultural Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abigail</td>
<td>Labor Issues</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Bicultural (Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>Labor Issues</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Bicultural (Latin America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>Labor Issues</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Bicultural (Latin America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>Labor Issues</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kali</td>
<td>Labor Issues</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Bicultural (South Asia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayn</td>
<td>Labor Issues</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Bicultural (South Asia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alana</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>US-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>US-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Bicultural (Latin America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dara</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Bicultural (Latin America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gianna</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Multicultural (Europe &amp; Southeast Asia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>US-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>US-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Bicultural (Latin America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>US-American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. For students who identified as American and an additional country-specific cultural identification, I use Bicultural or Multicultural accordingly and list the region of the countries with which they identify in parentheses to reduce identifiability. Other cultural identifications appear as reported by the student on the background questionnaire.

*a* Both of Claudia’s reported cultural identities are from Latin America.

b Kali did not complete the questionnaire.

c Jordan did not complete the questionnaire.

d Dara and Parker participated in direct service and so I do not explore their experiences in this dissertation.

3.5.1.2 Instructor Interviews. Instructors were invited to participate in two interviews; one shortly after I began classroom observations at about mid-semester, and one at the end of the semester. The purpose of the interviews was to better understand their opinions, experiences, and ideas about CBL. The interview questions can be found in Appendix B. I reviewed the consent form with each instructor before the first interview, gave them a chance to ask any questions, and asked them to take their time in making their decision. Each instructor was given the choice on
when and where to meet for the interviews. For my interviews with Valeria, we met in her department office. Our first interview lasted approximately an hour, while the second interview was about 38 minutes long. For my interviews with Martina, we met at a coffee shop for our first interview which lasted about 55 minutes and spoke over the phone for our second interview while she was abroad visiting family for the summer break. The second interview lasted about 57 minutes. I recorded the interviews using my personal laptop and/or cellphone. I also sent the instructors follow up questions via email. Some questions were clarification questions while others were aimed at better understanding reported actions or opinions from the interviews which had become important to my analysis. These follow up emails were sent in January 2020 and June 2020.

3.5.1.3 Community partner interviews. Community partners were invited to participate in a mid-semester and end of the semester interview. During these interviews, I asked them about their opinions, experiences, and ideas about CBL. The interview questions can be found in Appendix C. The consent form was sent to them via email. I reviewed the consent form with them before the interview began and gave them the opportunity to ask any questions. Both community partners then signed and sent the consent form back to me via email prior to the start of the first interview. Each community partner was given the choice on when and where to meet for the interviews. Both chose to meet over the phone for their interviews. My first interview with Elizabeth lasted about 26 minutes, and our second interview lasted 29 minutes. My interviews with Ramon lasted about 37 and 34 minutes. I recorded the interviews using my personal laptop and/or cellphone.
3.5.2 Reflections on rapport-building

Given that my study began mid-semester, I did not have much time to build rapport before beginning data collection. Of the three stakeholder groups, I feel I was able to build the most rapport with the instructors. This was due to the fact that I had the most communication with the instructors as I coordinated classroom visits or chatted with them before or after class and interviews. I believe this allowed them to get to know me a bit outside of my researcher role and also to get to know me as a graduate student and fellow undergraduate instructor. I used both English and Spanish in my interactions with the instructors to different degrees. I feel that being able to speak Spanish, and perhaps my shared South American background, helped me build rapport.

Students were familiar with me from my classroom observations, but I had not otherwise interacted with them extensively until the interviews. During my interviews with students, I did not share much about myself but I noted my personal connections to some experiences they shared, particularly experiences that native/heritage speaker students shared, such as having to act as a language broker for their parents (see López, 2020). When I asked if they had any questions at the end of the interviews, some students asked about my dissertation. During my interview with one student, Kali, she talked about her plans to pursue doctoral studies and shared, “eventually, I’ll have to do exactly what you’re doing…like write a dissertation.” These examples seem to indicate that students oriented to me as a graduate student, which was something they could relate to as undergraduate students who might one day be graduate students as well.

As for the community partners, I did not have the opportunity to build much rapport with either of them. While I had the opportunity to briefly meet Ramon on the day of final
presentations (prior to our second interview), I did not get to interact with Elizabeth beyond our interviews. As I discuss in Chapter 5, questions I asked Elizabeth during the interviews sparked ideas for things she could do differently in her CBL participation. This seems to indicate that she viewed my questions as well-informed and perhaps saw me as knowledgeable about CBL. Having built more rapport with all participants might have impacted what they shared in their interviews and given me a better understanding of their experiences. Overall, I would have liked to start my study at the beginning of the semester to have gotten more time to build rapport and integrate myself into the courses more, but ultimately this did not work with my timeline.

3.5.3 Documents

3.5.3.1 Reflection essays. Both courses included reflection essays as part of their class assignments as is typical in CBL courses. The Labor Issues course had three essays with different foci throughout the semester for students to, as stated in the course syllabus, “reflect on their class content and/or CBL experience (this is a chance to write from one’s own life experience as long as it is contextualized).” These reflections were written in Spanish. The Translation course had one reflection essay due at the end of the semester, which was meant to be a space to reflect on the CBL component of the course. Students could write about any aspect of their CBL experience, such as what they liked or disliked, what they learned, or what they felt they contributed to the community. Students had the choice of writing the essays in either English or Spanish. The essays I collected from students in this class were all written in English.

All students were invited to share their reflection essays with me. Ultimately, seven students shared their essays with me; two students from the Labor Issues course, who shared three essays each, and five students from the Translation course. This resulted in 11 essays for
analysis. The essays ranged from about 1-2 pages double-spaced. Information on the seven students who shared their reflections essays is shown in Table 4.

**Table 4**

*Students who shared their reflection essays*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Cultural Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>Labor Issues</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayn</td>
<td>Labor Issues</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Bicultural (South Asia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dara a</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>American, Latino (semi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>US-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Bicultural (Latin America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>US-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>US-American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* For students who identified as American and an additional country-specific cultural identification, I use Bicultural or Multicultural accordingly and list the region of the countries with which they identify in parentheses to reduce identifiability. Other cultural identifications appear as reported by the student on the background questionnaire.

* aDara participated in direct service and so I do not explore her experiences in this dissertation.

3.5.3.2 Other course-related documents. In order to further contextualize the focal classes, I also collected other relevant course-related material. I asked instructors to share their syllabus and other any other class material related to CBL with me. As a result, I collected class syllabi and CBL criteria for each course as well as some additional service work related documents from the Translation course. I also obtained copies of class readings that students referenced in their interviews or reflection essays in the Labor Issues course. Elizabeth, the Translation course community partner, shared her organization’s English resource guide as well as the Spanish version of the resource guide produced by the students with me. Martina shared a copy of the original material translated by students for the community healthcare clinic with me as well.
3.5.4 Classroom observations

Classroom observations took place over six weeks between April and May 2019. I observed each class four times, which is approximately 18 hours of classroom observations. I took field notes during observations. My primary motive for conducting observations was to better understand the context of my focal classes and familiarize myself to the instructors and students (and vice versa). I always communicated via email with the instructors ahead of time letting them know when I would be observing their class and if I would need a few minutes of class time to recruit students for participation in a part of my study.

In the Labor Issues course, students sat at tables organized in a U-shape. I always sat at one end of the U close to the front of the room during observations. As computers were not permitted in class, I took notes by hand. I did not actively participate in class, but rather focused on observing. In the Translation course, the configuration of tables differed across class periods, but generally was organized in three long rows with students facing the front of the room. I usually sat at a table on the side of the classroom separate from the students. Other than times when I was recruiting students, I did not regularly speak during class time. In this class, I alternated between taking notes in a notebook and on my laptop.

Although I did not seek to play an active role in the classroom, I acknowledge that my presence influenced the context. Given that I started classroom observations mid-semester, I hoped that my presence was not overly intrusive. Although I do not know how my presence was perceived, Abigail, a student in the Labor Issues course, shared in an interview how my presence in the classroom influenced the way she viewed CBL. She shared,

…another enlightening piece for me was that really like kind of framed this issue into a bigger light than this like x like having you in our class as a <PhD(?)> student <in our
class(?)> and realizing oh I guess CBL is bigger than what it may seem like it’s not just-it’s not just limited to colleges or people who have the college experience who still find value in it…so that <was good for me(?)> to see as well.

It appears that my presence in the classroom as a researcher conducting a study on CBL seemed to influence Abigail’s view of CBL as a topic of value to a wider audience that she might have originally imagined.

As I did not audio or video record the class sessions, I do not draw on observations as a primary data source. However, I do make reference to observations as a way to triangulate my data. Overall, the classroom observations allowed me to understand what a typical class period looked like in terms of class activities, discussions, and interactions. Table 5 provides a timeline of my classroom visits.

**Table 5**

*Classroom observation timeline*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Class observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Labor Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>Labor Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>Labor Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>Labor Issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.5.5 Questionnaires**

I created a questionnaire on Qualtrics to collect background information including demographic and language information about the students in each course. This information allowed for a better understanding of the student population in the focal courses. Questions asked about their majors, languages spoken, cultural identification, Spanish acquisition, Spanish use
and abilities, and participation in other CBL courses. The list of questions from the questionnaire are provided in Appendix D. A total of 25 out of 31 students across both classes participated in the questionnaire.

3.6 Analysis

As Bloomberg and Volpe (2016) explain, “qualitative data analysis is an interactive and recursive process, not a linear one.” Analysis of data begins as soon as you start collecting data and continues throughout the writing process. With this in mind, I provide an overview of my analysis process.

I describe my analysis process as taking a thematic analysis approach. According to Braun and Clarke (2006), “thematic analysis involves searching across a data set—be that a number of interviews or focus groups, or a range of texts—to find repeated patterns of meaning” (p. 86). An important first step in analyzing my data was transcription of the 23 interviews I conducted. I transcribed each audio recording which resulted in approximately 371 pages of transcripts. The act of putting audio into writing involves decisions regarding what and how to include the audio you hear and in making these decisions, analysis is occurring (Lapadat & Lindsay, 1999). I adopted a relatively broad transcription approach given my focus on content and to facilitate readability of excerpts. I chose to use a few basic transcription conventions (see Appendix E) to capture key aspects such as overlapping speech, laughter, and word emphasis.

Recognizing the role that I play in the co-construction of interviews (Mann, 2010; Talmy, 2010), I adopted two approaches for the presentation of excerpts. In many instances, I have chosen to present complete transcripts including the participants’ and my contributions. At other times, I have opted to present only the participants’ speech, while providing the topic of discussion and the question I asked the participant in prose. In these cases, my deleted utterances were all
minimal responses, such as ok, mhm, or yeah. My transcription of interviews began as I continued to conduct additional interviews. As I transcribed the interviews, I noted topics that stood out to me and questions that arose. I also had a running document of ideas that emerged as I transcribed, read literature, and thought about my data. Once I had transcribed all the interviews, I uploaded the transcripts into NVivo along with the reflection essays. NVivo is a qualitative data analysis software that allows you to code and organize your data.

Overall, I took an inductive approach to coding the data (Braun & Clark, 2006). While I was aware of themes that previous studies had identified, I did not set out to look for any explicit themes from previous research in my data. However, as Holliday (2016) explained, although themes are emergent, they “are also influenced by questions or issues that the researcher brought to the research” (p. 105-106). As I discussed in section 3.1, I was interested in exploring sociopolitical learning in Spanish language education, therefore this impacted the way I looked at my data. For example, I paid particular attention to instances of student learning about social issues and the lived experiences of community members. However, I also made a point of noting different types of learning as well.

My first round of coding resulted in 104 coded categories. Examples of these codes include broad categories driven by my interview questions such as challenges and more emergent and theory-driven categories such as insider-outsider identities. I then conducted a second round of coding by recoding each interview and reflection essay. Many categories from the first round of coding reappeared as salient in the second round. Other categories were dropped or combined, and some new categories emerged. During the coding and overall analysis process, I discussed my findings and emerging themes with my advisor, my committee members, and two professors who teach Spanish CBL courses (neither of which were participants in the
study). These conversations and others I had throughout the process allowed me to continually develop and refine my analysis of the data.

As I continued to explore my data, have conversations, and write, I thought about how my codes fit into larger themes. This included phases of searching for themes, reviewing themes, and defining and naming themes (Braun and Clark, 2006). For Chapter 4, my themes were generated by considering what elements allowed me to understand how CBL was framed in each course. For Chapter 5, I was guided by my interest in sociopolitical learning and in Chapter 6, I was guided by my interest in how communities can benefit from participation in CBL. I began to focus on the concepts of students’ development of community awareness and addressing community partner goals. Guided by my research questions, which underwent revisions as my analysis developed, I explored the opportunities and challenges related to the development of community awareness and addressing community partner needs in each course. I then looked for patterns amongst these opportunities and challenges that spanned across both courses. This resulted in my themes which serve as headings within the chapters. Subthemes also arose under some of the larger themes. Some of my codes from NVivo became the themes or subthemes, while others did not become a part of my analysis.

I also conducted members checks via follow up email with the two instructors as another form of triangulation. Member checking allows qualitative researchers “to check their reconstructions of the emic perspective by having field participants review statements in the researchers’ report for accuracy and completeness” (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2005, p. 551 as cited by Duff, 2008). I only conducted members checks with instructors as they were potentially the most identifiable to readers of this dissertation. I sent the two instructors pieces of my writing where I discussed them and/or excerpts from their interviews. I asked them to provide feedback on
whether I had accurately described/understood what they said as well as if there was anything they would like me to add or remove. Based on their feedback, I made some changes and additions to my writing and transcripts. For example, Martina provided some additional insight that helped me further understand her decision not to include readings about CBL in her course (see Chapter 4).

3.7 Chapter summary

Taking a qualitative case study approach, I explored two Spanish CBL classrooms. Using interviews, document gathering, classroom observations, and a questionnaire, I explored the experiences, ideas, and opinions of three key stakeholders—students, instructors, and community partners. Through a thematic analysis, I identified themes that demonstrated the approach to CBL taken in each course and the opportunities and challenges related to students’ development of community awareness and addressing community partner needs. Importantly, the data collection and analysis process was influenced by my role as the researcher and so I aimed to be reflexive throughout this chapter and the study. In the following chapter, I demonstrate how the two focal cases represent different approaches to CBL in Spanish education.
CHAPTER 4: EXPLORING APPROACHES TO COMMUNITY-BASED LEARNING IN SPANISH EDUCATION

In order to better understand the opportunities and challenges involved with the development of students’ community awareness and addressing community partner needs in CBL, it is important to first examine how CBL is carried out in the two focal courses. As Britt (2012) points out, knowing an instructor is employing [CBL] pedagogy does not tell the whole story about why [CBL] is being employed, what constitutes a community service-experience, or how community service offers additional outcomes for students not easily gained through traditional classroom-only learning (p. 81).

While there are various ways to conceptualize approaches to CBL (see Hammersley, 2017), Mitchell (2008) discusses the concepts of traditional and critical approaches. Traditional approaches “emphasize students, focusing on “preprofessional” experiences (viewing service much like an internship or practicum), and the personal or social development of students (mostly attitudes toward leadership, altruism, and sometimes thoughts or feelings about the people served in the community)” (Mitchell, 2008, p. 52). Critical approaches, on the other hand, “challenge students to investigate and understand the root causes of social problems and the courses of action necessary to challenge and change the structures that perpetuate those problems” (Mitchell, 2008, p. 53). My goal is not to merely classify these courses or examine to what extent they follow a certain approach. Rather, I draw on approaches from the literature to better understand how CBL is approached in the two focal courses providing context for the exploration of the development of students’ community awareness and addressing community
partner needs in Chapter 5 and 6. Therefore, the research question I aim to answer in this chapter is:

How is CBL approached in the two focal Spanish CBL courses?

I explore the approach to CBL in the two focal courses by examining them through the following themes: 1) the course curriculum and class time, 2) the instructor’s goals and motivation to implement CBL, and 3) the community partner’s goals and motivation for participation in CBL. I explore how these three themes played out first in the Translation course and then in the Labor Issues course. My analysis draws on interview data with the instructors and community partners as well as classroom observations, follow up email, and the course syllabi.

In terms of curriculum and class time, I explore how the course descriptions and objectives on the syllabi as well as the content covered in class provide an understanding of why and how CBL was implemented in the two classes. I also explore the courses’ learning outcomes as stated on the syllabus as a way to understand the implementation of CBL based on what learning opportunities the instructors aimed to provide through their CBL courses. While learning outcomes are reflective of an instructor’s explicit goals for their students, instructors also have additional learning goals that are not always reflected in the stated learning outcomes. Therefore, in terms of the instructors’ goals and motivation for implementation, I explore the discourse of the instructors to provide insight into how the instructors understand and frame CBL in their courses. Lastly, I explore the community partners’ goals and motivations for participation. Understanding why community partners participate and what they view as the outcomes also provides insight into how CBL is approached in the two courses. Overall, these three themes allow me to demonstrate how the focal courses adopted different approaches to
CBL while maintaining a common interest in developing students’ community awareness and addressing community partner needs.

4.1 Translation course

4.1.1 Curriculum and class time

As an introductory class in translation, translation is at the core of the Translation course.

As stated under the Course objectives section of the syllabus,

The primary emphasis in the course is on the practice of translation. Students will undertake a rigorous review of the Spanish and English language in order to improve their understanding of the grammatical, lexical, and semantic language issues central to the task of translation in both directions.

This excerpt demonstrates that there is a focus on the linguistic elements of translation including grammar, vocabulary, and meaning. The Course objectives section goes on to state “Students will explore the field of translation in the context of community-based learning.” This appears to position CBL as a means to learn about and practice translation. Additionally, the Course objectives section states that,

students will learn about the role of translation and interpreting in the community, and will gain a deeper appreciation for the role education, support, health and wellness advocacy have in promoting the healthy development of children.

This demonstrates that learning about the role of translation in the community and issues impacting children in the community are also positioned as goals.

The Community-Based Learning section of the syllabus includes a definition of CBL at the university that describes it as a pedagogy and seems to put the focus on student learning through involvement with the community. However, the section also highlights the reciprocal
aim of CBL by including the following sentence, “Performing this valuable task is mutually beneficial to The Caregivers Coalition, as it meets a specific organizational need, as well as to students, because it will challenge students linguistically to meet the rigorous standards of professional translation.” This excerpt makes reference to the reciprocal aim of CBL by noting how CBL meets the community partner’s need while also benefiting students. The benefit to the student that is highlighted seems to focus on the development of their translation skills for a professional context. This idea appears to be reinforced in the Course objectives section in which the course is described as providing “opportunities to students to develop professional translation skills in collaboration with the organization The Caregivers Coalition.”

In general, the course syllabus appears to indicate a career orientation to the course. A reference to careers appears in the first section of the syllabus and states,

Translation is a fundamentally human and universally shared activity. It is also a booming industry. The US Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that the translation and interpretation industries will grow at a rate of 42% by 2020. Accordingly, this course presents the task of translation to students as both a deeply poetic endeavor and as a marketable skill.

The inclusion of statistics on the expected growth of the translation and interpretation industries from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Course description section suggests that translation is being framed as a viable career option to the students. Furthermore, the description of translation as a “booming industry” and as a “marketable skill” appears to position translation as a job-related skill. Reference to careers also appears under the Community-Based Learning section of the syllabus which describes how students will “gain important career skills through practicing peer-editing, working with a deadline, and delivering a quality product.” Again, this
connects CBL to the development of career skills. Although also described as “a deeply poetic endeavor” in the Course description, translation seems to mainly be framed through a career-based, skills perspective.

The Student learning outcomes also demonstrate how CBL is approached in the course. Through taking this course, students are expected to,

1. Critically evaluate the main concerns that are central to the field of Spanish<>English translation;

2. Apply the grammatical, lexical, stylistic elements learned throughout the semester to the translations produced in both directions;

3. Identify key techniques involved in the task of translation;

4. Employ specific strategies and resources to the translation of different types of texts (mostly general, but also advertising, business, medical, sports, legal, and IT).

5. Understand the need and impact of translation and interpreting skills in community-based organizations working with the Latino community in [the city].

6. Provide professional level translations to meet the needs of non-profit organization.

7. Build relationships with The Caregivers Coalition (or the organization chosen by the student), and gain knowledge about the organization’s engagement with low-income families and mission to provide young children with a safe, supportive, and loving environment in which to learn and thrive.

Of particular relevance to CBL are outcomes 5-7. Outcome 5 focuses on the role of translation in the community and students’ understanding of their service work in context. Outcome 7 is focused on working with and learning about the work of the community partner. Important to note is how these outcomes are associated with learning about issues impacting community
members and community organizations and seem to indicate that development of students’ community awareness is a desired outcome. Outcome 6 highlights how the translation produced by students will meet the community partner’s need, demonstrating that addressing community partner needs is an important part of the course’s goals as well.

Furthermore, the approach to CBL is demonstrated by Martina’s, the course instructor, thoughts on incorporating readings about CBL into her course. During an interview, Martina shared that after attending a faculty training on CBL, she had borrowed a book on practical advice for CBL given by other faculty members implementing CBL. She shared that she had considered including it as a class reading for the students and including it as material on the exam. However, due to lack of time and after seeing what a more experienced colleague of hers was doing in another CBL section of the same course, she did not include any readings on CBL as part of the class. She said,

I just went over- I skimmed some of the- the- the material and um I decided against it. I- because mainly because the CB component it- it was just, you know, it’s supposed to be just- just one component… of all of the components in the course.

In this excerpt, Martina seems to position CBL as competing for time against other components of the course. Similarly, in responding to a question in a follow up email about her thoughts on whether there should be more space for discussion of issues impacting the local “Latino” community, particularly issues related to students' service work, in the course curriculum, Martina shared CBL “had to be added to the expense of other components/materials.” These excerpts appear to demonstrate that CBL is positioned as a component of the course rather than the main pedagogical approach taken.
This is reflected in the organization of class time. Based on classroom observations as well as interview data from the instructor and students, class time was not spent on CBL beyond when CBL was introduced to students at the beginning of the semester. Instead, the CBL translation was worked on as homework. Students also peer reviewed each other’s CBL translations and shared a Google Doc which was meant to help keep terms being used across the CBL translation consistent. Neither of these elements were reviewed in class. Furthermore, final presentations did not connect to CBL. Martina did express, however, that she would like to have more time to work on the CBL component in class in the future.

4.1.2 Instructor’s goals and motivation for implementation

Martina had been teaching the Translation course for four semesters at the time of my study and this was the third semester she had implemented CBL in the course. Martina explained that implementation of CBL in her course began through a colleague. The colleague also teaches the Translation course and was involved with CBL herself. She had told Martina about CBL who “liked the idea right away.” Her colleague put Martina in touch with her university’s Office of Community Engagement which led her to attend a training and ultimately include CBL in her section of the course. Martina also shared that there was interest from within her department for CBL courses.

Martina: and then it appeared that um because of um there was a- a class that was not exactly a class that had a community component

FV: <ok>

Martina: <but> was not offered anymore, it seemed like it would be a good um fit for the department to be- for the Spanish

FV: <mm>
Martina: <pro>gram to include it and that way make up for that other class

FV: ok

Martina: so it was both like

FV: mhm

Martina: it was my interest at first and then it appeared to be like more of a necessity for the program

FV: for the-

Martina: to offer some CB

FV: ok

Martina: component

FV: so the department was interested in

Martina: yes

FV: <like encouraging>

Martina: <so it was both> [a colleague’s] and my idea. we said well what if we offered this more on a regular basis?

FV: mm

Martina: so whenever either [a colleague] or I teach the course we do offer this one(?)

This excerpt suggests that both a personal interest and a departmental need to offer a CBL course in the Spanish program supported Martina’s choice for implementation. When implementing non-traditional pedagogy, institutional buy-in can be an important factor to sustainability. Martina also shared that she had people within her department that she could turn to when it came to CBL. Having experienced faculty members serve as mentors can be helpful for instructors implementing CBL (Abes et al., 2002).
Martina shared that her goal for CBL was for students to “really like take it [translation] as a slow process that requires um many steps that requires editing…that requires more than one person looking at the same text....” Further exploring Martina’s motivation to implement CBL, I asked what she saw as the benefit or advantage of including CBL in her course. She responded that,

I think my goal most of all… is that they can do something meaningful…cuz everything else, even for the advanced course, even when the texts are like more taken from real life…they’re going nowhere, they’re gonna die in their computer…and I think my idea is that they feel that they are doing something relevant…that they feel like their work matters to somebody um and that they are contributing ….so I would say that’s my main concern that they get the idea of doing something that’s actually useful… to somebody and just making a contribution and also maybe hopefully that they can take it like with more responsibility…try to make it look better… and sound better because they know that it’s gonna be published somewhere...and people are act- actually gonna read it.

In this excerpt, Martina frames CBL as a way to give her students experience with translation in a context where their work would be useful and valuable. In doing so, one of Martina’s goals in implementing CBL seems to be to motivate students to take their work more seriously since it will ultimately be used by an organization.

When I asked Martina what she hopes students learn from the course overall, she shared that the two main concepts she hopes that students learn is that translation is a process and that it is not a word by word job. When I asked if there was anything from the CBL component in particular that she hoped they learned, Martina shared,
Martina: so I hope that um as I said just by reading um because it always happens even to me when I'm translating anything

FV: <ok>

Martina: <that> I learn something about the material that I'm working with

FV: mm

Martina: and these are all nonprofits and they all have to do with the Latino community

FV: <yeah>

Martina: <so> I think- um I hope it makes them aware of some of- some of the many problems that they face

FV: <ok>

Martina: <in> our, you know, in our community

FV: yeah

Martina: and also that they are able to- to actually, you know, not just understand the concept of the complexity of the- of the process but they’re able to actually suffer it@

This excerpt demonstrates that while Martina frames CBL as an opportunity for her students to experience the complex translation process, she also hopes that students will learn about the issues faced by the local “Latino” community. This suggests that she frames CBL as a way for her students to develop community awareness through translating the community partner’s material.
4.1.3 Community partner’s goals and motivation for participation

Elizabeth, the community partner[^1], shared during an interview that The Caregivers Coalition’s initial work was largely with the local African American community. A change in immigration policies under the Trump administration and their possible impacts on mixed-status families, however, sparked a new initiative for The Caregivers Coalition focused on reaching out to the “Hispanic” community. Elizabeth explained,

and then as the Trump administration’s new policies came into place…I started thinking about the Hispanic community and how this could affect them and what’s gonna happen to the children if some of the um parents get deported but the children are American citizens…and so that is how we started this new initiative to um-to help that community so that they can make safety plans for who will care for their children if they- in the unfortunate circumstance- that they would be deported.

In this excerpt, we see that Elizabeth’s motivation for seeking out a Spanish translation was tied to the threat posed to “Hispanic” immigrants and their families by the president’s policies on immigration. These policies include an executive order on border security which allows for the detention of noncitizens for violations of immigration law to the extent permitted by law (Executive Order 13,767, 2017). As Elizabeth points out, in many cases the children of parents who are deported are American citizens. In fact, in 2018, 32,123 individuals who identified as the parent of at least one US born child were deported (United States Department of Homeland Security, 2019a, 2019b). Many children whose parents have been detained or deported are often

[^1]: Although students from the Translation course worked with a total of four organizations (see Chapter 3), the primary community partner in the Translation course was Elizabeth from The Caregivers Coalition. Throughout this dissertation, I focus on Elizabeth as the community partner for the Translation course.
cared for by a relative caregiver such as their grandparent or other family member (Generations United, 2018). Given these realities, The Caregivers Coalition seemed to see an additional space in which their knowledge, expertise, and services for relative caregivers was needed.

Elizabeth shared that at an information referral group for relative caregivers that they offered with another local nonprofit organization, there were a number of mothers who had active deportation orders present. At this group, The Caregivers Coalition helped the parents sign custodial powers of attorney and financial powers of attorney, which would allow relatives to care for their children and have access to money to help support the children, in the event of a deportation. Interpreters were present to mediate communication, however, they only had the resource guide available in English. Elizabeth shared that that was when she realized they needed to make the resource guide available in Spanish as well.

Before participating in this CBL collaboration, Elizabeth was unfamiliar with CBL. Elizabeth explained that in trying to find a way to have the organization’s resource guide translated into Spanish, she met with another local organization’s translation unit to see how much it would cost to have them translate the document. Although she found that the cost was outside of their range, the woman who worked at this local organization had met Martina at an event and knew that she was looking for translation opportunities for her students5. Therefore, she put Elizabeth and Martina in contact and the collaboration began.

When I asked Elizabeth what her main motivation for collaborating with the class was she shared,

5 In fact, three students from the Translation course worked on translating material for this organization as part of their CBL service work (see Chapter 3).
Elizabeth: um so it just sounded like a really good project on bo- it seemed like a win-win for both sides
FV: mhm
Elizabeth: like, you know, we could get the translation done at, you know, no cost which is definitely good for our budget @
FV: yeah@
Elizabeth: and um and they could get the experience of providing this service and the experience of doing the translation and getting credits for the class
FV: mhm
Elizabeth: it just seems like a really good, you know, partnership

This excerpt demonstrates that Elizabeth was motivated to participate in CBL because of the benefits it could offer both to her organization and to students. Elizabeth saw the benefit to her organization as receiving a Spanish translation of her resource guide for no cost. Given that The Caregivers Coalition is both a new organization and a small organization, cutting costs and saving money is an important aim. At the same time, Elizabeth appeared to see the students providing the service as benefitting by gaining translation experience and course credit.

When I asked about the benefits she sees in working with CBL courses, Elizabeth expressed,

Elizabeth: I mean hopefully the students will from, you know, on their end
FV: mhm
Elizabeth: getting a sense, from their end working on the resource guide, all of the issues and maybe become passionate about the issues that I'm passionate about
FV: mm
Elizabeth: because they can see how hard it is to care for a child that’s not your own

FV: mhm

Elizabeth: especially when you’re already living in poverty, you know, and it’s hard to, you know, bring somebody else into the family unit when you have no savings

FV: yeah

Elizabeth: so, you know, I think it’s good sort of information for- separate from my- you know, I work sort of in a microcosm of my own

FV: mm @ yeah

Elizabeth: so I provide information referrals but it’s within certain community groups and I think this will get the word out and information about issues to sort of a larger and different group than my normal

FV: mhm

Elizabeth: so I think that’s good both for them and for me because I think the more education and awareness there is about these issues and what we do, the better

FV: mm yeah so giving the students the chance maybe not only to hone their translation skills but also learn about the issues your organization

Elizabeth: yeah

FV: works with, yeah

Elizabeth: mhm

FV: mm that’s great

In this excerpt, we see that Elizabeth seems to be interested in spreading awareness and education about relative caregivers beyond her usual sphere of contacts demonstrating her interest in students’ development of community awareness. This reflects findings from Bell and
Carlson (2009) and Tryon and Stoecker (2008) who found that community partners were motivated by the chance to educate the public and students. Similar to Martina, Elizabeth seems to hope that students will learn about the issues impacting the community her organization serves through translating the resource guide. Elizabeth also appears to position the CBL collaboration as an opportunity to inspire future advocates for relative caregivers. As I discuss in Chapter 6, these motivations are connected to addressing community partner needs through continued engagement.

4.2 Labor Issues course

4.2.1 Curriculum and class time

The first line of the Course Description and Methodology section of the Labor Issues course syllabus reads, “[The Labor Issues course] is a community-based learning (CBL) course conducted in Spanish that focuses on the dynamic interaction between migration, identity, and labor in the Latin@ community.” Positioning the course as a CBL course from the opening line of the course description suggests that CBL is positioned as the main methodology through which teaching and learning takes place. This is further reflected in the Learning Outcomes section where “the theory and practice of community-based learning-CBL” is described as being at “the core of this course.” Furthermore, the Learning Outcomes section states, “As a CBL course, students will have the opportunity to closely study identity, migration and labor issues as they directly pertain [sic] the [city] immigrant day laborer community and the ways in which the latter have also become advocates for their rights.” This excerpt further demonstrates how the course is referred to as a CBL course as well as how course topics are connected to better understanding the community with which the students work thereby demonstrating a focus on the development of students’ community awareness.
According to the *Course Description and Methodology* section, the main course topics of immigration, identity, and labor were explored from a cultural studies perspective that assumed that “race/ethnicity, class and gender are critical categories of analysis since these are known tools that regulate the unequal distribution of power, status and material life.” These topics were explored through reviewing and discussing weekly readings and occasionally through film viewings and guest speakers as well. During a class where students discussed an ethnographic study of day laborers in Berkeley, California, I observed how Valeria, the course instructor, asked students to think about the similarities and differences between the day laborers in the readings and those that they were working with through their service work. Valeria also shared that instructions for homework always asked students to make connections to their service work in the community. Final projects also focused on the link to the day laborer community and, as described in the syllabus, were all products meant to address “issues related to day labor in [the city]” (see Chapter 6 for a list of final projects).

The approach to CBL is also demonstrated by the readings and discussions about CBL included during class time. The theme of one of the classes early on in the semester was about working with the community. For this class, students read pieces that critically examined CBL such as “Does Service Learning Really Help?” (Strom, 2010) and “Why Service Learning is Bad” (Eby, 1998). Students reflected on these articles in their first reflection essay. The explicit inclusion of discussion and reflection on the theory and methodology of CBL demonstrates CBL’s importance in the course as well as the consideration given to the implications of service work.

The Labor Issues course had two sets of learning outcomes. The first were labeled as *Learning Outcomes* and the second set were labeled *CBL specific Learning Outcomes*. The
distinction between the two sets of learning goals seems to imply a division between CBL and other aspects of the course. However, the Learning Outcomes seem to be holistic outcomes that students are expected to achieve by the end of the course. CBL is also included in these outcomes as seen in outcome 3 below, which focuses on connecting theoretical understandings to the lived experiences of the community partner and the population it serves. The Learning Outcomes were:

1. To identify the connections among identity, migration and labor within the Latino community.
2. Critically analyze alternative theories of identity, race and ethnicity, social structuration, migration, and labor.
3. Identify the ways in which these theories [and] course topics inform our everyday lives, including our community partner and the population it serves.
4. Identify a variety of strategies aimed at promoting change, including the sanctuary movement, youth organizing, and policy initiatives.

These outcomes seem to put emphasis on critical analysis and promoting change. The CBL specific Learning Outcomes are,

1. To examine the philosophy, theory, methodology, aims, and impact of community-based learning, and how it seeks to develop reciprocity between university students and community partners.
2. Explore and develop personal values of service through critical analysis of social issues, reflection, and practice.
3. Develop the skills to responsibly, respectfully and professionally approach and reciprocally work with the community partner staff and the people they serve.
4. Connect what students [sic] in class to practical experiences in the greater [city]. community.

5. Engage in community service and critical reflection in order to gain a deeper understanding of issues related to migration, labor, identity, diversity and civic engagement.

6. Critically reflect on what students learn through their community experience.

Overall, both the development of students’ community awareness and addressing community partner needs are addressed in these outcomes. For example, outcome 5 positions CBL as a way to learn about sociopolitical topics impacting the day laborer community. Addressing community partner needs is highlighted in outcomes 2 and 3 which focus on examining and exploring why and how to serve as well as in outcomes 1 and 3 which connect to reciprocity. Furthermore, outcomes 4 and 6 highlight the importance of the connection between course content to the community experience as well as critical reflection on their experiences.

4.2.2 Instructor’s goals and motivations for implementation

Valeria was teaching the CBL Labor Issues course for the second time at the time of my study. However, she had a long-standing interest in incorporating community-based components in her courses. Valeria shared that she had incorporated a community-based element into a course on globalization and the effects of globalization on the local immigrant community earlier in her teaching career when she was at another university. Although it was not officially a CBL course, Valeria described it as students learning about the topic of globalization and then getting to “walk around the neighborhood and see directly firsthand” as well as have some contact with community members. Valeria also shared that prior to formally implementing CBL in the Labor Issues course, she chose one course she was teaching each semester and had 10% or 15% of the
students’ grades be related to a community project. Ultimately, Valeria participated in a faculty training about CBL offered by her university that helped her prepare to formally implement CBL in her teaching. After participating in this training, Valeria decided to create the Labor Issues course. Valeria also formed part of an advisory committee on CBL out of her university’s Office of Community Engagement. Overall, Valeria appeared to have a high level of involvement and knowledge about CBL.

When I asked Valeria why she chose to implement CBL in the Labor Issues course, she pointed to the theory-practice connection that CBL allows.

Valeria: <it make-> it makes um methodological sense to me

FV: mm

Valeria: uh as I told you I studied a- a doctoral program in Cultural Studies and in there uh we see any problem or any topic

FV: uh huh

Valeria: um as affecting somebody’s way- everyday life

FV: mhm

Valeria: the everyday life of- of something and there are certain big structural

FV: yeah

Valeria: organization, country, town whatever it is but that aff- that has an impact on how people see everyday life

FV: yes

Valeria: and what better way of having theory and then having something very real

FV: mhm

Valeria: connected to it. it’s very- the line is right there, straight line, and I love that
FV: so
Valeria: <x>
FV: <co>necting the theory to practice
Valeria: right that I can, yes, have this theoretical concept <here>
FV: <mhm>
Valeria: and then boom, it’s right there. It makes a lot of sense in my head.

This excerpt demonstrates that Valeria’s implementation of CBL is motivated by the opportunity to have students make connections between what they are learning in the classroom and what they experience in the community during service work. Eby (1998) critiques CBL for “teaching a false understanding of need” (p. 3) that results in students not understanding the roots of community needs. Connecting theory to the day laborer community through a cultural studies perspective, such as in this course, allows students to gain an understanding of how structural issues create the needs being addressed through service work. Furthermore, this excerpt demonstrates how Valeria frames CBL as a methodology, which suggests that it guides how she teaches the course overall.

Beyond the stated learning outcomes listed on the syllabus, Valeria appeared to have other learning outcomes in mind as well.

FV: what is the main thing you hope that they learn?
Valeria: compassion
FV: compassion mm
Valeria: I want them to lose their innocence
FV: @<@>
Valeria: <their> academic innocence and also a little bit of the innocence about the world
<yous know>
FV: <mm>
Valeria: to observe critically
FV: mm
Valeria: things are not just what they appear to be

This excerpt suggests that Valeria hopes students’ participation in the course will open them to new ways of seeing the world, their place in it, and their relations to others. This excerpt also seems to suggest that Valeria’s implementation of CBL is less about students acquiring specific content knowledge and more about students developing understandings of the world and themselves. This is reflective of O’Meara and Neihaus’s (2009) finding that 53% of faculty in their study framed service learning as a way to shape civic and moral dispositions such as compassion.

In continuing her response to why she chose to implement CBL in the Labor Issues course, Valeria shared,

and I learned this from um Freire’s…Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Everybody has something to teach and everybody has something to learn. We’re all intellectuals in a way, you know…so I tell my students there are things that you don’t know that these day laborers know and there are there things that those day laborers don’t know but you do…and this exchange is precisely what, you know, brings us together…in that kind of respect…respecting each oth- each, you know, each other’s knowledge um and way of life, you know, and so I think they un- understand that very well.
This excerpt suggests that Valeria was motivated to implement CBL in her course because of the exchange that is possible between students and community members. By positioning both students and community members as learners and teachers, Valeria appears to value not only what students can give to the day laborer community, but importantly what the day laborer community can give to the students as well. This demonstrates an emphasis on reciprocity, where both students and community members can benefit and grow from the partnership.

**4.2.3 Community partner’s goals and motivations for participation**

Ramon, the community partner, was involved in collaborations with university students and professors prior to this CBL course. He shared that he knew the director of the Office of Community Engagement at the local university and that she invited him every year to a community partner fair on campus where organizations can showcase their work and find potential collaborations with professors and students. Ramon shared that he had worked with all kinds of different classes, however not all courses connected their course content to the work in the community or had all students in the class work with the organization.

In terms of his participation in the Labor Issues course, Valeria and Ramon knew each other and had worked together before the CBL course. As a passionate supporter of labor rights, Valeria had been working with the day laborers in the area for about six years. Knowing that Ramon’s organization “needs a lot of help,” Valeria shared that she created a CBL course in which Labor Rights for All would intentionally be the sole community partner organization for the course. O’Meara (2008) found that personal commitment to issues, people, and places, such as in Valeria’s case, was a motivating factor for instructor’s implementation of CBL.

When I asked Ramon what he saw as his main role in the collaboration as the community partner, he shared,
My main role in this thing has to do with basically making sure they’re collaborating with the <work from(?)> school because I do need the assistance from the school… from the students to… build the organization so my role is basically making sure that things be(?)- things happen well…we build that relationship with the- with the students. That they are getting- getting something out of this thing. My concern with that they get something out of it…that they’re learning because we have- not only we- we- they go to the things that we do but we have a lot of discussions here x about things…and we find out that they actually- sometimes the school don’t give you all the- the details that you need to have because it’s difficult…so because you read a book doesn’t- doesn’t mean that you really know the details about what’s really happening in out here…and when you interact with people and their realities so forth that’s where you learn actually…that’s where you really learn what is really going on out here… and even though you may have some theory and understanding of different things…and skills doesn’t mean that you necessarily understand…what is really out here…so by- they get involved so I will make sure that they get as much of the- of the ideas and realities that’s- what’s happening out here in the community…so they do learn quite a bit from- from the process.

This excerpt demonstrates that Ramon is motivated to participate in CBL both by what he can receive and by what he can give. Ramon notes that he needs assistance from the university and students. As I discuss in Chapter 6, the university and students provide access to resources, skillsets, and ideas that help Ramon build up his organization. Furthermore, this excerpt demonstrates that Ramon cares about what students get out of the experience and seems to make it a goal of his to provide students with an understanding of the community they are working
with. This is reflective of Rinaldo et al. (2015), which found that community partners were interested in contributing to student learning. Ramon seems to doubt the extent to which understanding theory and having certain skills, which students acquire at school, mean that you understand what is going on in the community you are working with. He appears to see it as his role to expose students to new experiences in the community and to discuss with them topics that they may not talk about in school.

Ramon also appears to make a distinction between academic spaces and the community by stating “out here” three times. This appears to position academic spaces as separate from the community. This is reflective of Swaminathan’s (2007) findings that community partners were interested in preparing students for the “real world” and took on “teacher-mentor” roles. In line with this, Ramon appears to take on the role of a co-educator. I discuss this role and its implications for the development of students’ community awareness in Chapters 5. In Chapter 6, I discuss how the co-educator role also allows Ramon to build relationships with students, which he mentions as part of his role in the above excerpt, and which supports the addressing of community partner needs. Overall, Ramon appears to position CBL and specifically his role in the partnership as a way to develop students’ community awareness.

4.3 Discussion

In this chapter, I examined the approaches to CBL in the two focal Spanish courses as demonstrated by 1) curriculum and class time, 2) the instructor’s goals and motivation to implement CBL, and 3) the community partner’s goals and motivation for participation in CBL. These three themes illuminate how the two focal courses are approaching CBL through different lenses by positioning learners and service differently (Britt, 2012). Given the focus on students’ skill development and preprofessional experiences, the Translation course appears to be
consistent with a traditional approach to CBL. In the Labor Issues course, the focus on students’ understanding of the lived experiences of community members and discussion of structural causes of community issues appears to align with a critical approach to CBL. I further discuss how these courses align with these approaches below.

The disciplinary focus of each course appears to have impacted the approach taken. Translation courses are often positioned as Language for Specific Purposes (LSP) courses, which emphasize skill development and adopt a professional prospective. The career orientation in the Translation course syllabus suggests that the course was positioned in this way. Scholars have highlighted the link between LSP and CBL by noting, for example, the ways in which CBL can prepare students for professional work (Lafford, Abbott, & Lear, 2014; see also Lear, 2012). Aligning with the professional orientation, the course’s primary focus appears to be on developing students’ translation skills. CBL appears to be a way to make students’ translation practice into something that will be used.

The Labor Issues course followed a cultural studies perspective. According to During (2004), cultural studies “tends to position itself on the side of those to whom social structures offer least” (p. 1). The content of the Labor Issues course focused on topics such as identity, immigration, and labor issues which impact the lives of the day laborers the students work with. Other courses that have taken a critical approach in Spanish CBL have also incorporated discussion about topics impacting the lived experiences of the community members they were working with. For example, Rabin (2011) discussed a Spanish course in which students worked with day laborers learning English while also learning about the factors that impacted their lives (also see Arries, 1999; Plann, 2002).

The integration of CBL in each course also serves to demonstrate how CBL can be
framed differently. In the Translation course, CBL was positioned as a supplementary part of the course. Accordingly, the CBL translation was positioned as homework and was not discussed in class or connected to final presentations. This positioning is reflective of Alsina Naudi’s (2020) CBL translation course in which the CBL translation “was not considered the main purpose of the course but rather an extra activity” (p. 31). In the Labor Issues course, CBL was positioned as a methodological approach to teaching and learning. Class time was spent on discussion of readings with the aim of encouraging students to think critically about the content they were learning about and how it connected to the day laborers they were working with. Additionally, students also read critiques of and reflected upon CBL itself. As Mitchell (2008) noted, “educators using a critical [CBL] pedagogy must support students in understanding the consequences of service alongside the possibilities—the ways service can make a difference as well as those ways it can perpetuate systems of inequality” (p. 53). Students also had to make connections to their CBL experience in their homework assignments and produced final projects that addressed community partner needs. Overall, CBL seemed to be incorporated throughout the Labor Issues course.

Both instructors appeared to value CBL as a way to move beyond the classroom. This is reflective of O’Meara and Neihaus’s (2009) finding that 90% of faculty in their study framed service learning as experiential learning and theory to practice application. However, each class positioned the space outside of the classroom offered by CBL as allowing for different types of experiences. In the Translation course, CBL appeared to be framed as a way to provide a real-world context for the meaningful application of translation skills and knowledge acquired during class time. Martina made reference to other Translation courses, where students often work on translations that have no use beyond practice. In contrast, she appeared to frame CBL as a way to
motivate students by having them work on translations that address the need of a local organization. This is reflective of other courses such as in Lizardi-Rivera (1999) who created a CBL translation course “to provide both technical training of the translation process and a real-life experience in translating for a worthy cause” (p. 109). Martina also appeared to frame CBL as a way to learn about the community as students translated material that discussed issues impacting local Latinx communities. From these goals and motivations for CBL, as well as the learning outcomes on the syllabus, both students’ development of community awareness and addressing community partner needs appear to be important course goals.

In the Labor Issues course, CBL appears to be framed as a way to make connections between theoretical concepts and the lived experiences of the local day laborers with whom the students work through their service work. For example, the concept of wage theft may seem abstract and far removed to many students at a private university when reading about it, but in working with community members, students meet and speak with people who are experiencing the injustice firsthand. For Valeria, CBL appears to be a way to bring theory alive and to give students the chance to take a critical look at the world around them. Valeria also appears to value CBL for giving students the chance to learn and experience things that a traditional classroom could not offer. This includes learning from community members who they would otherwise not learn from at a university. This demonstrates the critical approach taken by the course in redistributing the power from the university to the community (Mitchell, 2008; see Chapter 6 for more discussion). Overall, CBL appears to be framed as providing a venue for new experiences and expanded understandings of the world while working with and learning from the day laborer community. Additionally, Valeria’s goals and motivations as well as the learning outcomes of
the course demonstrate that the development of students’ community awareness and addressing community partner needs are also important course goals.

Community partners’ goals and motivations also help us understand how CBL was approached in these courses. The community partners became engaged in their CBL collaborations in different ways. Elizabeth got connected to the course by a mutual contact who knew Martina was looking for translation material for her students. Ramon, on the other hand, partnered with a course that was intentionally created with his organization in mind. Both community partners were interested in participating in the collaboration to have their needs met (see Chapter 6 for more discussion on this). Elizabeth was looking for an affordable way to translate her organization’s resource guide, while university resources and student skills provided Ramon with organizational capacity. However, each community partner was also interested in what students could learn. While Elizabeth saw CBL as a chance for students to practice their translation skills, she also hoped they would learn about and perhaps become passionate about issues related to relative caregivers. As for Ramon, he appeared to see it as his role to expand upon what students learn in school and expose them to the realities in the community he and his organization serve. He also noted his role in building relationships with students, which connects to the notion of building authentic relationships in critical CBL approaches (Mitchell, 2008). Overall, both community partners appeared to see CBL as a way to develop students’ community awareness and have their needs addressed.

Furthermore, the nature of stakeholder relationships appears to reflect the different approaches to CBL taken in the two courses. Given the ways in which the instructor and the community partner framed CBL in the Translation course, the relationship between the students and the community partner appears to primarily be that of translator and client. This is reflective
of a transactional relationship in which the primary purpose of the relationship is instrumental and the main exchange is a product (Enos & Morton, 2003), which in this case is a translated resource guide. In the case of the Labor Issues course, the instructor and the community partner appear to primarily position students and the community partner and members as both learners and teachers. Valeria appears to see the interactions that her students can have with the day laborers as an exchange where students are not only providing a service, but are also learning from the knowledge and experiences of the day laborers. Similarly, while Ramon acknowledges how students assist the organization, he also highlights the ways in which he can provide access to experiences and information that students do not get at a university. In fact, Ramon discussed how students “start a new- a new life, a new experience” when they start working with Labor Rights for All and that that is “where the real learning starts.” This appears to be consistent with more transformational relationships in which different stakeholder groups create knowledge and transact power (Enos & Morton, 2003).

The different approaches to CBL in the two focal courses highlight how CBL can be framed and implemented in diverse ways with varying goals and motivations. These courses provide an example of the heterogeneity of CBL within Spanish education. Furthermore, despite taking different approaches, the stakeholders in both courses appear to position CBL as a way to develop students’ community awareness and address community partner needs. Chapters 5 and 6 will further demonstrate the ways in which the two focal courses took different approaches to CBL, while also demonstrating that common themes impacted the opportunities and challenges in each course. In the next chapter, my aim is to explore the opportunities and challenges related to the development of students’ community awareness in the two focal courses. The different approaches to CBL taken in these courses allow me to explore how awareness of the lived
experiences of local Latinx communities is both fostered and constrained in diverse Spanish CBL courses.
CHAPTER 5: EXPLORING WHETHER AND HOW COMMUNITY AWARENESS IS DEVELOPED IN SPANISH COMMUNITY-BASED LEARNING

In Chapter 4, I demonstrated how the two focal courses took different approaches to CBL in Spanish education. The Translation course mainly focused on the development of students’ translation skills and approached CBL as a meaningful application of students’ skills by completing a translation for a nonprofit organization. The Labor Issues course framed CBL as a means to better understand the connection between theories and the realities of the day laborer community with whom they were working. Although each course took a different approach to CBL, instructors and community partners from both courses expressed wanting to have students develop community awareness, which I define as learning about the lived experiences of local Latinx communities. In this chapter, I will explore what fostered and what constrained students’ development of community awareness in each of the two focal courses.

CBL can develop students’ awareness of issues in the local community (Lowther Pereira, 2016). As Carney (2013) notes, when students participate in CBL they “are…human agents navigating a specific set of circumstances that often include poverty, immigration issues, and educational barriers” (p. 235). Whether serving as conversation partners, translators, or in other roles, it is crucial to acknowledge that there are societal issues that necessitate the service. As Mitchell (2008) argues, not paying attention to these issues can “perpetuate inequality and reinforces an “us-them” dichotomy” (p. 51). Moreover, Abbott (2017) reminds us that “knowledge of pertinent policies can help Spanish [CBL] students avoid incorrect conclusions and gain a more accurate understanding of that community and its members” (p. 38). Furthermore, developing community awareness allows students to thoughtfully engage in service
and to better understand their role as members in multilingual communities. Given this, the research question I aim to answer in this chapter is:

What opportunities and challenges related to students’ development of community awareness exist in the two focal Spanish CBL courses?

In order to answer this question, I will focus on three themes that arose as important in explaining factors that foster or constrain the development of community awareness: 1) service work, 2) ideologies about the place of sociopolitics in the curriculum, and 3) the community partner as co-educator. As in the previous chapter, I explore how these three themes played out first in the Translation course and then in the Labor Issues course. My analysis draws on interview data with instructors, students, and community partners as well as class observations, student reflection essays, and follow up emails.

In regards to service work, I will discuss elements of the service work experience that impacted the development of community awareness. I will focus on what specifically about service work tasks allowed for or impeded the development of community awareness in the two focal courses. I will also discuss particular ideologies related to the discussion of sociopolitics in the curriculum that influenced instructors’ pedagogical choices and impacted opportunities for students to develop community awareness. Furthermore, in regards to the role of the community partner as a co-educator, I will discuss the community partners’ opportunities to share their knowledge and expertise and interact with students, and the impact these opportunities, or lack thereof, had on the development of community awareness. Overall, examining these three themes provides insight into practices and ideologies that impact the development of community awareness in Spanish CBL courses.
5.1 Translation course

As I discussed in Chapter 4, Martina, the Translation course instructor, wanted students to learn about issues that impacted the local “Latino” community. Similarly, Elizabeth, the community partner for the course, hoped that students would learn about the issue of relative caregivers and the related work that her organization does. In doing so, she hoped to spread awareness about relative caregivers and her work beyond her usual sphere of contacts. Given these goals and motivations, it is evident that the instructor and community partner aimed to foster students’ community awareness.

5.1.1 Service work

In order to better understand the opportunities available for development of community awareness through service work in the Translation course, I first provide an overview of the service work undertaken in this course. As I discussed in Chapter 3, students chose between a direct and an indirect service option. Fifteen of the students chose the indirect service option, which entailed producing a Spanish translation of a resource guide for The Caregivers Coalition (see Chapter 3 for more information about the organization). However, the resource guide was not long enough to provide each student with at least 1,000 words to translate over the course of the semester. Therefore, three students worked on a translation for a local community health center.

Martina split The Caregiver Coalition’s resource guide and the community health center’s document among the 15 students so that each student was responsible for a different section. Each student then had to divide their assigned section into three parts. As part of their homework, students worked on translating one third of their section at a time. Once they translated and submitted one third of their section, their homework for the following week was to
peer edit a classmate’s translation. Students also shared a Google Doc where they could post suggestions or questions regarding the translation of words or phrases that were used repeatedly in the resource guide. This was meant to help students standardize common words across their assigned sections. This also allowed students to see how translation is a collaborative process.

The type of information they were tasked with translating varied depending on the section they received. Students who worked on the resource guide shared that they translated sections about topics such as types of custody and guardianship, the judicial process involved in becoming a foster parent, information on applying for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and a directory with different services in the community. The students who translated the document for the community health center had sections relating to healthcare spending, access, and equity for immigrants in local counties.

As I discussed in Chapter 4, Martina hoped that students would learn about issues impacting the “Latino” community through reading and translating the documents. This seemed to have occurred for some of the students. For example, one of them, Gianna, shared that her section was “a review…on a community town hall about healthcare accessibility in [the state].” This was a section of the document being translated for the community health center. She described the content as being about undocumented immigrants’ accessibility to healthcare and the healthcare funding disparities that exist in different counties. When I asked Gianna if these were topics she knew about beforehand, she shared that she was “not very well versed in healthcare policy…especially as it pertains to um immigrant communities.” However, it seems that through reading and translating her sections about the town hall meeting, Gianna got to learn more about local healthcare access for immigrants and expand her knowledge about issues in the local community.
FV: do you feel like you got a chance to learn um more about um like these issues overall um through <the course?>

Gianna: <oh yeah definitely>

FV: yeah <what are>

Gianna: <I mean>

FV: what are some of the things you learned? I guess, yeah

Gianna: I mean going to school in the [local] area I’ve always known that there is a disparity in wealth um just between like [County A] and [County B]

FV: mhm

Gianna: and even though like there are rich parts of [County B]

FV: <yeah>

Gianna: like it’s definitely overall not the same as [County B]

FV: ok

Gianna: I mean [County A] is not the same as [County B]

FV: ok

Gianna: and so reading this and just like reading about the like statistics of like per person um like budgeted healthcare, you know, that their governments can provide locally

FV: <mhm>

Gianna: <is> just so sparse

FV: mm

Gianna: or like so stark I mean like [County A] is nothing compared to that of [County B] and just learning those things kinda puts things into perspective for you especially when
you think about like the number of people of color that live in [County A] versus [County B]

FV: ok mhm

Gianna: um so I thought that was very interesting and something that deserved attention and I was very happy to be able to translate it for communities that it’s directly affecting

It seems that through translating her section of the resource guide, Gianna came to better understand the disparities that exist in the local counties surrounding her university. Although she was familiar with the differences in wealth distribution between the counties previously, seeing the statistics about per person budgeted healthcare seems to have “put things into perspective.” Gianna made note of how the county with a smaller per person budget is also the county with a higher percentage of people of color. This indicates development of community awareness, particularly learning about structural inequities that impact local Latinx communities and other minoritized communities’ access to healthcare.

Additionally, when I asked Gianna if she heard of the organization she was translating for beforehand, she shared that, “no, not at all…The Caregivers Coalition. I had never heard of it before.” As I mentioned above, however, Gianna’s assigned section was from the community health center’s material. Another student, Gwen, who also translated a section from the community health center’s material, wrote in her reflection essay that she was translating for The Caregivers Coalition as well. This suggests that it may have been unclear to the students who translated material for the community health center that their work was for a different organization than the resource guide was for. Given that most students in the class were translating for The Caregivers Coalition, the organization was the only community partner organization mentioned on the syllabus and may have been the only or primary organization
mentioned in class as well, leading to some potential confusion for Gianna and Gwen. In regards to the development of community awareness, this seems to indicate that while Gianna had the opportunity to learn about structural inequities related to healthcare through her translation work, she seems to have missed the opportunity to learn about the community partner organization she was translating for.

Another student, Samantha, also appeared to develop community awareness through her translation work. When I asked whether she thought she was able to learn more about the topic of the resource guide through translating, she shared,

Samantha: yeah even, you know, just I remember thinking to myself as I was translating I think the second or third part that I didn’t expect it to be this much@ of a- of a process

FV: mm <what do you mean>

Samantha: <xx>

FV: by process I guess?

Samantha: process like kinda the steps to- kinda steps to take custody of a child

FV: ah <ok>

Samantha: <or> for the child to be you know kinda taken away from the biological parents if the child is experiencing neglect or any sort of emotional abuse

FV: ok

Samantha: o any type of abuse at all

FV: mhm

Samantha: and even the process of just being registered as a foster parent

FV: ok ok so the process of um yeah the foster care process
This excerpt seems to demonstrate that through translating, Samantha learned about the processes and policies that must be followed in the foster care system and seemed to be surprised by its bureaucratic nature. In this way, translating the document served as an opportunity for development of community awareness about the systems relative caregivers must work within.

As the excerpts from Gianna and Samantha demonstrate, students appear to have had the opportunity to develop community awareness through their translation service work. Learning about issues through translating has also been reported in other studies which explored CBL Translation courses. For example, Faszer-McMahon (2013) found that students had the opportunity to learn about sociocultural and socioeconomic issues impacting the communities they were translating for through their translation work.

Some challenges, however, impacted the extent to which students were able to develop community awareness through their translation service work. As I discussed above, the documents were split into smaller sections. While this served a practical purpose, having students work on one section of the document also seemed to limit some students’ opportunity to develop community awareness. Translating one section of the resource guide seemed to be a disadvantage for some students since not all sections included the type of information that provided opportunities for learning about the topics and issues that the nonprofit organization works with. For example, Clara shared that the particular section she was assigned to translate consisted mostly of street addresses for different resources around the city for caregivers.

Clara: so 90% of what I translated was just street addresses

FV: ok ok um and uh was that something you had experience doing before this um translation <um yeah>?

Clara: <not really> no I actually I did a lot of learning while working on it
Clara: I would talk with my classmates and we would talk in class about how to work with things like that cuz like I said there’s a lot of proper nouns in street addresses

FV: yeah

Clara: and numbers are universal so it’s kinda working with making sure everything still in the correct order and it’s grammatically correct

Translating street addresses gave Clara the opportunity to learn about the translation of proper nouns. The translation of proper nouns can raise questions such as whether names like Queen Anne in Queen Anne’s Road should be translated into la Reina Anne. While this type of linguistic learning is important to the course’s learning outcomes and in providing a quality translation, the opportunity for learning about issues related to relative caregivers through translating this type of material is limited in comparison to students who translated sections that were more content rich. Further demonstrating this disadvantage that certain sections posed, Thomas wrote in his reflection essay that,

As I had the first section of the document, I did not learn a lot about the organization, but I learned how involved the community was with the organization. I learned about the extent of the involvement of [County A], and also about the Latino immigrant population of the County.

In sum, the content of students’ assigned sections and the practice of having them focus on one section of the document seems to play an important role in the opportunities for development of community awareness. This becomes a challenge for development of community awareness since much of the learning about the organization and issues impacting local Latinx communities is placed on learning while translating in this course.
The challenges for development of community awareness posed by having students translate one section of the larger document was mitigated, however, by the peer review process. As I mentioned above, students exchanged their CBL translation with a peer every other week and reviewed their peer’s work as homework. This provided students with the opportunity to read about other aspects of the organization and the issues they work with beyond the content in their assigned section. For example, Cristina described the section she translated as “really just a directory” and shared that she “didn’t actually get to see a lot of what actually- the important information.” However, she also shared that she read about other aspects of the organization and their work while peer-editing. When I asked Cristina what she read about while peer-editing, she shared,

Cristina: they talked a lot about what steps to take <especially>
FV: <ok>
Cristina: if um you’re enrolling a child um that is your foster child or
FV: mhm
Cristina: like you are um their family but not their parent
FV: ok
Cristina: and um what steps to take if their parents are in jail or aren’t here and able to be in their custody
FV: mm
Cristina: what kind of paperwork you need <to show>
FV: <ok>
Cristina: to enroll them in school
FV: mhm
Cristina: to take them to the doctor, all of that

This excerpt suggests that through peer-editing, Cristina learned about some of the policies and procedures pertaining to relative caregivers in terms of caring for a child. Therefore, although having students focus on one section of the larger document could limit their exposure to learning about issues related to relative caregivers, peer-editing provided another avenue for which development of community awareness could occur. In completing her CBL translation and peer-editing, it appears that Cristina was able to place the content of the translation in the larger context of the city’s immigration population.

FV: do you feel like you got to learn a little bit about it [content mentioned in previous excerpt] like through reading the translation?

Cristina: yeah

FV: yeah

Cristina: um it was very- definitely very interesting especially cuz [the city] has such a um a large immigration population

FV: mhm

Cristina: so there’s a- um well- this goes off- off the class but

FV: ok @

Cristina: during the semester itself I was working with- at my job with um recent like immigrants

FV: ok

Cristina: in high school

FV: <ok>

Cristina: <so> a lot of them weren’t- were here without their parents
FV: wow <ok>

Cristina: <so> it started like connecting

As demonstrated in this excerpt, Cristina was able to make connections between issues related to relative caregivers and the high school students she was working with. Cristina seems to have learned about the possible situations that the students might be experiencing, such as being under the custody of relative caregivers. This indicates development of community awareness as she better understood how issues she learned about through her CBL experience impacted those in the local community.

Although students had the opportunity to learn from their assigned section as well as the sections they peer reviewed, a related challenge to the development of community awareness through translating is that students did not necessarily have to read the full document from which their assigned section was taken. For example, in talking about the topic of her assigned section, Alana shared,

the section that I was working on was um about informal custody…like relative caregivers…<and> taking informal custody um so I think the majority of it, I never actually read the full document that we were translating…<but> I think it was about just different custodies, relatives, or whoever can take the kids if either parents aren't able to…<and> what this organization does is that they are like legal advocates…resources.

In this excerpt, Alana states that she did not read the full document suggesting that she is not fully aware of the material contained in the resource guide beyond her section. Not reading the full resource guide is a missed opportunity for development of community awareness in terms of students learning about the organization and the issues that they address. Additionally, it could be potentially problematic in terms of understanding the context and full content of what they are
translating. Although I do not know what percentage of students did or did not read the entire document from which their assigned section was taken, it is likely that Alana is representative of a number of students.

Furthermore, some students demonstrated their developing community awareness by making connections between their translation work and the social and political climates in which their work was taking place. For example, Samantha expressed,

Samantha: I know specifically around [the city] and I know during the last kinda half of class we were talking about, you know, migration

FV: uh huh

Samantha: of Latino communities here in the US and I even wrote here [referencing her reflection essay] especially “since the [city] is becoming more populated with Hispanic immigrants, it’s important to provide bilingual information guides”

FV: mhm

Samantha: that will kinda help serve as their guidance in navigating the process

FV: mhm

Samantha: so kinda bringing into that Latino migration as well when it comes to um I guess you could say making a difference in the CB component and the differing kind of levels and degrees in which they could help especially, you know, across classes

FV: mhm

Samantha: when you bring into like my writing class

FV: <ok>

Samantha: <and> then this class

FV: yeah
Samantha: and, you know, you’re kind of addressing that specific phenomenon that’s happening too, you know?

FV: of- of migration?

Samantha: of migration

FV: yeah

Samantha: yeah

In this excerpt, Samantha appears to make a connection between her translation work and “Latino” migration. In doing so, Samantha demonstrates an awareness of how sociopolitical factors, such as migration, intersect with translation and the need for community materials to be accessible in Spanish as well. The connection between immigration and translation has been discussed in the literature (see Campbell, 2014). This connection highlights the ways in which translation intersects with social issues suggesting translation students would benefit from learning about such topics. Samantha also seems to be making connections across classes related to the topic of “Latino” migration. This suggests that overlapping content across Spanish courses can help students better understand the scope of an issue.

Another student, Sara, connected her translation work to the issue of deportation and the legal system. In her reflection essay, she wrote,

I can imagine how invaluable a Spanish language version of this document will be to the Latino immigrant community, who may have questions about what will happen to their child or loved ones if they are facing deportation. The legal system should be much more accessible than it is, both financially and linguistically, and this document is one small step toward achieving that.
In this excerpt, Sara shows an awareness of how the issue of deportation connects to the topic of relative caregivers, as well as awareness of how structural systems such as the U.S. legal system pose barriers for speakers of languages other than English and those with less financial capital. Samantha’s and Sara’s excerpts serve as examples of how students can come to understand how their translation work connects to sociopolitical issues that shape the lived experiences of local Latinx community members.

5.1.2 Ideologies about the place of sociopolitics in the curriculum

Ideologies about the place of sociopolitics in the translation curriculum also impacted the opportunities for students’ development of community awareness. These ideologies may be enacted by the instructor as a main stakeholder of the CBL course. In a follow up question via email regarding the extent to which she thought it was important for Translation students to learn about sociopolitical issues related to Spanish and Spanish-speaking communities, Martina responded,

Incredibly important. This course is just an introduction to translation, but if they were to continue studying translation studies in the future, they would need to understand what the context is, what the population in the US is, what the market is going to be like; they need to be sensitive to the Spanish-speaking population since translation is, after all, a "humanistic" discipline and you cannot disassociate it from reality.

Martina’s response demonstrates that she sees learning about sociopolitical issues as important for translation students, particularly in regards to understanding the context and audience. However, inclusion of such topics in the course was limited. For example, in response to a follow up email question about the extent to which information about the “Latino” population and/or “Latino” migration in the local area was included in the course, Martina responded,
Not much other than when we initially talked about the CB component, and when students did their presentations at the end of the semester. Also, whenever I found out about events in the [university] or in the [city] community, I would let them know, and sometimes, I would offer extra credit to those of them who could attend and make a small presentation in class.

While I do not know how many students participated in the extra credit opportunities, based on my classroom observations, most students’ final presentations did not relate to issues impacting local Latinx communities. Therefore, while attending external events and working on final presentations were identified as ways that information about the “Latino” population and/or “Latino” migration in the local area was included in the course, they were not required and therefore were missed opportunities for many students. Furthermore, as I aim to demonstrate in this section, although Martina noted sociopolitical learning as important, particular ideologies appear to have impacted the extent to which such issues were included in the course.

One such ideology is demonstrated in the above excerpt. While recognizing the value of learning about sociopolitical topics for translation students, Martina appears to place this type of learning at more advanced levels beyond the focal course, which is an introductory course in translation. This is reflective of the perception by many teachers and educators that inclusion of sociopolitical issues in language education is too difficult for students at novice levels given their developing language skills (see Kubota, Austin, and Saito-Abbott, 2003). While students in the Translation course have completed the language sequence requirements of the department and may not be considered novice language learners, they can be considered novice translators. Therefore, in similar ways, they may be seen as needing to build a foundation in translation theories and skills before including discussion of sociopolitical topics.
As Kubota et al. (2003) warn, leaving sociopolitical topics until more advanced levels, which many students will not continue onto, can create “the impression that learning a foreign language entails only how to communicate basic personal needs or facts” (p. 21). The same risk is run by beginning to include sociopolitical topics into the curriculum in more advanced translation courses. Students who do not continue on may walk away with an understanding of translation as simply switching linguistic codes and miss the opportunity to also see it as an activity situated within a broader sociopolitical context as well as a means of advancing social justice. The connection between translation and social justice is particularly salient in CBL translation courses where students often participate in community translation, which has “an overarching mission or role: empowering social groups for whom translations are provided, and enabling them to have full access to public service information and to participate actively in the different realms of the society where they live (Taibi & Ozolins, 2016, p. 65, as cited in Rueda-Acedo, 2018). As Rueda-Acedo (2018) points out, CBL shares this mission. To better understand the context and importance of their CBL service work, I argue that it is important for students in CBL translation courses to understand the lived experiences of the community members who may read their work and the impact their work is having on those community members, such as by providing language access to important information.

The ideology that sociopolitical topics are not part of an introductory course in translation is also reflected in Martina’s statement during an interview in which she shared that, while she gave space for discussion of “Latino” issues, she tried “not to impose it, let’s say, because it’s-it’s not actually part of the- the- the curriculum.” Following up on this comment via email, I asked Martina if she could expand on this notion of not wanting “to impose.” She responded,

Well, my class is a translation class. Although many students may feel interested or even
passionate about the topics of Latinos in the US, it doesn't have to be the case for justice issues. I am somehow able to link translation skills (what I teach) or even Spanish as a foreign language with the topics surrounding Latinos, and I can open the door for students to explore that option if they feel inspired to, but it is not my place or my role as a professor of foreign languages to "force" or impose contents that are outside my field.

In this excerpt, Martina appears to position translation courses, foreign languages, and the role of a language instructor as separate from topics related to US Latinx communities. This appears to contradict her discourse in the opening quote of this section, in which Martina regards learning about sociopolitical topics as “incredibly important” for translation students. This demonstrates the complexities of curricular ideologies and practice. Language education has largely ignored the sociopolitical nature of language and this promotes an ideology of neutrality among language teachers (Ortega, 1999). This is demonstrated, for example, in Spanish textbooks that follow a “food, fun, and fiestas” framework that largely exclude the discussion of sociopolitical topics related to Spanish-speaking people and cultures (Herman, 2007) as well as in instructors’ notes for Spanish textbooks where ideologies of a ‘global Spanish,’ perpetuation of stereotypes, and a one-sided view of immigration have been found (Padilla & Vana, 2019).

Students have been found to frame language courses in this apolitical way as well. As Kubota et al. (2003) note, “some students did not seem to think that language and the context that language conveys were connected, even though we use language to communicate issues and ideas” (p. 18). Pushback from students on the inclusion of sociopolitical topics in language classes included reasons such as language classes not being a sociology or anthropology class (Kubota et al., 2003). This demonstrates the association of sociopolitical issues with particular disciplines, but not languages.
Additionally, in her response to an interview question about whether the topic of “Latino issues” not being part of the curriculum was specific to the translation curriculum, Martina mentioned not wanting to overlap “with the professors that are specialists…in those areas.” Following up on this comment via email, I asked Martina if she could tell me about this and whether avoiding overlap was something discussed in department meetings. She shared,

Not that I recall. We have quite an amount of freedom in terms of the contents of our classes and the way we decide to teach them. As I mentioned before, it is more related to a personal conviction in the sense that there are instructors who have studied for years, wrote about and done extensive research in these topics, and that is their field of expertise, not mine. I want to be respectful of such boundaries and I expect the same from other educators as well.

This excerpt demonstrates that although Martina can determine the content of her curriculum to a large extent, she appears to choose not to include discussion of issues impacting local Latinx community members because she feels that she is not in the position to talk about topics outside her expertise. This is reflective of Abbott (2017) who notes that Spanish CBL instructors often do not feel able to discuss issues, such as immigration, which are often outside of their domain of expertise. Martina also appears to suggest that these topics belong to professors who have studied and researched the topics for years. Although Martina appears to be open to fostering space for discussion, she seems to feel that she is not in the position to facilitate those conversations. Furthermore, when discussing how the topic of “Latino issues” in the community is not part of the translation curriculum, Martina mentioned that her background is “Latino but it’s not necessarily the most representative@…of the [city] area problems.” This seems to suggest that her own identity impacted her choice not to include more discussion of issues.
impacting local Latinx community members in the course. Particular identities Martina may be referring to include class differences between herself, as a university instructor, and other Latinx immigrants in the city.

These ideologies make the assumption that instructors must have personal experience or professional expertise with the topics they discuss. However, instructors can provide guidance and materials for students to explore topics along with them through inquiry-based learning (Abbott, 2017; Cutshall, 2014). As Abbott (2017) discusses, inquiry-based learning in CBL can allow instructors and students to better understand the policies that impact the communities they are serving. Furthermore, CBL offers the opportunity for students and instructors to learn directly from community members themselves.

Instructors of CBL translation courses could also incorporate topics that draw on their expertise in translation. While it is understandable that they might feel out of their domain in discussing other disciplines, Martina and other CBL Translation instructors like her likely have knowledge and experience related to translation policies and their impact on Latinx communities. Discussion of these topics would allow the instructors to draw on their expertise and give students the opportunity to better understand the role of translation in the lives of community members who may read their translation work. Collaborating with other translation instructors implementing CBL in their courses could help provide a support system and serve as a space to brainstorm and share ideas.

Additionally, CBL translation courses discussed in the literature that have incorporated topics impacting the lives of local Latinx communities into their courses can also serve as models. For example, Bugel (2013) discussed her course where, in addition to learning about translation theory and methods, students also learned about the importance of translation in
allowing Spanish speaking parents to participate in their children’s education. Another example is from Alsina Naudi (2020) whose students in a legal and business translation course spent class time discussing the issue of refugees and asylum seekers before producing a translation of an interview with attorneys who specialized in asylum cases from Central America. In these examples of other CBL translation courses, the topics regarding Latinx communities covered in class directly related to the students’ service work. Although Alsina Naudi does not mention how much discussion about the topic of refugees and asylum seekers was included in the course, she does mention that the CBL translation was not the main purpose of the course. This is similar to the focal Translation course where the CBL translation was positioned as only one of the components to the course. Even in a course that may not be able to dedicate much class time to the CBL component, creating the space for discussion of issues impacting the local Latinx communities connected to students’ service work is helpful to students learning and their ability to better understand their service work and its context.

5.1.3 Community partner as co-educator

In the Translation course, the service work did not require students to work directly with the community partner and so students did not have the opportunity to meet or interact with Elizabeth. This lack of interaction seems to have posed a challenge to the opportunity for Elizabeth to serve as a co-educator who could share her knowledge and expertise about issues impacting the community her organization works with. In our end of semester interviews, both Elizabeth and Martina appeared to realize that the community partner could take on more of a co-educator role and expressed interest in the possibility for future collaborations. For example, Elizabeth shared her idea about going to class and speaking with students in the future.
FV: would you want to do anything differently in future collaborations now that you have one under your belt?
Elizabeth: um I guess maybe just based on some of the questions you asked it didn’t really occur to me
FV: mhm
Elizabeth: to maybe be more in contact with the teacher like- and also maybe to come and talk to the students
FV: mm!
Elizabeth: about what I’m doing
FV: ok
Elizabeth: like so that they can get a, you know, face and a name and put that together
FV: mhm mhm yeah and tell them more about the organization, things like this
Elizabeth: yeah
FV: yeah yeah
Elizabeth: it might make it more meaningful to them too

This was Elizabeth’s first time collaborating on a CBL course, and she had not known about these types of courses before this experience. This excerpt demonstrates that it was not until Elizabeth participated in the interviews with me that questions I asked sparked the idea of being more involved in the class. Prior to this, it appears she was unfamiliar with the possible roles that she could play in CBL as a community partner, such as being more involved and connected with students. This lack of awareness appears to have posed a challenge to having Elizabeth take on a co-educator role. Davis et al. (2019) found that “community partners look to course instructors to provide structure regarding the type of experience they are involved in and in
shaping their mutual expectations for the service-learning experience” (p. 151). Therefore, instructors, who are more familiar with CBL than their community partners, could consider having conversations with their community partners that outline possible ways for them to become more or less involved depending on their wants and needs. Community engagement offices can also play a role by providing some orientation and training material on CBL to community partners.

In sharing changes she would like to make in the next iteration of the course, Martina expressed that she would like to bring community partners into the classroom. Martina mentioned wanting to “present some more information about the…nonprofit” or to bring somebody from the nonprofit to talk…or even from other, you know, nonprofits where they could do direct service…um cuz I think that would be ehm that would be more motivational for them…to have somebody come from an organization. In addition to motivating students in their work, doing so could also expand the opportunities for development of community awareness by incorporating community partner’s knowledge about the community her organization serves and issues impacting them into the class.

In recognizing that instructors may not feel that they are in the position to teach about the lived experiences of local Latinx communities based on their own training, life experiences, and ideologies, instructors can invite their community partners into the classroom to help them learn and teach about these topics. For example, Bugel (2013) invited her community partner into her CBL translation class to discuss factors such why the texts needed to be translated and why translation is important in schools. Ruedo-Acedo (2018) had staff from the nonprofit organization visit her CBL translation class at the beginning of the semester to share their expectations as well as talk about the community’s translation needs and the importance of the
students’ service. Alsina Naudi (2020) had her community partner talk to the class about the organization and the displacement conflict in El Salvador, which connected to their service work.

Bringing the community partner into the classroom also allows student to see the value of the community partner’s knowledge and experience. This practice can be reflective of the translation process as well. Since translators cannot always be specialists in the topic of the texts they translate, they often have to conduct research and consult experts (Rogers, 2006). As a lawyer and director of a nonprofit organization, Elizabeth is well positioned to introduce students to policies and issues that impact the community she works with and which the students are translating for. When I asked Martina in a follow up interview whether she had discussed with Elizabeth why The Caregivers Coalition needed a Spanish translation and if so, whether the information had been shared with students, she shared that she had talked a little bit with Elizabeth about this and remembered mentioning it to student when introducing the organization. This seems to indicate that not much time had been dedicated to discussion of the immigration policies that sparked the need for the resource guide (see Chapter 4), which is a missed opportunity for students’ development of community awareness. As a co-educator, Elizabeth could have discussed the current Trump administration’s policies on immigration and how they motivated the organization’s need for a Spanish translation of the resource guide.

A practical challenge to inviting Elizabeth into the classroom is that not all students were working with The Caregivers Coalition. Since three students translated a document for a community health center and two students participated in direct service, the community partners from these other organizations could potentially also be invited into the classroom. However recognizing that time is a common constraint in any class, all students could still benefit from
learning from one community partner’s expertise and with the instructor’s guidance can find ways in which what they learn connects to their service work.

**5.2 Labor Issues course**

As I discussed in Chapter 4, Valeria, the course instructor, wanted her students to get outside of the confines of a classroom and experience different perspectives. This was echoed by the community partner, Ramon, who stressed that certain things cannot be learned from books but rather must be experienced out in the community. Central to both stakeholders’ goals and motivations is the development of community awareness by learning in and about the community they are working with.

**5.2.1 Service work**

Although all students in the Labor Issues course worked with Labor Rights for All as part of their CBL service work, the tasks students worked on and the experiences they had varied. In this section, I discuss how different service work tasks impacted the opportunities available for the development of community awareness through interaction with the day laborers.

While the class content of the course provided opportunities for learning about the lived experiences of the day laborer community through a cultural studies perspective, the interactions students had with community members through their service work seemed to play an important role in deepening their community awareness. As part of her service work, Kali, a student, had the opportunity to attend a wage theft court case. Along with Ramon, Kali and another student went to the hearing for a day laborer, X, who had been not paid for his work. In accompanying Ramon and X to court, Kali got the chance to chat with X, who shared other struggles he was facing such as “maltreatment…not feeling respected…not feeling humanized…not feeling like he has a community.” Kali noted that much of what X expressed reflected what she had read in
her class readings about the struggles that day laborers face. In talking to X, Kali had the opportunity to make connections between the community she was working with and class content. As Kali described, hearing these struggles firsthand from X was “way more powerful than reading about them.” This demonstrates how the interaction between students and community members that CBL affords can be a valuable learning tool for development of community awareness by enhancing students’ ability to understand how the theories and experiences they read about in a more abstract and removed way play out and have implications for real people in their surrounding community. Kali saw interaction with the day laborers as a particularly important part of CBL saying,

   I think that community-based [learning] is- I think how a lot of education should be especially in liberal arts when you are studying about a group of people. I think interaction with that group of people and immersion with that group of people as much as possible… is important to actually see like firsthand… cuz like readings can only get you so far, but I think once you actually interact with people, that’s when you start seeing the nuances… and that’s when you have more questions…about what’s going on and you realize the complexities cuz, you know, no author’s ever going to- to get all the details down.

Here we see how Kali sees engagement with community members as a means of expanding her learning about topics discussed in class by allowing her to see the “nuances” and “complexities” of labor issues and the day laborer experience. She also appears to demonstrate a critical view of academic texts by recognizing that “no author’s going to- to get all the details down.” This suggests an acknowledgment of the limitations of what can be represented in an article or book chapter and connects to a questioning of the extent to which we can learn about
communities without engaging directly with them. This echoes Ramon’s opinions on the type of learning that can occur through CBL, which goes beyond what textbooks or a classroom can provide.

Another student, Eleanor worked with community members on a theatre project. She described the project as being about identity, understanding community engagement, and communicating issues of social inequality and difference. In her reflection essay, she wrote about how Ramon, herself, and a councilmember of the organization that was spearheading the project, discussed the purpose of the project as being to create a piece that expressed the identity of the day laborers. In developing their skits, the theatre group had to have discussions about the stories they wanted to represent as well as how to represent them. The group had to think about how to unite the story of different people such as when “person A’s community is different than person B’s community.” Eleanor shared that the discussions she had with community members clarified her understanding of who the community is. For example, she described how one of the day laborers in attendance took issue with the purpose of the project saying,

que hay demasiados lados de la identidad de los jornaleros, que ‘la identidad de jornaleros real no es una sola identidad’ y que eso es algo confundido por el público estadounidense [that there are too many sides to day laborers’ identity, that “the real day laborer identity” is not only one identity and that that is something misunderstood by the American public].

Being a part of these discussions gave Eleanor the opportunity to realize that the community that day laborers form is a “chosen community” based on “a unity of custom and unity of culture” but also “a unity of circumstance.” This demonstrates how her service work allowed her to develop
her community awareness by better understanding the community she was working with as well as thinking critically about what it means to be a community.

Eleanor also shared how her collaboration with the community members expanded upon what she learned through class readings. For example, through her work with Labor Rights for All, Eleanor learned about the ways in which day laborers need to both expose and hide themselves because of the work that they do. She expressed that “this duality” was not portrayed well in the class readings.

You read personal accounts and we- we read articles and interviews and all sorts- all sorts of things... but it’s a totally different deal... when you’re sitting across from someone at a restaurant... and they’re telling you how they crossed the border... and you know um... so I think my- my understanding of the difficulties (sigh)... of the lives of- of day laborers and the- the community itself... has grown massively... and I think in terms of understanding the connection to the class... um there I- there’s just a personal narrative... There’s a face to the name, there’s a face to the statistic... and so it’s- it’s- it’s a huge deal.

This excerpt shows how the interactions Eleanor had as a result of her service work provided opportunities for better understanding of the community of day laborers and their experiences. With the shift from learning inside a classroom through a reading to learning about a person’s life while sitting across from them at restaurant, there appears to be a deepening in the level at which Eleanor understands how labor or migration issues impact the lives of people she is forming relationships with.

As the examples above demonstrate, interaction with community members during service work provided students with opportunities to develop their community awareness. However, a
challenge to providing these opportunities to students is that they were assigned to different tasks. The opportunities that were available for each student depended to some extent on their skills and interests, such as Eleanor’s involvement in the theater group as a theater major, and also on practical matters such as scheduling and availability. For example, it seemed to be a matter of timing for why Kali had the opportunity to attend the court hearings. She described it happening because one day she was in the office and Ramon happened to be going to court and did not have much work for her to do and so he invited her along.

While some students had the opportunity to interact with community members regularly, not all service work tasks provided that opportunity. For example, as part of his service work in the course, Zayn worked on fixing an ID card machine, which Labor Rights for All uses to print ID cards for the day laborers. The ID includes background information such as the individual’s birthday and address as well as Ramon’s number, which is listed as an emergency contact number. Zayn explained that the cards were “very important… to the organization” with all day laborers who are affiliated with Labor Rights for All receiving one. However, the machine had not been working for a few months. Zayn took over the task of fixing the machine, which was “very expensive and very old.” He was unable to find any manuals online so it involved “just kind of tinkering with technology,” but eventually Zayn was able to fix it. From then on, he became the point of contact on the ID machine, helping others learn how to use it or address any issues with it.

Through this task, Zayn did not have the opportunity to make connections between his experience working in the community and readings as a way to develop his community awareness. Zayn shared that he spent all of his community work hours in the office, which
limited his opportunity to get to know community members. However, being in the office did offer some chances to interact with the day laborers.

Zayn: occasionally I would meet people who would just stop by

FV: mhm mhm

Zayn: and they would talk to me but um then that’s where I would get these conversations cuz they would talk to me about like school and how expensive college is

FV: @

Zayn: um

FV: yeah

Zayn: stuff like that and then that’s where I would get these snippets of like class consciousness and ethnic consciousness

FV: mm

Zayn: kinda but um I think I would be able to- if I had had more contact

FV: mhm

Zayn: with the actual day laborers which is something that I wish I had done. Valeria’s told me that she wished that I like- Ramon had kinda pushed me on

FV: ok

Zayn: um then I think I would have gotten a better understanding of their lives in [the city]

In this excerpt, Zayn expresses his desire to have had more interaction with the day laborers so that he could have better understood their lived experiences. This demonstrates students’ interest in developing community awareness through learning from community members themselves. As Lear and Abbott (2009) note, organizations often need help with office work, but students can
become frustrated when they do not get to interact with the community as they expected. Zayn appears to point to the rare conversations he had the opportunity to have as particularly rich learning moments for discussing and further developing his understanding of topics discussed in class, such as ethnic and class consciousness (see Baker-Cristales, 2004). Zayn also references Valeria’s desire for him to have the opportunity to work on different tasks. Valeria made reference to this herself in an interview where she discussed the different spaces that existed in which students might be completing their service work.

FV: so each student has a different experience

Valeria: <yes> yes

FV: some of them have been

Valeria: yes and then-

FV: only to the corner

Valeria: yes

FV: not to the office <all this>

Valeria: <exactly> exactly

FV: ok

Valeria: yes and some of the students have been stuck in an office

FV: ok

Valeria: you know what I mean, so <it’s not>

FV: <all depends>

Valeria: it’s not fair

FV: yeah yeah
Valeria: so I told Ramon this morning there is this guy who’s never been anywhere but in front of this machine that you have him attached to

FV: mm

Valeria: he can do much more. he’s very creative. so yeah.

In this excerpt, Valeria suggests that she does not like when students only have the opportunity to work in the office as demonstrated by her choice of “stuck in the office.” Her expression of “it’s not fair” suggests that she believes students who only have the chance to do office-based work are at a disadvantage and that this type of work is also not making use of the students’ full potential. At another point in the interview when discussing how scheduling impacted the type of service work students could ultimately get involved with, Valeria also expressed, “I wish students could be more involved directly with the day laborers in the corner but sometimes it’s just not possible.” This connects to Valeria’s goal to have students always be making the connection between what they are learning in class and what they learn through their service work, as discussed in Chapter 4. The student excerpts discussed in this section suggest that students did indeed learn and develop their community awareness through their interactions with the day laborers during service work.

While Valeria appears to value the learning opportunities that students can experience from interacting with community members, she also expressed some concerns, such as when students go to the corner where day laborers congregate to look for work.

FV: and you had also mentioned um that when you first take the students to the corner you talk about some possible risks um what are some of those risks that you share with the students?

Valeria: mhm um the corner is a hard place. it’s a very masculine place
Valeria: um there is uh alcoholism

FV: <ok>

Valeria: <on the> corner um some of the day laborers are alcoholics um and so some of them come to the corner drunk

FV: oh

Valeria: so I never risk sending students there to the corner without

FV: mm

Valeria: you know, Ramon or the other guys from the day laborer organization um or even with myself um as- I have thi-, 12 women and 1 man in the classroom

FV: right

Valeria: um so I was- one of the first things is don’t go to the corner without one of us

FV: ok

Valeria: never

FV: mhm

Valeria: never I don’t want them to go through, you know, anything that they don’t need to go through

FV: <yeah>

Valeria: <you know> like catcalling or um just being uncomfortable. there is no need um but I certainly did not- um I- I certainly pushed for the students to be in the corner, you know, to go to the corner

FV: mm

Valeria: with Ramon or to go to the corner with Pedro, be there, you know
Valeria: just see um but the corner is harsh um when they see you approaching them with a camera or anything, they just run away

FV: <ok>

Valeria: <because> they don’t wanna be caught on camera for anything

FV: ok

Valeria: uh but it is a very masculine place. it is a competing space

FV: mm

Valeria: um they can be talking to you- they are kind, they are kind people obviously

FV: sure

Valeria: but you know somebody pulls up to find day laborers, they just leave you, you know

FV: yeah

Valeria: and that’s completely understandable

The possible safety concern for her students seems to pose a challenge to the development of community awareness through interaction with day laborers. Since Valeria only wants students to go to the corner with Ramon, another Labor Rights for all staff member, or herself, then the opportunities available are more limited and depend on the overlap in schedules. This excerpt also demonstrates how certain dynamics of the corner also seem to play a role in the extent to which students could have the opportunity to interact with day laborers, including day laborers’ uneasiness with being identified and their need to prioritize interaction with potential employers. Relatedly, Ramon discussed how day laborers at the corner are sometimes a bit uneasy with people they do not know, such as the students, wanting to take their photo or talk to them. This
can pose a challenge to fostering interactions between community members and students. Learning to respectfully work with community members is key to breaking down this potential barrier. I discuss learning to respectfully and responsibly work with community members further in Chapter 6.

5.2.2 Ideologies about the place of sociopolitics in the curriculum

Although service work contributed to students’ development of community awareness by providing opportunities for interactions with community members, a challenge to the development of community awareness through service work was that Valeria appeared to be concerned with her students becoming involved in political events, such as rallies and marches, as part of their service work. This was something that needed to be discussed with her community partner. Valeria explained that,

A great difficulty is that he [Ramon] is very political and then I- you know, how you tell your community partner my students are their own people, their own persons and they cannot be involved in activities that may go against their political leanings or whatever…They don’t agree…That is a conversation with him….I think that’s one of the things of separating these- these two spheres… and I have always been very clear uh I don’t- I don’t want my students to be at rallies if they don’t feel that they are comfortable and you cannot hold that against them…and that doesn’t count towards the hours of the community-based learning project.

This excerpt suggests that Valeria wanted to avoid situations in which students felt that they needed to participate in political events as part of their service work. The separation of participating in political activities is not a clear boundary, however. For example, Eleanor’s participation in the theatre group could be considered political in the sense that the stories that
are told through their skits may express particular opinions and perspectives. Furthermore, the theater group performed at a fundraiser for Labor Rights for All, which raises money that may then be used for activities, such as organizing rallies. In responding to my question about whether he thinks CBL courses can promote social justice, Ramon mentioned his organization’s tight connection to political issues; “we can’t avoid the fact that we are involved in politics <x> of politics… you know, the immigration issue is <este(?)> immigration issues are very political.” Ramon’s comment further demonstrates that it can be difficult to separate politics out when working with his organization. The organization has a political orientation to immigration issues, which informs the work that they do and which students are involved with. Arguably, any service work that students engage in for Labor Rights for All is meant to advance their mission and in doing so supports the political agenda of the organization. Valeria is, of course, aware of the service work that students engage in and supports the work that they do. Therefore, it appears that she is most concerned with students being required to participate in events with very outward political messaging that they may not agree with.

In a follow up email, I asked Valeria what determines whether a task is too political for students to participate in as part of their service work hours for the course. Valeria shared that there were two reasons she could not count rallies towards students’ CBL service work hours. She wrote,

1. It is up to the student to participate in the rally and they do so willingly. I cannot count that as service because I know that many of my students work and do not have the time to engage in that kind of activity. It would be unfair with other students.

2. Rallies are politically charged and similar to my classroom and based on what they learn both in class and with the community engagement projects, I believe students can make
up their own minds. I have received feedback from students who are a bit uncomfortable when the community partner tries to “sell” a political ideal. Students have told me that they understand what they are doing and the importance of that work but that they are not too political themselves. I have to respect that and not insist on that.

Both responses seem to account for why rallies cannot be required as service work. The first response provides a practical explanation; not all students are available to participate. This would also apply to other service work tasks, which are allowed to count towards service hours, however. The second response seems to provide a more specific reason based in avoiding pushing a political agenda on her students. Importantly, the second response demonstrates that Valeria has received feedback from students who have reported feeling uncomfortable when community partners push political agendas. Understandably, as an instructor, Valeria strives to create a safe and inclusive environment for her students and therefore appears to prefer not to push or require students to participate in activities, which may not align with their beliefs. When I asked Valeria in a follow up email what motivated her choice to keep politics separate from service work, she explained,

My job as an instructor is to get students to critically analyze texts of different kinds (: academic essays, stories, radio programs, official reports, NGO reports, photographs, music) and from there, talk about power relations, and how knowledge is produced, and analyze different perspectives on the subject matter. This is how students make up their political minds. I do not want to impose my political views, but my critical pedagogical approach does allow for students to examine biases (one’s own and biases towards others and the implications these have), question who produces knowledge and with what specific purpose.
This response appears to demonstrate that Valeria’s choice is grounded in an ideology regarding the role of an instructor. As the instructor, she appears to want to create the space and encourage the type of critical thinking that allow students to shape their political views, however she does not want to impose her own views on them. Instructors’ decisions to not “impose” their political views may be a consequence of claims that universities indoctrinate students into liberalism (see Shapiro, 2010). When I asked Valeria in a follow up email if there were any university policies requiring CBL courses to avoid engaging in political activities, she reported none to her knowledge.

Ramon, on the other hand, appeared to support student participation in political events saying, “for the students, it’s great because they- they have participated with marches going different places and so forth…so they learn about what is really going on in the country.” This excerpt demonstrates how Ramon positions marches as opportunities to develop their community awareness. Through their participation in rallies or protests, students could have the opportunity to better understand how communities organize and why they do so. While Valeria chose to not make participation in political events required, students can participate in marches and rallies if they want. The fact that participation in political events cannot be counted towards their service hours, if they choose to participate, poses a challenge to the development of community awareness that Ramon appears to believe is possible through political participation. This policy may discourage students from participating since many have to balance service work hours with coursework, jobs, and internships and therefore might prioritize tasks that count towards their hours.

Valeria’s preference for separation of politics from service work is reflected in the literature. Jacoby (2015) has “long advocated that proponents and practitioners of service-
learning should strenuously avoid directly or indirectly influencing participants towards specific political parties or toward their personally held political views” (p. 239). Jacoby also references the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993, which did not permit funding to be used for political acts, such as protests, strikes, or any act that influenced legislation. Clifford (2017) argues that “the conflation of non-partisan with nonpolitical is reinforcing the traditional [CBL] model and contributing to the depoliticization of citizenship” (p. 10). Supporting social change and structural transformation means embracing the political nature of CBL and education (Clifford, 2017, p. 10). The separation of politics from service work suggests that Valeria does not push for political engagement, at least not as part of the course, as critical CBL approaches advocate for. However, it is important to note that, as demonstrated in an above excerpt, Valeria’s choice is influenced by feedback she received from students regarding feeling uncomfortable when community partners tried to “sell” political ideals. Ensuring that students feel comfortable in course-related activities is understandably prioritized over any inclusion of political engagement instructors may want to adopt.

5.2.3 Community partner as co-educator

Related to the opportunities for development of community awareness through interactions with community members are the interactions that students had with the community partner. Through their service work, students also had opportunities to work and interact with Ramon. As I discussed above, students’ interactions with the day laborers provided them with opportunities to further develop their community awareness by providing context and a voice to the course material covered in readings. When I asked Valeria about her expectations of the community partner in terms of providing opportunities to merge the content with the community aspect, she shared,
Valeria: um one of the things that I uh that I always expected uh with the- the Labor
Rights for All
FV: mhm
Valeria: you know, as the community partner was that students could always relate the
content to what- what the community, what the organization was doing but also the
people that the organization served so for instance we were talking about migration
FV: mhm
Valeria: that the students- that the- that the community uh that the community partner had
the capacity
FV: mhm
Valeria: to inform students more in detail when they were there
FV: ok
Valeria: about, you know, about migration, migration trends
FV: <ok>
Valeria: <you know>, all those that stuff, that kind of information so that there is this
typey over here and then there is this reality over there and they talk to each other and
complement each other
FV: mhm
Valeria: and Ramon is very good at that
FV: that’s nice
Valeria: and he- he, I mean, he’s been at this for a long time and so he knows what he’s
doing in
FV: mm
Valeria: in that regard

This excerpt demonstrates that Valeria expects Ramon to play a role in the learning experience of the students. Valeria seems to turn to Ramon and his staff as co-educators who can further inform students on topics that they more personally work with and may know more about. She also seems to turn to them as a way to link the theory learned in the classroom to the “reality over there.” This is reflective of Ramon’s contrast between what you can learn in books and what you can learn “out here” as seen in Chapter 4. In this way, Ramon and Valeria blur the boundaries between where students learn and who they learn from and in doing so expand the opportunities for development of community awareness.

Students, however, may not always expect community partners to play a role in their learning. In talking about her understanding of CBL, Eleanor shared,

I didn’t realize like how involved um the people on- on the service side…would be in our learning…um and in our um understanding of material and you know contributing materials…and um resources and lessons and what not…and I think that that was- that kind of interconnection was- was quite important.

In expressing “I didn’t realize,” Eleanor suggests that she was not expecting for “people on the service side,” which would be Ramon and Pedro, to play a role in her learning. This suggests that students may not necessarily understand the role or contributions of community partners in CBL. For example, Lear and Sánchez (2013) discussed how some students were operating off the impression that the community partner was an undergraduate student rather than an experienced professional. Particularly in courses where students interact directly with the community partner, it is important for students to understand the knowledge and expertise that community partners have to share with them. In doing so, students can crucially come to see the “service side” as the
“learning side” as well and their opportunities for developing community awareness can expand greatly.

In Chapter 4, I discussed how Ramon appeared to take on a co-educator role. He aimed to give students new understandings of the community in which they were working and to ensure that they learned from their experiences. In taking on this role, Ramon had discussions with students. He shared that,

Ramon: we talked about a lot of politics
FV: ok
Ramon: we talked about what’s going on with the issues of Central America going on right now, what’s going on with Venezuela
FV: ok
Ramon: what’s going on with this, what’s going on with that
FV: mhm
Ramon: so we talk about a lot of things that are going on right now
FV: yeah yeah
Ramon: yeah we have to think about it because it affects us
FV: mhm
Ramon: we talked about if- if Guatemala is invaded and we have- we have uh people come, people suffering over there, they might have to come here

This excerpt demonstrates how Ramon engaged students in conversations about current political events impacting Latin America. Ramon mentioned that, “we have to think about it because it affects us.” This highlights how these events are not discussed from a distant, theoretical perspective that might be taken up in the classroom, but rather as global events that can
immediately impact the local day laborer community. For example, a bit later in the interview, Ramon talked about how a rise in migrants to the US might lead to a rise in day laborers as they seek work in the ways they can. Ramon shared that this would make his work more difficult and intense due to the lack of resources Labor Rights for All already experiences. In having these conversations with Ramon, students are able to develop their community awareness by learning how Labor Rights for All, the day laborers they work with, and the U.S. labor force in general can be impacted by migration patterns.

Ramon also shared how he had conversations with students that encouraged them to reflect on their own privileges.

Ramon: we talked about the- the fact that these young- that these workers out there at Home Depot

FV: mhm

Ramon: many of them have the same age as the- as the students that come in

FV: ok

Ramon: and then we make a comparison well if- if- if their countries were a little different

FV: mm

Ramon: they would be probably at the- in the college over there at their- at their country- in their country

FV: yeah they could be in college yeah

Ramon: so you have to make- you have to make the comparison. You guys are here and you have these resources around you

FV: wow
Ramon: *they* don’t have the resources so they have to come here

FV: yeah

Ramon: to- to work

FV: mm

Ramon: wow! This is a big shocking thing

FV: wow

Ramon: to a lot of them

FV: yeah

Ramon: so that’s- that’s the discussion that we- they get to learn

FV: mm mm mm

Ramon: they have this idea(?)

FV: ok

Ramon: so they make a comparison what their life is like versus theirs

FV: both the the- students and the day laborers can reflect on this

Ramon: yes

FV: yeah

Ramon: yes yes those pieces(?) are important

This excerpt demonstrates how Ramon guides students to make a comparison between themselves and individuals their age who work as day laborers and who did not have the same opportunities available to them in their countries. In this way, Ramon acts as a co-educator who takes it upon himself to ensure that students are reflecting on topics he believes are important for students to be exposed to and to consider. In doing so, Ramon provides the opportunity for students’ development of community awareness, including an understanding of their own
positioning within the community they were working with through reflection, which is a key component of CBL. This is similar to findings by Darby et al. (2016), who found that community partners engaged students in reflections about their CBL experiences. Ramon’s description of many students finding the comparison shocking suggests that students were indeed given the opportunity to learn something new about the community of day laborers through Ramon’s guidance.

Students also discussed the ways in which their interactions with Ramon contributed to their development of community awareness. For example, Zayn pointed to conversations he had with Ramon that helped him better understand the day laborer community. He shared,

Zayn: I had conversations with Ramon about like um, you know, this person didn't like this person because they took a job
FV: ahh
Zayn: <or like> there was a level of resentment but all of that based in fundamentally the job
FV: ok mm <mm>
Zayn: <um> so I- so what I learned@
FV: mhm <yeah>
Zayn: <is that> it was a very strong community
FV: <ok>
Zayn: <and> obviously there are friendships
FV: yeah
Zayn: and connections that are genuine
FV: mhm
Zayn: but I think the issue is just because like the way day laborers are already kind of set back
FV: mhm
Zayn: um through lack of representation <and>
FV: <sure>
Zayn: lack of protection, whatever
FV: uh huh
Zayn: um these communities are also that like that same level of vulnerability
FV: oh! wow yeah yeah that’s a really interesting analysis of it yeah um yeah
Zayn: yeah which was like another push for why Ramon wanted the cooperative because
FV: ok
Zayn: it created a space for community
FV: <mm>
Zayn: <for> these jornaleros to work together but also be protected
FV: ok
Zayn: and so that community couldn’t break down as easily as it can now

This excerpt demonstrates how Zayn’s conversations with Ramon allowed him to learn about the rivalry that can exist between day laborers who compete for work. The tensions that can exist amongst day laborers was explored by DuBord (2018), who found that monolingual Spanish-speaking day laborers saw bilingual day laborers as tricksters who use their bilingualism to take advantage of them. In knowing the day laborers more personally, Ramon is able to share his knowledge about the relationships between members of the day laborer community with students in a way that a textbook cannot do. By having these conversations with Ramon, Zayn learned
about the challenges that impacted the cohesiveness of the day laborer community and came to better understand Ramon’s motivations for wanting to create a cooperative for the day laborers. This type of learning was particularly important for Zayn, who conducted research on cooperatives for his final project. Better understanding how a cooperative could strengthen the day laborer community could have added a level of focus and purpose to the final project assignment. Overall, this excerpt demonstrates how interactions with the community partner can play an important role in students’ development of community awareness.

5.3 Discussion

In this chapter, I explored the opportunities and challenges related to developing community awareness by exploring three themes in the two focal courses: 1) service work, 2) ideologies about the place of sociopolitics in the curriculum, and 3) the community partners as co-educator. Although the two courses are quite different from each other, these three themes played an important role in shaping the learning opportunities for students in both courses.

A key part of any CBL class is, of course, the service work component. In both focal courses, service work provided a number of opportunities and posed challenges to students’ development of community awareness. In the Translation course, students had the opportunity to develop their community awareness as they translated their assigned document. Given that translation involves reading and understanding the original text, students were exposed to information regarding the nonprofit organizations, services the organizations provide, community resources, and statistics and facts related to the organizations’ work. This was one of the central ways in which the instructor hoped students would learn about issues impacting local Latinx community members. The extent to which students had the opportunity to develop community awareness through translation was impacted, however, by the fact that students
worked on only one section of the document and were not required to read the full document. This meant that some students translated sections that did not contain much content, but were for example, a directory of services meaning students spent time translating many addresses and phone numbers. The peer review process mitigated this challenge to some extent by allowing students to read other sections of the document as well. Overall, the format of the service work presented students with both opportunities and challenges to developing community awareness.

In terms of the Labor Issues course, service work tasks that provided opportunities for interactions with community members allowed students to engage with issues firsthand and appeared to be great learning opportunities for students. As Valeria mentioned in discussing her reason for implementing CBL in her course (see Chapter 4), it is a way of making a connection between theory and practice. As students engaged in the community, they were able to see how readings and other course content played out in the lives of the day laborers they were working with. However, some tasks, like Zayn’s fixing of the ID machine, did not offer much opportunity for this. As the excerpts above demonstrate, students’ experiences in the community can both validate and contextualize their classroom learning or challenge and raise questions about their classroom learning. In both cases, students are learning more about the community around them and understanding the extent to which theoretical concepts represent real people and experiences.

Overall, the opportunities and challenges from the two focal courses demonstrate that it is difficult to provide each student with similar opportunities for the development of community awareness. This was the case both in the Labor Issues course, where students worked on an array of different service tasks, and in the Translation course where all students (other than the two students who chose direct service) worked on translating a document. Bettencourt (2015) argues that understanding what specifically about a task provides opportunities for certain types of
learning can be useful for planning out service work that links to course goals and expected learning outcomes. In the same vein, understanding the challenges also allows us to understand what could be improved upon and how to work within constraints.

In the Translation course, the section that a student translated and/or peer reviewed appeared to be key in terms of the opportunity to develop community awareness. Since the documents had to be split into sections because of length which is likely to occur in other CBL translation courses as well, the instructor can require all students to read the full document and write a reflection response and/or hold a class discussion. This would create opportunities for all students to read the same material and therefore better understand the context in which their section is situated. This would contribute to the development of students’ community awareness as well as to producing a quality translation, thereby addressing the community partner’s need as well (see Chapter 6 for more discussion).

In the Labor Issues course, the opportunity to interact with community members stood out as a key element of service work, which provided opportunities for development of community awareness. This is similar to Darby et al. (2016), who found that the interaction between students, community members, and community partners provided opportunities for students to understand the lived experiences of others and to learn about issues impacting the community they are working with. Since the task that students were assigned depended on when they were available, what Ramon needed done, and the students’ skills and interests, not all tasks provided the opportunity to interact with day laborers. Although difficult because of the constraints, planning for each student to be involved in at least one task that allows them to interact and learn from the day laborers would be ideal.
The second factor that impacted the opportunities available for students to develop community awareness in both courses was ideologies about the place of sociopolitics in the curriculum. In the Translation course, ideologies about what a language teacher should teach and what students should learn about in an introductory course in translation seemed to impact the extent to which Martina included the discussion of sociopolitical topics in the course. Furthermore, ideologies about what she could teach based on her personal background and disciplinary expertise also appeared to play a role in the opportunities Martina created for discussion of issues impacting local Latinx community members. In the Labor Issues course, ideologies regarding sociopolitics and service work appeared to impact Valeria’s choices. Attending rallies and protests could serve as opportunities for students to better understand the concerns and struggles of the community members they were working with. However, Valeria did not count such activities as service work, which posed a challenge to the development of community awareness, since their participation was discouraged by the fact that attending such events would not count towards their service hours. Valeria’s choice seemed to be a result of student feedback on feeling uncomfortable when community partners tried to “sell” political ideals. Additionally, the political nature of CBL has been criticized for pushing liberal agendas (see Butin, 2006; Mitchell, 2008) and such criticism may impact instructors who may fear receiving similar backlash.

The third factor that impacted the opportunities available for development of community awareness in the two courses was the role of the community partner as a co-educator. In the Translation course, the community partner did not have the opportunity to take on this role. Given the nature of the service work, the community partner and the students never had to meet or communicate directly with each other. This may be a consequence of the more transactional
nature of the relationship in which the main expected outcome was a product. Additionally, with students never meeting the community partner, it is possible that the relationship is one of unilateral awareness, which is on the lower end of Bringle et al.’s (2009) relationship continuum ranging from unaware of other person to transformational. While the service work was still successfully completed, this was a missed opportunity for students to learn from the community partner’s knowledge and expertise. Having the community partner attend a class session to speak with the students, as both Martina and Elizabeth suggested doing in the future, would give students the opportunity to listen, ask questions, and expand their understanding of the context of the translation and lived experiences of the community members that are the audience of their translation.

In the Labor Issues course, students had frequent interaction with the community partner through their service work tasks at the Labor Rights for All office and other community locations such as the corner and the courthouse. Ramon reported having discussions with students and asking them to reflect on their experiences. In these ways, Ramon took on a co-educator role. The knowledge and experience that Ramon was able to share with the students allowed for the students to develop community awareness in a way that went beyond academic texts and instead was grounded in the realities of the community they were working with. Doing so was both a goal of Ramon’s and an expectation that Valeria had of Ramon’s involvement as a community partner. Working towards common goals is characteristic of relationships closer to the transformational end of the relationship continuum (Bringle et al., 2009).

While other course-related factors, such as class discussions and final projects provided students with opportunities and challenges to developing community awareness as well, I focused on the themes of service work and community partner as co-educator since they are
unique to CBL courses. Additionally, while examining ideologies related to sociopolitics in the curriculum is applicable to all language courses, it is particularly important in CBL courses where students are asked to engage in social and political work. Furthermore, it is important to acknowledge that although the focus of my analysis is on the development of community awareness, this is, of course, not the only type of learning that occurred in these two courses. In the Translation course, students learned a great deal about translation theory and practices. Importantly, such learning was key to addressing the community need of translated material. The Translation course’s service work offered an array of learning opportunities, including linguistic and professional. For example, in interviews and reflection essays, students discussed gaining confidence in their translation abilities, learning new vocabulary, and overall gaining experience with real-world translation. As I discussed in Chapter 2, courses that take a more critical approach to CBL, such as the Labor Issues course, involve “teaching students to understand structural issues of power that concern the communities in which they are to work” (Rabin, 2014, p. 172). Therefore, the inclusion of sociopolitical issues as main topics of the Labor Issues course—identity, migration, and labor—are expected. However, students also reported getting to learn about nonprofit work, how to write grants, and different Spanish dialects through their service work. All of these learning opportunities are valuable, and many align with the learning outcomes of the courses. However, I chose to focus on the development of community awareness because as CBL engages students in a community, it is important for students to learn about the issues that impact the lives of the community members they are working with/for so that they can participate in informed ways.

Overall, the two focal courses demonstrate the opportunities and challenges involved with the development of community awareness in CBL. As I have suggested at various points
throughout this chapter, the development of community awareness connects to addressing community partners’ need and goals. For the Translation course, students’ development of community awareness in relation to the issue of relative caregivers and the services and resources available (or healthcare spending and minoritized populations in the case of the three students who translated for the community health center) could allow them to contextualize and provide a more informed translation. In the Labor Issues course, the development of community awareness allows students to better understand what factors lead to the need for service and the impact their work can have in the lives of the day laborers they are working with. In the following chapter, I explore the opportunities and challenges to addressing community partner needs in the two focal courses.
CHAPTER 6: EXPLORING WHETHER AND HOW COMMUNITY PARTNER NEEDS ARE ADDRESSED IN SPANISH COMMUNITY-BASED LEARNING

In Chapter 5, I examined how service work, ideologies about the place of sociopolitics in the curriculum, and the role of the community partner as a co-educator provided both opportunities and challenges to students’ development of community awareness in the two focal courses. While student learning is a key part of CBL, what the community partner gains from the collaboration is equally as important. As I discussed in Chapter 2, the majority of Spanish CBL studies focus on how students benefit from CBL with fewer studies exploring how community partners benefit from their participation. Therefore, in this chapter, I turn my focus to exploring the opportunities and challenges involved with addressing community partner needs.

Community partner needs refer to “concerns, issues, and resources that can be addressed through the service-learning relationship” (Mitchell, 2008, p. 55). Need can be seen as taking on a deficit orientation, however it is important to keep in mind that, as Mitchell suggests, community partner “needs” are products of structural and systemic problems, not individuals. As various scholars suggest, community partners should be included in the development of the course (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Chupp & Joseph, 2010; among others). This includes having community partner needs identified by or with the community partner. Community needs can be transactional in nature—concrete and tangible, such as a document—or transformational—abstract and hard to measure, such as combatting systemic inequalities (see Chapter 2 for a discussion of transactional and transformational relationships). In implementing CBL, it is important to

---

6 Although Mitchell (2008) uses the term community needs, I have selected to use the term community partner needs to highlight the fact that the needs I discuss are representative of the needs of the community partners and their organizations. Whereas these needs are likely closely linked to those of the community members that the organizations work with, they may vary from the needs that community members would identify themselves.
consider how stakeholders work towards addressing the community partner needs. Importantly, we must better understand not only whether or not community partner needs are addressed, but what fosters or constrains this from occurring. Doing so can allow campus and community stakeholders to support and sustain more reciprocal relationships in Spanish CBL. Given this, the research question I aim to answer in this chapter is:

What opportunities and challenges related to addressing community partner needs exist in the two focal Spanish CBL courses?

In order to explore the opportunities and challenges related to addressing community partner needs in the two focal CBL courses, I will focus on three themes that arose as important during my analysis: 1) service work, 2) instructor-community partner communication, and 3) continued engagement. Using these three themes as lenses through which to explore opportunities and challenges, I draw on interview data with instructors, students, and community partners as well as class observations, student reflection essays, and follow up email as data sources in this chapter.

In regards to service work, I will discuss how service work tasks addressed community partner needs and take a specific look at challenges associated with ensuring that needs were met through service work. Gaining a better understanding of the challenges stakeholders face in relation to service work can allow stakeholders to consider how they can prevent some challenges from arising and how best to work with other inevitable challenges. In regards to instructor-community partner communication, I explore the extent to which these stakeholders communicated, including when these stakeholders communicated and what topics they communicated about. In particular, I focus on how their communication patterns had an impact on addressing community partner needs. In regards to continued engagement, I discuss how
addressing community partner needs may extend past CBL service work and what may contribute to students’ longer-term involvement with the organization or causes after the semester is over. Overall, examining these three themes provides insight into the complexity of addressing community partner needs, and how three key stakeholders–instructors, students, and community partners–play a role in the process.

6.1 Translation course

6.1.1 Service work

As the community partner, Elizabeth’s main need was obtaining a Spanish translation of her organization’s resource guide. The Spanish version of the resource guide was part of an overall initiative that The Caregivers Coalition had to become more involved with the “Hispanic” community. As I discussed in Chapter 4, Elizabeth shared that one of the motivating factors for becoming more involved with the “Hispanic” community was the Trump administration’s policies on immigration. However, since The Caregivers Coalition had not previously focused their work on the “Hispanic” community, Elizabeth shared that they were met with some challenges in establishing relationships with “Hispanic-serving” organizations. Due to this, she shared that she came to see the translated resource guide as a way to show other organizations that The Caregivers Coalition had “skin in the game” and had started making steps to work with the “Hispanic” community. In this way, the Spanish translation of the resource guide that the course provided was seen as playing a role in establishing relationships that would allow The Caregivers Coalition to more effectively support “Hispanic caregivers”. Additionally, the Spanish version of the resource guide that the students produced was going to play an important role in providing Spanish-speaking community members access to information and support related to relative caregiving. As Elizabeth explained,
and this particular one [the Spanish resource guide], as I said, is tailored for the Hispanic community so we put in there, the kinds of things that um, you know, if you are a legal resident versus undocumented how that could impact, you know, what sort of resources you could get and try to provide that sort of information because I know a lot people are afraid…to, you know, go and ask these questions…in that community.

The students’ translation provided language access for Spanish-speaking community members to information that they may not otherwise have access to due to language barriers and fear. In doing so, the course provided a much-needed translation allowing The Caregivers Coalition to start their initiative and expand their support and resources to the “Hispanic” community.

Furthermore, Elizabeth shared that the Spanish resource guide would likely not have been possible had it not been for her collaboration with the CBL course. She had applied for a grant to support the translation, however had not received it. Therefore, the fact that the course was able to provide the organization with a cost-free option for translation was key to facilitating The Caregivers Coalition’s ability to carry out their initiative. This demonstrates that the service work had a direct impact on the community partner’s ability to have their need addressed.

As students addressed the community partner’s need for a Spanish translation of their resource guide, they were met with a few challenges along the way. Given that students’ main task was translation, many of the difficulties students referred to involved difficulties related to the process and practice of translation. This included matters such as vocabulary, grammar, and capitalization. Given my focus on student learning beyond language-related outcomes, I will more closely examine the difficulties in relation to community awareness that students faced when addressing the community partner’s need for a translation. In particular, students’ limited
knowledge about the topic of the resource guide and audience of their work appeared to impact their translation process and process of addressing the community partner’s need.

All the students interviewed expressed that the topic of relative caregivers was an issue they were not previously familiar with. Being unfamiliar with the topic seemed to pose some challenges to the translation process. For example, Sara faced some difficulties when translating material about permanent and semi-guardianship, which she shared she was not really familiar with. She stated, “I had not really any frame of reference, yeah, so it made it a little difficult when translating… it can be hard to know like know what words to look for and stuff like that.” This demonstrates how opportunities for learning about issues impacting the community that students are working with/for, as discussed in Chapter 5, connect to addressing community partner needs. Another student, Alana, also shared that being unfamiliar with the topic of relative caregivers made the translation a bit difficult. She expressed that it would have been helpful to have a better understanding of the context of this resource guide.

Alana: I think it could’ve helped with like maybe a bigger um environmental analysis of like the whole thing like as opposed to me just looking at my section of the document

FV: <ok>

Alana: <um> I think like the context really helped for me, at least specifically with my section, because once I understood the concept in English, I could make decisions in Spanish

FV: <mhmm>

Alana: <that> were like, you know, based on how- how I can translate the concept not just the words
In this excerpt, Alana appears to acknowledge that reading the entire resource guide and understanding the larger environmental context in which it is situated is important for the translation process. This suggests that students see how learning about the topics and context related to their work is connected to their role as translators and their ability to address the community partner’s need. Having students read the full document and discussing the topic of the resource guide in class, for example, could help students learn about the topic. For example, Alsina Naudi (2020) discussed how her students in her CBL translation course read about immigration issues as a way to familiarize themselves with the topic they would be translating and the vocabulary they would be working with. Providing students with opportunities to learn more about the topic of the material allows them to feel more prepared to translate the material and make informed choices, which in turn, contributes to better addressing the translation need of the community partner.

In the case of the Spanish resource guide, Martina, the instructor, shared during an interview that they considered the target audience of the translation as the local “Latino” community in the city. Not all students, however, were familiar with the makeup of the local “Latino” population. Given that the Spanish language consists of many geographical and social varieties (see Lipski, 2012), it is important to understand the variety or varieties of Spanish that the target audience speaks when translating. When I asked if such dialectal differences came up during the CBL translation work, Clara shared,

Clara: and it was kind of um you had to sometimes pick and choose saying ok well this is the region I’m gonna choose

FV: mm
Clara: and that would- that would get confusing sometimes cuz I wasn’t fully familiar with the makeup of [the city]’s Latinx population and where their dialects may be centered around

FV: yeah

Clara: that was a little challenging but I would just do my best to find the most universally used term

FV: ok

Clara: I’d highlight it so that way I could draw my partner’s attention to it and see if they had a different idea

This excerpt demonstrates that unfamiliarity with the demographics of the target audience posed a challenge to making translation decisions. This again connects back to the development of community awareness and the importance of understanding the context of the service work. Students’ understanding of the audience impacts their ability to produce a target translation and in that way better address the community partner’s need. Although Martina shared that they talked about the audience at the beginning of the semester, it appears that revisiting this discussion throughout the semester could reinforce the information and help students make more informed decisions.

It is important to note that time constraints seemed to impact the inclusion of discussion of topics that would contribute to the development of community awareness, which would help students complete their translation service work and address community partner needs. When I asked Martina in a follow up email whether she thinks there should be more space for discussion of issues impacting the local “Latino” community, particularly issues related to students’ service work, in the course curriculum, she explained that “one class per week ends up being not enough
time to discuss the material, answer questions, do translation practice and also talk in depth about CB.” Institutional support from community engagement offices or more experienced CBL colleagues could help instructors create syllabi that balance CBL and discipline-specific learning objectives. Additionally, institutions could have CBL courses count for more credits, therefore allowing classes to meet more frequently.

Another challenge related to addressing community partner needs is that the service work that is needed may not always align with the type of work that instructors would ideally select for their students. For example, Martina aims to have students translate from Spanish into English since English is most of the students’ first language. However, when working with community partners, they primarily need English material translated into Spanish.

Martina: I try to work mostly um into Spanish into English

FV: mhm

Martina: translation because that’s most of the students’ mother tongue

FV: ok

Martina: um it’s just that for the CB component it’s usually the need of the communities

FV: <mhm>

Martina: <to> translate the material into Spanish

FV: sure

Martina: um but ideally they should be- I mean ideally they should be translating into English um

FV: ok because of uh- because <that’s their native tongue?>

Martina: <so we do- we do talk about that> um but I think it’s- because usually- because usually when you learn translation
FV: yeah
Martina: you learn- first you translate into your mother tongue
FV: ok that’s- ok
Martina: and then, you know, and then once you are very much skilled
FV: <mm>
Martina: <you> start translating into your second language

This excerpt demonstrates the complexities involved with implementing CBL that both supports student learning and addresses the community partner’s needs. Martina’s choice to implement CBL, even when knowing most community partners would need Spanish translations, suggests that she is committed to addressing the community partner’s needs even if it may mean shifting her pedagogical practices.

An additional challenge related to addressing community partners’ needs is the match between a university schedule and an organization’s desired time frame for completion of service. Elizabeth, the community partner, explained how this can be a challenge for organizations participating in CBL whose need is a translation.

I mean the only thing I think that was a little bit um maybe for some other organizations but it wasn't for us…was that, a little bit um difficult but it worked out for us, was that um they couldn’t do it that quickly…so obviously if we’re gonna have a professional business do it, they could do it within a week or something you know…and so here we have to wait until the course is over and so that was part of the discussion…like is that ok and we said yes…you know, we’re gonna- we’re willing to wait you know to be able to have it, you know, for free…so that’s how it came about so that’s- so that’s why- I think again going back to- we got- we didn't know exactly how much it would cost or how long
it would take to get the resource guide done and once we made this decision to go with the class…to translate it um I think that’s when we decided to sort of put the initiative on hold until that was done and, you know…and we had the flexibility to do that…so it works out.

In this excerpt, Elizabeth notes that waiting the length of a semester is a slow turnaround time for a translation and that other organizations may not be able to wait. However, in the case of The Caregivers Coalition, they were willing and able to wait a few months even if this meant postponing the launch of their initiative. Particularly, their choice to do so seems to be driven by cost. This demonstrates that although semester long CBL collaborations are often critiqued for their limited length of community engagement (Enos & Morton, 2003), organizations seeking translations might find that a semester timeline is, in fact, too long of a time period and that it can be a challenge to addressing their need for a quick turnaround.

6.1.2 Instructor-community partner communication

Martina and Elizabeth’s CBL relationship was newly established during the semester in which my research took place. As I discussed in Chapter 4, a mutual contact from another local organization put Martina and Elizabeth in touch knowing that Elizabeth was looking to have material translated into Spanish and that Martina was looking for translation opportunities for her students. Martina was in her third semester of implementing CBL in her Translation course. She shared that she always communicates with the community partner at the beginning of the collaboration to explain what they do, when the document will be ready, and the level of professionalism they can expect. Other than at the start of the collaboration, both Martina and Elizabeth expressed that they did not have much contact during the semester. Overall, continual communication was not necessary to managing the translation service work needed by the
community partner in ways that service work that requires coordination of schedules and multiple tasks might. This limited communication is reflective of Tryon and Stoecker’s (2008) finding that few community partners and instructors checked in with each other during the semester regarding service work management and problem-solving. However, they argue that regular communication with the higher education institution would help community partners understand the CBL expectations and facilitate a smooth CBL process. For example, Elizabeth shared that she had added new information to the resource guide after sending it to Martina and the students, but had been unsure whether to communicate these changes to them since they had already begun translating. Elizabeth expressed,

Elizabeth: I guess it’s just hard being that, you know, it’s not like a normal relationship where you can- I felt like it was too onerous

FV: mhm

Elizabeth: and maybe this was just my own- maybe I should have asked her

FV: @

Elizabeth: it felt too onerous to say oh! here’s these like 500 changes

FV: <right>

Elizabeth: <by> the way, you know, throw them into the mix after you’ve already started

FV: <ok>

Elizabeth: <it> just didn’t seem fair <you know?>

FV: <mhmm> mhm mhm mhm

Elizabeth: like obviously if you’re paying someone to do it that would be different

This excerpt demonstrates that Elizabeth was unsure about whether she could make particular requests related to the translation work due to the nature of the relationship. Elizabeth shared that
she ultimately sent some of the changes and decided she would make other changes herself, such as ones that were not language-specific like numbers. Elizabeth made the decision about what to send to Martina on her own rather than communicating with Martina about how to manage changes made to the resource guide. Martina also discussed this matter during an interview when talking about the work she has to do for the CBL component, explaining that when the changes to the resource guide had been communicated to her, it was “just too late…to tell the students.” Instead, Martina made the changes to the resource guide herself. Communicating about the changes made to the resource guide could have helped both Elizabeth and Martina determine the best route forward for incorporating the changes, thereby more efficiently addressing the community partner’s need. Issues similar to these could be resolved by regular check-ins between the stakeholders about any questions or challenges either the community partner or the instructor is facing.

However, it is important to acknowledge that regular check-ins can be hampered by instructors’ and community partners’ busy schedules and numerous responsibilities in addition to their CBL collaboration. Support for CBL at the institutional level could help facilitate the communication process between stakeholders. This might involve giving instructors course release time and providing them with teaching assistants, as suggested by faculty members in Darby and Newman (2014). This type of support would allow instructors to have more time in their schedules for the management of their CBL courses. If community partners are formally recognized as co-educators (see Chupp & Joseph 2010), then institutions could also consider assigning them a teaching assistant, who could help facilitate communication on their end.

In addressing the community partner’s need for a publishable translation, instructors of CBL translation courses often take on the role of editor (Alsina Naudi, 2020; Ebacher, 2013).
Therefore, in addition to making the changes discussed above, Martina also edited and formatted the final document. Martina explained that she also created the table of contents and made sure each page corresponded accordingly. Martina expressed that she tried “to make the document as... seamless as possible in terms of formatting.” However, Elizabeth explained that the resource guide would ultimately be printed as a pocket size booklet and had to be formatted in a particular way. Therefore, it seems that Martina’s time spent formatting the resource guide as a Word document may not have been necessary. Communication about these details between Martina and Elizabeth could have ensured that each stakeholder understood document expectations, made the best use of their limited time, and streamlined the process of addressing the community partner’s need.

While talking about challenges with CBL and how she has worked with different organizations each semester, Martina pointed to the importance of communication in her relationships with community partners.

Martina: it’s just that you need to be sure that the- the - the interaction is- is working well and that you have good communication so maybe, I don’t know, maybe if things work out with this organization

FV: mhm

Martina: I could keep working with them

FV: like translate other materials

Martina: for them next semester yeah

FV: mhm

Martina: yeah that’s definitely a factor

FV: ok
Martina: like if I see- like if- if they wouldn’t respond or if they would not- like if communication was a problem I would definitely choose to work with somebody else

This excerpt demonstrates that successful communication is key to Martina’s decision to continue collaborating with a community partner. Over the course of her three semesters implementing CBL, Martina had worked with a different community partner each time. This was due to communication challenges caused by turnover at community partner organizations, which Martina expressed was the biggest challenge in her experience with CBL. As Abbott and Martínez (2017) note, regular communication can help anticipate the impacts of community partner turnover.

Dorado and Giles (2004) explained that partnerships may not be sustained over time when there is not an interest due to institutional reasons. Martina’s experiences with community partners demonstrate how organizational constraints can also impede the possibility for a long-term relationship to grow. For example, in a prior semester of the Translation course, Martina had partnered with an organization, who she connected with at a fair. Her contact at this organization left before the semester was over, and so Martina was referred to another person at the organization. At the end of the semester, Martina sent the website translation that students had worked on to the organization, but shared that she did not know who received it and that as far she knows, nothing had been done with the translation. This example demonstrates that another challenge related to addressing community needs can be organizational capacity and follow through. In describing this challenge, Martina shared,

Martina: this is something else that I'm trying to work on, one of the organizations, I think it was another one [not The Caregivers Coalition] they offered to put the students’ name when they published <this material>
FV: \textit{<oh ok>}

Martina: and I said yes of course

FV: mhm

Martina: um so I sent them the names

FV: ok

Martina: along with the final document and I asked them please to let me know when they published it

FV: yeah

Martina: so far I haven’t- I haven’t heard back from any@

FV: ok@

Martina: so I'm not sure if they haven’t published it, if they did and forgot to tell me

FV: \textit{<ok>}

Martina: \textit{<because>} that would really, I think, that really would be a nice full circle for them [the students] you know \textit{<to see>}

FV: \textit{<yeah>}

Martina: so that’s something else that I’m not quite happy about the way it’s working right now

This excerpt suggests that Martina is frustrated that the translations that her students work on are ultimately not published by the organizations. Given that Martina seems to value CBL because of the real life context it gives her students by giving them texts to translate that will actually be used (see Chapter 4), the fact that students do not get to see their work published somewhat undermines Martina’s motivation to implement CBL in her class. As of July 2020, over one year after Martina had sent Elizabeth the translated resource guide, The Caregivers Coalition had not
yet posted the Spanish translation online. Community partner follow through on publishing material provided by CBL courses demonstrates the role that community partners play in ensuring their needs are met. While students’ successful completion of service work and instructors’ supporting actions are important components of addressing community partner needs, community partners must be ready to receive and share the service work in order for their goal to be achieved. In this way, it seems that community partners act as a sort of gatekeeper to the impact that fulfillment of their needs can make.

6.1.3 Continued engagement

Elizabeth’s main need of a translated resource guide was addressed within the semester. However, as discussed in Chapter 4, Elizabeth was also interested in students learning about the issue of relative caregivers and perhaps becoming passionate about the issue. As Hidayat, Pratsch, and Stoecker (2009) explained, community partners see CBL as an opportunity to encourage students to develop long-term relationships with organizations or causes. In discussing the benefits she sees in working with CBL courses, Elizabeth appeared to express a desire for students’ continued engagement.

Elizabeth: and maybe they’ll want to volunteer with us or something

FV: right yeah!

Elizabeth: you never know!

FV: mhm

Elizabeth: as you can tell I mean most of- just giving you the- when I told you the story of how I got hooked up with the- with the class

FV: yeah
Elizabeth: with the professor it was from networking and that’s almost of the things that I’ve been able to get done like that are through other people I know that knows somebody else who knows someone else so

FV: mm

Elizabeth: so I think again it’s really good to just make those connections

In this excerpt, Elizabeth appears to see the CBL partnership as a chance to gain volunteers and build up a network, who she might be able to call upon in the future. This reflects findings from Bell and Carlson (2009) who found that community partners were motivated to participate in CBL to foster long term support for their work. This excerpt also demonstrates how participating in CBL relationships can address the community partner’s need for network-building. Network-building can be helpful for organizations since students can draw on their social networks to provide community partners with access to resources (see Goertzen et al., 2016).

Even within more transactional relationships where the primary need is a product, community partners may still desire to establish relationships and create the potential for longer-term collaboration. This could be accomplished through inviting the community partner into the classroom in the role of co-educator (see Chapter 5 for more discussion). In doing so, Elizabeth could educate students about the issues she is passionate and knowledgeable about and establish more personal connections with students. By playing a role in developing students’ community awareness, the community partner’s need for spreading her message and growing her network can also be addressed. Since Elizabeth did not have the opportunity to take on a co-educator role (see Chapter 5), this may have impacted the extent to which students became interested in engaging with the organization once the semester was over. Since I did not specifically ask nor
did any students mention so, I do know whether any students continued to work with The Caregivers Coalition after the end of the semester.

6.2 Labor Issues course

6.2.1 Service work

In the Labor Issues course, there was not a specific need that all students worked to address. Rather, students engaged in a range of service work tasks. For example, Ramon, the community partner, shared that students helped with keeping good records, doing research, applying for grants, and that they also got involved with the day laborers and had a chance to provide assistance to them. As Ramon explained, “whatever we do, they do too.” Ramon also shared, “they [the students] help us with the things that we are not really equipped to do.” Particularly given the small size of the organization, students provided much needed people power and brought skillsets that Ramon and his staff did not have. Ramon shared that sometimes students give him and his team ideas about things that they can do. He expressed,

Ramon: organizations like us need to understand what else you need

FV: mm

Ramon: and sometimes we don’t know everything that we need

FV: ok

Ramon: you know, cuz it- or we may not have the skills to- to be able to understand what else is needed and so forth

FV: mm

Ramon: that is always the problem

This excerpt demonstrates how community partners can benefit from the fresh perspectives and ideas that students bring (Blouin & Perry, 2009). Ramon appears to be interested in discovering
what new insights and skills students can offer the organization. The different skillsets, knowledge, and resources that students bring are valuable to organizations for expanding their capacity.

In general, the service work tasks that students were engaged in can be seen as fulfilling community partner needs. For example, Zayn’s service work fixing the ID machine (also discussed in Chapter 5) addressed a pressing community partner need.

Zayn: Ramon had been asking for help on that for like months
FV: <mm>
Zayn: <and> it had been like the ID card didn't work at all
FV: ok
Zayn: and that’s like one of the number one things they did and like- like I volunteered without really understanding how hard it would be
FV: @
Zayn: I was like I'm kinda good with computers
FV: yeah
Zayn: I can deal with it
FV: ok
Zayn: but I didn't realize actually how hard it would be
FV: mm
Zayn: um but then I finally did it
FV: <mhm!>
Zayn: <and they> were just printing out just so many of these ID cards
FV: right
Zayn: um so I think- well that filled me with a lot of pride

FV: mhm!

Zayn: Ramon was always congratulating me

FV: aw good@

Zayn: he’s like oh you did- thank you so much

FV: @

Zayn: now I can finally get all these ID cards out

FV: yeah

Zayn: and I was like um so I think that was probably the most important thing I did

FV: mm

Zayn: and it filled me with a lot of pride knowing that like I’ve done this@

In this excerpt, Zayn reports Ramon’s joy and appreciation for his fixing the ID machine. The machine had not been working for months, which was preventing the organization from printing out ID cards for the day laborers. As a result of Zayn’s service work, Labor Rights for All was able to continue printing their ID cards. This was a service the organization greatly needed and one that would serve the organization long after the course was over.

However, not all tasks may address community partner needs in the same way. For example, as discussed in Chapter 5, Kali had the opportunity to attend a wage theft court trial. Although Kali had the opportunity to interact with a day laborer and learn about his experiences, allowing her to make connections between class readings and the community she was working with, the extent to which community partner needs were addressed by this task are limited. However, as I discussed in Chapter 4, it was a goal of Ramon’s to expose students to experiences they had never had before, so it is important to note that Kali’s court experience does align with
Ramon’s goals for CBL. Tasks like the court experience seem to demonstrate the tradeoff that exists in some service tasks that present opportunities for development of community awareness, but may not serve the community partner’s immediate needs. Nevertheless, tasks like the court experience can allow students to become immersed in the community they are working with and form relationships with community members, which may foster students’ long-term investment in the organization leading to community partner needs being addressed beyond the end of the semester (see section 6.2.3 for more discussion).

The coordination of service work tasks also appeared to be a challenge for Ramon. He shared,

We’ve had a lot of students and uh it’s hard to coordinate the time with everything…with everybody…because they have different- different times that they have- they are available at different times in the day…or in the week and they can come at certain times and that might not be necessarily the right time for us@.

It appears that the coordination of students’ schedules with the organization’s schedule presented challenges to Ramon, who had to have tasks ready for students to work on even if they went at inopportune times for the organization. This suggests that working with students’ schedules can be a difficulty as noted by Worrall (2007). The community partner is the one who knows the tasks that are needed and so a certain level of responsibility may fall on them to identify service work tasks. This demonstrates the important role that the community partner can play in ensuring their needs are met through CBL collaborations. Effective coordination can ensure that community partners are able to engage students in tasks that address their needs. Ramon noted the role of effective coordination in addressing his needs by saying, “we do gain some advantage from this…we do gain and gain more if we were more organized, we could probably
gain more.” Given that community partners may not have the time or experience in organizing students, instructors or community engagement offices could offer support. This might involve having instructors or community engagement office staff work together with community partners to pre-identify tasks that address the community partner’s needs and that students can work on regardless of the day or time that they engage in service work.

Time and scheduling appeared to be a challenge for students as well. Valeria, the instructor, acknowledged this noting that it is a big challenge “for students to really have the time, the physical time. Our students are very busy people.” For example, in discussing the challenges associated with the CBL course, Ana shared,

I mean I think timing was the biggest thing for me…just like sorting out my schedule so I could do the x hours …it was just like a little tough cuz I do intern and then I have- I work as a server…and then@ I have class…so like finding the time was a bit difficult but I- I was able to manage it um and it’s- I’m very like lucky that they do work on the weekends…so that was like the majority of how I was able to get my hours… in.

Given students’ many other competing responsibilities, they may have difficulties coordinating their schedules with those of the organization and community members. This is reflective of Ramon’s challenge coordinating with student schedules discussed above. Ana notes how the ability to work on the weekends allowed her to fit service work into her busy schedule. However, it is important to note that not all organizations are open on the weekends, and not all students may have this flexibility in their schedules due to family obligations, for example.

Another challenge that impacts addressing community partner needs is working within the constraints of a semester. As Tryon and Stoecker (2008) note, semester-length service work is often seen as problematic by community partners. Although students may have accomplished
what they set out to do–complete their service hours and learn more about the community they are working with, course content, and themselves–community members may potentially be left with incomplete projects and a sudden lack of people power. Students seemed to recognize the issues and constraints imposed by the semester-long length of their community engagement.

Eleanor shared that,

something that a lot of students and I talked about was how I would love for this course to have been a year… because then I think we would be able to, you know, really see things come to fruition a in way… that we couldn’t in 4 months.

This suggests that students felt more time was needed in order for their projects to develop, which has implications for the extent to which community partner needs can be addressed within a short time frame. When I asked Eleanor what some of the advantages of having a yearlong course would be, she responded,

Eleanor: um I just think that it’s important to really establish roots with the people that you’re working with before you start to make a change

FV: sure

Eleanor: or try to implement some kind of project

FV: mhm

Eleanor: it felt sometimes like very ostentatious

FV: <ok>

Eleanor: <just> going into this small office and being like hey we’re gonna

FV: mm

Eleanor: make moves

FV: @
Eleanor: and we’re gonna help you guys but we don’t know any of you

FV: <mhm>

Eleanor: <you know>

FV: mm

Eleanor: so um if it’s an organization that’s huge you know

FV: mhm

Eleanor: that has a lot going on and a lot of projects to fulfill

FV: yeah

Eleanor: I could see how going in day one and fulfilling these projects could work really really well

FV: got it

Eleanor: but there- I mean the first month and a half I felt like mostly was just trying to understand what was needed

FV: ok

Eleanor: um and then we were only just starting

FV: mm

Eleanor: these projects I think when we ended

FV: ok

Eleanor: like really getting going on them

FV: <yeah>

Eleanor: <and> they could have been furthered

FV: <yeah>

Eleanor: <had> we had more time
Eleanor expressed that the benefit of having a yearlong CBL course would be having more time to develop relationships with the community members, including the community partners. Clifford (2017) notes that semester length CBL courses make it difficult to build relationships with the community. Eleanor seems to have experienced this challenge as demonstrated by her feeling that going into a community space and starting on a project right away without first getting to know the people felt “ostentatious.” This suggests that students may feel some discomfort with the ways in which they enter these communities. Accordingly,

proponents of [critical CBL approaches] …urge the forging of collaborative relationships between university and community partners in an effort to avoid what is known as ‘parachuting’ into communities of need, or imposing solutions from outside the community (Rabin, 2014, p.172).

These concerns can be discussed in class discussions and reflection essays.

The time constraint of a semester impacts the extent to which students can spend time getting to know the community members and partners before getting started on and while working on the projects. For example, community partners have reported that semester-long service is a challenge particularly for service that requires building trust with clients (Tryon & Stoecker, 2008). For example, Eleanor’s community work with the theatre group involved building community and supporting day laborer’s self-expression. Such a task involves relationship-building and places an importance on getting to know the community members in order to address the community partner need. Other tasks, however, such as writing a grant proposal, as some students did, might not require a high degree of relationship-building before getting started and addressing a particular community need.
Eleanor’s concern regarding the semester-length of CBL courses also seems to be that there is not enough time to develop their projects. This can be particularly true when the service work does not follow the transactional model of focusing on products (see Clifford, 2017). For example, in talking about her involvement with the theatre group, Eleanor shared,

I didn’t understand necessarily this lens and…this perspective…um and I didn’t fully comprehend the value…of this sort of project. At first I was kind of like I should be doing… you know, trying to understand policy…and, you know…trying to do fundraisers and apply for grants…but I slowly realized that it was, you know, a good- a good project to- to be a part of.

In this excerpt, Eleanor points to tasks like writing a grant proposal, which result in a product that can be completed within a semester and whose implications are clearly understood by students. Other tasks, such as her involvement with the theatre group, have less clear cut accomplishment markers since it is a continually evolving project that is more focused on the long-term work of relationship-building (see Clifford, 2017). It appears that engaging in such tasks can pose a challenge for students as they address community needs while having certain ideas about what service work should look like or accomplish.

Students may also face challenges with understanding how best to address community partners needs as they learn how to work with community members. For example, Eleanor discussed how CBL is a way of “bridging the gap” between theorizing solutions and enacting solutions to community issues. When I asked for an example of when theorizing a solution might not have aligned with practicality, she shared,

Eleanor: yeah yeah I mean with the theatre project especially that was really- that was really prevalent because we talked a lot about what story do we want to tell
Eleanor: and who do we want to present this story to

Eleanor: I would say something like if well we, you know, start bringing in university students they tell their friends blah blah blah

Eleanor: and the people that were working on the project would tell me like that’s kind of pointless

Eleanor: because um that makes the project not about- it’s for someone instead of for ourselves

Eleanor: um and so that was an interesting conversation to have

Eleanor: and then conversations about um like the- the success of art and like who like it- are we doing this to, you know, feel more confident in ourselves

Eleanor: doing this for our community

Eleanor: are we doing this to create a change like what

Eleanor: is the intention here
Eleanor: <and> I think that a lot of times um I find my- maybe it’s just myself- but I find myself thinking like we can do this!
FV: mhm
Eleanor: and then it’s gonna create this effect
FV: <mhm>
Eleanor: <and> everything’s gonna be better
FV: mhm
Eleanor: and changed
FV: mhm
Eleanor: but it’s a lot- a lot more effort than that obviously
FV: mm
Eleanor: um and so slowly you start to realize that, you know, the only people that you can go to for those solutions to those barriers are the people who are, you know, facing
FV: mhm
Eleanor: facing all that stuff

In this excerpt, Eleanor discusses a development in her understanding of how to responsibly and respectfully work with community members to meet their needs. While she entered the community which with she was working with certain ideas about what could benefit the community members, she came to better understand through discussions with community members that solutions must come from the inside rather than the outside. Eleanor’s experience demonstrates how students can “come prepared to act [when] they really [need] to inquire” (Flower, 2002, p. 182). When addressing community partner needs, students must be willing and
ready to learn from the community members. This connects to Valeria’s emphasis on the importance of listening when working with community members.

Valeria: as I tell my students we cannot go to the community and say I know better because you don’t know nothin

FV: yeah

Valeria: yeah no you have to listen. one of the first things that you learn is to listen

FV: mm

Valeria: in the community, listen. Listen listen listen listen listen listen.

This excerpt demonstrates that Valeria encourages students to think about their positioning in the community they are working with and during their service work. Students are not positioned as the experts. Listening and learning from community members is necessary to addressing the community partner needs. As discussed earlier in this section, when addressing the community partner needs, it is important for students not to enter thinking they know the “problem” or have the “solutions” (Rabin, 2014). Rather they should turn to the community members to guide them in better understanding the context. In doing so, CBL works towards redistributing the power from university instructors and students to community members (see Mitchell, 2008).

6.2.2 Instructor-community partner communication

As I discussed in Chapter 4, Valeria and Ramon had a previously established relationship prior to the implementation of CBL in the Labor Issues course, and Valeria had created the course knowing that the community partner organization would be Labor Rights for All. Both times that Valeria had taught the Labor Issues course, Ramon was the community partner and she shared intentions to continue working with him in future iterations of the course.
Highlighting the importance of strong instructor-community partner communication, Valeria shared that “one of the things that is encouraged in these kinds of courses [CBL] is…constant communication with the community partner…you are working with…of the(?) course. That we create the syllabus thinking of them and with them.” Valeria explained that in the first semester she taught the course, she had not had time to meet with Ramon to go over the syllabus. However, during the second iteration of the course, which was taking place at the time of my research, she collaborated with Ramon on the syllabus. She explained that they met over lunch and that Ramon provided input on bringing in guest speakers, attending class himself, and inviting day laborers to attend the class. By playing a role in shaping the syllabus and the curriculum, community partners have the opportunity to ensure that they benefit from the collaboration and that their needs are met. Furthermore, including the community partner in the planning process highlights their role as a co-educator as discussed in Chapter 5. As a co-educator, the community partner can suggest activities, assignments, and guests that can contribute to addressing their needs.

Whereas the first iteration of the course did not have a final project that was a “tangible thing that they [had] to provide the organization with,” Valeria shared how, in this second iteration, she met with Ramon and one of his staff members to design a template of activities that students could work on for their final projects. The final projects included an information sheet on cooperatives, a grant proposal, a pamphlet of information for day laborers with different organizations that offer services in the city, and videos for the organization’s website. Collaborating on the list of possible options for final projects with Ramon allowed him to be actively involved in creating opportunities for his needs to be met through the final projects.
Valeria and Ramon also regularly communicated throughout the semester with Valeria sharing that they “speak a lot during the week”. She explained that Ramon called if there were any problems and she called him if she had questions about students’ performance or the work they were doing. For example, Valeria explained that she communicated with Ramon about her discontent with Zayn having only worked on fixing the ID machine and not getting to work on more creative tasks or tasks outside the office (see Chapter 5 for more discussion about this). She then proposed a new task for Zayn and two other classmates to work on, which was the creation of a Spanish-English workplace vocabulary booklet for day laborers. Lear and Abbott (2009) point to the importance of regular, unscheduled communication between instructors and community partners for aligning expectations. In better aligning expectations, instructors and community partners can work together to ensure community partner needs are being met, while also providing opportunities for students to learn. Valeria and Ramon’s regular communication seems to have allowed them to do this.

Overall, their previously established friendship seems to have impacted the way and the frequency with which they communicated. Valeria shared,

Valeria: I speak with Ramon 5 times a day I mean he calls me at these like ungodly hours

FV: @

Valeria: <because I know>

FV: <that’s a friendship> you had before

Valeria: exactly I know him and I know he cares and I know he does whatever he can to improve the lives of the day laborers and I appreciate that very very much so sometimes I'm like really Ramon? It’s 10 o’clock. Go to sleep.

FV: @
Valeria: right but I don’t mind too much

This level of communication may not be typical or necessary for all instructor-community partner relationships. However, the close connection between these stakeholders can facilitate a collaboration where each stakeholder understands the goals and challenges of the other making it more likely that everyone will benefit. Sandy and Holland (2006) found that community partners felt that instructors needed to be more involved with their service work sites and better understand their community partners. Valeria and Ramon provide an exemplar of the type of relationship that can form when instructors are personally involved with the organization and understand the community partner and their needs.

6.2.3 Continued engagement

By participating in CBL, Ramon gains students, who bring a different set of knowledge and skills, that contribute to the organization’s learning and growth. However, as I discussed above, when the semester is over, this can lead to a sudden drop in organizational capacity. Yet, Blouin and Perry (2009) found that some community partners reported that students continued to serve the organizations even once their CBL requirement was over. These longer-term commitments can contribute to ongoing work on addressing community partner needs.

Ramon discussed the continued engagement of past students who had served at Labor Rights for All. For example, a student who had worked with them last semester was now in Nicaragua but continued to stay in touch and volunteer with the organization by representing them abroad. Furthermore, Ramon described how he had a network of past students whom he could contact for assistance.

Ramon: sometimes I need something done from somebody and I can call them and they just do it from wherever they are
FV: yeah

Ramon: they tell me ok send me the information and I’ll produce that for you

FV: mm and-

Ramon: actually they’ve done quite a bit. they’ve done quite a bit of things for us just being away but they still do it

FV: that’s great

This demonstrates how CBL courses provide an avenue by which community partners and students can connect and form relationships that extend past the bounds of a semester. By calling on students who he formed relationships with through CBL, Ramon is able to continually address his need for resources and different types of knowledge that allow him to expand his organizational capacity.

In regards to students from the focal Labor Issues course, Ana shared how she was willing to continue offering her multimedia skills to Labor Rights for All in the future, even once the semester was over, and she had graduated from the university.

Ana: I was actually talking to Ramon and he wants me to do like more video stuff so like I guess if he ever does like hit me up, I guess I would try to see if I was available to like film a video for him but um I just got a job so I don’t know how possible that’s gonna be@

<4 lines discussing her new job removed>

FV: yeah@ ok so you might um like- some plans to keep in contact with Ramon and maybe like continue um lending your skills to them
Ana: Yeah! I mean like I feel like all the students felt this but like we got really close to Ramon and Pedro so like if they ever need help from us like obviously like they can always email me or whatever

Miron and Moely (2006) found the community partners who reported having interpersonal relationships with students reported benefitting from CBL. This excerpt demonstrates that these interpersonal relationships can be beneficial by leading to students’ willingness to continue serving past their service work requirement. I witnessed the bond that students formed with Ramon and Pedro on the day of final presentations with many students going up to them to give hugs and say goodbye. Through the fostering of relationships between students and community partners, community partner needs can continue to be addressed even after the semester is over.

Creating opportunities for interactions between students and community members can also foster continued engagement. For example, when I asked Kali if there was anything else about CBL that she wanted to share towards the end of our interview, she expressed,

Kali: one thing is that I’m- I didn’t expect to come out of this like wanting to stay engaged

FV: mhm

Kali: in the community

FV: mm!

Kali: um but here I am like continually like keeping track of X’s court case

FV: <yeah!>

Kali: <which> is some level of engagement and so that- I mean- that for me like

FV: mhm
Kali: was a big takeaway. I was like wow I actually really feel like I have some sort of like continued interest

FV: yeah

Kali: <and>

FV: <sounds> like it yeah@

Kali: yeah I also think like once you see people- once people open up to you about like their plight

FV: mhm

Kali: and what they’re experiencing it’s hard to not be engaged in some manner

FV: yeah yeah

they’re experiencing it’s hard to not be engaged in some manner

FV: yeah yeah

This excerpt suggests that learning about community members’ lived experiences through conversations with them seems to have motivated a level of continued engagement that Kali had not expected to have. Earlier in the interview, Kali shared that she was going to be attending a hearing for X that week, which was a month after the semester had ended. As I discussed above, although Kali attending the hearings does not work towards addressing an immediate need of the community partner, her continued engagement suggests she developed a commitment and interest in day laborers’ well-being. For example, Kali explained how she believed students should use their voice to make issues relating to day laborers more known to the public.

We’re kind of at this point now ambassadors…for them…just mostly cuz, you know, we speak English, we’ve heard of their plight, we have more legitimacy than them whether or not we want to admit it…just because we’re university students and like the public see
us…as more legitimate as it sees them so we should use that privilege to kind of, you know, make their issues more known…um…and so ideally, I would hope that, you know, jornaleros feel the same way about us.

This excerpt demonstrates how, through participation in CBL, students come to recognize how their privilege can be used as tool to advocate on behalf of community members. In this way, a need of the community partner is addressed by having more people join their cause in solidarity.

Continued engagement can also come in the form of working as an employee for the organization. One student from the course, Claudia, was hired as an administrative and intake specialist by Labor Rights for All. Claudia shared that she was working this position in addition to her 20 hours of service work and that she would be working full-time in the summer and then continue into the next year. This demonstrates how the connections that community partners make with students through participation in CBL can address the community partner’s need for qualified and experienced staff members.

Following up with students in regards to their plans for longer-term involvement and advocacy is beyond the scope of this study. However, Jorge (2011) and Pak (2020) have explored the longitudinal impact of participation in Spanish CBL for students. Although both studies found that students developed a sense of social justice through participation in CBL, this did not ensure future engagement in advocacy and activism. As Pak (2020) suggests, students could be asked to identify an area of interest and research specific opportunities for future engagement in final reflection essays. Doing so can encourage students to continue taking action once the class is over.
6.3 Discussion

In this chapter, I explored the opportunities and challenges involved with addressing community partner needs by exploring three themes in the two focal courses: 1) service work, 2) instructor-community partner communication, and 3) continued engagement. Although the community partners in each course differed in their needs, exploring these three themes allows for a better understanding of the complexities involved with ensuring that community partners benefit from their participation in CBL.

As I discussed in Chapter 5, service work can be an opportunity for student learning, however just as, if not more, important are the opportunities that service work provides for addressing community partner needs. The service work in which students engaged in the two focal courses looked quite different. In the Translation course, the service work task was translating The Caregivers Coalition resource guide into Spanish. Elizabeth had been exploring avenues of how to get her organization’s resource guide translated after deciding to expand outreach and services to the “Hispanic” community as a result of the Trump’s administration new immigration policies, which put many parents at risk of deportation. Collaborating with a CBL class allowed Elizabeth to receive a Spanish translation at no cost. In this way, the service work directly addressed the community partner’s need.

There were, however, certain challenges that stakeholders faced in relation to service work and addressing community partner needs. In terms of the community partner, Elizabeth shared that working with the CBL course involved waiting a longer than usual turnaround time.

---

7 As discussed in Chapter 3, three students translated documents for a community healthcare center and two students participated in direct service. Since the community partners involved in these other service options were not the primary community partner, I did not discuss this service work. However, it is worth considering to what extent these other community partners’ needs were met especially when they were not the focal community partner of the course.
for the translation. While a paid service might deliver a translation in a week or two, students in a CBL course work on the translation throughout the semester. Having to wait a few months to receive the translated resource guide posed a challenge to Elizabeth in terms of having to wait to advance her initiative. However, she was willing and able to wait. In terms of the students, they pointed to ways that their unfamiliarity with relative caregivers as a topic and the backgrounds of the target audience made translating the resource guide difficult as they were sometimes unsure about what translation choices to make. These challenges highlight the importance of providing students with opportunities to learn about the community members they are working with/for and the issues impacting them, which can facilitate their ability to better address community partner needs. In terms of the instructor, Martina shared that she typically has beginning translation students translate from Spanish into English, meaning from their second language into their first language, which is common practice in translation teaching. However, she recognized that most community partners need translations from English into Spanish. Even though the community partner’s need does not align with her preference, Martina demonstrates a willingness to work with the community partner and place their needs above her pedagogical preferences.

In the Labor Issues course, students worked on a variety of service work tasks during the semester, which provided Labor Rights for All with information, resources, and the organizational capacity to serve and empower low-wage workers. Service work tasks included organizing a fundraiser, brainstorming workshop ideas, creating a vocabulary booklet for day laborers, fixing an ID machine, and writing a grant proposal. Participating in CBL provided Ramon with access to university resources and a set of skills and knowledge different than his own. Overall, the service work tasks students engaged in addressed a variety of community partner needs.
Addressing community partner needs through service work posed some challenges, however. As the community partner, Ramon expressed some difficulty with managing the CBL process specifically in terms of coordinating with students’ schedules and having tasks prepared for them to work on. Not being prepared with specific tasks for students to work on can pose a challenge to addressing community partner needs since students’ skills and resources may not be put to best use. Tasks may also address community partner needs in different ways, on different timelines, and perhaps in unpredictable ways. For example, while Kali’s trial experience was a rich student learning experience (see Chapter 5), this task did not address an immediate community partner need. It did, however, appear to create an informed ally, which addresses the community partner’s need for longer term student involvement. Students also found coordinating their schedules with those of the organization and community members a challenge. Furthermore, the semester length of service also posed a challenge for addressing community partner needs. Eleanor shared how she and her classmates had discussed their interest in having CBL courses be year-long. Community partners have also reported wanting commitments of at least one year from CBL students (Hidayat et al., 2009). This suggests that multiple stakeholders see the drawbacks of short-term engagement and the value of sustained partnerships. Lastly, another challenge related to addressing community partner needs was student learning about how to work with community members. In order to address the community partner’s needs, it is crucial that students listen to community members and understand that they do not arrive with the answers or solutions. As students better understand their role in service work, they can better address community partner needs.

Although the challenges faced by stakeholders in relation to service work in each course differed based on the nature of the tasks, the semester length of service was a common challenge.
Interestingly, however, the semester posed a challenge to each course for different reasons. In the Labor Issues course, the semester was considered being too short a length of time. This is the typical way in which semesters are discussed in the CBL literature (see Martin et al., 2009). However, in the Translation course, the community partner pointed to the semester as being too long a length of time. This viewpoint is a result of the community partner’s need for a translation, which typically has a turnaround time of a few weeks. Although this did not appear to be an issue for Elizabeth, it might prevent other community partners in need of translations from participating in CBL. While the semester time length posed challenges in both courses, the differences demonstrate the importance of considering the nature of the service work and the community partner’s need when evaluating the impact of time. Although Enos and Morton (2003) state that “it is unlikely that [short-term placements] will generate new resources or knowledge” (p. 28), I argue that the two focal courses in my study successfully worked within a semester to generate new resources and knowledge that addressed community partner needs in a semester time length in spite of the challenges I observed.

The communication between instructors and community partners also arose as particularly important for addressing community partner needs. Fostering open lines of communication between all stakeholders is key to aligning expectations and ensuring a smooth process (Tryon & Stoecker, 2008). How stakeholders communicated in the two focal courses seems to be connected to where along the path of engagement the partnerships fell (Dorado & Giles, 2004). In the translation course, Martina and Elizabeth’s partnership was new and both stakeholders were new to CBL; Martina was implementing CBL for the third time in her translation course and Elizabeth was participating in CBL for the first time. This is an example of a tentative engagement (Dorado & Giles, 2004). In this path of engagement, stakeholders tend
to be learning about each other and about CBL, and learning how to communicate seems to be part of this process. For example, while Martina and Elizabeth communicated at the beginning of the semester about logistics and expectations, they did not consistently communicate during the semester. Doing so could have improved the process of addressing the community partner’s need by ensuring that everyone understood how to manage specifics, such as changes in the document and formatting. Martina also pointed to the importance of communicating after the translation was delivered to the community partner. This relates to community partner follow through.

Community partner follow through plays an important role in addressing community partner needs. In the Translation course, the translation was provided to Elizabeth, however, one year later the Spanish resource guide was still not available on the organization’s website. Martina also shared her struggles with past community partners in terms of having the students’ translation posted and shared with the community it was meant to serve. Similarly, in the Labor Issues course, videos for the Labor Rights for All website created by students as part of their final projects were not yet uploaded one year after the class had ended. A critical component to addressing community partner needs is for the translation and resources produced to reach community members. In many cases, it is the community partners who are in charge of providing community members with this access. Furthermore, having community partners and instructors communicate about when the material is published is an important step in order for students and instructors to understand that they contributed to addressing the community partner’s need(s). If community partners are consistently struggling to share students’ service work products with community members, instructors and community engagement offices should consider ways to support organizations in closing this gap, therefore more effectively addressing community partner needs. In order to provide this support, community engagement office staff could follow
up with community partners after the end of the semester to determine what resources they might be able to provide in order to facilitate the process of ensuring any products created reach community members.

Returning to instructor-community partner communication, in the Labor Issues course, Valeria and Ramon were in their second semester collaborating on a CBL course. In this second semester working together, they had increased communication. For example, Valeria sought Ramon’s input on the syllabus and worked with him to identify final project topics, which she had not done in the first semester. In this way, they worked towards better aligning their goals as is done in the aligned path of engagement (Dorado & Giles, 2004). By better aligning goals and increasing communication between stakeholders, community partner needs can be better met. Additionally, Valeria had been involved with Labor Rights for All for about six years already and for this reason had an established friendship with Ramon, which seemed to influence the way they communicated. Whereas newer relationships might struggle with knowing when and how to communicate, Valeria shared that she and Ramon talked multiple times a day. This allowed them to address issues as they arose and ask questions, continually allowing them to align their goals. Valeria and Ramon’s commitment to working together extends past (and prior) to any CBL projects and in this way, is also representative of a committed path of engagement (Dorado & Giles, 2004). Establishing a committed engagement contributes to a longer term commitment to addressing community partner needs.

Continued engagement also plays an important role in addressing community partner needs, particularly in the long term. In terms of the Translation course, while the immediate need for a translated resource guide was met within a semester, Elizabeth had other needs that continued engagement could address. For example, Elizabeth hoped that students might become
interested in volunteering with her organization as they learned more about the issues they work with through their service work. She also pointed to the importance of drawing on a network, and she seemed to see spreading awareness about her causes through CBL as a way to build up her network. Even though semester long partnerships are often criticized, community partners noted that it can have long-term effects when the students “become organizational advocates who educate others about the mission of the organization, enhance public awareness about related social issues and generally increase publicity about the organization” (Blouin & Perry, 2009, p. 126). In the Labor Issues course, Ramon was able to build his network of volunteers and gain advocates, and in these ways, continue to address his needs. Ramon shared stories of past students who continued to offer their support and assistance. Current students expressed a willingness to continue assisting the organization in the future, advocate for day laborers, and one student even continued on as an employee. Overall, CBL appeared to be seen as a network-building opportunity for both Ramon and Elizabeth. Furthermore, whereas Ramon had chances to form relationships with students and foster continued engagement, Elizabeth did not seem to have the chance to do so in the same way due to the nature of the service work and overall collaboration. The relationships that Ramon was able to form with students seemed to influence their motivation to stay involved even once the semester was over. As Clifford (2017) notes, more collaboration between students and community partners can foster a sense of solidarity (see Chapter 7 for more discussion). Overall, this highlights the importance of the student-community partner relationship in CBL.

In this chapter, I demonstrated the opportunities and challenges involved with addressing community partner needs in the two focal courses. Although community partner needs differed between courses, similar themes impacted the experiences of students, instructors, and
community partners in addressing community partner needs. Overall, it is important to consider how all stakeholders play a role in ensuring community partner needs are addressed in CBL. In the next chapter, I present a concluding discussion on Spanish CBL and offer recommendations and future directions for research.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

In the final chapter of this dissertation, I return to the literature review and analysis chapters as a way of laying out the main argument and findings of my study. I then discuss how my findings point to the importance of relationship-building in Spanish CBL. Additionally, in order to help readers interpret the applicability of my findings to other contexts, I address the issue of transferability of knowledge. Furthermore, I discuss the implications of my findings at the pedagogical, departmental, and institutional levels as well as present directions for future research on Spanish CBL.

7.1 Main contributions

In Chapter 2, I reviewed the literature in three key areas of CBL: 1) student outcomes and perspectives, 2) community partner outcomes and perspectives, and 3) instructor perspectives in CBL. The majority of research in the Spanish CBL literature has been focused on the first area, while research on the second area is limited, and the third area of research has been rarely, if ever, a main focus of investigation. By including all three perspectives, my study contributes to a more complete understanding of Spanish CBL. Furthermore, the majority of past research on Spanish CBL has been conducted by instructor-researchers with questionnaires and reflection essays as the primary sources of data. I utilized a diverse set of data collection tools, including interviews and classroom observations, in order to better capture the experiences and perspectives of the three main stakeholders.

As I mentioned above, the majority of past research is on student outcomes and perspectives in Spanish CBL, and it has focused on language- and cultural-related outcomes (e.g., Caldwell, 2007; Baker, 2018; Bloom, 2008; Jorge, 2006; Long 2003; Nelson & Scott, 2008; Pelletieri, 2011; Varas, 1999; Zapata, 2011). However, as students engage with local
Latinx communities, it is important for them to go beyond narrow understandings of language and culture. Some studies have shown that students develop an awareness of the lived experiences of local Latinx communities through CBL (e.g., Baker, 2018; Jorge, 2006; Lowther Pereira, 2015; MacGregor-Mendoza & Moreno, 2016; Nelson & Scott, 2008). I refer to this type of learning as community awareness. My study extends past work by exploring what facilitated and constrained community awareness as a type of learning outcome that results from CBL. Different levels of community awareness can be fostered depending on the goals and ideologies of instructors and community partners; both of whom I found to play a role in the development of students’ community awareness. My findings showed that community awareness can include student learning about policies and social issues that affect the lived experiences of local Latinx communities. At a deeper level, community awareness can also include student awareness of the systemic and structural constraints that shape the lives of community members. Although beyond the scope of this dissertation, future studies on Spanish CBL could further explore deeper levels of community awareness, which begin to overlap with related concepts, such as Consciousness (Trujillo, 2009) and critical consciousness (Freire, 1970/1986).

In addition to deepening the investigation of student outcomes, I also explored how community partner needs were addressed, arguing that more attention should be given to community partner outcomes in Spanish CBL. Importantly, exploring both student and community partner outcomes shed light on the reciprocity that is possible when university courses and community organizations work together. In exploring community partner outcomes, it was important to include their perspective. In doing so, my study contributes to a small but growing body of work that incorporates the community partner perspective in Spanish CBL (Abbott & Lear, 2010; d’Arlach et al., 2009; Darias et al., 1999; Isabelli & Muse, 2016; Jorge,
the findings from these studies provide insight into community partners’ benefits, challenges, motivations, and understandings of CBL. My study expands on this past research by also demonstrating the ways in which community partners play a role in fostering student learning outcomes and how their communication with instructors can impact community partner outcomes.

Finally, my study also included instructors as participants in the study, which to my knowledge, has yet to be explored in the Spanish CBL literature. This is likely due to the fact that the majority of research is conducted by instructor-researchers. By including the instructor perspective in my study, I was able to shed light on how instructors approach CBL, how their ideologies about the place of sociopolitics in the curriculum impacted decisions they made about their courses, and how communication with community partners impacted community partner outcomes.

Lastly, from a methodological standpoint, my study expanded beyond reflection essays and questionnaires as the principal form of data collection on students’ experiences and perspectives in Spanish CBL. These forms of data collection limit our understanding of what and how students learn in CBL courses. As I discussed in Chapter 2, students may be hesitant to share negative opinions or experiences in questionnaires and reflection essays that they know the instructor-researcher will read (Baker, 2018). Interviewing students as an outside researcher may have allowed me to collect more candid experiences than an instructor-researcher might be able to. Furthermore, the more open-ended nature of interviews allowed me to delve deeper into experiences and opinions and better understand the student perspective better. For example, depending on the nature of the service tasks in which they were involved, students’ opportunities for developing community awareness were varied.
Overall, I argued that it is important to include the perspectives of these three stakeholders—students, community partners and instructors—and explore their perspectives through multiple forms of data in order to understand the opportunities and challenges involved with developing students’ community awareness and addressing community partner needs.

7.2 Study findings overview

In order to contextualize the exploration of opportunities and challenges related to student and community partner outcomes, I explored the approaches to CBL taken in the two focal courses in Chapter 4. The Translation course aligned with a more traditional approach (Mitchell, 2008). This was reflected in the course syllabi as well as in the instructor’s and community partner’s discourse about CBL, which seemed to emphasize the preprofessional aspect of the service work. The instructor and the community partner appeared to see CBL as a way for students to gain translation experience while providing a needed translation to a community organization. They both also demonstrated interest in student learning about the issues impacting the community through translating the material. The Labor Issues course aligned with a more critical approach (Mitchell, 2008). Taught through a cultural studies perspective, class time included discussion of topics, such as labor and migration, which provided an understanding of the issues that impact the lives of the day laborers. Both the instructor and the community partner appeared to position CBL as a way to learn about the realities in the community in which students worked. Furthermore, they appeared to position CBL as an opportunity for both students and community members to give and receive resources and knowledge. The different approaches to CBL in each of the two focal courses demonstrated the heterogeneity of Spanish CBL courses, while also demonstrating a common interest in the development of students’ community awareness and addressing community partner needs.
In Chapter 5, I examined how service work, ideologies about the place of sociopolitics in the curriculum, and the community partner as co-educator presented opportunities and challenges involved with developing students’ community awareness in the two focal courses. In terms of service work, I took a specific look at not only whether community awareness as a student outcome was possible as a result of engaging in service work but also what opportunities promoted this learning. By exploring what fostered and what constrained the development of community awareness through service work, I was able to identify certain characteristics about tasks that presented more or less opportunities for students’ learning about the lived experiences of local Latinx communities. In the Translation course, the opportunity to develop community awareness through service work appeared to be largely based on the content of the section which the student was assigned to translate, while in the Labor Issues course, the chance to interact with community members, including the community partner, appeared to be important for this type of learning. Furthermore, the instructor perspective provided important insight to instructors’ ideologies that impacted their practices in CBL. In both cases, the instructors did not want to “impose” upon their students what they seemed to believe should not be part of the curriculum; for Martina, it was sociopolitical topics; for Valeria, it was her own or the community partner’s political views. This led to Martina’s choice not to include discussion of sociopolitical topics in the course and Valeria’s choice not to count attending political rallies or marches as service work. These choices constrained students’ opportunities to learn about the lived experiences of the local Latinx communities they were working with. Lastly, I explored the role of the community partner as a co-educator. While this role has been discussed in the wider CBL literature (e.g., Blouin & Perry, 2009; Darby et al., 2016; Worrall, 2007), it had yet to be explored in the Spanish CBL literature. As I demonstrated with my two cases, the extent to
which the community partner took on the role of a co-educator had positive implications for
students’ development of community awareness.

In Chapter 6, I examined the opportunities and challenges related to addressing
community partner needs in the two focal courses by exploring service work, instructor-
community partner communication, and continued engagement. In terms of service work, I
found that both classes addressed community partner needs, however stakeholders in each course
faced some challenges in doing so. Furthermore, while the importance of stakeholder
communication has been noted by scholars in the wider CBL literature (e.g., Blouin & Perry,
2009; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Tryon, Hilgendorf, & Scott, 2009), my study provides an
understanding of how instructor-community partner communication can play a role in addressing
community partner needs in Spanish CBL. While needs were addressed in both classes despite
different frequency of communication, the regular interaction in the Labor Issues course
appeared to facilitate the process. Lastly, I demonstrated how community partners hoped for
continued engagement from students as a way to build their network and bolster organizational
capacity. In this way, student involvement past the end of the semester can serve as a way to
continue addressing community partner needs past the end of the semester.

While many of the themes I explored have been investigated in the broader CBL
literature, they had not yet been explored in the Spanish CBL literature. By bridging these two
literatures together in this dissertation, I hoped to have demonstrated how the exploration of
these themes allow for a better understanding of how student and community partner outcomes
can be achieved in Spanish CBL.
7.3 Relationship-building in Spanish community-based learning

Spanning across all chapters of this dissertation is the importance of relationship-building. As Jacoby (2003) noted, “service learning is all about partnerships” (p. 315). Nevertheless, limited attention has been paid to relationships in the Spanish CBL literature. Given that relationships between stakeholders “deeply influence the processes and outcomes of [CBL] and civic engagement” (Clayton et al., 2010, p. 17), better understanding and paying increased attention to the fostering of relationships in Spanish CBL is key.

The two focal courses in this dissertation demonstrate the ways in which relationships can take different forms in Spanish CBL. As I discussed in Chapter 2, Bringle et al.’s (2009) SOFAR model presents the possible dyadic relationships between students, community organizations, faculty, administrators, and community residents. In this study, my findings shed light on the impacts of student-community partner and instructor-community partner relationships on the development of students’ community awareness and addressing community partner needs.

In terms of student-community partner relationships, the two focal courses differed in the extent to which this relationship type was fostered. In the Translation course, service work did not require students to engage with community members or with the community partner. Therefore, there was no chance to build relationships through service work. As I discussed in Chapter 4, the relationship between student and community partner appeared to be one of translator and client and therefore appeared to be consistent with a more transactional relationship, where the focus is on a product (Enos & Morton, 2003). However, bringing in the community partner as a co-educator, as discussed in Chapter 5, could have allowed for more interpersonal relationships to be established between the students and the community partner and
contributed to students’ development of community awareness by having the community partner share her knowledge and expertise on the impact of immigration policies on relative caregivers with students. The establishment of a relationship between students and the community partner could also contribute to the longer-term engagement of students with the organization and/or its causes thereby continuing to address community partner needs (see Chapter 6). While the space to form relationships can be more limited in Translation courses where the service is indirect, inviting the community partner into the classroom or dedicating a class period to visiting the community partner site could facilitate the relationship-building process and contribute to both student and community partner outcomes.

In the Labor Issues course, students often completed their service work tasks at the Labor Rights for All office and/or alongside Ramon giving him the opportunity to take on a co-educator role. This frequent interaction allowed for students and Ramon to get to know each other and have discussions. As I discussed in Chapter 5, these discussions allowed students to develop their community awareness. Furthermore, as I discussed in chapter 6, the interpersonal relationships formed between Ramon and students played a role in addressing community partner needs by sparking students’ interest in staying involved with Labor Rights for All beyond the end of the semester. Overall, students and the community partner had the opportunity to build relationships in this course demonstrating the impact relationships can have on student and community partner outcomes. As I discussed in Chapter 4, the relationship between the students and the community partner (and members) appeared to be positioned as a transformational relationship where both groups learn and grow (Bringle et al., 2009).

Another important relationship that my study shed light on is the instructor-community partner relationship. Stoecker & Beckman (2009) point to the importance of instructors building
and maintaining relationships with community partners. In the Translation course, Martina and Elizabeth were working together for the first time. They spoke at the beginning of the semester but did not correspond much during the semester. Despite this limited communication, the community partner need was addressed. However, findings discussed in Chapter 6 demonstrated how it would have been helpful to communicate about changes made to the translation material and following up regarding publication of the translation. Although Blouin and Perry (2009) found that organizations that have students work on specific projects prefer and are better prepared for transformative relationships, my findings point to a diffident trend. In general, Martina faced difficulties in maintaining relationships with her community partners because of the high staff turnover at nonprofit organizations. Although students are working on specific translation projects in CBL translation courses, it may be that it is difficult to maintain relationships overtime when the community partner need is something specific and finite like a translation. Organizations may not have a plethora of material that needs to be translated and therefore may not have a need to establish ongoing relationships with instructors. As I discussed in Chapter 2, Hammersley (2017) notes that while transformational relationships are often positioned as the ideal form of reciprocity, it may not be what is needed or desired in each relationship.

In the Labor Issues course, Valeria had created the course knowing that Labor Rights for All would be the community partner organization. In fact, Valeria had a previously established relationship with her community partner as she had personally been involved with the organization for about six years. This seemed to positively impact the instructor-community partner relationship. For example, Valeria and Ramon communicated regularly throughout the semester allowing them to address any issues as they arose and align expectations. The
relationship also seemed to have grown stronger in the semester in which I conducted my study, which was the second iteration of the CBL course. Unlike during the first semester, Valeria sought Ramon’s input on the syllabus and worked with him to identify final projects that would serve the organization’s needs. Working together in this way allowed the community partner to have more involvement in the design of the course and ensure that community partner needs were addressed.

Future Spanish CBL research should pay increased attention to stakeholder relationships, including to what extent stakeholders are content with their relationships and outcomes. Also, while community partner needs represent those of their organizations whose mission it is to serve community members, community partners are not entirely representative of community members. Therefore, while some studies in Spanish CBL have explored community members’ experiences in CBL (e.g., d’Arlach et al, 2009; Jorge, 2003), the extent to which local communities are served by Spanish CBL remains to be better understood. Future studies should also include community members as a stakeholder, expanding the outcomes and relationships explored to include those directly related to community members.

7.4 Implications

7.4.1 Addressing transferability

Qualitative case studies, such as this study, do not aim to generalize (Duff, 2012) and accordingly, I do not claim that what was found in the focal cases are representative of all cases of CBL courses in Spanish education. Nevertheless, the concept of transferability helps to explain how case study findings can be applied to other contexts. Transferability refers to “how (if at all) and in what ways understanding and knowledge can be applied in similar contexts and settings” (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016, p. 47). I hope others can evaluate the extent to which my
findings may apply in their contexts based on the description and details I provided about the two focal courses throughout this dissertation.

Although my cases are two specific Spanish courses that are shaped by the instructors, community partners, and students involved, as I demonstrated in Chapter 4, each course seems to be consistent with approaches to CBL, which have been identified in the literature. This suggests that other courses that take similar approaches may encounter similar opportunities and challenges. Furthermore, even between these different classes, I demonstrated how common themes shed light on the opportunities and challenges related to the development of students’ community awareness and addressing community partner needs. This suggests that these themes cut across contexts and may therefore be applicable to other CBL courses as well.

7.4.2 Pedagogical implications

The findings of this dissertation offer a number of implications at the pedagogical, departmental, and institutional level. In relation to pedagogy, I recommend that instructors consider the opportunities and challenges that service work tasks present to accomplishing their learning goals. The Translation course serves as an example of a class where all students (with the exception of the three students who chose the direct service route) worked on the same service work task; the translation of material for a community organization. However, as I demonstrated in this study, smaller level differences within the translation service task impacted the extent to which students had opportunities to develop community awareness. For example, each student focused on translating one part of a larger document with some parts of the document being more content rich than others. Therefore, some students did not have the opportunity to read and learn about the processes and options related to relative caregiving. This
points to the importance of considering the impact of more micro-level factors of service work tasks on student learning.

In the Labor Issues course, students worked on a variety of service work tasks. As my findings showed, service work tasks provided opportunities for development of community awareness and addressing community partner needs to varying degrees. A tradeoff seemed to exist in some service work tasks. For example, Kali’s courtroom experience presented opportunities for development of community awareness, but did not serve the community partner’s immediate needs (It did, however, appear to motivate Kali’s interest in staying engaged with the day laborer community, therefore potentially contributing to serving community partner needs in the future). On the other hand, Zayn’s ID machine repair addressed a much-needed community partner need, although it did not present him with opportunities to interact with community members and develop his community awareness. It is important to acknowledge that certain CBL tasks might favor one stakeholder group’s outcomes over another and that this may be necessary at times in order to address particular learning goals or community needs. However, ultimately, the important matter is for all stakeholders to continually assess to what extent relationships are meeting both student-related goals and community-related goals and how they can work towards more reciprocal collaborations.

I also argue for more intentional inclusion of sociopolitical topics in the Spanish curriculum, especially in CBL classrooms where students engage with communities. As Pascual y Cabo and Prada (2018) note,

by focusing on the issues and dynamics surrounding local minority languages and the speakers’ realities instead of on the language, strictly speaking, SFL [Spanish foreign language] learners will move from a superficial awareness of the factors at play in the
minority language and community experience, to the acknowledgment of attitudes, policies, and the lived reality of such minority communities, their members, and their heritage (p. 539).

I argue that, at a minimum, Spanish CBL courses should foster community awareness by providing students with opportunities to develop an awareness of community members’ lived experiences by discussing policies and social issues. I encourage Spanish CBL courses to go beyond lived experiences and include discussion and engagement with systemic and structural issues impacting the communities as well. This type of deeper understanding and awareness of local Latinx communities can begin to foster the development of students’ Consciousness (Trujillo, 2009) (see Chapter 2).

While the cultural studies perspective taken in the Labor Issues course facilitated learning about sociopolitical topics, the Translation course seemed to offer less opportunities to do so constrained by time and curricular ideologies. For example, Martina mentioned that she had considered but ultimately did not include readings about CBL itself during class time due to a lack of time and because a colleague who was more experienced at implementing CBL in the course had not done so. This seems to indicate that instructors who are newer to CBL are influenced by the models they see. Examples from the literature demonstrate that CBL translations courses have included discussion on topics related to their translation service work during class time (Alsina Naudi, 2020; Bugel, 2013). These can serve as models for other CBL translation instructors, who may not have exemplars to follow.

Furthermore, teachers should be supported in their efforts to include sociopolitical topics in the classroom, which can pose certain challenges. For example, Wassell, Wesely, and Glynn (2019) note that professional learning communities (PLCs) can be created as support for world
language instructors integrating social justice issues into their curricula. When possible, PLCs can be formed with department or institution-wide colleagues. Alternatively, professional organizations like ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) also offer special interest groups that bring together instructors from around the nation with similar interests, which could serve as a place of support and inspiration for CBL instructors.

Another pedagogical implication that arose from my findings is the need for yearlong CBL courses. As I discussed in Chapter 6, both community partners and students appeared to desire longer term collaborations. Instructors could address this by creating yearlong courses or sequences of courses (Clifford, 2017). As a student in the Labor Issues course, Eleanor, noted, extending CBL courses beyond a semester would allow the time for relationships to form and projects to develop. How this would be carried out would depend on the course. For example, in the Translation course, the community partner noted how a semester was a long turnaround time for a translation. Therefore, a yearlong CBL translation course should still aim to complete the translation within one semester (or less if possible). However, the yearlong structure of the course might allow for more time to be spent on discussion about the sociopolitical context in which their work is taking place and issues that their service work is addressing. The additional time might also allow for students to interact and build relationships with community members, who might be potential readers of their work. Implementing year-long courses also involves departmental support, which I discuss further below.

Furthermore, in line with course design suggestions put forth by Abbott & Martínez (2018), I recommend that community partners be given the space to participate as co-educators to the extent that they are willing and able. As my findings have shown, incorporating the community partner as a co-educator provided opportunities for student learning and in doing so
strengthened the student-community partner relationships, which motivated continued engagement and long term support for addressing community partner needs. Furthermore, instructors should consult community partners when setting course outcomes to ensure both student learning goals and community partner needs are at the center of the course (Clifford & Reisinger, 2019).

7.4.3 Departmental implications

A number of challenges faced by students, instructors, and community partners are systemic, such as working within a semester timeline. Therefore, departmental and institutional support are key. For Martina, her implementation of CBL fulfilled a departmental need. As departments seek to offer more CBL courses, likely in an effort to keep up with institutional calls for community engagement, it will be important for them to consider how they support learning about and engaging with local Latinx communities. For example, given the time commitment that CBL requires, departments should consider ways to support their instructors. As I discussed in Chapter 6, this might involve giving instructors course release time and providing instructors with teaching assistants (Darby & Newman, 2014). This might also include giving CBL instructors sabbatical time. For example, 33% of Campus Compact member campuses offer sabbaticals for CBL research, scholarship, and program development (Campus Compact, 2013). Departments should also recognize the work that instructors put into their CBL courses during tenure and promotion consideration (Chupp & Joseph, 2010).

Furthermore, as I discussed above, year-long courses can address stakeholders’ desire for longer-term engagement. Departments can support this effort by encouraging and allowing instructors to create and teach these multi-semester courses. Additionally, departments should consider offering a sequence of CBL courses taught by different instructors on diverse topics
within the department. This can not only deepen students’ community awareness, but also contribute to long term engagement with organizations as multiple courses can partner with the organization to serve different needs. For example, Barreneche and Ramos-Flores (2013) point to Tulane University’s Spanish program, which offers a number of CBL courses. As they note, Tulane has a university-wide service requirement for all students to graduate. Therefore, this is likely to influence the number of CBL courses offered. This points to the importance of institutional support for CBL.

7.4.4 Institutional implications

To support not only Spanish CBL but CBL across disciplines, institutions should maintain offices of community engagement “to connect potential community partners with the university, provide funding, create incentives to try new approaches, assist faculty with logistical support, and provide developmental instruction to new or potential [CBL] faculty” (Abes et al., 2002, p. 16). Trainings offered by offices of community engagement, such as those attended by Martina and Valeria as discussed in Chapter 4, can help prepare instructors to take on the task of implementing CBL. Future research could examine the content of these trainings and the extent to which they prepare language department faculty to implement CBL in their classrooms.

Institutions also should assist community partner organizations with their participation in CBL (Jones, 2003). For example, as I discussed in Chapter 6, Ramon shared that he felt he could get more out of the experience if he managed things better. In particular, he shared his challenges with managing student schedules and ensuring he had service work tasks to assign them. These and other responsibilities that community partners take on as co-educators should be supported by institutions. Just as instructors employed by the university have access to resources, community partner co-educators, who are also playing a role in the education of students
enrolled at the institution, should as well. One way universities could support community partners’ co-educator role is by compensating them for their instructional service to the university. According to the 2016 Campus Compact annual member survey, out of 396 institutions, 27% reported that community partners acted as compensated co-instructors (Campus Compact, 2017). Whether through compensation, awards, or other forms of recognition, the role that community partners play in students’ learning should not be overlooked. Furthermore, given the importance of department and institutional support, more research is needed to understand the opportunities and challenges associated with Spanish CBL implementation at the departmental and institutional levels.

7.5 Final remarks

In Chapter 1, I posed two questions in regards to what it means to become involved with and participate in multilingual communities, 1) What do we hope students learn? and 2) What do we hope communities gain? In regards to the first question, I demonstrated in this dissertation that CBL has the potential to provide students with opportunities to develop community awareness by learning about the lived experiences of local Latinx communities. In regards to the second question, I demonstrated in this dissertation that community partners can have their short-term and long-term needs met through CBL collaborations. I argue that these student and community partner outcomes are important for ensuring that CBL relationships are reciprocal. However, I also acknowledge that developing community awareness and addressing community partner needs are just steps towards more transformative collaborations.

Randolph and Johnson (2017) state, “in the current social and political climate in which our language classrooms are situated, the need is clear for students to be able to communicate, not only in the most efficient way possible, but also in ways that set the stage for relationship
building and problem solving” (p. 103). Relationship-building and problem solving are central to Clifford and Reisinger’s (2019) call for university stakeholders to work in solidarity with communities through CBL. Working in solidarity emphasizes working together to enact social change. Importantly, strong relationships are key to solidarity.

Although I discussed how relationship-building plays an important role in fostering student and community partner outcomes above, working in solidarity means framing relationship-building as a goal itself. For example, Clifford (2017), has called for a shift away from deliverables as outcomes and towards relationship-building as the target outcome of CBL. She argues, “how we engage with the community is a defining aspect of [CBL], and students need to see models of authentic relationships that support systemic change rather than prioritizing counting hours and producing deliverables as measures of their level of engagement” (Clifford, 2017, p. 5). This may involve shifting students views of what it means to engage in service. For example, as I discussed in Chapter 6, Eleanor initially thought that she should be engaged in fundraising or grant work as part of her service work, which seems to demonstrate the value she placed on products as outcomes. However, over time Eleanor appeared to see the value in her work with the day laborer theatre group, which was more about getting to know the day laborers and the stories they wanted to tell.

Importantly, shifting from products to relationship-building as the goal of CBL should not be done uncritically, that is, without analyzing how the shift would impact the ability to address stakeholders’ desired goals and needs. Building solidarity is a process that takes place overtime and needs to be negotiated between stakeholders. All stakeholders need to be a part of the conversation regarding what their relationship will look like, and it is important to acknowledge that each relationship will look different depending on the stakeholders involved.
No matter whether a relationship takes on a more transactional or transformational nature, I argue that by centering open communication in CBL collaborations, relationship-building can still be positioned as a target outcome.

In working in solidarity, Spanish CBL can extend beyond a course and work towards social justice (Mitchell, 2008). Although a shift from products to relationships may come with its challenges, positioning relationship-building as a goal of CBL can transform why and how students learn and engage with local Latinx communities in Spanish education in important ways.
APPENDIX A: STUDENT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. Could you tell me a bit about your experience with studying Spanish?
   a. How long have you been studying Spanish?
   b. Do you have opportunities to use Spanish outside of the classroom?
   c. Other follow up questions based on their responses to the survey

2. Could you tell me about your experience in your community-based service-learning (CBSL) course?
   a. Where do you serve?
   b. What kind of service do you perform?
   c. What do you do during your class meetings?
   d. How does your class meetings relate to the service-learning portion of the course?
   e. Why did you decide to take this course?
   f. In what ways have you found this CBSL course beneficial?
   g. What challenges have you faced in this CBSL course?
      i. Any language related difficulties?
      ii. Any cultural knowledge related difficulties?
      iii. Any professional skills related difficulties?

3. Do you think you are learning anything through this course that you would not have been able to in a more traditional language course?
   a. If yes, why do you think that is?
   b. If no, why do you think that is?
   c. If yes, can you give me an example?

4. How do you think your service impacts the community?

5. To what extent do you think CBSL courses can promote social justice?

6. Would you participate in a CBSL course again? Why or why not?

7. Is there anything else you would like to share?

In addition to the questions listed above, I will ask related questions based on what arises during the interviews.
APPENDIX B: INSTRUCTOR INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. Could you tell me a bit your experience with Spanish language education?
   a. How long have you been teaching?
   b. What drew you to teaching Spanish?
   c. What levels do you teach?
   d. What types of courses have you taught?

2. Could you tell me about your experience with community-based service-learning (CBSL)?
   a. How did you first learn about CBSL?

3. Could you tell me about the current CBSL course you are teaching?
   a. Did you create this course?
      i. If so, can you tell me about the process of creating the course?
   b. What are your course objectives and goals?
   c. Was there any particular social issue that you were interested in addressing through your course?
      i. How did you identify a particular social issue?
   d. How does the coursework connect to the service portion of the class?
   e. What resources do you have access to in helping you implement the CBSL course?
   f. What type of support do you receive from your department, colleagues, or others for your CBSL course?

4. Could you tell me a bit about the students in your CBSL course?
   a. What proficiency level are they at?
   b. What are their backgrounds?
   c. Do students receive preparation to serve in the community such as through trainings?
   d. Do you have heritage speakers and L2 learners?
   e. Do you believe there are any differences between heritage speakers and L2 learners that are particularly relevant to CBSL courses?

5. Could you tell me a bit about your work with community partners.
   a. How did you identify and create a partnerships with community partners?
   b. What sorts of topics did you discuss with you community partners?
   c. How often do you communicate with your community partners?
   d. What are your expectations of the community partner?
   e. How do you believe the community partner benefits from participating in CBSL?
   f. How do you believe community members benefit from participating in CBSL?
6. What are some challenges to teaching a CBSL course?

7. What are the benefits to teaching a CBSL course?

8. To what extent do you think both students and community partners benefit from CBSL?

9. To what extent does a CBSL course allow you to focus on knowledge or skills you would not normally focus on in the Spanish courses?

10. To what extent do you think CBSL courses can promote social justice?

11. Is there anything else you would like to share?

In addition to the questions listed above, I will ask related questions based on what arises during the interviews.

I will also ask questions in regards to my observations in the classroom and service sites (if applicable).

The end-of-semester interview will include follow up based on the above questions.
APPENDIX C: COMMUNITY PARTNER PROTOCOL

1. Could you tell me a bit about your organization?
   a. What services do you provide?
   b. Who do you serve?
   c. How does your organization meet the Spanish language needs of the community members?

2. Could you tell me about your experience with community-based service-learning (CBSL) courses?
   a. How long have you been collaborating with CBSL courses?
   b. How did your collaboration with <insert instructor’s name> begin?
   c. Why did you decide to participate?
   d. How often do you communicate with the instructor? And how?
   e. To what extent are you involved in the-class portion of CBSL such as assignments, presentations, or assessments?

3. Could you tell me about the students that serve at your organization?
   a. What services do students perform?
   b. Do students receive any orientation or training before starting to serve?
   c. What are your impressions of the students?
   d. What were your expectations of the students? Are your expectations being met?
   e. Do you notice any differences between second language learners and heritage speakers of Spanish?

4. What are the benefits to collaborating with a CBSL course?
   a. What did you hope the benefits to your organization of the community you serve would be?

5. What are some challenges to collaborating with a CBSL course?

6. What do you see are your main role in this collaboration?

7. What do you think students gain from the CBSL experience?

8. What do you think the community gains from the CBSL experience?

9. To what extent do you think CBSL courses can promote social justice?

10. Is there anything else you would like to share?
In addition to the questions listed above, I will ask related questions based on what arises during the interviews.

I will also ask questions in regards to my observations at the service site (if applicable).

The end-of-semester interview will include follow up based on the above questions.
APPENDIX D: QUESTIONNAIRE QUESTIONS

Q1 Name
________________________________________________________

Q2 Age
________________________________________________________

Q3 Gender
________________________________________________________

Q4 University name
________________________________________________________

Q5 What year of college are you in?

○ First year

○ Second year

○ Third year

○ Fourth year

○ Other________________________________________________________

Q6 Your major(s)
________________________________________________________

Q7 Country of birth
________________________________________________________

Q8 Please list the languages that you know in order of dominance.
________________________________________________________

Q9 Please list the cultures with which you identify. (For example: US-American, Chinese)
________________________________________________________
Q10 Please list the languages that you know in order of acquisition (your native language(s) first).

________________________________________________________________

Q11 Please indicate the age at which you began acquiring Spanish:

________________________________________________________________

Q12 How many years of Spanish did you study in elementary, middle, and high school in the United States?

________________________________________________________________

Q13 How many semesters of Spanish have you taken in college?

________________________________________________________________

Q14 Please indicate the amount of time (in school years) that you have spent in a school where Spanish was the primary language of instruction:

○ 0

○ 1

○ 2

○ 3

○ 4

○ 5

○ Other__________________________________________________________
Q14a Please indicate the level(s) of schooling at which Spanish was the primary language of instruction

☐ Elementary school
☐ Middle school
☐ High school
☐ University

Q15 How often do you use Spanish outside of a classroom?

☐ Regularly
☐ Sometimes
☐ Rarely
☐ Never

Q15a With whom do you use Spanish outside of the classroom?

________________________________________________________________

Q16 Have you lived in a country where Spanish is the majority language?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Q16a At what age(s) did you live in a country where Spanish was the majority language?

________________________________________________________________

Q16b For what length of time did you live in a country where Spanish was the majority language?

________________________________________________________________
Q17 Have you studied abroad in a country where Spanish is a majority language?

○ Yes

○ No

Q18 Please select your level of proficiency in Spanish for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginner</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q19 Including the Spanish community-based service-learning course you are currently taken, how many community-based service-learning courses have you taken?

○ 1

○ 2

○ 3

○ Other_______________________________________________

Q19a Which community-based service-learning courses have you taken prior to your Spring 2019 Spanish course?

________________________________________________________________

Q20 If you agreed to grant the researcher permission to use your reflection writings in the study, please provide your email so that the researcher, Francesca, can contact you regarding accessing your service-learning reflection writings if necessary. Otherwise you can skip this question.

________________________________________________________________

[If agreed to share reflection essay]
Q1 Name

________________________________________________________________

Q2 Please provide your email so that the researcher, Francesca, can contact you regarding accessing your service-learning reflection writings if necessary.

________________________________________________________________
## APPENDIX E: TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>@</td>
<td>Laughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&gt;</td>
<td>Overlapping speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>False start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Unintelligible speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>Uncertainty about transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>italics</td>
<td>Emphasized speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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