

Social Justice and Intercultural Issues in Service-Learning Pedagogy: An Empirical Study

Josephine Walwema

University of Washington, Seattle

Jennifer Sano-Franchini

West Virginia University

Jessica R. Edwards

University of Delaware

Sweta Baniya

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Abstract This article reports on focus groups conducted with scholars and teachers of technical and professional communication whose pedagogy is informed via service-learning (SL) or community engagement. With the relatively recent turn to social justice in TPC alongside longer term conversations about intercultural communication, we aimed to investigate how service-learning courses embrace the practical concepts of social justice and intercultural communication and translate those concepts into addressing the material imbalances they might encounter in the workplace and beyond. With the analysis of these focus groups, we offer empirical evidence that will contribute to understandings of how programmatic actions in TPC address issues of social justice and intercultural communication in service-learning programs. We suggest that social justice-informed SL, when thoughtfully developed as a part of TPC curricula, can help advance the long-term goals of social justice and cultivate transferable skills that students can take further into their career.

Keywords community engagement, empirical research, focus groups, intercultural communication, service-learning, social justice

Introduction

Service-learning (SL) has been a mainstay of TPC curricula since scholars like Thomas N. Huckin (1997) published work on the subject. SL is valued as a “path to virtue” (Dubinsky, 2002); civic engagement through cultural studies (Scott, 2004); technology (Turnley, 2007); as well as in online and distance learning (Bourelle, 2014). Scholars have established SL as a practical pedagogy that merges student learning and community service with a goal to improve both the learning and the community (Carter et al., 2003; Butin, 2010; Huckin, 1997). Catherine Matthews and Beverly B. Zimmerman (1999) defined SL as “experiential learning” (p. 384) given that learning occurs through the experience of providing service in support of community needs. Still, while the “service” in SL suggests that students do good for the community, SL is more complex in a few different ways. First, it is typically a component of curricula designed primarily to enhance student learning, and less to support the community. David A. Delaine et.al.’s (2022) systematic literature review of SL and community engagement in engineering established that because SL pedagogy is oriented toward the professionalization of students, scant attention is paid to community partners.

The difference between SL and community engagement, as Pamela Reynolds (2009) offered, is that where SL is “structured teaching and learning,” to enable students to offer community service, community engagement centers the community as a recipient of service. Another complexity arises when SL is considered charity work, as Rebecca Walton, Kristen R. Moore, and Natasha N. Jones (2019) have noted. And a third complexity emerges as students who do SL work are often in more privileged positions than the communities they serve. As Ntimi Mtawa and Merridy Wilson-Strydom (2018) found, “complex relations of power and privilege” are frequently in play “particularly in the context of extreme poverty in communities” that are often served (p. 249). Moreover, Dan W. Butin (2010) observed that in SL programs, “students typically have greater social privilege” than the communities they serve (p. 125). Yet what is not always evident from these incursions into communities is noticeable, lasting change. As Butin (2015) wrote, “few students envision SL through a justice oriented lens” and even fewer faculty know how to structure a SL course to foster social justice (p. 8) because it is not often considered the object of the SL curriculum.

This article reports on an empirical study of how social justice and intercultural approaches in technical and professional communication inform SL curricula and pedagogies in practice. The initial phase of the study involved a 2020 survey of 55 TPC teachers and administrators about their experiences with, practices for enacting, and attitudes toward social justice and intercultural communication in TPC (Baniya et al., 2022). Through our earlier survey, we were able to identify what

courses are reported as sites of SL projects as well as participants' self-reported perceptions about social justice in SL. In addition, we outlined four themes related to the application of social justice and intercultural communication theories to SL: activities, constraints, points of resistance, and goals and outcomes. Ultimately, we suggested that TPC administrators and programs "incorporate training in social justice pedagogies within graduate programs—especially where graduate instructors may be teaching TPC courses—as well as TPC programs more generally; and develop localized frameworks" (Baniya et al., 2022, p. 366). We followed this survey research by conducting focus groups, in hopes of gaining a fuller understanding of how TPC teachers and administrators enact social justice and engage intercultural issues in SL; we report on our findings in this article.

The impetus for this project follows from our concern that SL programs bring into sharp focus the divide between town and gown, owing in part to the non-profit status that many universities hold, which exempts them from paying taxes that would otherwise further contribute to uplifting and developing the communities around them. This status quo in turn imbues the university with ivory tower status. Without making efforts to step out of that tower and create inroads within the communities in which universities are located, but also social, economic, environmental, and cultural consequences will linger long after many SL projects are conducted among them. One of the ways universities have attempted to bridge this chasm is through community-engaged collaborations through SL, where students work with communities and improve their learning engagement as a result.

This project sought to identify where and how teachers of SL in technical communication enact their commitments to social justice and intercultural communication in practice. We were interested in understanding the process of designing and implementing SL programs by gathering experiences from program administrators and teachers. Towards this goal, we conducted three focus groups with 14 teachers, program administrators, and scholars of technical communication who helped us gain a clearer sense of how social justice and intercultural communication has been incorporated into TPC courses and programs across a range of post-secondary institutions and communities. With the analysis of these focus groups, we extend previous scholarship (Baniya, et al., 2022), offering additional empirical evidence that helps us understand how programmatic actions in TPC clarify issues of social justice and intercultural communication in SL programs. In the following sections, we provide a brief overview of literature, we describe our research methods, and we report on the thematic results of our research.

Defining Terms

When we use the term *social justice*, we draw on TPC scholars such as Natasha N. Jones and Rebecca Walton (2018) who have established that social justice aims to “amplify the agency of oppressed people—those who are materially, socially, politically, and/or economically under-resourced” (p. 242). In the context of this work, to achieve social justice through SL, programs must meaningfully attend to the needs of the often-oppressed communities with which they partner. Indeed, Angela M. Haas and Michelle F. Eble (2018) offered that social justice “explicitly seek[s] to redistribute and reassemble—or otherwise redress—power imbalances that systematically and systemically disenfranchise some stakeholders while privileging others” (p. 3). Moreover, doing social justice work entails being explicit and intentional when engaging acts of oppression and seeking out just action at all times (Walton et. al, 2018). In this study, we contend that SL occasions opportunities for not just learning, and service, but can also be a means for attaining social justice.

As we noted in “Revisiting SL in TPC Through Social Justice and Intercultural Frameworks: Findings from Survey Research” (2022), although intercultural communication is often perceived as a distinct area of inquiry separate from SL and social justice conversations in TPC, “social justice frequently relies on the ability to communicate effectively between and across cultures and across differently positioned subjectivities” (p. 5). Given that we understand intercultural communication as not being limited to communication across differences in nationality but also includes the more nuanced cultural differences that occur when people come from different educational, class, ethnic, and other backgrounds, we understand such theories as important for social justice-informed SL, as well as for effective TPC more broadly. Indeed, Godwin Y. Agboka (2014) has asserted that “intercultural communication and the objectives of social justice are interconnected” (p. 304). In other words, to engage in social justice generally requires an ability to communicate with members of under-resourced communities with self-reflexivity, and the propensity to decenter and situate one’s own experiences and naturalized ways of knowing” (p. 357)—practices that are integral to intercultural communication. For example, students involved in SL programs must often learn to work effectively with community members from different cultural, class, and educational backgrounds and who live based on a different set of experiences, values and norms.

Thus, we argue that given the complexities of SL described in the introduction to this article, pairing SL with intercultural communication for achieving social justice might bring about a different paradigm that is reciprocal and mutually beneficial between the two entities. Such a paradigm would entail creating learning outcomes

that include intercultural communication and social justice with a problem-solving disposition. And, of course, problems cannot be solved until they are articulated and understood. When students can articulate the core problems afflicting the respective communities with whom they engage, they might equip themselves with the kind of knowledge that would be targeted and directed towards restoring these communities. In short, our study is built upon the notion that SL, intercultural communication, and social justice conversations in TPC can and should be in dialogue with one another.

With the relatively recent turn to social justice alongside the longer-term engagement with intercultural communication in TPC, we wanted to investigate how SL courses embrace the practical concepts of social justice and translate those concepts into addressing the imbalances students might encounter in the workplace and beyond. In addition to that, we wanted to investigate pedagogies of intercultural communication and how such pedagogies are designed and implemented in these quasi-workplaces. It is evident that in various SL partnerships students get an opportunity to work with community members from a wide range of cultural backgrounds, perspectives, and subjectivities, and intercultural communication is an area that can prepare students to thoughtfully and reflectively engage in this kind of work. Hence, in this multisite curricular study, we investigate how TPC programs in the U.S. implement social justice and intercultural-oriented SL pedagogy in and with their communities.

Literature Review: Service-Learning in TPC

Over the past two decades, there has been growing interest in incorporating SL in technical and professional communication programs. Many teachers and scholars of technical communication have conducted research and written about the successes, challenges, and also issues with embedding SL in technical communication programs. As a result of SL programs, students have reportedly sharpened their career goals; as Parul Chaube (2020) wrote, SL experiences “allowed us to further develop and exhibit leadership over small portions of the project and focused on the multicultural communication goal of the class” (25). Likewise, the organizations with which students are paired can also benefit from expanded networks with members of the institution, including students with whom they might form lifelong connections. In a collaborative article written by Rebecca Walton, Jared S. Colton, Rikki Wheatley-Boxx, and Krista Gurko (2016), community partners Wheatley-Boxx and Gurko wrote “defining and reflecting upon foundational issues such as social justice, privilege, and social change, students become better prepared to apply skills and concepts beyond a single course or organization” (126). In this way, social justice-informed SL, when thoughtfully developed as a part of TPC curricula,

can help advance the long-term goals of social justice and cultivate transferable skills that students can take further into their career.

Matthews and Zimmerman (1999) conducted a qualitative study in which they “implemented SL as a core part of a project management course” (p. 384). Their study uncovered challenges related to student collaboration, a tension they attributed to the lack of uniformity with the technical documents associated with the various components of the project. Because it was left to students to decide on the structure of the documents, they struggled to determine how accurately they were completing their tasks. David Alan Sapp and Robbin D. Crabtree (2002), for whom SL is “a pedagogical theory and method of experiential education” designed to help students to develop “civic responsibility” (p. 412), implemented SL in three TPC-focused projects including healthcare documents for rural Spanish speakers along the US-Mexico border; reports developed in partnership with a number of social service agencies; and document design for a local business. Their work demonstrated examples of the valuable partnerships that arise when learning and service converge. For Danielle Nielsen (2016), complications arise when SL is offered in the online TC classroom. For example, students may be put in a position where they must find their own service assignments (p. 241). Thus, placement for online learning students for SL becomes a problem. One way to contend with this issue is to establish students’ positionalities via the communities they wish to engage. Doing so enables an interrogation of the inherent power asymmetries between students and communities and might activate a sense of engagement with the community in ways that motivate social change.

SL pedagogy has long been touted as a sufficient perspective for technical communicators interested in improving civic engagement among students. In TPC, SL has been advanced to help “to develop students’ civic awareness and engagement” (Jones, 2016, p. 355). SL that emphasizes fellowship and coalitions can “bring together multiple ways of understanding the world and analyzing the oppressive structures within it,” enhancing community alliances and interrogating the connections among pedagogy, theory, and practice (Bell, 2007, p. 14). This approach is useful to technical communication because it foregrounds relationships based on genuine collaborations and cooperation with other scholars, participants, and communities. In addition, the participatory approaches often used in SL encourage empathy as a conduit to understanding and advocacy. And such views reflect James M. Dubinsky’s (2002) note of caution regarding the need to strike a balance between service and learning—between community partners and students.

Before the social justice turn, educators engaged in a wide array of activities that brought learners to communities (see Dubinsky, 2002). Such community-institutional partnerships involved students doing work that ostensibly benefited the

communities in question. The results of these SL outreaches, however, often augmented student learning more than they benefited the communities in question (d'Arlach, Sánchez, and Feuer, 2009). This point is reflected by the mere fact that the injustices that necessitate SL outreach continue to persist (Baniya et al., 2022).

From a programmatic point of view, while SL has been widely adopted in TPC programs and in the academy in general, its reach with respect to social justice and intercultural communication has not been as widely felt (see Bocci, 2015; Mitchell, 2015). Indeed, as Nancy W. Coppola, Norbert Elliot, and Faye Newsham (2016) observed, social justice and intercultural communication pedagogy can now more overtly expose students to differential opportunities and outcomes; critically assess the structural conditions that perpetuate injustices and engage students in coalition building and other social justice initiatives that can dismantle and topple these structures. Kirk St.Amant (2021) listed some programmatic opportunities that have arisen in the wake of a global pandemic such as internationalizing research-based projects, working in “globally distributed contexts,” and “addressing local problems” (pp. 2–5). These opportunities do inform a more capacious programmatic outlook to SL, intercultural communication, and social justice pedagogy. The opportunity to partner with international organizations, for example, allows for developing skills such as “teleworking” (p. 6). Similarly, St.Amant suggests that emerging “local problems” can offer opportunities for internationalizing online education (p. 16) by drawing on the expertise of community members who are the custodians of local knowledge as well as from their international student-partners.

Culturally speaking, SL can pedagogically benefit from the communities with who they partner. Consider that classrooms on college campuses are rarefied spaces that grant access to credentialed individuals with pre-approved metrics of expertise and qualifications. SL partners may not operate freely in such spaces. But if we grant that they have knowledge worthy of imparting to students, then we can make room in our programs to permit instruction on turfs where they can fully exercise agency and fortitude. Educators can relate more equitably with community partners and invite them to be more than passive recipients of the service offered through SL programs. Community partners can contribute actively to shaping the goals and processes of SL projects, and, preferably with compensation, participate in lectures, facilitate class discussions, and engage in activities related to learning about them and their organization. Educators can more directly tap community expertise to draw on their knowledge directly so that there is less separation between class pedagogy and SL as learned within communities. To this end, Michael Carter, Chris M. Anson & Carolyn R. Miller (2003) found it useful for TPC courses to “create learning outcomes” to help clarify the nature of principles and skills students will gain and to bring together disciplinary content and (community) application (p. 108).

SL is considered valuable in cultivating citizenship by providing opportunities for service to not just learners, but also faculty and ultimately their respective institutions. It is different from internship and other forms of apprenticeship, where the immediate focus is to inculcate skills and induct employees into workplace discourse culture. Sapp and Crabtree (2002) called for “integrating service-learning projects into technical communication courses” in order to build technical skills and apply them as needed (p. 417). SL in fact illuminates the value of the field beyond its vocational bent; it demonstrates community outreach and is conducive for “socially relevant” and by extension, ethical “research” (p. 425). Because SL often involves community outreach, administration buy-in is necessary. A heightened interest in SL might attract resources and training and might lead to more outreach to the community in ways that are beneficial to both the community and the institution. After all, community partners are known to “accommodate” requests from institutions and their students. For this reason, “service should not benefit students to the detriment of the community” (p. 425).

Sapp and Crabtree (2002) cautioned against the programmatic institution of SL lest it promotes antipathy to uninterested faculty. Instead, they recommend that interested faculty, committed to “the philosophy of education for citizenship,” be supported in this endeavor (p. 426). Such faculty can gradually develop more expansive learning outcomes and increasingly student projects. Above all, relations with community members evolve to where each other’s needs can be reciprocated. “Service learning, then, can be seen as a companion laboratory as much focused on applying academic skills as on creating responsible participants in democratic life” (p. 427).

Research Methods

This section details the methods of our focus group research that made up the second part of our two-part IRB-approved study. The larger project, “Service Learning in Technical and Professional Communication through Social Justice and Intercultural Frameworks: A Multisite Study” was reviewed, determined to have IRB-exempt status, and approved (see Appendix B). The goal of the study was to gather data from multiple technical and professional communication instructors at universities across the country in order to help us understand how TPC commitments to intercultural communication, social justice, antiracism and equity inform the implementation of SL on the ground. In general, we hoped to better understand how social justice, intercultural communication, and SL inform (if at all) the larger goal of bringing about meaningful and material social change, such as more equitable distribution of material resources across the community, providing support for marginalized community members, enhancing accessibility, or otherwise “[amplifying] the agency of oppressed people” (Jones and Walton, 2018, p. 242).

Following survey research of TPC faculty and administrators, we conducted three focus groups in March 2022. We chose to use focus groups as the method for this part of the study as a way to help us gather fuller perspectives on how social justice and intercultural frameworks are conceived and implemented in the context of SL in TPC courses and programs. Additionally, because they are conversational, focus groups would enable participants to build on one another's ideas, thus yielding potentially richer insights. They would also enable us to learn from more varied perspectives than we would have been able to do through interviews or other means alone. We collectively developed our focus group questions in a series of meetings as we were working on our IRB protocol (see Appendix C) to have them ready for review by our respective IRBs. The focus group questions were developed to elicit some description of participants': 1) personal commitments to social justice, 2) institutional contexts within which they were working, and 3) concrete practices and methods that they used to engage with communities and facilitate and institute SL projects in TPC.

Focus group participants were largely self-selected; they were individuals who had responded to the survey that we distributed earlier and from which we reported the initial results (Baniya et al., 2022). Conditions for survey respondents were that participants identify as instructors of TPC who also have an interest in teaching social justice. Although we had indicated that participants needed only to be interested in teaching social justice in SL, we found that all participants had experience teaching SL in TPC. At the conclusion of the survey, participants were invited to indicate their willingness to participate in a focus group discussion. Out of 55 total survey participants, 15 indicated on the survey that they would be willing to participate in a focus group. We contacted all 15 respondents who indicated their willingness to participate in a focus group using the recruitment email in Appendix A. Among the 15 people we contacted, 14 were able to participate given scheduling constraints. All focus group participants received a \$50 gift card for their participation.

All three focus groups took place late in March 2022, during the COVID pandemic. We note this context because the kinds of experiences people were sharing and interactions they were having were limited by social distancing and the conditions that were prevailing at the time. Given the context, we held the three focus group sessions using the virtual platform Zoom to both (a) offer video and phone choices to our participants and (b) ensure a diversity of participants from different institutional contexts to hear, learn, and engage with one another. The research team met in advance of the first focus group to prepare. The focus groups were 90 minutes in length each, and they were recorded using Zoom's record feature. The focus groups ranged from two to seven participants in size, not including facilitators. This variation was purely a result of participants' scheduling availability.

To start the focus group discussions, both the facilitators and participants were asked to introduce themselves and situate their teaching and research interests in TPC. They were also encouraged to state whether or not their programs had majors or minors in TPC as that would have some bearing for curricular information. Although we asked the same questions in each focus group session, our conversations about intercultural communication, social justice, and SL varied largely because of the lived experiences and institutional contexts of our participants. Our first focus group consisted of five participants from five different institutions, in five different states. Our second focus group included two participants from the same university. Our final focus group included seven participants from six different universities. Participants were a mix of tenure track assistant and associate professors, adjunct and other non-tenure track professors, and graduate student instructors. Given these various factors, our study is not intended to be a universal statement of how all TPC instructors and administrators work toward social justice and intercultural oriented SL; instead, this is an analysis of how several of our TPC colleagues have engaged with social justice and intercultural SL in practice.

After the focus groups were conducted, we had the recordings transcribed using Rev, a transcription service. We each read and reread the transcripts separately in order to look for themes in the interest of coming up with codes associated with the questions we had posed in the survey. We entered our codes into a shared spreadsheet where we were able to compare and contrast them against each other. We then met and discussed what codes we had in common, before collaboratively developing a coding scheme based on five emergent codes:

1. **“social justice” use**—in other words, where participants provided explanations of how “social justice” and social justice frameworks were used in SL courses, programs, and institutions more broadly;
2. **activities, strategies, and practices** for addressing or designing social justice/intercultural SL projects;
3. **challenges and “failures”** in social justice/intercultural SL;
4. **context, support, and other factors** that influenced participants’ ability to do social justice/intercultural SL; and
5. **programmatically and pedagogical recommendations** for social justice/intercultural SL.

After we developed this coding scheme, we each individually went back and coded the three transcripts manually (see Lauer, Brumberger, and Beveridge, 2018). We then copied our coded data to a shared spreadsheet for comparison and discussion. One byproduct of making use of Zoom was that we not only had our spoken conversation, but we were also able to make use of the chat feature, which we

invited participants to use as part of our opening to the focus groups. We capture some of the Zoom chat data in our results section as well.

Results

In this section, we present our focus group results. The results are organized under the five themes that emerged from our coding of the focus group data: (a) "social justice" use within the context of SL, (b) activities, strategies, and practices for developing social justice/intercultural SL, (c) challenges and failures in social justice/intercultural SL, (d) context and support for social justice/intercultural SL, and (e) programmatic and pedagogical recommendations for social justice/intercultural SL.

"Social Justice" Use in Service Learning

This section discusses how participants used the language of "social justice" within the context of SL. This theme included the kinds of SL projects that participants described as being informed by social justice, and or intercultural communication. Participants additionally disclosed what informed their approach to projects related to SL, be they personal experiences and commitments, scholarship, professional experiences, pandemic issues, and the institutional context. We were interested to know the various factors that influenced how instructors think about designing a project that aims to address the goals of social justice as they understood them.

The code "social justice" use was applied to moments when participants noted or explained how "social justice" and social justice frameworks were being used in their TPC courses, programs, and institutions more broadly and specifically in SL contexts. As stated earlier, we based our definition of social justice on the work of Jones and Walton (2018) to "amplify the agency of oppressed people" (p. 241). This is the definition we provided participants so that when we mentioned social justice, we had a shared understanding of the term. We proceeded with the belief that coding for specific usages of "social justice" among participants would usefully provide us with a sense of how the concept and language of social justice was actually being applied in TPC programs, projects, and SL courses. In brief, we found that: (a) conceptions and applications of social justice frameworks in SL were informed by institutional commitments that occasionally changed over time, (b) efforts to do social justice work in SL are at times challenged by larger state political climates, (c) social justice efforts within SL contexts can be rooted in efforts to impact material flows of resources as well as student dispositions, and (d) the scope of social justice can be a complicated question.

When asked about what SL, community engagement, and social justice means within the context of their TPC programs, we found that there is, not surprisingly,

variation in institutional and programmatic social justice commitments. Several participants described how social justice was either embedded—or largely absent from—the fabric of either their university or their TPC program and programmatic goals, which impacted their ability to incorporate social justice-informed SL. At times, social justice was “just threaded throughout all of the classes in our curriculum.” Moreover, how social justice is embedded within institutions changes over time; one participant shared:

I think the social justice focus has become much more explicit over my last 10 years and teaching in [my] institution. And I think for a variety of reasons, both what has shaped the world in the last decade, but also those experiences within the classroom with students who are grappling with issues. So just the question of connecting it to social justice feels like it's both been latent but making it much more explicit for students.

In short, this participant described how their institution’s commitment to social justice became more explicit over time, illustrating how much shared commitments to social justice between instructor or individual and the larger unit can impact the application of social justice pedagogies in SL, as well as in the teaching of TPC courses broadly. Such efforts are at times tied to and supported by the mission of an institution, and there is occasionally a disconnect between an instructor’s pedagogical attention to social justice and the larger program’s commitment to social justice—both of which may impact the degree to which such approaches are applied in the teaching of SL. Because social justice frameworks center the oppressed, SL efforts informed by this approach can strategically foreground the lived experiences and everyday lives of the communities who engage in such partnerships, with a goal to bring about material change. From this centering, a shared language and understanding can lead to coalition building.

Another participant shared that their institution’s mission helps them do social justice work, noting:

Our mission is in the De La Salle tradition, which is Catholic. Teaching communities and the whole person are part of the kind of key features of the De La Salle mission. So, there is an inherent social justice element. And we are also a DACA [Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals] school. So, we have a really interesting and diverse student population.

This participant’s acknowledgment of the presence of undocumented students brings into focus the need to address issues that concern such students—issues of justice and of intercultural communication. That, coupled with the university’s mission that “responds to the needs of the disadvantaged” means that centering social justice would be in keeping with the mission and vision of the institution. To

promote social action, SL projects can prompt intercultural discussions in which minoritized students can freely discuss the unique challenges they encounter. In turn, these forums become educational and can result in the kinds of support structures these students need in the form of mentorship, the development of culturally responsive pedagogy, and even advocacy.

While social justice was easier to implement for some because of programming and even their school's stated mission, other participants noted some of the real challenges connecting to social justice in their learning environment. One participant said, "we're in a state where currently the university is kind of being targeted as a political pawn in the governor's race, and critical race theory." Another participant noted that their program was still working to understand how to implement social justice practices across the program: "As for social justice and intercultural communication, I think it's striking to me that we all, a bunch of us, are interested in doing it. We do it in our classrooms, but I don't know that it's happening programmatically." In many ways, the situation described here is rather common in social justice and intercultural communication pedagogy as it is in SL pedagogy, as it can be easier and quicker to implement things at an individual level than at a larger-scale programmatic level. In addition, we note that this participant specifically reinforced intercultural communication as a topic that is perhaps integral yet distinct from social justice.

In addition to institutional commitments, one participant who had maintained deep ties with their home community described their overarching goal and vision for doing social justice work in SL as being focused on "divert[ing] university resources toward my people." This reparative disposition toward SL for social justice that focuses on the flow of material resources was the most explicit yet, and it demonstrates a compelling approach for amplifying the agency of the oppressed. In other words, SL is often imagined in ways that divide communities from the postsecondary institutions within which many of us work; however, culture comes with all of us. This statement from the participant reflects their positionality, their ties to their community, and shows how that rootedness results in a commitment that goes beyond fulfilling academic and pedagogical tasks. Still, the participant acknowledged that the ability to do this kind of social justice work is contingent on institutional position, access to resources, and one's position in the academic power structure. Graduate students often have less power and fewer resources compared to tenure-track faculty members who may have start-up or other research funds from which to draw. Still, this participant's response displays a robust understanding of the ways in which SL projects further reify inequities outside the academy, as well as an approach for resisting this tendency. It also demonstrates the complexity of doing meaningful social justice-informed SL, given its dependence on resources that faculty alone may not be able to access.

At least one participant also spoke about social justice in terms of affecting student values and commitments. They suggest that social justice in SL is “a way of engaging students with the broader world and trying to show them that they can use their gifts, talents, but particularly their skills that they’re developing at college, in different ways.” In this way, participants show how the language of social justice gets used for not only attending to the material flows of resources but also in terms of impacting embodied, individual values, dispositions, and commitments toward a socially-just mindset. There are documented cases of students supporting communities through translation to address linguistic injustices and in creating multimodal texts for access and portability (Gonzales, 2018). Actions that are deliberately inclusive can help individuals understand the work that they do as important and may engender trust across SL partnerships.

Finally, another participant noted a felt tension when it comes to the scope of social justice work, stating, “There is an interesting break between the international emphasis and the local” when we talk about social justice. This comment was interesting to us as it suggests how social justice is taken up and imagined can vary in terms of scope, distance, and in terms of the relationship between those affiliated with postsecondary institutions and the local and international communities who may be impacted by particular social justice issues and commitment. In some ways, this local/international tension reflects similar tensions in conversations about intercultural communication. Importantly, there seems to be an underlying suggestion that these questions of scope in discussions of social justice are perhaps politically and culturally complicated, as reflected by white saviorism tendencies that look to “fix” or “help” with problems “over there,” as opposed to addressing injustices within our own backyards and in which we might feel more apparently implicated. Notably, as we learn from Agboka (2014), faculty can position community partners as participants in the project of learning and not merely as recipients of service. This would help to dispense with the savior ethos.

Activities, Strategies, Practices for Developing Social Justice/Intercultural Service-Learning

This section describes the code “activities, strategies, practices for addressing or designing social justice/intercultural SL projects.” This code refers to moments when participants described intentionally designed assignments, lessons, projects, and curricula to address social justice and intercultural learning within their SL projects and programs. It also includes approaches and actions taken in the process of project development and implementation. For example, one participant explained that what “we are teaching should be problem-based, should be rooted in the community, should be to solve problems because problems aren't solved just theoretically, they have to be solved with people.” Additionally, another participant

echoed this need while discussing conceptual ways to do so, through a focus on location and modality:

we have to expand the rhetorical triangle to be more three-dimensional reader-writer, text, location and modality. Modality is technology or distribution. And location can be working in a community, seeing what the community's needs are, or issues of inclusion and trying to figure out what we have not been looking for with just reader, writer and text.

For both of these participants, there is a clear notion that social justice and intercultural-informed SL projects are built from community needs, to address problems that community members are facing. In addition, these responses speak to pedagogy, theory, and practice. The participants allude to the preparatory work they do in order to facilitate student learning in SL projects. Participants also point to the need to expand our theoretical understanding of the rhetorical triangle to intersect with community, service, and social justice. Because SL projects are designed to meet specific community needs at a given time, their design might be iterative from initializing, assessing, before integration into a larger curriculum. As this was a multisite study comprising faculty from multiple institutions across the country, we noted how drawing attention to local concerns is critical as it enables to more targeted ways of working with communities. Community needs vary from location to location, and it is those community needs upon which structured interactions of SL are constructed.

In addition to approaches for developing the goals and purposes of social justice and intercultural-informed SL projects, at least one participant noted methods that they used to connect and maintain relationships across students and community partners:

In any of the client or community projects that I work, we have a pretty locked down structure of the students communicating with the clients and I get cc'd and also I am surveying the clients at the midpoint and at the end point of how it's going.

This participant aptly highlights the need to facilitate, guide, and manage student communication with community partners in social justice and intercultural informed SL. We surmise that this is perhaps because of the cultural, material, and embodied differences that exist across students and community partners, and thus a way that the participant is instantiating intercultural communication theory. The need for evaluation and checking in with both students and community partners during the process is what helped one participant understand the power of reflection throughout the teaching process. As studies have shown, SL in itself is

not inherently valuable as a pedagogical approach until it is paired with student reflection on their experience (Turnley, 2007). As one participant put it:

I know that these relationships have to be reciprocal, like students have to benefit and the organizations have to benefit. But I have tilted more to the students who have to benefit, they have to benefit right now. And I hope we can support the organizations, but I really set up the expectations with them is that... And I'm working with undergrads, many of them it's their first experience having any kind of professional relationship with somebody, because they're early undergrads. And so really having to tilt towards, let's make sure that these students are feeling safe enough to be able to have these experiences in a productive way.

This privileging of students—even if they are undergrads who are new to SL—in relation to community partners may be one of the balances we have to strike in order for both students and communities to benefit from SL as a reciprocal relationship. To make headway, care must be taken at the curriculum design stage to recognize community partners as integral to SL learning outcomes. If benefits of a reciprocal nature accrue to communities, we lessen the possibility of reinforcing existing gown/town power differentials. This issue may be alleviated through institutionally-supported professional development opportunities for instructors who are interested in creating pedagogical innovations related to community outreach.

Professional development would help instructors cultivate the kinds of expertise that students need, especially as understanding and negotiating student abilities and skillsets in light of community needs can be difficult to work through:

I found it really hard to work with students where they don't have any expertise, even if I'm trying to teach them the expertise alongside the class ... I've had a lot of problems, a lot of challenges I should say. They already can dig into centering their own experiences and knowledge that they already have and positioning it as valuable to the project and then giving them some tools and skills along the way to bring that out.

We would offer that instructors teaching SL must juggle student learning, community needs, and the kinds of expertise students *do* have in ways that fit larger course and curricular goals. Given its dependence on a reciprocal institutional-community partnership, SL projects require a mutually beneficial approach, particularly if social justice is to result from them. This participant offers an important reminder of the challenges of maintaining such an approach, and the potential need for institutional support to ensure that SL projects go as smoothly as possible and SL arrangements are just.

The study participants noted how, in working with students, they try to help students understand the connections between the activity and their own personal lives. In terms of specific approaches, one participant said, "So in my project, I act as coach. That's what I say, 'I'm your coach for the class. I'm your mentor and your coach.'" Such a positioning allows the students to "bring their own experience and knowledge" into the work they are doing. While courses are semester or quarter-long, depending on the institution, this duration may limit how much work a given class can undertake to satisfy both students and communities.

In terms of connecting social justice to classroom dynamics, a participant offered that they tried to be strategic in engaging these topics:

...strategic not just about managing our white students' lack of understanding or concerns, but also, and particularly ... students of color in classrooms. The danger is not only that we activate some anxiety from white students, but then we force students who represent the groups that we would be talking about in a lot of social justice conversations, whether they're queer or Black or Latino, or whatever, they'd be forced to be representations.

This point is really a conundrum in our society at large, where discussing issues of inequity gets one branded as having a "victim mentality" while ignoring them means one is "not woke." Either way, an educational institution should be the place to broach such issues critically and without fear of recrimination, and intercultural communication can potentially be a useful approach for doing so. Subjects like these should be integrated into learning outcomes and course materials to make learning about them more structured and planned. However, as Agboka (2014) cautions, the institutional ethos within which SL projects are designed ought to be interrogated, given its invariable impact on the outcome (p. 302). The balance that this participant noted helps underscore just why intentional practices with inclusive structures are needed to run successful programs.

Challenges and "Failures" in Social Justice/Intercultural SL

With all of the positive aspects to infusing social justice and intercultural communicative practices and projects, participants also lamented the struggles that they had encountered personally and professionally. This code was particularly useful for reimagining more supportive and just infrastructures for teaching and administering SL programs. As researchers, we were prompted to critically consider the nature of support for doing this work, including in terms of building and initiating community partnerships from the start. Christine M. Hammond (1994) found that most faculty who engage in SL were motivated by student learning outcomes as well as fostering student understanding of the course content. For faculty who want to promote analytical and problem-solving skills, i.e., achieve

concrete outcomes, there is little room on the syllabus for the needs of community partners, much less social justice—unless it’s a core learning outcome of the course.

A few participants reported “scaled down” versions of SL projects after having been burned by more ambitious projects, as well as staying away from certain topics that might be difficult to address given the context within which they were working. Others wondered about having access to resources from grants, for instance, and how those can be “funneled back into communities” so that these communities are left a little better off at the end of the project. The nature of challenges participants expressed frequently had to do with resources, both material and human, as the enterprise was found to be “energy depleting” given the preparatory and ongoing work that goes into running SL projects and maintaining strong and ongoing relationships with community partners. There was also lack of institutional and programmatic support and, in one case, “sabotage.” As well, concerns of “colonizing” when it comes to working with rural communities coupled with the perception of “pandering” when instructors attempt to immerse themselves in cultural knowledge were voiced. This, coupled with the fear that SL ventures might be disruptive to communities who now have to make room to accommodate institutional requests, can limit the kinds of interactions that social justice and intercultural-infused SL entails. We understood all of these to be legitimate concerns, and they provide the field further insight into doing this work.

Moreover, as one participant noted, there is an “inherent capitalistic nature of technical professional writing” that, particularly when coupled with student expectations, makes it hard to do social justice and intercultural-informed SL work in the first place. They expressed, “students [were] basically saying like, I’m not sure if this is business writing. Like, why are we doing this stuff?” Such questioning can deter some faculty from taking on the kind of innovative curriculum that requires student buy-in without being penalized for it by way of student evaluations. Explaining this mismatch becomes an added responsibility instructors may have to take on in their annual reflection. These circumstances can be avoided if SL and social justice are part of the department or program’s stated values. This need is relevant to SL curricula situated within TPC-focused departments, as well as TPC programs or coursework in non-TPC departments where technical communication and writing is taught.

Noting that some students may not be as open to learning about the topic raises even more questions about audience readiness and the type of background work that instructors may need to prepare in order to best tackle the topics in classes. As a participant shared, “we were doing stuff like social media proposals and infographics instead of, I don't know, whatever else business students expect to

happen in a professional communications class.” This point speaks to the necessity of managing student expectations, and helping students to recognize how social justice and intercultural communication work is important for them to study in TPC or even in a business class for that matter. One way to contend with this complexity is to engage students’ positionalities via the communities they wish to engage by examining examples of small local businesses in the community. Doing so enables an interrogation of the inherent power asymmetries between students and communities and might activate a sense of engagement with the community in ways that motivate social change. The participant also brought up the need for more opportunities to discuss pedagogy amongst fellow colleagues to advance these conversations, especially in a department where there are different specialties such as in literacy and composition studies in addition to TPC.

In discussing how to connect social justice conversations in a virtual setting, one participant offered that they have had little success operating in that environment. For another participant, they had yet to do any social justice work because as they explained, “I don't want to come at it from a colonizing viewpoint. There's a little bit of that savior, ‘We're bringing you good things,’ and that's not always wanted and not a good way to approach the work.” This participant brings up a good point with the need to strike a delicate balance to avoid falling into a superiority complex. The participant highlights the need for meaningful approaches that are reciprocal and respectful of communities as partners rather than mere recipients of aid. If community partners are seen as integral to the project of SL and therefore indispensable to its success, this kind of fear can be mitigated. We learn from this interaction the need to structure SL as rooted in the relationships of all parties involved. The same participant noted how uneven buy-in across faculty ranks may be an issue contributing to the lack of programmatic social justice implementation, saying: “We are quite junior faculty heavy. So, there's a dynamic of trying to lead from below in the hierarchy.” Doing such work can be challenging for junior faculty without tenure given that the tone for programs is often set by more senior faculty whose viewpoints are frequently prioritized in review and promotion committees. That power dynamic may cause junior faculty to restrict their curriculum to “safe” topics that do not threaten to upend the social order nor rattle the hierarchy. Still, the participant strikes a hopeful tone, underscoring the need to press for programmatic changes when a faculty member is able to do so.

Context and Support for Social Justice/Intercultural SL

The “context, support, and other factors that influenced participants’ ability to do social justice/intercultural SL” code encapsulates the wide-ranging factors that impact SL—namely, student learning outcomes, faculty support, community partners, and the institution itself. The environment in which SL takes place is

critical as it often affects the material resources, actions, and support structures for developing and carrying out SL projects and curricula. Thus, this code speaks to participants' specific institutional, departmental, and community settings that affected their ability to most effectively and responsibly do social justice and intercultural SL. This code further provides us with an understanding of what kinds of structural supports exist and are effective for enabling social justice and intercultural SL.

Many of our participants made known just how social justice initiatives were threaded into their programs sharing, for instance, "we teach [students] about technical communication through a social justice lens, so it's just threaded throughout all of the classes in our curriculum." Thus, the support for programming is inherently provided for these faculty members. Others, however, did not have the same support in their institution contexts; one participant communicated:

My thoughts about participating in a focus group on service-learning and community engagement are that I'm hoping to learn something. I'm excited to hear about the ways other folks have done it. I feel like I've tried really hard to follow best practices, and I've been a little disappointed in some of the outcomes for my own classes, and so I've pulled back. And so I'm hoping that perhaps I can learn some things that will help me in my classes do a better job of specifically reciprocity. So I'm stoked about it.

Another participant made sure to highlight what it can feel like to work in such a context, particularly when coming from a program that did take on social justice as a mission and program goal. Specifically, they shared how acknowledging and declaring their practices brings a certain level of visibility to their classroom:

[social justice work was] something that I, as a student, was doing in these classes, but then also as now somebody that's on faculty and has a lot more power, it's funny, when I was a grad student, those choices didn't feel as radical, but as a faculty member in a program that doesn't say social justice is our thing, what we do is social justice, it feels like I am raising a flag of this is who I am, and I'm declaring an identity as a scholar in my own right.

Responses to questions in this category were mixed. A few participants spoke to faculty members' feelings of inexperience with SL and others to the material support available to do the work. There was hope that participating in this focus group would yield some lessons on best practices and result in ideas for how social justice and intercultural-focused SL can be approached. We recognize that the pedagogy of TPC emphasizes critical thinking so that we can generate knowledge out of rhetorical actions. We remain hopeful that SL, while "an emergent

pedagogy," can still help students engage in critical thinking (Turnley, 2007, p. 107).

Programmatic and Pedagogical Recommendations

Our rich focus group discussions provided space for instructors to imagine "programmatic and pedagogical recommendations for social justice/intercultural SL." This code offered us several insights for further improving SL projects, curricula, and programs with social justice and intercultural communication in mind. Here, participants attempted to grapple with the need and indeed desire to do this critical work weighted against the obstacles they had thus far encountered. Many participants saw in SL for social justice an issue of "problem versus capacity." To that end, participants suggested an expansion of reading lists in the curriculum that bring together learning outcomes and effects on community partners. That way, the activities designed within the SL project will be more consistent with expectations derived from that theoretical foundation. Moreover, learning outcomes that include the benefits of SL informed by social justice goals and intercultural communication theory and practice are critical. Indeed, one participant put it succinctly:

If your outcomes are racist, your systems are racist. So asking what the outcomes are and evaluating. Are they racist? Will this have implications for that? What we're planning to do, how we're planning to do it, how we're communicating it. And then the other question is or this is more of a statement, but it's when the experience of dominant groups is the baseline, there is no equity. So whose experience are we factoring into our decisions? And what is the relationship with equity?

By the same token, if learning outcomes are neutral on issues of race and racial inequality, the course might be exhibiting the kind of ivory tower criticism that has been labeled against institutions of higher learning for failure to intersect with the communities within which they are constructed. Worse, it may reinforce systems of discrimination and alienation.

Participants also considered flexibility a necessary component for doing this work. With flexibility, instructors might not feel constrained to check off all the items on their planning list while making it difficult to address contingencies as they arise. Furthermore, there was a call for protecting junior faculty who do this work and promoting self-advocacy so that faculty can speak out rather than cower and act in deference to senior faculty as this dynamic has the potential to perpetuate injustice. When it comes to students, suggestions ranged from developing a kind of heuristic that would enable students to tease out their expertise, strengths and skills. The goal here is to enable students to take ownership of these skills so they can be motivated to go out and do the work and take responsibility "for their own

learning.” As one participant put it, “we have to understand that people are much more important than the objectives that we're trying to get across in our classes. I think shifting that mentality is difficult, especially if you have a lot of students” Indeed, one participant offered:

One is by choosing community partners wisely. And this is a trial by fire I think in some ways of making some bad choices early on and being like, oh, I'm not going to do that again.

I'm thinking a lot more about monetary ways that we can play the system in order to actually foster material change.

This participant makes clear the importance of connecting with community partners who are open to learning about the particulars of the course and are willing to work with the faculty member to create a healthy balance where students are neither exploited nor exploitative. In addition to striking a solid working relationship, this participant notes a need for thinking about monetary contributions that could be sought in order to offer something else tangible for community partners besides the SL work that students may produce.

Our focus group findings lead us to posit that small, yet specific improvements have the potential to make a positive difference in how SL programs are positioned. For example, identifying a clear theme or thrust for SL programming helps to cement purpose and provides more traction for faculty, students, and community partners to work, since, as Butin (2015) shared, SL programming is often not part of curriculum since few faculty understand how to get started (p. 8). As noted in our “Challenges” section, many practitioners can feel overwhelmed and burned out because of a lack of steadiness and support. They can also feel like there is a disconnect between the classroom and community experiences. Our findings underscore the importance of infusing values consistent with social justice and intercultural communication throughout SL programs and curricula to both respect and ensure meaningful experiences for both community partners and students. SL courses that make use of TPC programmatic values that foreground social justice, intercultural communication, and context as major elements of programming, for instance, stand to have the foundation to help make useful strides for both students and community partners.

Additionally, by organizing our findings using five themes—social justice use, activities, challenges, context, and recommendations—we extrapolate the significance of faculty relationships with community partners, noting that a socially just and interculturally balanced SL program requires strong community relationships as well as having space for faculty to discuss SL in TPC. For the

former, as noted in our “recommendations” section, more than three participants talked about the need to liaise as best as possible with community partners so that their needs are understood and so that the faculty members have the chance to share their needs with students as well. This core understanding helps to build what can be a sustained relationship across semesters or quarters. With the latter, participants noted the need for spaces, like the focus group, to gain ideas and talk about their experiences. We gather that more research, workshops, and opportunities for faculty to talk about SL in TPC, especially as intersecting with ongoing conversations about social justice and intercultural communication in TPC, would be welcomed.

Zoom

Our zoom chats during the three focus group sessions were also sites that deserve attention in our discussion. We’ve chosen to include two chat interactions here as examples to highlight the power of making use of technology and discussion in real time. When asked “How did you begin or conceive of connecting service-learning projects in TPC with a slant toward social justice?” participants shared this using the chat feature:

Participant 1: I like using principles of andragogy, which is adult learning theory, and PBL (problem-based learning), and spend time with students determining problems they want to solve. We then think about the best strategies to solve them, which includes projects and artifact development.

Participant 2: 🙌 choose community partners wisely!

Participant 3: To me, that relationship makes the experience "real" and in a way, it's easier to ground the ethical, social, and the just when you have someone sitting across from you/in the same Zoom room.

Participant 1: I like to develop "internship agreement forms," which are individualized amendments to the syllabus, a contract negotiated by client and student, which helps forefront potential miscommunication

Participant 2: "the what" and "the who" 🙌

Participant 4: ^^Awesome!

Participant 2: Exactly—the relational aspect of it is key!

This exchange was insightful in that participants explicitly brought together their pedagogical approaches to SL and social justice with concrete activities, practices, as well as concerns. These examples could be construed to be primary teaching methods, given that participants shared them unprompted and are based on their individual pedagogical experiences.

Additionally, when asked about how they engage SL and social justice, several participants offered these points in the Zoom chat:

Participant 1: We have a large percentage of BIPOC students in our College of Engineering. Consequently, our classes have a good bit of diversity, though we are lower on international representation in more recent years (particularly in relation to COVID). We also have a university emphasis on Research that Reaches out, which aims to (eventually) place 95% of students in a service-learning opportunity related to their discipline, particularly in an international context by their senior year. While the university emphasizes international service learning and inter-cultural experiences, there are only a few opportunities for the same caliber of research-based or technical projects here in the local community.

Participant 2: I think helping the students understand the context of the client (in contrast with their own personal context as a TPC student) helps up front to alert them to be sensitive to the nuances going in and avoid jumping to conclusions—even when they've done research on the client ahead of time.

Participant 3: In my Community Engaged Learning certificate class, I had students utilize Assets Based Mapping to try to move them away from thinking through colonizing paradigms and deficit-based "needs."

A lot can be deduced from these impromptu chats. For one, a university that prioritizes international service creates conditions necessary for faculty to create programs and projects that bring students into these spaces, even if only metaphorically. Engaging students in these kinds of projects inevitably gets them to grapple with difference and intercultural issues in TPC, which might lead to close interactions with people who are different, including critical engagement with power structures by which they are circumscribed. Second, building in time for students to learn about the client promotes active learning, on a firsthand basis. Students not only gain knowledge but also understand the values and the vision of the client, which makes them better able to accurately represent and advocate on their behalf.

And finally, evoking the concept of “colonizing paradigms” is germane to the U.S. context within the discourse of critical pedagogy. Such a critical engagement with less “deficit-based” conceptions of community needs opens up the possibility to interrogate and resist power dominance and to develop a vocabulary of imagination in which the interests of service and justice can be served.

Conclusion and Implications

Our study demonstrates that faculty are grappling with questions of approaches, capacity, and expertise as they pertain to social justice in their classrooms. They are also at times operating under a cloud of political and ideological oversight that is opposed to mentions of (in)equality as patently un-American. In a climate such as this, we find ourselves as holders of disciplinary knowledge weighing between operating within a social justice framework that makes “social, institutional, and organizational change toward equity” (Haas and Eble, 2018, p. 4–5) and operating within highly politicized public climates in which we may be still figuring out how to best address systemic injustices perpetuated by TPC and not fall into the trap of its perceived neutrality. Ongoing issues of discriminatory practices and intercultural miscommunication demand that we critically engage and dismantle them in order to achieve some measure of social justice.

SL locates learning in spaces where students might exert institutional, personal, and social privilege. Acknowledging this possibility invites further analysis of what those spaces might look like long-term when more just structures are put in place. Indeed, helping students confront and grapple with privilege in the communities within which their learning occurs compels engagement with less structurally privileged communities, while presenting an uncomfortable but potentially necessary space that promotes critical analysis of systems of power. Further, questioning privilege can help students confront their broader obligations to the community and the unjust systems in which those communities subsist. Ultimately, SL and social justice is fraught with both vulnerability and complicity with power and privilege.

As well, TPC is about user-advocacy (Hart-Davidson, 2013; Jones, 2016) which renders its pedagogy a site of advocacy. As Jones (2016) argued, TPC scholars ought to “perceive their work as advocacy (broadly defined), promoting a more genuine and critical interrogation of how our work impacts the human experience (p. 309). On this score, we are fortunate that since its humanistic and social justice turns, TPC pedagogy has developed the language and tools to ensure that social justice is a core component of our curricula (see Agboka and Matveeva, 2018). Furthermore, as categories of TPC such as UX and design thinking have shown, instructors do not have to look too far to weave the strands of SL, social justice, and intercultural communication course content. As we engage in SL for social justice and as informed by intercultural communication, we can learn from community partners and their ways

of knowing to shape technical discourse in caring and compassionate ways (Agboka 2014). SL is best positioned to “amplify the agency of the ... under-resourced” communities with a view to supporting their ongoing efforts to restructure the material conditions that render them prime targets for SL opportunities in the first place.

With an intersection of social justice, intercultural communication, user-advocacy, and SL courses and programs, our research can inform TPC practices across teaching, learning, community, and departmental contexts. Not only did we prioritize a specific community of practice by choosing the focus group as a research method, but we also provided a space for practitioners to contend with the many ways that programs are doing well and also struggling to do the work of social justice and intercultural SL advocacy in their respective locations. With the more recent elimination of DEIA initiatives and other inclusive forms of engagement, TPC scholars, teachers, and practitioners could play a pivotal role in collaborating with the communities impacted by such directives to collectively develop a plan of action that is grounded in social justice and that centers university outreach for affecting material change at the same time that our students can gain deeper insights into how they can positively contribute to society.

This article focused on gaining insights into how social justice and intercultural approaches in TPC inform SL curricula and pedagogies in practice. In the course of our study, we recognized the need to highlight the importance of community representation within SL contexts. Our research pool was limited to TPC teachers and administrators, which limited our ability to interview either students who have been involved in such programming or the community members with whom such partnerships have been developed. Future research can examine this question of social justice and intercultural approaches to SL from the perspective of community partners and the students who engage with them. Finally, future research can further explore how intercultural communication pedagogies are designed and implemented in quasi-workplaces, and how these pedagogies equip students who have taken such courses to more easily navigate their future workplaces.

References

- Agboka, Godwin Y., & Matveeva, Natalia. (2018). *Citizenship and advocacy in technical communication: Scholarly and pedagogical perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Agboka, Godwin Y. (2014). Decolonial methodologies: Social justice perspectives in intercultural technical communication research. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 44(3), 297–327.
- Baniya, Sweta, Edwards, Jessica, Sano-Franchini, Jennifer, & Walwema, Josephine. (2022). Revisiting SL in TPC through social justice and intercultural frameworks: Findings from survey research. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 65(3), 353–369.
- Bell, Lee Anne. (2007). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (pp. 1–14). New York: Routledge.
- Bennett, Elaine. (2018). A simple, practical framework for organizing relationship-based reciprocity in service-learning experiences: Insights from anthropology. *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement*, 6(1), 1–15.
- Bocci, Melissa. (2015). Service-learning and white normativity: Racial representation in service-learning's historical narrative. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 22(1), 5–17.
- Bourelle, Tiffany. (2014). Adapting service-learning into the online technical communication classroom: A framework and model. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 23(4), 247–264, DOI: 10.1080/10572252.2014.941782
- Broad, Bob. (2003). *What we really value: Beyond rubrics in teaching and assessing writing*. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Butin, Dan W. (2010). *Service-learning in theory and practice: The future of community engagement in higher education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Butin, Dan. (2014). Dreaming of justice: Critical service-learning and the need to wake up. *Theory Into Practice*, 54(1), 5–10.

- Carter, Michael, Anson, Chris M., & Miller, Carolyn R. (2003). Assessing technical writing in institutional contexts: Using outcomes-based assessment for programmatic thinking. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 12(1), 101–114.
- Coppola, Nancy W., Elliot, Norbert, & Newsham, Faye, Postscript by Andrew Klobucar. (2016). Programmatic research: An interpretive framework for writing program assessment. *Programmatic Perspectives*, 8(2), 5–45.
- Chaube, Parul. (2020). Importance and challenges of international service-learning. *Purdue Journal of Service-Learning and International Engagement*, 7(1), 19–27.
- d’Arlach, Lucía, Sánchez, Bernadette, & Feuer, Rachel. (2009). Voices from the community: A case for reciprocity in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 16(1), 5–16.
- Delaine, David A., Redick, Sarah, Radhakrishnan, Dhinesh, Shermadou, Amena, McCormick Smith, Mandy, Kandakatla, Rohit, Wang, Linjue, Freitas, Claudio, Dalton, Casey L., Dostilio, Lina Dee, & DeBoer, Jennifer. (2024). A systematic literature review of reciprocity in engineering service-learning/community engagement. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 113(4), 838–871.
- Dubinsky, James M. (2002). Service-learning as a path to virtue: The ideal orator in professional communication. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 8, pp. 61–74.
- Gonzales, Laura. (2018). *Sites of translation: What multilinguals can teach us about digital writing and rhetoric*. University of Michigan Press.
- Haas, Angela M., & Eble, Michelle F. (2018). *Key theoretical frameworks: Teaching technical communication in the twenty-first century*. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Hammond, Christine M. (1994). Integrating service and academic study: Service-learning and faculty motivation in Michigan higher education. [Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Hart-Davidson, William. (2013). What are the work patterns of technical

- communication? In Johndan Johnson-Eilola and Stuart A. Selber (Eds.), *Solving Problems in Technical Communication* (pp. 50–71). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Huckin, Thomas N. (1997) Technical writing and community service. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 11(1), 49–59.
- Jones, Natasha N., & Walton, Rebecca. (2018). Using narratives to foster critical thinking about diversity and social justice. In Angela M. Haas & Michelle F. Eble (Eds.), *Key Theoretical Frameworks: Teaching Technical Communication in the Twenty-First Century* (pp. 241–267). University Press of Colorado.
- Jones, Natasha N. (2016). The technical communicator as advocate: Integrating a social justice approach in technical communication. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 46(3), 342–361.
- Lauer, Claire, Brumberger, Eva, & Beveridge, Aaron. (2018). Hand collecting and coding versus data-driven methods in technical and professional communication research. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 61(4), 389–408.
- Matthews, Catherine, & Zimmerman, Beverly B. (1999). Integrating service learning and technical communication: Benefits and challenges. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 8(4), 383–404.
- Mitchell, Tania D. (2015). Using a critical service-learning approach to facilitate civic identity development. *Theory Into Practice*, 54(1), 20–28.
- Mtawa, Ntimi, & Wilson-Strydom, Merridy. (2018). Community service learning: Pedagogy at the interface of poverty, inequality and privilege. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 19(2), 249–265.
- Nielsen, Danielle. (2016). Facilitating service learning in the online technical communication classroom. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 46(2), 236–256.
- Reynolds, Pamela. 2009. Community engagement: What's the difference between service learning, community service, and community-based research? *Journal of Physical Therapy Education*, 23(2), 3–9.
- Saavedra, Jean Abigail, Ruiz, Lizette, & Alcalá, Lucía. (2022). Critical service-

learning supports social justice and civic engagement orientations in college students. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 28(1), 1–27.

Sapp, David Alan, & Crabtree, Robbin D. (2002). A laboratory in citizenship: Service learning in the technical communication classroom. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 11(4), 411–432.

St.Amant, Kirk, England, Peter, Johnston, James, Killgore, Vanessa, Richardson, Natalie, & Siepert, Daniel. (2015). Annotated bibliography of academic program assessment. Technical Communication Body of Knowledge (TCBOK). Retrieved August 14, 2016, <http://www.tcbok.org/wiki/academic-programassessment>.

St.Amant, Kirk. (2021). Globalizing programmatic perspectives in pandemic contexts. *Programmatic Perspectives*, 12(2), 16–25.

Turnley, Melinda. (2007). Integrating critical approaches to technology and service-learning projects. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 16(1), 103–123.

Walton, Rebecca, Colton, Jared S., Wheatley-Boxx, Rikki, & Gurko, Krista. (2016). Social justice across the curriculum: Research-based course design. *Programmatic Perspectives*, 8(2), 119–141.

Walton, Rebecca, Moore, Kristen R., & Jones, Natasha N. (2019). *Technical communication after the social justice turn: Building coalitions for action* (1st ed.). New York: Routledge.

Acknowledgement

The research study described in this article was funded by a 2020 Council for Programs in Technical and Scientific Communication (CPTSC) Research Grant. The authors thank the CPTSC for their generous support.

Author Information

Josephine Walwema is with the English Department at the University of Washington, Seattle, where she coordinates the program in technical and professional communication.

Jennifer Sano-Franchini is the Gaziano Family Legacy Professor of Rhetoric and Writing Studies and an Associate Professor of English at West Virginia University.

Jessica R. Edwards is an Associate Professor of English and internship coordinator for the Department of English at the University of Delaware in Newark. β

Sweta Baniya is an Associate Professor of Rhetoric, Professional and Technical Writing at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.