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ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Recognizing the Range of Proficiencies Involved in Service-learning and Community Engagement Efforts: Standpoints from Facilitators in International Baccalaureate Organization High Schools in Kenya, Ethiopia, and South Africa

by

Sarah Ruth Lillo

Doctor of Philosophy in Education

University of California, Los Angeles, 2016

Professor Edith S. Omwami, Chair

Schools are increasingly tasked with the cultivation of global citizenship in their students. This is especially the case in international schools and in International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) contexts, as both institutions tend to stress ideals of global-mindedness and engaged participation in communities. Rhetoric hailing service-learning pedagogies abounds in these settings, and yet educators and students that try to organize community engagement efforts often face a host of challenges. This disconnect, between rhetoric and practice, is one that teachers and institutions alike seem interested in narrowing. Accordingly, this study focuses on pragmatic elements that can support and promote community engagement efforts.

This study is based on six months of fieldwork in three international IBO high schools that were recognized in the African region for their developed service-learning
programs: the International School of Kenya, the International Community School of Addis Ababa, and the American International School of Johannesburg. Through document analysis, interviews, surveys, and participant observation, I focused on the perceptions of facilitators within these settings. As I explored facilitators’ standpoints, the follow questions guided my inquiry: 1) How do teachers and students perceive community engagement? 2) What are the perceived barriers to community engagement? 3) How do school communities approach these barriers? 4) What are the perceived supports that enable or promote community engagement? 5) How do school communities approach these supports? Ultimately, I was interested in understanding the pragmatics of service-learning efforts and on identifying strategies that might support their development.

Across all three settings, facilitators consistently alluded to a wide range of skills and understandings involved in community engagement efforts. This dissertation argues that projects are enhanced when team members develop proficiencies related to the following domains of knowledge: service-learning pedagogy, global issues awareness, familiarity with the school context, familiarity with the local context, leadership/organizational development, and communication/public relations. By recognizing the wide scope of competencies involved service-learning efforts, teams can be attentive to their collective proficiencies. They can solicit experts and refine skills in each respective area.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

My Journey to this Project

Qualitative research is always perceived from a particular vantage; my personal experiences and values undoubtedly shape my aims, approaches, and even my findings. Countless methodologists and theorists have recognized the impact of a researcher’s positionality and the need for investigators to critically reflect upon it (Borer & Fontana, 2012; Denzin & Giardina, 2009; Gubrium & Holstein, 2012; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Merriam, 2009; Schostak, 2006; Spradley, 1979b; Yow, 2014). Therefore, as it is the lens through which my entire project is viewed, let me begin with my story.

As long as I can remember, I have been passionate about people, about justice, and about social responsibility. Elements of my youth certainly contributed: the Christian home that I was raised in, the humanitarian nature of both my parents’ jobs, the responsibility that I felt as an older sibling, my grandparents’ stories and endless generosity, the ethnic diversity I was surrounded by in San Jose, my early involvement in community service, my socially minded and liberal friends, and my innate interest in different life stories. My collegiate years also contributed to my worldview—I taught part time in Nashville public schools, met friends from all over the United States, adopted a counter-normative teaching pedagogy, had my first tastes of international travel, and gained a deeper commitment to global responsibility as I became better versed in world happenings. I joined the full time teaching profession with a deep conviction that education changes lives and has the power to promote global social justice.

Upon completion of my Master’s degree, I was attracted to international schools—Independent schools that seemed to have progressive mission statements,
international curriculum, and students from all over the world. In 2007, I started teaching high school literature at Taejon Christian International School, an International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) school in Daejeon, South Korea. At that school, many of my students were ethnically Korean, though nearly all had lived in multiple countries. Their parents were typically missionaries, business owners, professors, or other professionals. In 2010, I transitioned to the International School of Uganda, an IBO school in Kampala, Uganda. There, my students hailed from all over Africa, Europe, North America, Australia, and Asia; most had lived in four or more countries by the time they entered high school. Their parents were often diplomats, non-governmental organization workers, missionaries, medical providers, multi-national business affiliates, or affluent local professionals. My students’ distinctive, globally mobile childhoods resulted in unique skills; for example, their exposure to diversity was reflected in their extraordinary levels of empathy and high intercultural communication skills. At the same time, I noticed that many felt detached from communities or geographic space beyond the school bubble. As someone deeply dedicated to global responsibility, I wanted to reduce this disconnect.

This led me to become deeply invested in community engagement efforts, both through the curriculum and in extracurricular offerings. I integrated service-learning into my own teaching and also mentored other teachers that wished to do so. I ran an array of service groups in both Korea and Uganda. In Uganda, I spent considerable time mentoring young leaders. Each year, I took teams of rising student leaders to regional Global Issues Service Summits (GISS), where they met passionate community-oriented teens from other international schools across Africa. In these gatherings, students
connected to one another, swapped strategies, and gained inspiration from one another’s struggles.

I, too, found such connections with like-minded individuals to be invaluable, and this research endeavor was born directly out of these encounters. While our students met, the chaperones also exchanged stories. There were several emerging themes in our discussions. First, we all were deeply passionate about global issues. We all had different sources of inspiration; for example, my fervor for women’s empowerment was sparked by personal relationships with trafficked children in the Philippines, former sex workers in Thailand, and single mothers in Uganda who lacked access to education. Other people were more personally engaged in issues around environmental concerns, inter-racial tensions, LGBT rights, or rural education access. Despite our varied passions and stories, all of us seemed to share a vision for an education that encourages teens to care deeply about regional and global issues.

A second common theme in our discussions was a common sense of struggle. Most of us worked in IBO schools that explicitly hailed global citizenship and community engagement. Yet, our efforts to promote programs that addressed these aims often faced overt or subtle resistance. We found the process of building, sustaining, and promoting community engagement opportunities on our respective campuses to be both exhausting and laborious. We all cared deeply about global engagement, and our respective institutions did too, at least rhetorically, but challenges to actualizing community engagement abounded.

A third emerging theme served, in many ways, as this project’s commission—there was a deep craving amongst these educators to understand each other’s experiences
and efforts. On our individual campuses, we often felt alone in our endeavors, especially in light of the challenges we faced. However, it was always clear at the service summits that passionate like-minded educators existed—they were just geographically far away. At dinner one night, a group of service-learning educators collectively envisioned this research project. My dissertation research project evolved from its initial conception, but still retained a focus on the concerns expressed by this team of educators.

While collecting data, I worked closely with some of the very same individuals who were part of my “commissioning.” I also met many like-minded individuals—both faculty and students. Their collective passion, struggles, and encouragement reinforced my dedication to this work. I feel a deep sense of respect for and loyalty to these educators and student leaders. I hope that the findings of this study support their efforts and are beneficial to their aims.

**Statement of the Problem**

While international schools around the world can be quite varied in nature (Hayden, 2006), a large number offer the International Baccalaureate Organization’s curricula (Hill, 2002). Both the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) and the international schools that teach IBO curricula explicitly hail global citizenship, service-learning, and community involvement in their guiding documents, on their webpages, and in their publications (Roberts, 2009).

Despite such lofty intents, community engagement efforts are often far less central than the institutions claim and the rhetoric is extremely difficult for teachers or student leaders to put into practice. The gap between ideal and praxis has been alluded to
in the literature on international schools. Blandford and Shaw (2001), for example, referenced a disconnect that can occur between school visions and the realities of what are taught. Hayden (2006) described tensions between “pragmatism” and “ideology” in numerous aspects of international schools and alluded to the role of schools’ curricular choices (p. 138). Catling (2001) discussed the dissonance between intended curriculum and received curriculum. Regardless of the terminology that authors used, there seems a recognition that there can be disconnects between the ideological aims and the practice of these goals. These are gaps that teachers, schools, and the IBO alike seem invested in reducing.

Through this study, I explored the strategies that educators and student leaders on three campuses used to reduce the gap between community engagement ideals and practice. As I did so, it became clear that these facilitators drew on a wide range of understandings. There were far more skills and understandings involved in efforts than the literature typically acknowledged. Individual facilitators had strengths in particular areas and teams benefitted from these strengths. At the same time, they depended on the collective expertise of their members across domains. In my analysis chapters, I offer a framework for understanding these diverse areas of understanding. It seems that such a structure can help teams structure their reflections and refine their efforts with intentionality.

Rationale

With its pragmatic focus, this study is intended to benefit several different groups including international school communities and the IBO. It also speaks to broader
educational challenges including the implementation of educational initiatives and to
globalized education.

**Significance for International Schools and Their Immediate Communities**

This study focused specifically on efforts within international school contexts. It
should be noted that the concept of an “international school” is somewhat muddled. As
Hayden and Thompson (2013) explained, the term *international school* is an unregulated
descriptor. Some use it to refer to “Type A” “traditional” international schools, whose
“*raison d’être* is to support the expatriate community of their city or wider region” (p. 6).
It can also refer to the less common “Type B” “ideological” international schools, in
which “an ideology is their primary *raison d’être*” (p. 6). Finally, the term also describes
a third, more recent category of international school: “‘Type C’ ‘non-traditional’”
international schools. These schools have “arguably only really emerged since the late
twentieth century, as investors and entrepreneurs have identified a market in national
economic elites who perceive international schools as providing a form of education
superior to that available in their own national system” (p. 7). While this study focused
primarily on the first category, traditional international schools, all three types of schools
have ideological components that emphasize international mindedness and global
citizenship. Accordingly, this study’s focus on service-learning and community
engagement efforts has implications for all three categories of international schools. With
over 3.5 million students in 7,000 English-medium international schools worldwide
(International School Consultancy Group, 2014) and an estimated student enrollment of 6
million by 2022 (International School Consultancy Group, 2012), this is no small
population to consider. This study is all the more important because, as Hayden (2006) suggested, research on international schools is relatively thin.

Rhetoric in many traditional international schools promotes strong community ties, despite the highly transient populations that fill the school settings (see Chapter Three for more details on international school community membership). Thus, it seems that they would be highly interested in any practical strategies for reaching their ideological aims. This seems especially true in the African region. Recently, the Association of International Schools in Africa (AISA) created a service-learning task force to explore this very issue. In informal communications, a member of AISA leadership directly articulated considerable interest in the findings of my study and the potential benefit of this research for the service-learning task force. Accordingly, the timing and geographic centering of this study are especially pertinent.

By deconstructing the pragmatics involved in service-learning facilitation, this dissertation can inform schools’ service-learning teams as they refine their community engagement efforts. As schools develop their efforts, this study could in turn positively impact international school students. In subsequent chapters, I detail many benefits of service-learning, but it seems important to note at this stage that these are of especial consequence to students in traditional international schools. For example, globally mobile students often have an especially difficult time making attachments or getting involved in the communities in which they dwell, partially as a result of their constant mobility (Hayden & Thompson, 2013). There is often a sizable economic disparity between students and the local community, another factor that often makes genuine engagement challenging. Yet, this is a byproduct of neoliberalism and globalization that must be
minimized in order to promote a more just world. If schools were better equipped to help students cultivate relationships with the local community, perhaps some of the profound disconnects across people could be reduced.

Implicit in these claims, is a belief in the value of global-mindedness. There is considerable research that has pointed to the potential benefits for those involved in service-learning, including expanded world views (see Chapter Two for a detailed exploration of these benefits). From a psychological perspective, adolescence is a particularly crucial time in an individuals’ development; one’s experiences and the resulting memories are likely to stick with that person for life (Pollock, Van Ruth, & Van Reken, 2009). As Wray-Lake and Syvertsen (2011) have argued, adolescence is also an important period for moral and character development. Accordingly, it seems of especial interest that schools focus on the cultivation of global compassion and responsibility in youth. This is all the more pressing in international schools, where students are projected to fill roles with substantial global impact. For instance, they are more likely than other youth to take jobs in international businesses, governmental positions, or international relations (Pollock et al., 2009). If we want these individuals to develop worldviews that are mindful of the varied communities that their future roles will impact, it is of utmost importance that we cultivate deeper community awareness.

Similarly, psychological research has correlated economic privilege, a common attribute of international school students, with increased unethical behavior (Piff, Stancato, Cote, Mendoza-Denton, & Keltner, 2011). Yet Piff et al. (2011) have discovered that this is not necessarily a fixed state; rather, they have pointed to the contagious nature of pro-social thought and to an individuals’ heightened commitment to
pro-social behavior with exposure to such values. A related study found that rich study participants could be easily influenced to become more compassionate (Piff, Kraus, Cote, Cheng, & Keltner, 2010). Participants demonstrated higher levels of pro-social behavior after watching a single video intended to elicit compassionate responses. Thus, if compassion and pro-sociability are malleable traits, it seems all the more integral to expose affluent students, who might naturally be inclined towards oppressive tendencies, to more pro-social patterns of behavior.

Additionally, it seems important to note that benefits of this research could extend to those situated beyond the school walls. Community engagement efforts can improve school-community bonds and impact local communities directly. Ideally, schools are able to foster reciprocal relationships that enable both the school community and the local community to support one another. As Bringle (2005) puts it, “high quality service-learning classes demonstrate reciprocity between the campus and the community, with each giving and receiving” (p. 168). This dissertation explicitly addresses this aim.

Significance for the IBO

Much like international schools, the IBO has an explicit focus on community engagement and service-learning. This focus seems to be increasingly emphasized, for example, with each new iteration of the Creativity, Activity, and Service guide there are more descriptions of the centrality of service-learning and more allusions to the related instruction that schools must provide (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2015b). Chapter Two explores IBO stances in greater detail. Presumably, with such a clear interest in students’ community involvement and with an ultimate goal to “create a better
world though education” (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2014d), the IBO would value understandings that help schools promote these aims.

By specifically choosing field sites that utilize the IBO’s curricula, I hope that the findings of this study may be applicable to other IBO sites as well. The IBO is taught in both international and national school settings, and has a wide stretch: as of February, 2016 there are 5,578 authorized programs offered in 4,335 schools around the world (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2016) to over 1.3 million students (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2015a). Despite the differences across these settings, the IBO curricular framework and ideology provides considerable consistency in structure and design. Accordingly, strategies may be especially transferable.

**Broader Significance**

While international schools and the IBO are especially ideological in their grounding and may be more overt in their community-orientation than some national schools, concerns about global citizenship development and global-mindedness are hardly restrained to those international institutions. As I will explore in Chapter Two, global citizenship is a pressing concern in today’s globalized world and schools are increasingly tasked with the role of cultivating global responsible global actors. Accordingly, studies such as this one are especially instrumental; this research begins to untangle the vague knot of discourse around community engagement and global civic duty.

In Chapter Two, I also consider larger trends and challenges in the implementation of educational policy and prescribed curricula. In an era of seemingly
constant educational reform initiatives, insight into the implementation process is certainly welcomed. By exploring ground-level implementation efforts surrounding service-learning initiatives, perhaps I will be able to draw larger conclusions relevant to other policy implementation.

**Dissertation Structure**

Following this introduction, Chapter Two overviews some of the key existing literature related to globalization, global citizenship education, the IBO, and community engagement pedagogies. Chapter Three outlines my theoretical framework and details my methods. Chapter Four describes the unique shape of community engagement efforts on each respective field site. I integrate findings and discussions in Chapters Five and Six. In Chapter Five, I describe the complexity of community engagement efforts and introduce a “domains of knowledge” framework as a way to recognize the diverse skills and understandings involved. In Chapter Six, I look deeply at one of these, service-learning pedagogy, in order to demonstrate the range of competencies involved in any given domain. Finally, in Chapter Seven, I discuss some of the broader implications of this research, acknowledge limitations, and suggest areas for further research.
CHAPTER TWO: CONTEXTUALIZING THE STUDY: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Globalization and the Rise of Global Citizenship Education

We live in an increasingly global era with a global economic market (Bowles, Edwards, & Roosevelt, 2005; A. Cabrera & Unruh, 2012), technological advances that minimize the limitations of geographic distances (A. Cabrera & Unruh, 2012), people and products that cross boundaries with increasing frequency (C. Suarez-Orozco, 2004; Visvanathan, Duggan, Wiegersma, & Nisonoff, 2011), and permeating neoliberal ideals (Torres, 1998). The scholarship on globalization is considerable; it spans across a wide range of disciplines ranging from the social sciences to the hard sciences. It should be noted, however, that these discussions have often yielded as much disagreement as convergence in thinking (M. Suarez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard, 2004). Many negative aspects of globalization have been highlighted. For instance, globalization has “aggravated existing economic injustice” (Noddings, 2005, p. 3). At the same time, others pointed to positive outcomes as well: “globalization is more than an economic, financial and technological process; it also challenges us to preserve and celebrate the rich intellectual and cultural diversity of humankind and civilization” (Roche, 2007, p. 34).

Discussions of globalization are clearly both divergent and multifaceted. My own study is interwoven into this complex globalized tapestry. The students I interacted with, for example, are often positioned as elite global nomads in part due to global capitalistic markets. At the same time, this study does not assume they are fixed in a globally
pressive position. Rather, it also explores the potentially positive of globalization as articulated by those such as Roche.

In line with scholars’ keen interest in globalization, global citizenship has also become a subject of much discussion. Yet, conversations around the definitions of global citizenship are just as divergent as debates around globalization. For example, some have framed global citizenship as good international citizenship and have emphasized the human rights component of global civic duty (L. Cabrera, 2010). Others have focused on economic interconnectedness that is implied by global citizenship:

A global citizen is committed to respecting the rights and dignity of all individuals who are affected by his or her business. A global citizen will work at creating true value for all parties involved in a business transaction rather than trying to exploit some for the benefit of others. (A. Cabrera & Unruh, 2012, p. 118)

Yet others have framed global citizenship as a blend of world cultures or as a blurred world culture. Heater (2002) discussed a cosmopolitan morality. Noddings (2005) positioned peace education and global citizenship as intimately intertwined. Similarly, Roche (2007), described a global conscious as “a reality, even a phenomenon, of the new age in which the planet has become our common home” (p. 30). Despite differences in global citizenship’s definition, there seems a broad concurrence amongst scholars that global citizenship is an important issue in today’s connected world (A. Cabrera & Unruh, 2012; Heater, 2002; Noddings, 2005).

This sentiment inevitably raises questions such as: Who is responsible for cultivating global citizenship? How should schools approach global civic ideals?
Citizenship development has regularly been assigned to schools. Schools have a long history of being used to disseminate values of nations, religious institutions, or dominant groups (Gardner, 2004; Omwami, 2014; Whitehead, 1981). Philosophers have consistently pointed to schools’ role in cultivating responsible citizens (Dewey, 1990, 2012; Wollstonecraft, 2012). Accordingly, it is not surprising that global citizenship has moved to the forefront of educational discourse (Goering & Henderson, 2012; Ibrahim, 2012; C. Suarez-Orozco, 2004; M. M. Suarez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard, 2004).

Yet, in a globalized context, the role of a responsible, active citizen is a muddled concept. For example, how do definitions of “citizenship” shift as boundaries between people and ideas become less rigid? Should citizens be invested in nation states, transnational issues, both? How does multiculturalism fit into this discussion, as globalization problematizes the very concept of cultural identity? As the agents slated with the task of cultivating global citizens, how should schools begin to address the needs of a globalized youth? These concerns, among others, begin to frame the contested backdrop for the International Baccalaureate Organization’s (IBO) decisions and program design.

The Curious Case of the IBO

As a program that is detached from any single nation’s agenda, the IBO offers a unique site for exploration of global citizenship education. The IBO does not have allegiances to any particular government and thus, attempts to address civics on a more global scale (Roberts, 2009). Such divergence from a national paradigm represents a fairly new endeavor (Richardson, 2008), making it all the more interesting. The IBO is an
ideologically oriented, non-profit, educational foundation that offers student-centered programs to over 1.3 million pre-K through secondary students (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2015a) and, as Drennen (2002) puts it, aims at “developing citizens of the world” (p. 57). It was one of the first educational organizations to emphasize global citizenship. A glance at two of the IBO’s central guiding documents demonstrates the pervasiveness of global citizenship rhetoric in its stated aims. For example, the IBO explicitly focuses on global understanding through its mission statement:

The IB aims to develop inquiring, knowledgeable and caring young people who help create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect. To this end the organization works with schools, governments and international organization to develop challenging programs of international education and rigorous assessment. These programmes encourage students across the world to become active, compassionate and lifelong learners who understand that other people, with their differences, can also be right. (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2014d)

While the term “global citizen” is not explicitly included above, the mission statement nonetheless reflects a particular ideology about what constitutes a responsible global citizen: a culturally sensitive, aware, and compassionate individual that actively contributes to the welfare of the world.

The Learner Profile, what the IBO itself refers to as their “mission statement translated into a set of learning outcomes for the 21st century” (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2014c), further clarifies the IBO’s aims and approaches. The
document opens with the following mantra: “the aim of all IB programmes is to develop internationally minded people who, recognizing their common humanity and shared guardianship of the planet, help to create a better and more peaceful world.” The IBO continues to articulate ten attributes that IB learners should strive to embody: inquirers, knowledgeable, thinkers, communicators, principled, open-minded, caring, risk-takers, balanced, and reflective. According to the IBO, these attributes “can help individuals and groups become responsible members of local, national and global communities” (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2014c). In this list and the subsequent framing of it, the centrality of global citizenship in the IBO’s vision is clearly inferred.

I will explore three aspects of the IBO’s ideology and approaches to global citizenship in greater detail: its heavy emphasis on global issues awareness and intercultural understanding, its curricular inclusion of both service-learning and traditional volunteerism, and its focus on critical thinking skills through active and engaged learning. All three of these ideals fit directly into larger discussions of civic development and all three relate to the various forms of community engagement that I will describe in Chapters Four, Five, and Six.

**IBO Position #1: Global Citizens Demonstrate Intercultural Understanding and Global Awareness**

As Drennen (2002) explains, the IBO is “unapologetically idealistic in believing that education can foster understanding among young people around the world” (p. 57). This dedication to intercultural understanding is reflected not only in their mission and learner profile, as previously mentioned, but also in the IBO’s curricular design. For
example, the IBO’s (2011a) Diploma Program (grades 11-12) literature guide detailed a significant world literature requirement in that curriculum. Through the requisite inclusion of varied texts, the IBO ensured that students are exposed to a wide range of global voices. While every subject guide differs, most include similar explicit references to multicultural content. Such curricular nuances ensure that students hear global perspectives and, accordingly, this encourages students to better understand the global community.

This emphasis on intercultural understanding and its role in global citizenship is regularly discussed in education literature. As C. Suarez-Orozco (2004) explains: “Preparing youth to navigate our multicultural world is essential to preparing them to be global citizens” (p. 198). Similarly, Gardner (2004), Schattle (2008), and Roberts (2009) all articulate the growing need for today’s citizens to learn to communicate and interact cross-culturally. Put slightly differently, Heater (2002) expresses students’ needs for global understanding in terms of both “comprehension and empathy” (p. 163). Thus, it is clear that the IBO is not alone in its interest in intercultural competencies for global citizenship’s sake.

The IBO’s investment in its students’ deep global understandings also includes a curricular focus on global issues, such as environmental and human rights concerns (Roberts, 2009). For example, the IBO’s (2014b) website includes a comprehensive “Global Engage” section that offers curricular resources for teachers to connect IB content to contemporary environmental issues. According to Hill (2002), an IBO expert, there are six key attributes of international education that the IBO’s curriculum directly addresses (emphasis added): a commitment to global social justice, an empathy for
others, a respect for diversity, a belief in the power of individuals to make a difference, an environmental concern, and a commitment to sustainable global development. Three of these directly relate to global issues awareness.

Again, the IBO’s tendency to correlate global awareness with global citizenship reflects larger trends in the literature. Drennen (2002), for example, explains the need for teachers to address global cooperation on transnational issues; in her words, there is an “awareness that many of the issues facing young people require collaborative global solutions” (p. 58). Similarly, quite a few scholars examine global citizenship education in its relation to environmental issues (Heater, 2002; Roberts, 2009; Schattle, 2008). As Ramirez, Suarez, and Meyer (2007) describe, there has been a growing focus on human rights education. Others point to the use of extracurricular offerings such as Model United Nations (MUN) groups to deepen students’ awareness of global justice enterprises (Garton, 2002). While it is not a part of the formal curriculum, many IB schools offer MUN or similar co-curricular activities. Again, it is clear that the IBO’s stances on the need for global awareness align with some of the best practices outlined in the literature.

IBO Position #2: Global Citizens are Involved in Local and Global Communities

As previously explored, the IBO’s rhetoric in its guiding documents elevates community involvement. This commitment is applied in several curricular design elements. For example, one could examine the secondary programs’ service-learning requirements. At the upper secondary level, as a portion of the Diploma Programme (DP) students must fulfill hefty Creativity, Activity, and Service (CAS) extracurricular requirements (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2015b). Through these, students
participate in regular service projects and reflect formally on these experiences. There is little formal accountability for DP teachers to integrate service-learning directly into the curriculum. Still, service-learning and volunteerism are clearly established components of the IB experience (Roberts, 2009). Activism for various global issues often fits into these practices as well, as students in international schools conceptualize “community” in both local and global terms. For instance, it is common for groups such as the Global Issues Network to encourage students to take ownership in various global issues endeavors ("Home," 2014). In all these requirements and efforts, it is implied that this regular direct involvement with the community promotes global citizenship. There is a considerable literature base that corroborates this assumption.

**Service-learning pedagogy**

Service-learning and volunteerism have regularly been connected with civic development, at least within a national context (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Goering & Henderson, 2012). Service-learning has been credited for fostering students’ tolerance, community-mindedness, and civic engagement (Butin, 2010; Cipolle, 2010; Colby, Erlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003; Eyler & Giles, 1999). The literature, which consistently attributes the pedagogy’s roots to both Dewey (1938) and Kolb (1984), hails service-learning’s counter-normative teaching strategies that move beyond what Friere (1993) calls the “banking system.” Instead of traditional teaching approaches, service-learning pedagogy compels students to get involved directly in communities and then critically reflect on the link between course content and these genuine community contexts (Jacoby, 2003b).
By intentionally providing students with educational experiences rooted in pupil engagement and discovery, much like those romanticized by Rousseau’s (1979) *Emile*, students are able to individually uncover their relations to their communities. It is assumed that this personal connection, in turn, promotes a deeper commitment to communities (Eyler & Giles, 1999). This assumption is supported by data that reflected a positive correlation between service-learning and long-term community involvement (Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999; Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000). Many other positive student outcomes have also been associated with the pedagogy including increased engagement in academics, both during undergraduate studies and beyond (Astin et al., 1999; Stelljes, 2008), a heightened sense of self-esteem (Eppler, Ironsmith, Dingle, & Errickson, 2011; Whittig & Hale, 2007), a refined sense of self gained through a values reflection process (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Yeh, 2010), openness to diversity and reduced negative stereotypes (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Henry, 2005 as cited by Butin, 2010), and higher levels of human rights awareness (Belisle & Sullivan, 2007). Teachers also describe better class discussions, higher levels of student engagement with material, and stronger teacher-student relationships (Hou, 2010). The positive impacts of service-learning on civic engagement have led groups such as Campus Compact to call for more widespread implementation in American classrooms (Campus Compact, 2014). In short, the IBO’s choice to utilize service-learning pedagogies reflects a common civic engagement tactic with a considerable research base in its favor.

I should note that not all service-learning necessarily results in the outcomes listed above. As Butin (2010) put it, “service-learning is never a singular, stable, or ultimately, controllable practice” (p. 4). There have been some warranted criticisms about the
varying degrees of rigor in service-learning programs (Butin, 2010; Eyler & Giles, 1999), weak research methods in service-learning studies (Butin, 2010; Keshen, Holland, & Moely, 2010), and the potential for service-learning projects to inadvertently reinforce issues of privilege (Butin, 2010; Vaccaro, 2011). Even so, it seems that research largely supports the use of service-learning pedagogy for the promotion of civic engagement, a central tenant of global citizenship.

**Traditional volunteerism**

There is also a body of research that suggests that volunteerism, or acts of service that are less directly attached to formal curriculum, may also help promote civic engagement and global-mindedness. For example, Astin et al. (1999) found in their longitudinal study that students with a pattern of volunteerism in high school were more than twice as likely to be regularly involved in service after high school. Primavera (1999), too, found long term social benefits of volunteerism. Likewise, Wilson and Musick’s (1999) article overviews a wide host of studies that correlate volunteerism with positive civic and personal development outcomes. This all bolsters the IBO’s promotion of volunteer efforts, suggesting that these may be cultivating pro-social patterns for life. Other researchers frame volunteerism more as an offshoot of civic engagement than a catalyst for it (Elisasoph, 2003); Putnam, as quoted by Dekker and Halman (2003), calls it “the syndrome of good citizenship and political involvement” (p. 10). Within all these examples, it seems quite clear that volunteerism is regularly associated with civic duty.

Yet this still does not put volunteerism above reproach. In the literature, for example, there is a strong preference for service-learning over traditional volunteerism,
partially because the former promotes more critical reflection (Eyler & Giles, 1999). There are also questions surrounding the savior mentality motivations that drive some volunteers (Butin, 2010). Despite these criticisms, volunteerism has long been associated as a civic action and sustained commitment to a particular field site can lead to some of the same outcomes as service-learning.

**Activism efforts**

Advocacy, while perhaps one of the more controversial approaches to community engagement, is also clearly affiliated with global citizenship. Advocacy, an often cited civic engagement skill, has been correlated with long-term investment in issues (Colby et al., 2003). There are some legitimate concerns about students’ involvements in advocacy efforts: the safety of involvement in volatile political contexts (Garton, 2002), the authority of students and the degree to which the desires and needs of those directly impacted are considered (Sandmann, Kliwer, Kim, & Omerikwa, 2010), and whether western conceptions of human rights are being imposed through humanitarian efforts (Kachur, 2008). These are valid concerns that are certainly pertinent considerations for educators who work with student advocates. Yet, I think it is important to recognize that education is always a political act (Dewey, 2012; Oyler, 2012; Rousseau, 1979; Torres, 1998). Broadly speaking, global activism/advocacy work encourages students to actively consider injustice and global needs. It fosters global responsibility and, accordingly, is included within the scope of this study.
**Blurred boundaries**

As I will explore in greater detail in Chapter Four, the lines between different forms of community engagement are quite blurry and divergently defined. While the three categories offered in this chapter (service-learning, traditional volunteerism, and advocacy) help delineate trends within different bodies of existing literature, they are not the way that either the IBO or study participants tended to describe community engagement efforts. Rather understandings of *service* and *service-learning* differed from person to person and from school to school. Each school interpreted the IBO’s call for service-learning slightly differently. Facilitators clumped activities under the umbrella *service-learning* that academics might categorize differently. Because of such divergent interpretations of related terminology, I intentionally approach *community engagement* broadly and allow participants to define their own pedagogies and approaches. I adopt the language of these facilitators even as terminology on sites differed from terminology in the existing literature.

**IBO Position #3: Global Citizens are Critical Thinkers and Life-long Learners**

The IBO includes a heavy emphasis on critical thinking skills. The Diploma Program requirements include a course called “Theory of Knowledge,” that asks students to pose epistemological questions across the disciplines (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2013). Likewise, assessment approaches reflect an emphasis on critical thinking. One of the six stated goals for assessment in the DP is to develop “critical thinking and reflective skills” (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2014a). While such curricular elements are not always explicitly linked to civic development, the IBO
mission statement and learner profile clearly suggest this connection. In both instances, the rhetoric pertaining to inquiry and life long learning is clearly framed around the IBO’s ideological aims. Thus, these skills are implicitly tied to active global citizenship.

This link between critical thinking and civic engagement also aligns with points raised by related scholars. For example, Suarez-Orozco and Qin-Hilliard (2004) emphasized the fact that critical thinking and life long learning are key attributes of an active citizen. Eyler and Giles (1999) also emphasized the relationship between critical thinking skills and individuals’ ability to act upon complex issues as they explained that thinking within a problem-solution framework is not enough. In their words:

Problems are complex and open ended; their solution creates new conditions and new problems. Such problems require, first and foremost, the ability to recognize that the problems are complicated and are embedded in a complex social context, the ability to evaluate conflicting information and expert views, and the understanding that there is no simple or definitive solution. (p. 16)

This explanation emphasizes that critical thinking skills are a central part of navigating contexts that are constantly evolving. In other words, as the world and its problems continually change, global citizens need critical thinking skills to approach community challenges.

In general, it seems that the IBO’s approaches again are consistent with suggestions being made by lead scholars in the field. While critical thinking skills and lifelong learning commitments may seem less overtly connected to community engagement than the prior two IBO stances explored above, both still contribute to long-term concern for communities and global civic potential.
Implementing Policy and Curricula: Challenges for Educational Reform.

Research suggests that the implementation of education policy or a prescribed curriculum is rarely as straightforward as it seems. Firstly, with the assignment of any sweeping education policy, the particular issues of any given locality are overshadowed by more global considerations. This concept pertains directly to service-learning initiatives within the global IBO span. Belisle and Sullivan (2007) for instance point to the nuanced context of each location, to the site-specific issues ranging from safety concerns to the cultivation of relationships with field partners. However, service-learning curriculum is hardly the only curriculum that requires nuanced school-level consideration. Scholars have regularly pointed to the challenges of implementing curriculum into diverse settings. For example, research on the science education reform, GLOBE, suggested that “localization” issues profoundly influence implementation success (Penuel, Fishman, Yamaguchi, & Gallagher, 2007).

Similarly, policy or curriculum is often designed with “big pictures” in mind; yet on the practical level these broad policies may have vastly different impacts than originally intended. In fact, a host of unintended consequences may in fact overshadow the initial lofty aims. The American No Child Left Behind initiative is a prime example of an idealistic and seemingly positive policy that, in actuality, resulted in a range of negative and unanticipated classroom-level consequences (Kovacs, 2011). Studies revealed that teachers support the policy’s underlying aims; however educators suggest that the law inadvertently decreases the quality of education for some children through its
incentives system (Murnane & Papay, 2010). This example highlights the importance of examining policy implementation at the “ground level.”

This need for classroom level investigation is also linked to another key policy implantation issue: the regular disconnect between policy makers and those individuals that directly implement these policies (McLaughlin, 1987). Policy intents get filtered and muddled between the design phase and the implementation phase as a result of both institutional and individual lenses (Wallace & Priestley, 2011). In their article, Marz and Kelchtermans (2013) also highlighted that teachers’ beliefs had a profound influence on their attitudes towards reforms and their interpretations of implementation. Relatedly, profound philosophical tensions made expected implementation more challenging.

Leadership theorists underscore the need for “buy in;” in other words, individuals must recognize the favorability of a particular effort for their own position (Kotter & Cohen, 2012; Kotter & Whitehead, 2010). This is especially true where training or material resources are limited and educators must make difficult decisions about which initiatives to prioritize (Penuel et al., 2007). Accordingly, studies have focused on the role of professional development in supporting teacher buy in and preparedness for reforms (Capps & Crawford, 2013; Penuel et al., 2007).

These larger tensions surrounding the policy-implementer gap surface as I examine the implementation of IBO curricula aims. For instance, the IBO’s articulated approaches tend to be both innovative and counter-normative. Butin (2010), for instance described the disruptive nature of service-learning, an instructional approach dictated by the IBO in its guiding documents. He explained, “Service learning is a strategy, specifically, a strategy of disturbance. By this I mean that service-learning challenges and
decenters our static and singular notions of teaching, learning, and research by moving against the grain of traditional practice” (p. 19). In this description, it is clear that the strategies that the IBO dictates are far from traditional. Considering that most western-trained educators were likely taught methods more consistent with what Freire (1993) describes as the banking method and that “it is much easier to teaching within the boundaries of normal” (Butin, 2010, p. 19), this raises questions about the training and resources that they have been provided to prepare them to teach in such counter-normative ways (Blumenfeld et al., 1991). Penuel et al. (2007) highlight that necessity of teachers to have sufficient background in both the content and pedagogy implicit in any educational reform effort. Without ample teacher training in the teaching of cognitive processes, implementation of innovative curricula reforms are far less likely to succeed, as seen in the case of an inquiry-based curriculum reform in Singapore (Kim, Tan, & Talaue, 2013). In short, attention must be paid to the strategies used to foster educators’ ability to carry out innovative educational approaches.
CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODS

Recognizing a Partial Picture, Seeking a Specific Standpoint

Community engagement in international schools is a topic that could be approached from a wide range of angles. For instance, the field could benefit from studies that offer evaluations of specific programs, perspectives of local community members on international schools’ efforts, philosophical considerations of neoliberal ideologies at play, or top-down explorations of the IBO’s intended outcomes and program design. Perhaps in future research, I will be able to delve into some of these important areas that undoubtedly influence the subject that I study.

Yet, as in all research endeavors, the scope of my project has limits; I must make critical choices about which perspectives to adopt—which partial pictures to bring into focus. In this study, I chose to zoom in on those individuals that directly implement programs: educators and students. I identify strategies specifically for them, and, accordingly, I assume that they are the optimum source of knowledge on the topic.

I turn to standpoint theory to help explain the potential insight that can be gained from the lived experiences of these individuals. The “logic of a standpoint” (Harding, 2004b, p. 216), which I will explore in this chapter, profoundly shaped my methods. By adopting this theoretical lens, I intentionally empower teachers and students.

Standpoint Theory

A Brief Overview

Standpoint theory is a feminist critical theory that arose in the 1970s and 1980s. Considered an epistemology, theory, methodology, and philosophy, standpoint theory is
primarily concerned with the creation of knowledge and the influence of power on this endeavor (Harding, 2004b). Standpoint thinking recognizes that all knowledge is constructed within social and political contexts (Haraway, 2004). Standpoint theorists argue that claims of objectivity, with their implied immunity to power or positionality, merely mask epistemic privilege (Harding, 1992). Rather than deny power dynamics through claims of neutrality, or what Haraway (2004) famously termed “the god trick,” standpoint theory fundamentally acknowledges that power dynamics are always at play. It suggests that systems tend to privilege dominant ideology (either inadvertently or intentionally), and that dominant ways of thinking make it difficult to recognize the perspectives or experiences of those that are more marginalized (Smith, 1972).

Accordingly, standpoint theorists posit that by starting from the lived experiences of those that are disempowered, we can access new ways of knowing and understanding (Harding, 2004b). From the standpoint of these individuals, we can gain new knowledge not only of their lives, but of the systems that they operate within (Bowell, 2011).

Before progressing further, I wish to reiterate that the subjects of my study (students and teachers in international schools) are hardly marginalized in the traditional sense. They tend to have considerable economic and social capital in a global context. Nonetheless, while these individuals might possess considerable privilege in a wider sense, within schools educators and teachers are often at the base of the power hierarchies. They ultimately have little control over the school’s objectives, curricula, and resources. They are the ones that grapple within school parameters to actualize programming. Accordingly, by viewing school practices through the standpoint of these
individuals, I grant greater legitimacy to their triumphs and their challenges by understanding their daily experiences more deeply.

There are three aspects of standpoint theory that are especially pertinent to my own framing of this study and which I will explore in greater detail: 1) its emphasis on the socially situated nature of knowledge, 2) the potential value of a bottom-up vantage point, and 3) its framing of a standpoint as an achievement.

**Socially Situated Knowledge**

Standpoint theory vehemently protests against traditional claims of scientific objectivity or value neutrality. Standpoint theorists have expressed concerns about the influence of values or privilege in different ways. For instance, Smith (1972) questioned patriarchal epistemic privilege of the field of sociology. Rose’s (2004) critique centered on gendered knowledge in the sciences. Narayan (2004) raised questions about dominant western ideologies that are pervasive in feminist theorizing. Collins (2004), similarly, suggested that white feminists might have certain blinders related to their racial privilege. Regardless of the contexts within which these standpoint theorists highlighted systematic epistemic ignorance, all the accounts share a common thread: that knowledge is constructed from particular stances, stances that are inevitably limited. Haraway (2004) synthesized this perspective clearly: “Feminist objectivity is about limited location and situated knowledge, not about transcendence and splitting of subject and object. In this way we might become answerable for what we learn how to see” (p. 87).

The belief that traditional objectivity is far from neutral, while highly contentious when first conceived, has become widely recognized and embraced. For instance,
Harding (2004b) notes that related themes emerge in the literature from scholars in the fields of ethnic, LGBT, and disability studies. Likewise, limitations of neutrality are also raised in literature on anthropology (Behar & Gordon, 1995; Holy & Stuchlik, 2014; Marcus & Fischer, 1986; Moore & Sanders, 2014), qualitative research methodology (Borer & Fontana, 2012; Gubrium & Holstein, 2012), and oral history (Yow, 2014). In short, knowledge is never politically detached, nor complete.

I share this epistemological stance in my own research. There is no neutral way to explore community engagement efforts in international schools. Engagement efforts have been described broadly by the institutions themselves, for instance through the IBO’s website. However, such institutional perspectives inherently miss the nuances of the experiences of those that are actually engaged in programming. As private institutions that need to positively market themselves, the IBO and international schools alike have vested interest in publicly describing community engagement efforts in flattering terms. Yet, glossy expressions of teachers’ and students’ efforts minimize the palpable challenges that actual implementers must grapple with. In so doing, potential barriers and supports alike may be overlooked; oversights include strategies that could better promote the very ideals that these institutions overtly strive for.

The Value of Bottom-up Ways of Knowing

Standpoint theory also advocates a bottom-up approach to knowledge; it argues that research should begin with the lives of those who lack power within systems. Harding (2004) generalizes the sentiments of these individuals: “The social order looks different from the perspectives of our lives and our struggles” (p. 3). Standpoint theorists
argue, accordingly, that these alternative views should be viewed as legitimate and valuable. Not only can marginalized individuals offer insight into their own lives, they can offer unique perspectives into dominant ideology as well. For example, Collins’ (2004) work on the potential of outsider-within positionality revealed this thinking clearly. For these reasons, it is desirable to adopt bottom-up methodology and focus on the lived experiences of those that are relatively disempowered.

I borrow this theoretical stance in my own work, for I see tremendous value in the perspectives of those that work on the ground level of program implementation within the mega-institution of the IBO. These individuals are the ones that navigate daily the challenges of balancing IBO objectives with logistical constraints, of interpreting lofty institutional objectives within their own classroom contexts. By adopting a standpoint methodology, I elevate the experiences of these students and teachers; I attempt to understand both their lives and the systems that they work in through their eyes.

A Standpoint as an Achievement

It seems important to highlight that standpoint theorists are not simply advocating for a compilation of stories from the disempowered. Rather, they emphasize the critical and interpretive effort that goes into the construction of a standpoint. Hartsock (2004) puts it in this way: a standpoint is “achieved rather than obvious, a mediated rather than immediate understanding” (p. 39). Both Harding (2004b) and Jaggar (2004) echo Hartsock’s emphasis on the active struggle that is crucial to the formation of a standpoint.

I strive to construct a standpoint on community engagement from the views of invested students and teachers. However, it is not merely a retelling of these individuals’
stories that I strive for, but rather the sort of “engaged vision” that Hartsock (2004) described. This has implications for both my choice of methods and also for my process of analysis.

**Methods**

**Project Overview**

In this study, I explore community engagement efforts through the eyes of student and faculty facilitators at three secondary IBO international schools: the International School of Kenya (Nairobi, Kenya), the International Community School of Addis Ababa (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia), and the American International School of Johannesburg (Johannesburg, South Africa). In order to understand the viewpoints and approaches of facilitators in these settings, I used a range of qualitative methods to collect data. At each school my methods included: informal interviews, surveys, document analysis, participant observation, and semi-structured interviews. Note that all three schools allowed their identities to be revealed. Meanwhile, the identities of individual participants were masked with pseudonyms by default. Yet in numerous cases, individuals preferred to be named. Appendix A clarifies which names are pseudonyms or given names. In the instances where participants preferred their real names, I included their full name the first time I mentioned them in the text.

Altogether, I spent approximately six months collecting data among my three field sites. School calendars and logistical constraints influenced the amount of time I was able to spend at each school. I explored community engagement efforts at the International School of Kenya for eight weeks (September and October, 2014), the
International Community School of Addis Ababa for five weeks (November through early December, 2014), and at the American International School of Johannesburg for nine weeks (January through early March, 2015). At all three schools, I collected data either on campus or at a service site between four and six days a week. My approaches allowed me to examine school-specific perspectives; meanwhile I could also explore viewpoints shared by facilitators across campuses.

I intentionally selected sites with input from regional educators. In order to identify school sites with programs that were both fairly developed and varied, I solicited feedback from educators involved in the African International Schools Association (AISA) service-learning working group. These individuals, who were selected for the group based on their leadership roles in the region, were familiar with many of the regional efforts and helped me narrow down the potential pool of school sites. Based on their recommendations, I selected three schools that seemed to represent a range of programs and local contexts.

In order to provide some continuity across sites, all field sites share the following attributes: they are all private, fee-paying, English-medium international schools. They offer the IBO’s Diploma Programme to eleventh and twelfth grade students; at the same time all allude to their inclusion of North American instructional approaches. All are affiliated with AISA. The schools all have faculty from more than ten nations, cater to multi-national student bodies of at least fifty nationalities, and as such, all three could be referred to as what Hayden and Thompson (2013) call Type A/traditional international schools. The majority of graduates from these schools pursue higher education in either North America or Europe. Additionally, all three schools make explicit references to
global citizenship or community engagement either in their mission statement or guiding school documents. Finally, all have teacher representatives on AISA’s service-learning working group.

**Central Research Questions**

This study ultimately strove to deconstruct the pragmatics of community engagement efforts in IBO international high schools. In order to do so, I considered facilitators’ perceptions of the following:

- How do teachers and students perceive community engagement?
- What are the perceived barriers to community engagement?
- How do school communities approach these barriers?
- What are the perceived supports that enable or promote community engagement?
- How do school communities approach these supports?

**Detailed Methods**

I explored site-specific understandings of the central research questions on three distinct international school campuses; this project is framed as a multiple case study accordingly. Twenty-two individuals, whom I interchangeably refer to as *in-depth participants, standpoint participants, student/teacher participants, or facilitators,* contributed heavily to the standpoints that emerged from each respective site (detailed information on participants can be found in the “Field Sites and Participants” section below). At each school, I used a range of qualitative and ethnographic methods to explore site-specific understandings.
The research design for each school included two phases: an exploratory investigative phrase (Phase One) and an in-depth focused phase (Phrase Two). While I originally conceptualized each phase as a discrete data-collection period, the boundaries between Phase One and Phase Two were blurred on all three sites due to practical considerations. As a visiting researcher, I was not in a position to adapt school schedules, for example, to cater to my study design. Accordingly, exploratory observations continued through Phase Two and informed my Phase Two discussions.

**Phase One: Exploratory investigation**

At each site, I began with exploratory research focused on the following three goals:

- Understand the range of community engagement programs or efforts at the school that are offered both formally and informally
- Gain a broad understanding of the positionality of these programs within the school’s structure, articulated and actual priorities, and context specific demands
- Identify between five to ten teachers and students on each campus that are well suited to offer perspectives on the process of navigating institutional barriers

These three goals were intimately linked to my central research questions. It was essential that I gain a working understanding of the context prior to engaging in questions of “how” people approach these elements.

I used a range of ethnographic fieldwork approaches in this investigative stage: informal interviews and discussions, document analysis, and participant observation. While this investigation was not a pure ethnographic endeavor, I chose these methods
because they are especially well suited for explorations of practice in specific contexts (Richards & Morse, 2013). I detail my goals and use of each respective method below.

**Unstructured interviews and informal conversations**

As Merriam (2009) describes, unstructured interviews are often the best approach for exploratory aims. Informal conversations are also instrumental for eliciting general information about a space and the phenomena occurring within it (Richards & Morse, 2013). Accordingly, I relied heavily on unstructured interviews and informal conversations to explore the efforts on each site.

Since my goals for this phase were centered on understanding the range and position of community engagement efforts in the school, I spoke to many people that were both formally and informally connected to various efforts. I had conversations with many who could be considered “stakeholders” in the efforts: community service sponsors, DP coordinators, related club advisers, community partners, student leaders in service or environmental clubs, service-learning coordinators, parent chaperones, etc. I also spoke with those that played more passive roles in the facilitation of engagement endeavors: students that attended service outings, students in required Global Citizens classes, administrators with more indirect supervision of projects, parents at information sessions, etc. I ensured that all individuals I spoke with were aware of my researcher status and that I followed IRB guidelines for documenting these interactions.

Overall, people were quite keen to share their experiences with me and I had hundreds of related conversations on each campus. It seemed from these conversations that the aims of my research resonated with diverse school members; accordingly,
individuals were happy to share their views and welcome me into spaces. For the most part, individuals were not only accommodating, but proactive in supporting my work. For example, enthusiastic facilitators hosted me, sometimes for weeks or months, in their homes. In these instances, related informal conversations often spilled into evenings or weekends. Such facilitators introduced me to dozens of related individuals, both on campus and at after-school social gatherings. When I first arrived at each respective school site, at least one administrator formally introduced me to the school community and urged people to reach out and involve me in related classes or activities. As I made myself visible around campus and in the teacher community, many individuals independently sought me out. Even when individuals were not proactive, I found that if I approached them they were consistently willing to share their views.

In nearly all cases, informal interviews were captured in detailed field notes but not recorded. Conversations ranged considerably in length; some conversations were only minutes long while others were approximately an hour. In a few cases, I anticipated that interviewees might be likely candidates for the Phase Two in-depth interview portion and asked to audio record our conversation or capture more personal information in my field notes. In these instances, I followed the formal consent process in accordance with IRB guidelines. In all cases, pseudonyms were used to protect the identity of all individuals within the school.

Document analysis

Prior to arriving at each school I explored all publicly available school documents (e.g., the school website, published accreditation reports, etc.) and related documents
available on either the IBO or AISA webpages (e.g., documents on the IBO “Global Engage” webpage). On each field site, I continued to collect and analyze relevant documents as they were shared with me (e.g., handbooks shared by the service-learning coordinator). As Merriam (2009) noted, documents can be valuable resources; they can be “mined” for data. Accordingly, I included documents such as school-designed action plans for DP community service aims, club descriptions, mission statements, school charters, five-year plans, or related policy documents. Again, my focus in the examination of these documents was on the three goals articulated above. I took detailed notes that contributed to my ongoing analysis.

*Participant observation*

Participant observation was also crucial to my exploratory research phase. Participant observation is an ethnographic method that researchers use to understand the *emic* perspectives of the participants, in other words, the insider views (Richards & Morse, 2013). As much as possible, I strove to understand the everyday contexts of my study participants. This approach also aligned neatly with my standpoint theoretical aims.

My use of participant observation methods looked different at each site, depending on happenings during my stay. In general, I spent four to six days a week on each campus or at service sites. To the fullest extent possible I attended activities related to community engagement: service club meetings, high school assemblies, classes where content was linked to community engagement, service activities, student leadership retreats, divisional faculty meetings, grade level planning sessions, etc. Key facilitators also allowed me to shadow them to gain deeper understanding of their daily lives.
My level of participation in activities or classes varied considerably from activity to activity and school to school. At times, I was primarily an observer. I sat on the sidelines as students ran a soccer clinic for local youth in Ethiopia and watched student presentations at a service project sign up fair in South Africa. At other times, I participated fully in activities; for example, I helped students clear debris from a forest in Kenya, and I fed homeless with faculty members in Ethiopia. In some instances, I played more of a facilitator role myself; for example, I led a workshop at a student leadership retreat in South Africa at the request of the retreat coordinators.

Throughout these varied involvements, the goals for Phase One remained paramount in my mind. I took detailed field notes and performed ongoing analysis. All analysis is interpretive work; even the act of transcribing is riddled with subjectivity (Schostak, 2006). As Geertz (2003) puts it, “The line between mode of representation and substantive content is as undrawable in cultural analysis as it is in a painting” (p. 155). It is partially for these reasons that I strove for the type of description that Geertz (2003) described in his piece as thick description.

**Transitioning between Phase One and Phase Two**

Near the end of the exploratory phase, I approached the adult participants that I wished to interview further. Adult facilitators helped me recruit student participants in accordance with IRB parameters. Overall, I aimed for participant pools of five to ten individuals per site. My central recruitment focus was to find a varied sample of community engagement facilitators. While I did strive for some balance of other demographics in my participant group including gender, country of origin, ethnicity,
grade level, and length of stay at the school, I was more concerned with composing a
group with diverse facilitator roles than balancing any other demographic feature.

**Phase Two: Focused construction of a standpoint**

My focus during Phase Two shifted from Phase One’s exploratory aims to my
stated research questions. By design, I had already gained a working knowledge of the
school context and had established a basic rapport with in-depth participants before
commencing Phase Two. In this second phase, I deeply explored a set of individuals’
experiences and perceptions through a range of qualitative methods: questionnaires,
semi-structured interviews, and participant observation.

**Questionnaires**

Each participant completed a brief online questionnaire, typically prior to our first
recorded interview. In this questionnaire, individuals were prompted to supply
background demographic information including their nationality, language fluencies,
tenure in each country of residence, and experiences in IBO and international schools.
The questionnaire also asked participants to define central concepts in the study, for
example *global citizenship* and *community*. Finally, the questionnaire asked individuals to
define their current role in campus efforts and to outline prior experiences that they
deemed relevant to their current leadership roles through a series of open-ended questions
(see Appendix B for questionnaire items).

While on-site, I primarily used the information from these questionnaires to tailor
subsequent interview talking points. The open-ended items related to concept definitions
and role descriptions were especially helpful for interview preparation. The demographic information items also informed my discussions with individuals. However, these items were primarily included to offer background information on in-depth participants for the analysis phase of my study.

In-depth, semi-structured interviews

In line with my Phase Two aims, I maintained a more nuanced focus in my interviews with my standpoint participants than the informal discussions in Phase One. I used a semi-structured interview approach, as described by Merriam (2009). My standpoint aims required considerable reflexivity in my interviewing, a responsiveness that is fairly common in ethnographic endeavors (Schostak, 2006). At the same time, I heeded advice of the oral historian, Yow (2014), who advocated for a balance of detailed preparation and flexibility in these sorts of interviews. Accordingly, prior to each interview I considered both my interview protocol (see Appendix C) and my prior knowledge of the individual/their involvements to assemble a list of anticipated discussion topics. These topics asked participants to engage in context-specific consideration of the central research questions. As discussed below, I often included a member check of emerging site-specific themes into second interviews.

Interviews at this stage were audio recorded. As Spradley (1979a) and Yow (2014) have both noted, rapport is one of the most fundamental precursors for a productive interview, which is part of why I postponed recording until this second phase of my study. While it has been observed that the use of recording equipment can be unsettling for participants (Schostak, 2006), there are profound advantages to having full
transcripts for the analysis phase (Merriam, 2009). Accordingly, I chose to record and transcribe all interviews in Phase Two. Whenever possible, I completed this transcription process and loosely analyzed interviews prior to any subsequent interviews with the same participant. This allowed me to be purposeful and increasingly focused in my lines of questioning.

The adults in my study participated in one or two recorded interviews. The first interview typically ranged from 45 to 110 minutes. Most adult facilitators also participated in a second interview, which ranged from 30 to 65 minutes. All student participants were involved in at least one interview, lasting between 30 and 80 minutes. About half the student facilitators participated in a second interview, which lasted between 20 and 40 minutes. I found that my extensive interactions with these individuals during Phase One enabled these recorded conversations to be nuanced, focused, and open. My background with each individual varied, though. In some cases, interviews were the first opportunity to discuss at length individuals’ views on their experiences. In other cases, interviews followed dozens of hours of related conversations.

*Participant observation*

In Phase Two I continued to conduct participant observation whenever possible, making a special effort to attend events or activities that the participants were involved in. Much like in Phase One, what I actually observed differed considerably from campus to campus and from participant to participant. However, my purpose for using participant observation remained the same: to explore the daily experiences of the individuals whose perspectives I wished to understand. I used my observations to brainstorm topics for
further discussion in interviews of informal conversations. I took detailed field notes that I considered in my ongoing analysis.

Field Sites and Participants

Before delving into the specifics of the selected sites and participants, it seems important to offer context for the populations that one finds in international schools. As I will further explain shortly, each school has unique features and each participant has a deeply personal relationship with the subject of community engagement. At the same time the sites and participants were selected to explore phenomena in international schools more broadly. It is important to understand the links between these sorts of individuals and institutions accordingly.

A collective international school culture

If one has spent little time in international schools, it can be understandably baffling how private institutions in Kenya, Ethiopia, and South Africa connect to one another or how individuals at these schools would share any common culture. After all, none of the three schools included are technically affiliated with one another. Participants are thousands of miles away apart. Each school has a distinct history, independent governance, and unique school sub-culture. The local contexts of these schools differ considerably.

Yet individuals who have been involved in these sorts of schools often perceive a deep connection between such seemingly independent institutions and populations. Educators know educators at dozens of other schools by name, can describe
administrative styles on campuses across the continent, and have taught students who each carry with them experiences from half a dozen other international schools. One of the teachers I interviewed in Ethiopia compared the links between these schools to the ties you might find between institutions in a sprawling American school district. Curricula, resources, and people are likely to flow across schools within these networks. Yet in international schools, this flow of people and resources crosses national rather than city borders. Schools share and sometimes compete for these sorts of resources (Allen, 2002). As one teacher explained: “(International) schools have commonalities and are facing the same problems. Our colleagues aren’t in local schools, our colleagues are in like schools… and the nearest like schools are a country away.” My own experiences during this study corroborate this perspective. At every field site, I encountered students, administrators, or teachers who had previously taught or studied at one of the other two field sites. On each campus, I reunited with former colleagues and students from my own time teaching in Korea and Uganda; similarly, I ran into many coaches, soccer players, and service leaders that I had met previously through regional tournaments or conferences. Even with individuals I had not directly encountered prior to my study, it was easy to discover connections: common international educator friends, conferences we had both attended, or administrators we had worked under in different countries.

Transiency is an important feature in the schools’ shared culture. International school transiency is widely acknowledged in the literature. As McKillop-Ostrom (2000) explains: “A high turnover rate in a school’s community is a distinctive characteristic of international schools” (p. 78). Students, for example, move between schools every two to three years (Sears, 1998, p. 6). Most students have spent the vast majority of their lives
outside the country of their passport(s) and the native land of their parents. Many are the children of diplomats, businessmen, missionaries, non-governmental organization (NGO) workers, or doctors; their families reside in a host country for a defined, limited contract period. Teachers and administrators are equally transient, Hardman (2001) suggests few teachers stay beyond their initial two year contracts. Hawley’s (1994) study of school heads estimates that they stay at a school less than 3 years on average. While staff and students from the home nation tend to stay in international schools for longer periods of time, Oto (2014) still noted that the experiences are marked by perpetual change as well and that for all individuals involved, transiency has a profound impact on school cultures.

With the interconnectedness of people within the broad international school community, it is only logical that there are shared cultural components across these sorts of campuses as well. In other words, despite considerable geographical distance between such schools, the movement of individuals creates ties between independent schools that go far beyond the shared IBO curriculum or the title “international school.” This is not to say that all individuals experience international schools in the same way; as Allan (2007) puts it: “International school experience is far from homogenous” (p. 428). Instead, I posit that, despite the particularities of each school or each individual’s experience, there is still a degree of commonality in the challenges for individuals or cultures that exist in international schools.

The concept of a transnational culture is one that is increasingly referenced in the literature. For example, academics have suggested that definitions of culture must move beyond geographic constraints (Anderson-Levitt, 2002; Cantle, 2012; Coleman & Collins, 2006; Goodenough, 1976; Hannerz, 2003). There has already been some work
that has looked at the transnational culture in international schools, though this research body is still quite thin. Most of what is known about this cross-school culture relates to students. Various terms including third culture kids (TCKs) (Useem & Downie, 1976) and global nomad (McCaig, 1994) have been used to clump the shared experiences of globally mobile youth, including those that are taught in international schools (Fail, 2007). As Pollack, Van Ruth, and Van Reken (2009), leading contemporary TCK scholars, noted, TCKs often create an “interstitial culture” or a “third culture lifestyle” that allows them to cope with the constantly shifting cultural norms of the local contexts (p. 49). Pollack et al. (2009) generalized TCKs as empathetic, multilingual, adaptable, open-minded young people who possess expanded worldviews and a wealth of multicultural experiences. At the same time, of especial interest in a study on conceptions of civic duty, it seems important to note that TCKs often struggle with identity, and suffer from “confused loyalties” (p. 90) and an “ignorance of home culture” (p. 96) that can result in both “rootlessness” and “restlessness” (p. 123). Others have expressed a pressure on TCKs, especially those connected with foreign service families, to act as young ambassadors for their “home” countries in some ways (Kittredge, 1996). In general, the concept of TCK culture is openly discussed in international schools. Students on all three campuses used the term to describe their own identity. In the questionnaire I conducted with in-depth study participants, one item prompted individuals to identify the communities that they identified with the most; 14 out of 22 described the international school community or groups of Third Culture Kids in response to this item.
Overview of each field site

As noted previously, this study explored efforts at three different school campuses. In Chapter Four I explore each school in depth and provide detailed information regarding school-specific definitions of community engagement, programming, and interpretations. Meanwhile, Table 1 offers basic school characteristics at a glance.

Table 1
Field Sites at a Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>International School of Kenya</th>
<th>International Community School of Addis Ababa</th>
<th>American International School of Johannesburg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic information</td>
<td>*Students: 870 from 60+ nationalities preK-12; many from diplomatic families; approximately 10% Kenyan, including scholarship students (International School of Kenya, 2011h)</td>
<td>*Students: 850 from 60+ nationalities preK-12; in high school 16 Ethiopian merit scholarship students (International Community School, 2015c); 92% of graduates have a mother tongue other than English (International Community School, 2014)</td>
<td>*Students: 1,200 students from 107+ nationalities preK-12; 40% mother tongue is language other than English; 25% transition to a new school and country each year (American International School of Johannesburg, 2015c);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Teachers: faculty from 13 nationalities with average tenure of 6 years (International School of Kenya, 2011c)</td>
<td>*Faculty: 100+ teachers from 12+ countries (International Community School, 2015b)</td>
<td>*Faculty: 156 teaching staff including 43 host country teachers (American International School of Johannesburg, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School’s history</td>
<td>Established 1973 as a joint partnership between the American and Canadian governments</td>
<td>Established 1964 as the American Community School with Ethiopian Emperor Haile Sellassie’s royal decree of</td>
<td>Established in 1982 and moved to current campus in 1986; huge surge in school growth post-1994 end of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accreditation and Affiliations

*Council of International Schools (CIS)
*Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSA)
*International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO)
*Association for the Advancement of International Education (AAIE),
*Association of International Schools in Africa (AISA)
*Principal’s Training Center (PTC)
*Round Square (International School of Kenya, 2011f)

Curriculum

“North American style” curriculum with an international focus; IB Diploma Programme (grades 11-12)
(International School of Kenya, 2011a)

“U.S. style of instruction” with “international best practice;” IB Diploma Programme (grades 11-12)
(International Community School, 2015d).

“American style curriculum, enriched with a diversity of international courses and programs;” IB Diploma Programme (grades 11-12)
(American International School of Johannesburg, 2015b)

Overview of participants

To protect the anonymity of individual facilitators in this study, I present most demographics in a collective manner. Altogether there were 22 participants involved in the in-depth portion of my study, with an equal balance of students and teachers. Seven of these facilitators were male and fourteen were female. This group represented a range
of facilitator roles; collectively there were: four service-learning or CAS coordinators, ten teacher supervisors for service groups, eleven student leaders for service groups, three members of the AISA service-learning work team, eight current or future Global Issues Service Summit attendees, and four teachers of courses with a global issues or global citizenship subject focus. Of the student facilitators interviewed, six were in twelfth grade; meanwhile three eleventh graders, one tenth grader, and one ninth grader also participated in the study. Interestingly four of the adults also actively facilitated an NGO or foundation outside of their school roles.

The cultural influences on these individuals were very mixed. The group varied in passport culture: seven were from South Africa; five from the United States; two from Australia, Canada, and India; and one from Ethiopia, Kenya, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, and Norway respectively (four of the twenty-two individuals were dual citizens). Collectively, the group had resided in thirty-eight different countries. The average adult spoke approximately three languages, while the average student spoke between three and four. Altogether the twenty-two individuals spoke twenty-four languages other than English. Second to English, French was the most commonly spoken language (ten participants). Other languages spoken by multiple individuals included Afrikaans (six), Spanish (three), Swahili (three), Amharic (two), German (two), Hindi (two), Portuguese (two), Sepedi (two), Sesotho (two), Xhosa (two), and Zulu (two).

The average length of stay for participants in the schools and in the host countries varied considerably from site to site: the six facilitators from ISK stayed in Kenya an average of 5.0 years and had been at the school an average of 5.0 years; the six facilitators from ICS lived in Ethiopia an average of 2.3 years and had been at the school
an average of 2.1 years; and the ten facilitators from AISJ had resided in South Africa an
average of 22.9 years and had been at the school an average of 6.9 years. See Appendix D
for more detailed demographic information.

**Analysis of Data**

**On-site ongoing analysis**

While on each site, I conducted ongoing analysis. Approximately three weeks into
my data collection at each site, I created a set of site-specific codes based on related
terms and ideas expressed by school community members and also from literature on
global citizenship, international schools, and service learning. The codes, approximately
100 per school, included both topical codes and descriptive codes as described by
Richards and Morse (2013). As Merriam (2009) describes, code creation is a reflective
and responsive process:

> Devising categories [for coding] is largely an intuitive process, but it is also
> systematic and informed by the study’s purpose, the investigator’s orientation and
> knowledge, and the meanings made explicit by the participants themselves (pp.
> 183-184).

Accordingly, my analysis was heavily shaped by ideas emerging from individuals on
each campus. See Appendix E for code descriptions and for frequency charts.

I reviewed my coded documents and research notes on a regular basis. I wrote
analytic memos, expressed ongoing questions, and created graphic organizers to represent
my evolving understandings. Prior to leaving each site, I synthesized my observations
into succinct presentations to be shared with participants and administrators. These
presentations grouped my observations into themes related to each research question.

These preliminary summaries were used in my member checks as described below. They are excluded from this report to protect the anonymity of individual participants.

**Member checks of preliminary findings**

Merriam (2009) spoke of the significance of member checks: “Participants should be able to recognize their experience in your interpretation or suggest some fine-tuning to better capture their perspectives” (p. 217). This is especially true in a study with standpoint aims, for any claims I make should resonate with the participants whose views I strive to express. Accordingly, I was very deliberate with member checks on each site. I conducted member checks of my preliminary findings with teacher and student facilitators, school administration, and with regional service-learning facilitators.

With adult participants, logistics typically permitted sufficient time to participate in a lengthy second interview. In these interviews, I typically shared a draft of my anticipated administrator presentation. Participants spoke about their views related to each preliminary theme noted in this presentation. Facilitators had the opportunity to confirm or question these themes, tweak wording, express nuances, or note perceived gaps in my understandings. They also had the opportunity to note any personal information that they did not want shared with administration. In nearly all cases, participants’ feedback was overwhelmingly positive, suggesting that my preliminary expressions aligned well with their experiences. At the same time, their questions, suggestions, and explanations provided essential information for my ongoing analysis process.
With student participants, logistical constraints often limited the amount of interview time available; comprehensive member checks were not feasible. Even still, I was able to conduct shorter, more focused member checks related to student-specific themes with the majority of student participants. I either conducted these member checks during second interviews or in informal conversations with these individuals, as time allowed.

On all three campuses, school administrators (such as school directors or heads of school) set aside at least an hour to discuss my emerging themes. While administrators were not the primary “members” whose views I was trying to represent through this study, the feedback they offered on these presentations was very helpful for my overall understanding of efforts at their schools. Their willingness to dedicate so much time for these discussions reiterates the significance of this study’s topic to their respective school’s mission.

I also had some opportunities to gain broader regional views on emerging themes. I attended an AISA pre-conference learning institute in Capetown in March 2015 during my last week on the continent. At this advanced service-learning institute, nearly all members of the AISA service-learning work team congregated. This included facilitators from all three schools included in this study. The group also included key service-learning facilitators from other schools around the continent. I had the opportunity to solicit feedback on emerging cross-school themes from these individuals through informal conversations. The discussions that happened organically within the institute, while not formally included in this study, still reiterated for me the relevance of certain
themes. In general, through this conference I was able to gain considerable insight into regional perspectives.

Prior to attending this conference, I also devised an online survey to explore regional trends more formally. I solicited feedback from several study participants in the survey’s creation and obtained IRB approval prior to its distribution. The survey listed dozens of factors that seemed to influence community engagement efforts on the three observed campuses (e.g., dedicated professional development time or formal student leadership training). I asked service-learning facilitators about the degree to which these factors influenced current efforts on their respective campuses. I also asked participants to express the importance of these factors in service-learning efforts more generally. I should note that this survey was not created to collect statistically significant data; instead it was designed to offer a small snapshot of regional perspectives.

At the service-learning institute, I recruited participants from AISA schools that were not included in my formal study. Conference participants also offered to share the survey link with service-learning facilitators at their school or other regional. Altogether, I received 9 survey responses, only 5 of which were complete. It was preferable for participants to complete all the survey items; even still partially completed surveys were still of use. Survey participants worked at schools in Ghana, Mauritania, Mozambique, Tanzania, Zimbabwe, and Lesotho. While the sample size of this survey was far too small to make any substantial claims about generalizability, the responses nonetheless offered useful perspectives from a broader “member” community.
Second round of data analysis

Upon returning to the United States, I reconsidered the themes that emerged from my first round of coding and identified tentative assertions based off my preliminary analysis. I developed a secondary set of codes to intentionally probe for examples or counter-examples of each of these claims. I revisited all data and applied these codes as appropriate. See Appendix F for an overview of these second-round codes.

Additional member checks

Throughout my analysis process I continued to conduct member checks. While I drafted my dissertation, I wrote a quarterly column for an international education magazine that offered an overview of key dissertation themes (Lillo, 2015a, 2015b, 2016a, 2016b). As I did so, I solicited feedback from all adult facilitators and school administrators on the content of these pieces. While I did not receive feedback from all participants on every piece, the feedback I did receive reinforced my central arguments and helped me consider some of the nuances of my claims. I also gave adult participants the opportunity to check the accuracy of my dissertation in progress and offer feedback on key themes. While it would have been optimal to receive feedback from all student participants as well, it was too logistically challenging to do so. Accordingly, I focused on adult feedback only at this stage of my analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR: SCHOOL-SPECIFIC APPROACHES

Before I can delve into facilitators’ perceptions of the mechanisms involved in community engagement endeavors, which I will do in Chapters Five and Six, I need to contextualize facilitators’ projects within each respective campus. Accordingly, this chapter addresses the study’s first research focus: the way that community engagement efforts are perceived. In the concept of perceived, I include both school-specific interpretations of community engagement efforts and attitudes towards these approaches. This chapter paints a picture of the key contextual elements that influenced facilitators’ approaches and overviews each school’s community engagement efforts.

I begin by briefly offering a description of the IBO’s CAS requirements, for all three school’s programs were heavily shaped by the IBO’s expectations. Then for each school, I overview their key guiding documents including their mission, vision, and stated educational aims. Such statements tend to shape institutional priorities and influence school’s strategic planning (Kotler & Murphy, 1981). As Morphew and Hartley (2006) put it, “A clear mission statement helps organizational members distinguish between activities that conform to institutional imperatives and those that do not” (p. 457). Studies have also shown correlations between idealistic, ethically focused school missions and student ethical behaviors (Davis, Ruhe, Lee, & Rajadhyaksha, 2007). Missions and visions offer key contextual details for this study, accordingly. Next, I describe each school’s co-curricular and curricular efforts. I include descriptions of the people involved and school-specific procedures and documentation. I briefly describe a few elements of the local environments that seemed to influence programs and efforts. Consistent with my standpoint approaches, in this chapter I focus primarily on the aspects
of the local context that facilitators frequently alluded to. Finally, for each school I consider the range of perspectives different school community members had towards these efforts. While I intentionally attended to these elements during Phase One, my understanding of school-specific perceptions became increasingly refined throughout the entire duration of my study at each campus.

**IBO Creativity, Action, Service (CAS) Requirements: An Influence on all Three Campuses**

As the IBO’s (2015b) CAS guide describes, in the Diploma Programme model, students are expected to take classes in six academic areas (language and literature, individuals and societies, mathematics, the arts, sciences, and language acquisition) and fulfill three core elements (a course called Theory of Knowledge, an Extended Essay, and the CAS program). The IBO (2015) describes the three aims of these core pieces as the following: “Support, and be supported by, the academic disciplines; foster international mindedness; and develop self-awareness and a sense of identity” (p. 3). As the IBO continues to describe these aims, they explicitly link CAS with global citizenship aims and community participation. Accordingly, the IBO’s framing directly influences school-specific interpretations.

What exactly is CAS? The CAS program is composed of three strands: creativity, (physical) activity, and service. Students are expected to create co-curricular programs for themselves that include ongoing experiences across all three strands for at least eighteen months. Throughout their involvements, students maintain portfolios that capture their experiences, reflections, and achievement of seven CAS learning outcomes.
Because evidence of achieving these IBO learning outcomes (LO) is the primary indicator for student achievement, I list them here:

- **LO1:** Identify own strengths and develop areas for growth
- **LO2:** Demonstrate that challenges have been undertaken, developing new skills in the process
- **LO3:** Demonstrate how to initiate and plan a CAS experience
- **LO4:** Show commitment to and perseverance in CAS experiences
- **LO5:** Demonstrate the skills and recognize the benefits of working collaboratively
- **LO6:** Demonstrate engagement with issues of global significance
- **LO7:** Recognize and consider the ethics of choices and actions (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2015b, pp. 11-12)

In addition to the expectations listed above, students are to undertake a CAS project, follow the CAS stages (investigation, planning, action, reflection, demonstration), and participate in a series of interviews with coordinators/advisers.

The CAS service strand is the one that most directly links to community engagement on each campus. As the IBO described,

The aim of the ‘service’ strand is for students to understand their capacity to make a meaningful contribution to their community and society. Through service, students develop and apply personal and social skills in real-life situations involving decision-making, problem-solving, initiative, responsibility, and accountability for their actions. (2015b, p. 20)
This explanation reiterated the role of CAS in any school’s community engagement efforts. The IBO (2015) guide explained that the five-stage model (which I will discuss in far more detail in Chapter Six) is the preferred way to approach service experiences. It recommended students’ participation in four types of service: direct service (e.g., working directly with animals in a shelter), indirect service (e.g., creating resources for an NGO), advocacy (e.g., running an awareness campaign), and research (e.g., exploring the environmental impact of a particular litter disposal technique). The IBO acknowledged that there are many different “approaches” to service, such as ongoing efforts, school-based efforts, community-based projects, responses to urgent/immediate needs, fundraising efforts, international service, traditional volunteerism, and service that stems from the curriculum. In other words, their broad framing is fairly inclusive and allows students and schools to create service programs that match their respective contexts. I will further explore the IBO’s CAS framings in the upcoming chapters.

The International School of Kenya

ISK Mission and Vision

According to ISK’s (2011e) website, the school was guided by the following mission: “ISK provides an exemplary education offering both the International Baccalaureate and the North American diploma. We prepare students within a culturally diverse community to become informed, independent thinkers and responsible world citizens.” This mission articulated global citizenship as a central goal and described attributes of this model citizen: knowledgeable, independent thinker, responsible, and comfortable within culturally diverse communities. Note that the school’s mission has
since changed, but that this chapter attempts to frame the school context as it was at the
time of the study. The school’s vision statement alluded to similar key values:
“Empowering students to create solutions for tomorrow’s challenges.” This framing also
implied that students should be involved in the world around them, seeking out problems
and pursuing solutions. It puts the onus of community problem-solving on students,
suggesting that students should gain the skills to approach complex challenges.
According to ISK’s (2010-2011) self-study report for accreditation, the mission and
vision are revised every five years. The mission included above was revised during the
2008-2009 school year.

ISK’s educational aims also help position community engagement efforts
within the school. Figure 1 captures the school’s aims, which, according to the
ISK’s (2010-2011) self-study accreditation report, were revised during the 2010-
2011 school year. As this report explained, the “IB learner profile was used to
underpin this aims process and ensure alignment between the school and IB
missions” (p. 8). Figure 1 demonstrates the perceived interconnectedness of
various actions: learning, communicating, solving, creating, and acting. It offers a
holistic view of student development. Note that it explicitly aims for students to
act on both global and local levels and engage directly with the environment as
well.
ISK Co-curricular Efforts

There were many co-curricular service projects that involved ISK students in the surrounding community. This paragraph offers a small sampling of these efforts: students in the Global Issues Network ran advocacy and awareness campaigns related to various global issues; they also facilitated activities for kids from a local arts school. Students with Interact, a club affiliated with Rotary International, supported several local service efforts including a large feeding project that fed hundreds of children and elderly people. Through a group called Under Construction, students contributed manpower to construction efforts; I watched them sand and paint classroom walls in a school at the edge of a major slum. Other students visited Karura Forest weekly and supported the efforts of park rangers. One week, I observed them assist rangers in clearing an
aggressive weed off a small lake. There were projects that were more focused on cultural exchanges; for instance, ISK students and students from a local school learned various Kenyan traditional dances together from members of a Kenyan dance troop. The leaders incorporated dance moves from ISK students’ home cultures into their collaborative routines. Meanwhile creatively inclined students shared their interests and talents through an art therapy program within a children’s hospital ward. There were dozens of other co-curricular groups that focused on community involvement and service-learning as well.

One unique feature of ISK’s co-curricular community engagement approach is that the school created protected blocks of time for students to engage in service projects. For example, there was one afternoon a week of after school activities that was dedicated fully to service; no sports practices or other major activities were allowed to spill into this block. Similarly, two early morning blocks were designated for meetings of the three largest clubs, all of which had some degree of focus on either service or global issues: Interact, Global Issues Network, and Model United Nations. Some of the activities, such as the direct service portion of the major clubs or the planning meetings for smaller or more infrequent projects, rolled into lunch hours, evenings, or weekends. In general, by offering protected blocks of time, the school created space for students to join service activities while still playing on a sports team and participating in the performing arts.

While many of ISK’s co-curricular efforts were focused on consistent, regular partnerships with individuals geographically close to the school, once each school year students had the opportunity to engage with others in more distant parts of the country through trips the school called InterCultural trips. Ninth graders, for instance, climbed
Mt. Kenya and learned about local geography and ecology. Meanwhile tenth and eleventh graders were able to choose between a range of options across the nation that all “emphasiz(ed) adventure, local culture and community service” (International School of Kenya, 2011d). Grade twelve students all visited Masinga Dam, where they considered unique ecosystems and learned about the cultures in that region.

There was one additional influence on ISK’s co-curricular community engagement approaches that seems worth noting: ISK was in its first semester as a Round Square school at the time of my visit. Round Square (2016) offers a holistic learning approach that uses six IDEALS (International, Democracy, Environmentalism, Adventure, Leadership, and Service) to help center students’ learning experiences. When I did my study, the Round School model was still a new framing for most students and faculty. Yet student leaders from all school clubs and activities gathered once a week in Round Square leadership meetings to reflect upon their co-curricular efforts through the lenses of the six IDEALS. Student leaders discuss ways that their efforts could be more coordinated and compelling. The discussions around environmentalism and service seemed especially pertinent to this study. While I only observed the advent of this program, it seemed that Round Square was already beginning to impact co-curricular approaches.

ISK Curricular-based Efforts

Service-learning and global issues instruction was broadly encouraged in the ISK curriculum. While select teachers may have used service-learning pedagogy to promote curricular content, I did not have the opportunity to observe many examples of it. At the
same time, I did see considerable evidence that students had developed nuanced understandings of various global issues, understandings that they carried with them to their respective co-curricular service experiences. This suggested to me that, while there was little formal tracking of related instruction across the curriculum, individual teachers were making links between course content and the local and global contexts. For example, I heard numerous students allude to lessons in class while they were at their service sites. Two students discussed the relevance of a biology lesson on deforestation as they served at Karura Forest. Another group of students alluded to a particular geography lesson as they discussed the harsh juxtaposition of slums and affluent suburbs that they were passing on a bus ride. Even when students were not explicitly crediting courses or teachers for their understandings, I saw evidence of related instruction in students’ speech and nuanced understandings of complex global issues. For example, I observed a Model United Nations’ simulation where students discussed a proposed peacekeeping resolution. As students did so, they consistently used advanced rhetoric and made allusions to international affairs in ways that suggested they had had considerable related instruction. Statements, equally sophisticated to the following, were common: “Does the delegate agree that deployment would only exacerbate the situations for national troops in that country?” In this sample statement, the student recognized that international interventions often have secondary effects. It seems logical that students gained these sorts of understandings from the school’s International Relations elective course or from other social science courses. In a different discussion that I observed at a service site, students comfortably and accurately used terms like absolute poverty and relative poverty in their
discussions. Again, this suggested that formal instruction on global economics had happened somewhere within the curriculum.

One course in particular offered a context for students’ co-curricular service-learning experiences. ISK offered an elective class, Education for Sustainable Development, to further students’ understandings of global issues and development issues. In this interactive and student-driven class, students actively considered the twenty global issues described by Rischard (2002). Numerous students explained to me that this class helped them learn a lot about the complexity of global issues. Not all students chose to take this class, as it was an elective option. However it was a unique opportunity for those who did.

**ISK People Involved**

ISK had a K-12 service-learning coordinator, Pierina Redler. Her full-time administrator role also included trip and co-curriculum activity coordination across the three divisions. Pierina was the one who dealt with many of the big-picture pieces, such as school-specific guides, partner screening, and supervisor training. She also handled many of the logistical planning elements such as buses for the weekly service trips, securing supplies for projects, communicating with the administrative team, etc. The service-learning coordinator was assigned a part-time administrative support to assist with these details. The CAS portion of ISK’s service was spearheaded by Pierina; she was the one who reported to the IB whether students’ fulfilled their CAS requirements. Meanwhile, homeroom teachers counseled students on their CAS progress and oversaw their ongoing reflections/portfolios. At ISK, individual clubs, groups, or efforts had their
own internal leadership structures. Most service groups had at least two faculty sponsors and a team of student leaders. The weekly afterschool service trips often had parent volunteers or ISK local staff members as chaperones/facilitators. Any given project involved coordination between a wide range of people including the school’s security team, transportation team, teachers, supervisors, parents, and ISK student participants. As noted in the section above, individual teachers also took initiative to integrate service-learning or global issues instruction into their respective courses.

**ISK Documentation and Requirements**

The school’s co-curricular efforts were well documented. ISK had a clearly defined conceptual framework for its service-learning program (see Figures 2 and 3). These conceptual illustrations, that depicted key features and aims of the program, were widely published in school documents and are included below with permission from the school. Figure 2 captures the range of impacts the program hopes to have—on students, on their families, on school communities, local communities, national communities, and global communities. This inclusive model highlights that as students develop, they can have impacts on various spheres of influence.
Meanwhile, Figure 3 stressed that ISK’s model has a focus on meaningful experiences that are sustainable and promote interdependence. It teased out some of the impacts that the school hoped would result from these efforts, for both students and the community.
The school also had documents that articulated school requirements and expectations. The Guide to High School Academic Programs 2014-2015 (International School of Kenya, 2014a) detailed related graduation requirements. Beginning in 2012-2013, students were expected to participate in and reflect on one intercultural activity each year (see notes above on ISK InterCultural trips). They were also required to
“successfully complete an acceptable Creativity, Action, and Service (and Leadership) program for each year in the ISK high school, as defined by the CAS guidelines for full IB diploma students or CASL booklet for all other high school students” (p. 3). The High School Handbook (International School of Kenya, 2014b) offered more details on the CASL requirements. For the service portion of these requirements, students were expected to engage in at least one sustainable project (weekly for 9 weeks or biweekly for a semester). The CASL student handbook (International School of Kenya, 2014c) gave students program instructions, lists of activities for involvement, information on what to include in their reflections, guidelines for their final reflective essays, explicit learning outcomes, a sample reflection, and reminders of ISK’s educational aims. Meanwhile the CAS handbook, designed specifically for full Diploma Programme students, offered more detailed information on ISK’s monitoring system, ManageBac. It outlined the IB’s CAS expectations. It included a few school-specific requirements, such as a final essay. Much like the CASL guide, this handbook offered sample reflections and clear guidelines of what sorts of things were or were not appropriate forms of action. The school even developed a trip assistant/parent volunteer handbook (International School of Kenya, 2013). This document overviewed the aims and visions of ISK’s service-learning program and included job description for various leaders, service trip guidelines, service/field trip request for information. In short, the co-curricular service-learning program was extensively documented.
ISK Local Context

There were several aspects of the local context that I heard frequently discussed at ISK in relation to community engagement efforts. Here I focus on four: Nairobi as an international development/diplomacy/NGO hub, perceived political tensions and terrorist threats, Kenya’s natural environment, and Nairobi’s economic gaps.

Individuals at ISK often described Nairobi as a hub for international diplomacy and development. This makes sense, for in Nairobi there are over eighty embassies/consulates/high commissions ("Kenya embassies and consulates," 2015), a large United Nations office (United Nations, 2015), and hundreds of NGOs. Many ISK students came from diplomatic or development families. It seemed that the nature of students’ parents’ work influenced students’ attitudes towards the community and understanding of local issues. For example, one student spoke about how discussions at family dinners impacted her interest in post-conflict aid. Another told me of his parent’s role in East African disease control; as he described this, the student’s nuanced understanding of the different sorts of issues around the transmission and control of malaria, HIV, and Ebola was obvious.

The large diplomatic and development presence in Nairobi seemed to influence more than just student attitudes or understandings—it also impacted the school’s availability of community partners. As the service-learning coordinator explained to me at one point, it was normal for her to receive dozens of requests for new partnerships each month, including NGOs, Kenyan schools, and local organizations. The huge number of potential partnerships and the eagerness of these groups to build links with ISK allowed for greater selectivity. In other words, because of the huge potential partner presence in
Nairobi, ISK could be picky about which partnerships seemed to best fit the school and its students. While most ISK community members viewed the extensive international development context positively, several also alluded to postcolonial tensions involved in international aid models.

Another aspect of the local community that seemed to influence the shape of ISK community efforts was the political context. Many members of the ISK community felt nervous about Kenya’s security and spoke of terrorist threats posed by the Somali militant group affiliated with al-Qaeda, al-Shabab. Numerous people suggested that the diplomatic nature of students’ families increased security pressures. Safety concerns influenced the hefty security measures that were in place for all ISK activities. Safety concerns also seemed to impact individuals’ normal routines and daily lives. For instance, numerous individuals described how safety concerns inspired them to avoid public spaces whenever possible; instead they preferred to socialize in areas that would be less likely to be targeted by terrorists. My visit to ISK coincided with the two-year anniversary of the Westgate Mall attack, a terrorist attack on an upscale mall that was frequented by ISK families. The attack resulted in 67 casualties and over 200 people wounded (Okari, 2014); several individuals that were closely connected to the school were included in these numbers. The threat of terrorist attacks remained fresh in ISK students’ and faculty members’ minds. The mall itself, which many students and teachers drove by on a daily basis, remained boarded up and served as a physical reminder of the horrific incident. There were school-wide discussions of the Westgate attack when I was at the school, including a remembrance ceremony that marked its second anniversary. Ongoing attacks by the al-Shabab militants in Kenya, including the March 2014 Garissa University
massacre that claimed 148 lives (Iaccino, 2015), also served as reminders of the continued tensions in the region. Even as select students listened to the Wangari Maathai Memorial Lecture by visiting playwright, poet, and Nobel Laureate, Wole Soyinka, on a field trip to the 2014 Storymoja festival, they were reminded of the ongoing threats of terrorism in the region. In his speech, Soyinka remembered the victims of the Westgate attack and addressed ongoing terrorist presence in East Africa. He argued that the terrorists win if people live in constant fear. However, in general, safety concerns were still palpable within the ISK community and resulted in high security measures for school activities. These security screenings also accounted for other common safety concerns as well including thefts, demonstrations, and hijackings. It seemed such concerns resulted in student and teachers’ decreased interactions with local community members on a daily basis as many individuals intentionally avoided public spaces.

Students and teachers alike hailed the beauty of Kenya’s natural environment. The country’s natural resources seemed to increase students’ concerns for the natural environment. The school’s proximity to world-renown national parks and stunning coastlines seemed to augment students’ attention to environmental issues. For instance, after firsthand encounters with rhinos and elephants, students explained that they became passionate about protecting these creatures. Students spoke with conviction about anti-poaching efforts. Similarly, students who had spent time in Karura National Forest spoke passionately about maintaining and protecting the country’s forests.

Finally, students and teachers alike spoke of how the visibility of economic gaps influenced their views towards community engagement issues. Students alluded to slums in close proximity to the nice neighborhoods many of them lived in. An Oxfam GB
(2009) report suggested that at least 60% of Nairobi’s population lives below the poverty line and noted huge gaps between the rich and poor. The scope of material needs in the immediate community undoubtedly influenced students’ perceptions of the role that they should play. I discuss this in more detail in Chapter Six.

ISK Sentiments Towards Community Engagement Efforts

ISK teachers’ impressions

When I asked faculty members to describe community engagement efforts at the school, most pointed to co-curricular clubs and projects. A few referenced the sustainable development elective course or specific teachers who seemed especially passionate about service. Most teachers recognized and admired students’ initiative and seemingly genuine engagement in service projects.

All the faculty members that I spoke to were quite enthusiastic about the value of service. They consistently praised students’ participation in the service-learning program. They frequently used the term “service-learning” to describe students’ participation (in contrast to students, who more often described their participation as “service”). I found that most teachers felt overstretched and wished they could be more involved in service-learning projects. Several expressed, for example, that scheduling conflicts made it difficult to be on service sites with students. They recognized that school publications described students’ involvements, but acknowledged that they had little time to read these. Most were only aware of the details of projects that they supervised. Several expressed skeptical hope that the Round Square model that the school just adopted might help consolidate efforts.
ISK students’ impressions

There seemed to be a school ethos where students perceived their involvement as a natural part of their high school experience. They seemed to enjoy their experiences and saw value in their efforts. While students recognized that their involvements met school requirements or fulfilled CAS obligations, very few alluded to these requirements as their primary motivation for involvement. Instead, they alluded to “making a difference” or “giving back” to their communities. Most students described their participation as “service” and emphasized that projects should be “sustainable.” Many leaders perceived that they had strong ownership of their projects. Some of the students involved in the weekly projects in non-leadership capacities were less passionate about their involvements. However, by and large, students were enthusiastic about their participation. They did grumble about the formal written CAS reflections.

Students at ISK seemed especially aware of global issues and many could articulate how their respective local projects fit into larger trends or issues. They frequently conceptualized interventions in terms of international collaboration. For example, as several students discussed ways to minimize rhino poaching in the region they considered reaching out to peers in regions where the horns were regularly sold. They agreed that collaborative advocacy campaigns might have a greater impact than Kenyan-based campaigns alone.

The International Community School of Addis Ababa
ICS Mission and Vision

There were four key guiding pieces that were offered on ICS’s (2015f) website: a mission statement, vision statement, learner profile, and the ICS Way. The school’s mission was expressed as the following: “We nurture the talents, character and intellect of all learners, challenging them to be a positive influence and empowering them to excel in their world.” The latter part of this statement emphasizes that learners are members of communities. As a “positive influence,” they are expected to make constructive contributions. By “empowering them to excel,” this mission emphasizes students’ development. The school’s vision statement includes three parts: “Engaging learning experiences through inquiry and reflection’ a broad range of local, global, and virtual opportunities; and innovative and flexible use of resources.” The first piece describes learning pedagogies that align with many forms of experiential education or inquiry-based learning. The second situates learning in local and global contexts. ICS’s learner profile is the same as the IBO’s learner profile (that I described in Chapter Two). As I noted in that chapter, the language of this profile emphasizes the ethics of global citizenry. Finally, the website described the ICS Way:

The ICS Way is a simple reminder of our shared values and how we incorporate this philosophy in our learning, in our classrooms, and across our campus: Take care of yourself. Take care of each other. Take care of this place. This stresses responsibility and concern. It included attention to people in the community and to the environment/space as well.
ICS Co-curricular Efforts

There were a wide variety of co-curricular efforts in place at ICS focused on students’ engagement with members of the local community or on their interaction with the natural environment. This paragraph offers a small sampling. For example, a group of ICS soccer players hosted weekly training sessions with their peers from a nearby school. Other ICS students visited a local burn care unit, where they painted girls’ fingernails, read stories, did collaborative craft projects, and offered company to patients in pain. Students regularly tutored kids at a nearby orphanage on their reading skills. Similarly, ICS students taught English language skills to kids at an after-school NGO called Our Father’s Kitchen. Other students surveyed their peer’s consumption and travel patterns and considered ways to reduce the school community’s impact on the natural environment; for example, I observed a meeting where they contemplated ways to launch school-wide carpool initiatives. Drama students performed Shakespearean plays in Amharic, the local language, for members of the surrounding communities. Meanwhile, other ICS students helped hold, clean, and feed orphaned babies at a nearby baby home.

Many of the efforts I observed recurred regularly. Students, for example, visited an orphanage once a week or helped sew sanitary pads for local women twice a week after school. While certain days tended to be more popular for regular service projects, activities ran nearly every weekday during lunch and after school. Several students explained to me that they initially chose to get involved in a particular activity because it fit well into their schedule. While a few weekend activities happened during my stay in Ethiopia, most ICS service projects seemed to happen during the school week.
In addition to regular local service opportunities, students also participated in week-long Week Without Walls (WWW) trips. These trips had four aims: “Enrich classroom learning, develop socio-emotional growth, increase cultural understanding of the host country, and understand one’s own identity in a more profound and positive way” (International Community School, 2016). As the ICS website described, grade-level trips varied in focus. For example, ninth graders explored environmental issues in the Bale Mountain range, while tenth graders focused on economic and land use issues in the Awash National Park region. All high school WWW trips integrated IBO CAS elements in some way: ninth graders were first introduced to CAS learning outcomes while eleventh graders were given a “hands-on induction” into the formal CAS requirements.

ICS Curricular-based Efforts

It seemed that most of the curricular community engagement efforts at ICS were individual-driven. There were a handful of educators at the school with considerable experience and interest in service, global issues, and service-learning. For example, at the time of my visit, three faculty members had elected to take an online service-learning course through an American university. They regularly met to discuss service-learning as a pedagogy and related efforts at ICS. It seemed that these individuals were intent on integrating more of a community focus into the curriculum. Several other individuals discussed with me their intentions to link lessons to community concerns. A science teacher spoke of his passion for relevant teaching; he suggested that lessons should help students better understand the natural environment and the role that they play in it. An English teacher described her attempts to help students learn language arts skills in
relation to real topics; for instance students practiced using expository writing skills by creating guidebooks focused on the environmental issues that they just learned about on their recent Week Without Walls trip. A music teacher spoke about a folk music project she included in one of her classes. Students explored the musical traditions of their own families/cultures and considered these in relation to pop music. She described how this led students to explore issues like globalization, assimilation, and privatization of culture. In short, I saw individual faculty members’ efforts to link students’ learning to issues that impacted the broader community. However, there was little tracking of or organization to these efforts.

One elective course was explicitly dedicated to global issues instruction: Global Issues Leadership and Action (GILA). This elective course was in the process of being revamped as I visited the school. It was broadly focused on helping students develop their leadership skills, understand local implications of global issues, and recognize the role that they can play in these issues. At the time of my study, the class was focused on the topic of homelessness. There is a large homeless population in Addis and many students had considerable firsthand exposure to homelessness. In the class, students were exploring root causes, current local efforts to combat it, and their own role in both the related problems and solutions. Students were preparing for an overnight simulation event that was going to happen on the school fields later in the semester. They were also preparing for a large awareness campaign.
ICS People Involved

ICS had a part-time CAS coordinator who juggled that role with normal teaching duties. She was also responsible for teaching a global issues course. While other teachers helped with CAS supervision, she was the primary individual responsible for coaching students through the CAS process. Meanwhile, individual service projects and clubs had their own structures. Many were primarily student-run, with small teams of student leaders as key decision-makers and organizers. All groups had at least one faculty or staff member as a sponsor. All off campus trips included faculty or staff chaperones; these trips involved coordination with the transportation team. Teams of teachers took primary responsibility for planning service experiences within grade-level Week Without Walls trips. It also seems worth noting that there were several faculty members with a strong service-learning background that were interested in expanding/refining ICS’s efforts. While they did not all have formal positions that designated their leadership roles, these teachers often advised their peers on service-related issues and discussed school-wide approaches regularly.

ICS Documentation and Requirements

At the time of my visit, there were few documents published that focused on school-specific approaches to community engagement. The school website broadly overviewed the school’s co-curricular service options (International Community School, 2015a), Week Without Walls (International Community School, 2016), and an IBO (2011b) document that included a description of general CAS requirements. There were several documents that listed activities for students. An After School Activities guide
described the different clubs students could sign up for and listed the faculty sponsors for each group. Similarly, a document listed the 2014-2015 CAS service clubs with their schedules, student leaders, and faculty sponsors.

Note that when I was in Ethiopia, the CAS program at ICS was in transition. My visit aligned with the first semester of a new CAS coordinator and also with the release of the IBO’s newest CAS guide. Several facilitators recognized that further formal articulation of expectations would be beneficial the school. Several formal documents, including an ICS CAS guide, were created in the months following my visit.

ICS Local Context

There were several aspects of the local context that I heard frequently discussed at ICS in relation to community engagement efforts. Here I focus on two: the NGO culture in Addis Ababa and the centrality of the Ethiopian church in local culture.

Addis Ababa is a large diplomatic and NGO center within East Africa; the city has ambassadors from 88 nations, 95 local diplomatic missions, and dozens of international and regional organizations including several sectors of the United Nations, the African Union, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the World Food Programme, and the World Health Organization (Protocol Directorate General, 2012). There are offices for other large NGOs including Save the Children ("Ethiopia," 2016b), Catholic Relief Services (Catholic Relief Services, 2015), Oxfam (Oxfam International, 2016), and World Vision ("Ethiopia," 2016a). Many of the students I met at ICS had familial ties to the development or diplomatic community. Such family ties undoubtedly influenced students’ perceptions of community engagement efforts. For instance, one
student leader explained that her father’s involvement in the African Union inspired her to try to make a difference in the community too; she spearheaded several service initiatives accordingly. Another student leader admired his parents’ work in the field of development; he noted that both he and his brother intended to follow their parents’ occupational footsteps. The pervasive NGO presence in Addis Ababa also provided a wide range of potential community partners for school efforts. Though one long-term faculty member was quick to note that the highly transient nature of Ethiopian NGOs posed sustainability challenges for these partnerships. As she explained, employees regularly shifted between jobs within the Ethiopian NGO field. The frequent personnel movement made it difficult for the school to keep consistent contacts with any given organization.

The topic of the Ethiopian church also arose in many conversations about community engagement efforts. With 43.5% of the local population following the Ethiopian church (Central Intelligence Agency, 2016), it seemed to play a central role in the local culture. Several people alluded to cultural gaps between church ideals and those held by some members of the ICS faculty or student body. They described how, in order to be respectful to members of the local community, they had to “tread lightly” on particular issues. For instance, one teacher described her own passion for LGBT rights. Several of her students, who shared this passion, wanted to launch an aggressive advocacy campaign. However, she recognized that some of their strongest beliefs would counter predominant thinking in the church and in the community. She realized that students needed to be extra sensitive about their approaches to the topic accordingly. Several ICS facilitators also recognized that the large church presence in Addis Ababa
shaped local perceptions of the form and role of service. As one ICS faculty member explained to me, the Ethiopian church was the vehicle through which most local charity occurred. Community members might donate food to the church, which in turn fed those who were poor or homeless. This model seemed to promote the idea of charitable giving over direct service. While many ICS community members were not insiders to the Ethiopian church, the frequency with which facilitators alluded to the church suggested that its’ thinking still influenced ICS efforts.

ICS Sentiments Towards Community Engagement Efforts

ICS teachers’ impressions

When I asked teachers about service-learning or community engagement at the school, most pointed to the GILA elective class as the primary form of curricular service-learning. Teachers also alluded to students’ participation in WWW trips. There seemed a pervasive sentiment that community engagement efforts should be student-driven. Though some also questioned whether students had had sufficient training to facilitate effective service-learning projects.

A small group of faculty members at ICS were especially passionate about service-learning. Their prior experiences at other schools had solidified their dedication to the pedagogy and had helped them recognize its potential. Most of these passionate service-learning educators expressed that the ICS service-learning program had a lot of room for growth; one explained, for example, how the school’s current programs were more service than service-learning focused. He wanted to expand the focus on the learning piece. It seemed that many ICS teachers who were less experienced in service-
learning approaches were open to the pedagogy. These individuals craved professional development and did not know how to start using service-learning approaches. It seems worth noting that many teachers were enthusiastic about contributing to their communities and volunteered independently outside of school. Several suggested that time constraints and competing school initiatives influenced their involvement in school sponsored service projects.

**ICS students’ impressions**

A few student leaders passionately proclaimed the importance of service and argued that service-learning should be more stressed in the high school. Some students in ninth or tenth grade were involved in regular community service projects; those students tended to articulate moral or ethical reasons for their participation. However, most students involved in co-curricular service learning efforts were in eleventh or twelfth grade and explained their involvements as fulfilling CAS requirements. Students grumbled quite a bit about CAS reflections. A few students seemed to know a great deal about global issues. Meanwhile others seemed less accustomed to reflecting on the complex nature of local community challenges.

**The American International School of Johannesburg**

**AISJ Mission and Vision**

According to AISJ’s (2015d) website, the school’s vision statement was: “Together we dare to imagine, inspire to succeed, and courageously make a difference.”

Especially the later part of this vision suggests that students should impact the
communities around them. The school’s mission statement was, “Inspired learners: connected, creative and courageous.” The use of the word “connected” again suggested that students are involved in communities. The term “courageous,” when considered alongside its use in the school’s vision, seemingly alluded to courage in action.

AISJ listed eight core values on its (2015) website (note that italics are added for emphasis):

• Honesty, integrity, and accountability are fundamental
• Personalized, differentiated, authentic, and inspired teaching and learning are essential for achievement and growth
• A culture of continuous improvement is critical to success
• Diversity and inclusion encourage open-mindedness and empathy
• Learning is cognitive, creative, active and purposeful
• Creativity, adaptability, curiosity, and inquiry equip us to thrive in a changing world
• Strong community is built through participation, communication, collaboration, and mutual respect
• Contributing positively to society is our responsibility

While many of the values above are loosely connected to community engagement efforts, the ones italicized seem especially pertinent to this study, for they are the most explicit. These stated core values emphasized that students should intentionally cultivate positive relationships with community members and should make a positive impact on the world around them. The last value listed above emphasized the role that students play in the
process. At the same time, the rhetoric within some of the other core values (empathy, collaboration, mutual respect) framed community involvements as partnerships.

Finally, it seems worth noting that many people alluded to AISJ’s “four pillars”: academics, athletics, arts, and service. This positioning of service as one of the four key aspects of the school elevated service and articulated it as a central part of the institution.

**AISJ Co-curricular Efforts**

I observed a diverse set of co-curricular community engagement opportunities at AISJ. High school service groups were highly varied. This paragraph offers a small sampling of the activities I observed students planning or doing. Through Drama Connect, students used theater versus oppression techniques (Hartley & Bond, 2012) to explore contemporary issues with their peers from a local NGO. In an effort called Project Dignity, DP Biology students facilitated workshops where teens (from AISJ and local schools) discussed sexual health issues. At ShumbaShamba, students helped care for horses that were used in equine therapy for people with disabilities. Through a group called PAWs, students helped clean and care for abandoned pets at a local animal shelter. Students with Generation Earth took on a variety of environmentally focused projects; a sub-group was in the process of launching a community garden project at the time of my visit. AISJ students planned for the second annual South African Service Summit for Youth (SASSY), a gathering of student-leaders from regional schools to focus on youth empowerment and swap service-learning strategies. AISJ students offered instructional support for younger kids at a local partner organization, Teboho Trust. They helped document and publish stories from youth in an economically deprived neighborhood in
the Limpopo region. Other students brainstormed ways to advocate for the rapidly depleting rhino population. Meanwhile service leaders from AISJ joined service leaders from TigerKloof for weekend-long leadership conferences. This is not an exhaustive list; rather this paragraph demonstrates the range of co-curricular options at AISJ.

Another key feature of the AISJ co-curricular service-learning program is its annual Classroom Without Walls (CWW) trips. On CWW trips, students went with their grade-level peers to different parts of the country for cultural and service trips. Grades 9 and 10 took trips in the fall—grade 9 to Magieliesberg Oppiberg and grade 10 to the Mnweni Cultural Centre in Drakensburg. Grades 11 and 12 had Johannesburg-based enrichment weeks that also included a service-learning focus.

**AISJ Curricular-based Efforts**

AISJ’s curricular efforts were more formalized than those that I saw at the other two campuses. The school expected all teachers to integrate service-learning into the standard curriculum. There was a broadly recognized school-wide goal of integrating service-learning into every grade level and every subject area. At the time of my visit, this goal was more fully actualized in the elementary and middle school divisions than within the high school. To help support and monitor this goal, the school had developed service-learning standards and benchmarks that could be directly inserted into teachers’ unit plans (see Appendix G). The school offered professional development sessions on service-learning to teachers. A full-time service-learning coordinator was also available to support teachers as they developed curriculum.
The school also offered courses that gave students formal training in service-learning approaches. All ninth and tenth graders took a course known as Global Citizens/Missions. This course served a range of purposes—it taught students about study skills, digital citizenship, and service-learning. In regards to service-learning, the class introduced students to things such as the five-stage process, AISJ’s service project proposal process, and the school’s reflection monitoring system, ManageBac. The course included units that helped students consider their own cultural identities and perceptions of others. In eleventh and twelfth grade, students also were expected to enroll in a Missions class. Much like the ninth/tenth grade version, this course served a range of purposes; one such purpose was to monitor and support the CAS program. Accordingly, eleventh/twelfth grade students had the opportunity to discuss their service involvements in the context of these classes. Discussions in these classes were more directly tied to IB expectations than service-learning pedagogy in general.

**AISJ People Involved**

AISJ had a full-time service-learning coordinator who was responsible for overseeing the service-learning programs at both the Johannesburg campus and the sister-school at the Pretoria campus (not included in this study). This coordinator oversaw many of the major decisions and structural elements. For instance, she helped coordinate the creation of school-wide service-learning rubrics, standards and benchmarks, and curriculum maps. She offered support for a team of service-learning divisional representatives (one per division, per campus) and was the primary liaison between service-learning participants/supervisors and the school’s administration. The school had
a separate, part-time CAS coordinator who balanced that role with other teaching duties. The service-learning coordinator and CAS coordinator respectively worked closely with Global Citizens teachers, who were the primary ground-level instructors for service-learning in the high school. Parents were explicitly encouraged to monitor their child’s CAS portfolios as well. Each individual club, group, or effort had its own internal leadership structure. Student leaders served as key decision-makers and organizers. They were supervised by faculty sponsors. A high school service-learning council, comprised of student leaders from various service groups, played a role in distributing school funds, organizing activities, and coordinating efforts between various groups. The high school service-learning divisional representative, who was also a full-time teacher, was a key point person for all high school co-curricular service projects. Individual teachers took initiative to integrate service-learning projects into their own curriculum with the support of a service-learning coordinator. Most service efforts required ongoing collaboration with security, transportation, and other support teams.

**AISJ Documentation and Requirements**

AISJ’s service-learning program was extensively documented. AISJ had a CAS handbook that overviewed the school-specific expectations for the program. It included information on the IBO’s CAS expectations, on the school’s portfolio platform, Managebac, on the personnel involved in CAS and the responsibilities of each party, on the CAS proposal process, and on school deadlines.

The school also had an array of service-learning documents that extended far beyond CAS. These included a school-wide service-learning handbook, K-12 service-
learning standards and benchmarks, K-12 performance rubrics, and a service-learning scope and sequence document that overviewed curricular inclusions in each grade. In many ways, these documents, especially the last three, were quite unique. They provided far more detail on the expectations for grade-specific service-learning instruction and student learning than most schools provide. The documents broke down many of the skills and understandings involved in service-learning. These documents also allowed teachers to integrate specific standards into their unit plans, which in turn offered greater accountability and transparency in the instructional process. There are also quite a few support documents that are widely available to facilitators including proposal forms, permission/medical forms, service-learning monitoring forms, activity checklists, community contact forms, fundraising proposal forms, incident report forms, bus manifests, and service-learning requisition forms.

The AISJ (2013) service-learning handbook included the following mission for the school’s service-learning program:

AISJ’s service learning program enables students to actively engage in, lead, and understand meaningful service by responding to genuine needs of the community. This will be achieved through the delivery of an integrated service learning curriculum and the development of sustainable projects. (p. 3)

The handbook detailed that all high school students at AISJ were expected to participate in service-learning activities. In the high school, students in grades 9 and 10 were expected to participate in AISJ’s Creativity, Activity, Service, and Leadership (CASL) program through a Global Citizens class and through Classroom Without Walls. Students were expected to spend at least one semester engaged in a sustainable service project and
could receive a 0.25 credit for their participation. Students in grades 11 and 12 also took a Mission class that included several days a week of Global Citizens instruction/CAS support. They received a 0.25 credit for their 11/12 participation. Diploma students were expected to complete all IB CAS requirements including a minimum of 30 reflections as evidence of learning. Meanwhile, grade 11 and 12 students who were not Diploma Programme candidates were still expected to engage in service, maintain a portfolio of 10 reflections per year, and complete a final service project. In total, students needed to receive 0.5 credits of service-learning in order to receive their AISJ diploma. All students in the high school were evaluated according to the same performance rubric. Regular reports on students’ service-learning progress were prepared and sent to students and parents. It also seems worth noting that the service-learning handbook strongly encouraged faculty, staff, and even parents to participate in AISJ’s service-learning program.

**AISJ Local Context**

While there were many things about the local context that service-learning facilitators alluded to, a large number of them tied to South Africa’s fairly recent history. From 1948 through 1994, a series of laws promoted racial segregation, or apartheid, in South Africa. The struggle to overthrow the apartheid regime was bloody and tumultuous. When the last apartheid laws were finally repealed in 1993 and the first open democratic election happened in 1994, Nelson Mendela was elected president. Under his leadership, the nation began what has been a long and arduous process of integration and reconciliation. While many advanced towards greater equality have been made, there are
nonetheless remnants of the regime remaining. As Chisholm (2004) phrased it, there has been a “paradox of change and non-change” (p. 14).

Quite a few faculty and staff members at AISJ lived through years of apartheid rule. These long-term South African residents witnessed (and some even actively participated in) attempts to overthrow the country’s apartheid regime. As individuals who would have been identified as white, Bantu (black African), coloured (mixed race), and Asian (Indian and Pakistani) under apartheid law, their firsthand experiences during these unsettling times varied drastically. Many of the students, who were equally ethnically diverse to AISJ faculty, would have been too young to directly experience or remember life under apartheid rule. However, all AISJ community members seemed quite cognizant of the ongoing transitions the nation has experienced since 1994.

Against such a raw post-apartheid backdrop, AISJ students and faculty alike seemed hyper aware of race and power dynamics. I witnessed many discussions and trainings that helped students explore their identity and their perceptions of others. Students and faculty both spoke of their desires to interact with community members in respectful manners. Adults in particular described their desires to empower those who might have been denied resources under apartheid rule. Several people spoke frankly about their fears of inadvertently contributing to oppressive systems. They explained that their first hand experiences with oppression allowed them to be more empathetic in their approaches. They were more attuned to the power dynamics implicit in service-learning ventures than many people are.

Even in post-apartheid South Africa, it seems there are still significant gaps between rich and poor, white and black. Blacks who were denied educational
opportunities pre-1994, for instance, lacked the qualifications that enable them to get high paying jobs, despite their post-1994 legal entitlement to these sorts of roles. Accordingly, despite the shift towards a freer and more equal South Africa, there are still significant gaps between rich and poor along color lines. I could readily see these gaps as I looked around neighborhoods in Johannesburg. Rich suburbs, that were predominately white, were completely separated from predominantly black townships. While members of the AISJ community were from many different ethnic backgrounds, most lived in the more affluent suburbs. They had fewer opportunities to interact with individuals in the townships. Their primary contacts with members of these poorer communities were either through relationships with their house help or through people they met on service projects. Students and adults alike lamented the ongoing segregation in South African cities. Accordingly, many adult facilitators in particular reflected on the sorts of intercultural training that students needed to receive in order to interact in respectful manners. In short, community engagement efforts at AISJ were embedded in a poignant historical context.

AISJ Sentiments Towards Community Engagement Efforts

AISJ teachers’ impressions

When I asked teachers about the community engagement efforts within the high school, most pointed to co-curricular efforts. They described student-led projects and pointed to faculty sponsors or the service-learning team in overseeing these efforts. If they described curricular efforts, they consistently pointed to Global Citizens classes. They seemed to attribute responsibility for related instruction to instructors of these
courses or to CAS advisors. These instructors and advisors seemed to have mixed interpretations of service-learning’s purpose and form. There were discussions when I was there about ways to better align faculty visions and understandings. Most agreed that more related professional development time was needed. Teachers often favorably alluded to training with educational consultant Kaye, who had visited the school several times in the last few years. Several suggested that they also craved alternative service-learning models.

The teachers that were involved in various projects seemed highly passionate about their efforts. Most were connected to projects of personal interest. Many of the most enthusiastic faculty members were long-time residents of South Africa and felt a deep connection to the local community. Faculty often chose to engage in projects that also aligned with their skill sets; for example, a biology teacher mentored a group focused on reproductive health.

AISJ students’ impressions

AISJ students were generally quite enthusiastic about their participation in various service-learning projects. They saw the value of these efforts and expressed a desire to be involved in both “respectful” and “sustainable” projects. They perceived high levels of ownership and responsibility for projects’ success. Their language reflected that they had internalized many aspects of the school’s articulated approach. For example, many spoke of the process using terminology from the five-stage model. While students grumbled about CAS formal requirements, they rarely grumbled about their participation in the projects themselves. Students often spoke about the high standards that the service-
learning team held for projects in the proposal process. Several explained that these high standards frustrated them initially, yet they came to realize that these expectations ultimately led to better projects.

**Looking ahead to Chapters Five and Six**

This chapter has established the shape and role of community engagement efforts on each respective campus. As I move into the next chapters, I transition into findings and themes that cross campuses. I reference specific examples from each school and note similarities and differences between them. As I do so, I wish to reiterate the importance of timing. The activities that I observed and the conversations that I had on each campus were inevitably influenced by the timing of my visits. For example, by visiting Kenya at the start of the year, students were primarily focused on planning, initiating projects, and setting expectations. The timing of my visit to Ethiopia put me later into the process—students were in the middle of service-learning projects. Meanwhile my stay in South Africa aligned with the start of a new semester, so some students were shifting into new roles or anticipating unique end of the year challenges. However, most AISJ projects were well under way and students were more focused on action and reflection than planning. Accordingly, as I wrote the upcoming chapters, I found that certain sections relied more heavily on conversations at one school than another. While Chapter Four has certainly demonstrated unique elements of each campus, it is also logical to assume that some of the differences I saw in discussion topic are based in the temporal contexts.
CHAPTER FIVE: A FRAMEWORK TO CONCEPTUALIZE REQUISITE UNDERSTANDINGS

Introduction

I explicitly set out to explore the supports and challenges for community engagement efforts in IBO international schools. Yet going into this project, I also recognized that it was unlikely that I would find a single model for civically minded schools worldwide to adopt, a clear formula for teachers interested in developing service learning programs, or even a primary obstacle for community engagement efforts. My data reflected this initial hypothesis—efforts were complex, particularistic, and tailored to the individuals who carried them out. No two efforts looked identical, as should be clear from the descriptions of each school’s approaches in Chapter Four. No two individual facilitators faced identical obstacles, nor did they operate with identical resources.

At the same time, school-specific efforts, perceived challenges, and perceived supports were not too particularistic for patterns to emerge. Rather, facilitators on all three campuses recognized that their efforts involved a range of skills and understandings. While individuals articulated the different sets of competencies, or what I refer to as “domains of knowledge,” in the context of their unique efforts, there were nonetheless clear overlaps in the areas of understanding that individuals identified as existing or desired resources.

In this chapter, I explore six domains of knowledge that facilitators frequently acknowledged as influential: service learning pedagogy and implementation, global issues awareness, understandings of the school context, understandings of the local context, leadership and organizational development, and communication/public relations.
As I introduce each area of understanding, I describe instances where related knowledge was perceived as a resource and moments where a lack of related knowledge seemed to hinder efforts. I also link these standpoints to a sampling of related literature.

**Clarifying Terms, Drawing on Soccer Analogies**

Before delving into each domain, let me clarify some of the key concepts that I expand on in the next two chapters (domains, competencies, and shared leadership models) by drawing on an extended sports analogy.

In soccer, teams are made up of individual players, each of whom brings a unique set of skills. These skills and strengths vary; one player might have outstanding offensive or defensive talents, while another has tremendous fitness or speed, incredible game instincts, strong communication skills, or impressive ball control. A team’s roster may include a superstar player—one that is particularly adept at scoring or that has remarkable dribbling skills. Yet a single player cannot carry an entire team to victory. Likewise, a player cannot survive on single type of skills alone. The game is far too complex. Instead, a team is ultimately reliant on the whole group’s collective abilities. It relies on eleven field players, with diverse skills and talents, to navigate the demands of a dynamic and complex game.

There are many similarities between soccer and community engagement efforts. Community engagement efforts, much like those in soccer, occur in dynamic and social spaces and rely on a wide range of skills and understandings. Each individual who is involved in a community engagement effort brings with her/him unique knowledge and abilities. Just as soccer players have certain areas of strength, so too do service-learning
facilitators. Additionally, facilitators rely on their colleagues to cover their vulnerabilities in much the same way that an offensive soccer player relies on her team’s defense in a soccer match. Facilitators, like coaches, can attend to the holistic strengths and weaknesses of their teams. They can intentionally recruit team members with expertise in particular areas. Similarly, just as soccer teams recognize the sorts of skills involved in the sport and actively train to develop those skills, service-learning teams can use the domains of knowledge to help them recognize skills worth cultivating.

In the upcoming chapters, I use the term *domain of knowledge* to cluster skills and understandings by theme. In soccer, a domain might include a category such as offense, defense, or teamwork. Meanwhile, in community engagement efforts I suggest that relevant “domains of knowledge” include categories such as service-learning pedagogy or global issues awareness. I describe the individual skills and understandings involved in each as “competencies.” Just as a category such as offensive skills in soccer might capture a range of abilities (shooting, passing, creating space, anticipating passes), each community engagement “domain of knowledge” includes a wide range of competencies (investigating, planning, reflecting). See Table 2 for sample competencies related to each of the six domains.

Table 2

*Sample Competencies of Each Domain*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Sample competencies (not an exhaustive list)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service-learning pedagogy</td>
<td>• Design projects that balance meaningful service and meaningful learning experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop sustainable projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teach reflective skills and establish reflective habits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Foster dignity-aware relationships between students and community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Issues</td>
<td>• Recognize how local issues fit into global trends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Recognize the interconnectedness of issues
• Anticipate secondary outcomes of interventions or actions
• Address root issues

School context
• Align projects with institutional priorities (e.g., mission and vision, five-year plans, accreditation recommendations)
• Follow school protocols and procedures
• Navigate school politics
• Recognize key community “gatekeepers” (e.g., school secretaries, PTO presidents, outspoken faculty, security advisors) and develop positive working relationships with these individuals

Local context
• Align projects with community priorities
• Respect local customs, values, and social etiquette
• Recognize the historical and political contexts of projects
• Anticipate project needs and constraints related to transportation, safety, etc.

Leadership/Organization
• Establish individual and group accountability measures
• Create shared leadership models, where individuals’ use their unique strengths and interests
• Develop mechanisms to safeguard against transiency (e.g., student leaders “hand off” projects to new leaders before graduating/moving)
• Manage time effectively

Communications/Public Relations
• Communicate goals, needs, and expectations to a variety of stakeholders (within the school and the wider community)
• Use publicity to foster widespread buy-in for projects
• Celebrate positive relationships and collective accomplishments publicly
• Recognize effective channels of communication within different communities (e.g., social media for students v. faculty meeting announcements for teachers)

This chapter will demonstrate that community engagement efforts are complex and that competencies and domains of knowledge are important considerations.

Returning to the sports analogy, nearly every coach agrees that soccer players need to hone diverse skills. Coaches design their practices accordingly; they introduce drills to refine particular skills. They recognize that every player has skills to develop and
strengths to capitalize on. Yet in community engagement efforts, it seems that there are few frameworks that capture the range of skills involved. In my study, facilitators regularly recognized diverse demands implicit in their roles. Again and again, they alluded to particular skills that helped them navigate challenges or to specific understandings that benefitted their efforts. This chapter offers structure to these acknowledgements by synthesizing dominant themes into six domains of knowledge.

One final note—just as in the game of soccer no skill can be considered in complete isolation (e.g. fitness skills impact one’s ability to optimize their shooting skills), so it is with domains of knowledge in community engagement efforts. Understandings in one area impact understandings in other areas. Proficiencies in one domain can augment effectiveness in another. While I present domains separately in the upcoming pages, they are, in actuality, intimately connected to one another.

Service-Learning Pedagogy

Defining the Domain

Considering that the term service-learning was used to describe nearly all the efforts that I observed (as noted in Chapter Four), this domain recognizes that service-learning pedagogy is actually nuanced and complex. There are many related skills and understandings. Note that the term service-learning was used so frequently by participants in my study that I often substitute the term for community engagement from here on out. The term service-learning was loosely applied to everything from co-curricular service clubs to human rights focused coursework, from sustained partnerships to isolated fundraising efforts. The breadth of efforts labeled service-learning was not
altogether surprising, for as Chapter Two acknowledged, service-learning rhetoric abounds in IBO schools and even service-learning scholars have little consensus to their definitions or understandings of the term. In such a popular, yet loosely defined field, it seemed all the more important to have team members that were well-versed in the pedagogy, that could recognize the benefits and dangers of different approaches, that knew how to logistically implement service-learning approaches, and that understood the skills involved in the service-learning process. Figure 4 captures some of the sorts of understandings implicit in this domain.

Figure 4. Sample understandings involved in the domain of knowledge, service-learning pedagogy.
Facilitators on all three campuses seemed to agree—solid service-learning projects were not spontaneous occurrences; rather they were carefully crafted learning experiences that relied on specialized skills. As one adult facilitator explained, an affinity for the pedagogy was not enough; she observed that some educators and administrators were “behind service-learning as an educational buzzword, but they don’t really understand what that is.” Her explanation suggested that many individuals found service-learning approaches alluring, but lacked deep pedagogical knowledge. It implied that specific understandings and skills were important to the process.

**Flash Forward to Chapter Six**

In Chapter Six, I will consider in detail a dozen competencies involved in this domain. I will describe instances where related skills, or the lack thereof, impacted endeavors. I will include nuanced considerations of connected literature. Accordingly, I will suspend my discussion of this domain “in action” until Chapter Six.

**Global Issues Awareness**

**Defining the Domain**

Community engagement efforts, especially service-learning projects, target particular community needs. However, there are almost always larger contexts to these needs. Such root causes, underlying tensions, or secondary effects may not be always obvious on the surface. This domain acknowledges the sentiment amongst facilitators that students and teachers needed to develop their understandings of the complexities of these issues. By better recognizing their own role in issues, the web of interrelated elements,
and the larger contextual pieces to particular projects, facilitators could thus adopt more appropriate, informed, and meaningful approaches. For instance, I often heard the catch phrase, “Think globally, act locally.” This phrase implied that students should disentangle complex and interwoven global issues (e.g. poverty, environmental issues, global economics, human rights) and by so doing, consider how larger contexts influence projects in their particular localities. See Figure 5 for a sampling of the types of understandings involved in this domain.

Figure 5. Sample understandings involved in the domain of knowledge, global issues awareness.
Domain in Action

I observed many examples of students and teachers’ relying on understandings and heard facilitators reference dozens of skills related to each domain. For the sake of brevity, I focus on examples that highlight how understandings of the domain might be an asset for teams or how a lack of related understandings might inhibit efforts. By structuring my examples in this way, I also address my central research questions that focused on the perceived supports and barriers to community engagement efforts.

Understandings of global issues as perceived resources

When I asked facilitators about exemplary community engagement efforts, they often pointed to projects that showcased students’ nuanced understandings of complex issues. For instance, students at both AISJ and ICS launched similar projects that indirectly targeted girls’ education issues. Facilitators involved in each project explained that they hoped to impact gender imbalances in secondary education settings and noted widespread concern over girls’ academic persistence. However, rather than adopting obvious approaches, such as advocacy campaigns proclaiming the value of girls’ education, students on both campuses instead recognized and responded to one of the underlying root issues to girls’ high drop out rates: a lack of access to affordable feminine hygiene products. Menstruating young women who could not access feminine products were forced to miss school and fell further and further behind each month. Because the students involved in the ICS and AISJ projects had sufficient understanding of the interrelated nature of health issues and education, they were able to create projects that targeted these issues. ICS students involved in a co-curricular club called E-Pads,
designed, tested, produced, and distributed reusable feminine products to young women in the local community. Similarly, a group from AISJ, Project Dignity, partnered with a local NGO that created reusable sanitary pads and distributed these feminine products in the context of teen sexual health workshops. This project was facilitated by a group of DP Biology students who brought expertise from their class into workshop discussions.

All three schools implicitly recognized the value of global issues awareness by offering related coursework. As I overviewed in Chapter Four, ISK had an overtly global issues-focused elective course, Sustainable Development. This class explicitly reviewed those global issues identified by Rischard (2002). ICS also offered an elective course, Global Issues Leadership and Action, which explored global issues broadly. AISJ’s required ninth and tenth grade course, Global Citizens, also included some global issues related instruction. In short, there were numerous examples on all three campuses where understandings of global issues were either demonstrated or overtly valued.

Perceived obstacles related to understandings of global issues

Just as knowledge of this domain was framed as an asset, a lack of related knowledge was cited as a potential challenge to community engagement efforts. For example, one teacher lamented that some of her students’ seemed to lack knowledge of the complex nature of poverty or the role that each of them plays in in the issue. She described her frustrations that students, despite prompting to consider other options, kept defaulting their efforts to fundraising or charity efforts. These fundraising efforts reduced poverty to an issue of having/not having money. The teacher explained to me that she wanted these students to recognize the role that they played in some of the underlying
issues and to recognize root issues/interconnected challenges. Yet, as she described, students lacked the background knowledge to recognize these sorts of things.

Another adult facilitator, involved in a group that focused on animal care and animal rights, pointed out how difficult it could be to help students recognize the bigger contexts of their efforts. She explained:

Ultimately, I want to look at the bigger picture of animal abuse. I mean I normally say to them, what are we looking at? What is the bigger picture in the sense of, every week you going, you're cleaning up kennels, you're playing with the puppies…But why are there so many? Why is it growing? So those kinds of issues. The core group that's been there longer, they get it. So again, we're looking at how can we kind of grow that—the education part of it.

This quote highlighted a gap in some students’ understanding and recognized that deeper knowledge of the root issues and contextual elements would be beneficial for students. It exemplifies the sorts of recognitions I heard from facilitators again and again that there was always room to cultivate deeper understandings of complex local and global issues.

**Contextualizing this Domain in the Literature**

There are already some discussions in the literature about the complex nature of the community challenges that students target in typical service-learning projects. Eyler and Giles (1999), for instance, described how students in service-learning projects have to grapple with both “complicated real-world context(s)” and also with “ill-structured problems” (p. 102). In their words,
Most of the problems we face in our communities are not what social scientists call well structured, with clearly defined goals, with the information and processes necessary to solve the problem known, and general consensus among experts about how to proceed. (p. 102)

They recognized that the nature of these ill-structured problems meant that students need to be well-informed in the underlying issues. They explained, “Effectively addressing ill-structured problems requires both considerable expertise about the particular subject at hand and advanced abilities to evaluate competing claims” (p. 102). In this, Eyler and Giles alluded to specific subject knowledge and also critical thinking skills. I include the former in this domain of knowledge and the latter in my discussion of service-learning pedagogy in Chapter Six.

This domain also fits into a wider discussion of the role of schools in global phenomena. As Chapter Two overviewed, schools have often been expected to foster students’ civic development. Yet there are also recognitions that it is not easy to help students understand the role they play in local or global issues. For example, Zsebik (2000) recognized that international schools are embedded in deep political contexts, that political forces are always impacting schools. At the same time, he suggested that international education could also influence local and global political thinking. Walker (2000) emphasized the value of global collaboration in addressing the complex challenges of today’s world. He argued that schools should attend to both the local and the global. Meanwhile, Drennen (2002), in a chapter on curriculum development in international schools, argued that
The challenge is to foster development of citizenship at multiple levels—in the immediate community, at a wider national level and beyond, in an international sense, whilst at the same time encouraging the development in students of a sense of their own identity. (p. 58)

Drennen’s words captured the complexity of teaching students about global issues, and the role that they play in these issues within international schools. Students are simultaneously learning about their immediate communities, about global contexts, and about themselves.

Other authors have also captured the tensions between global and local understandings. For example, numerous scholars have suggested that international school communities gravitate more frequently towards international perspectives than local ones. Garton (2002) noted that international schools tend to overemphasize the global in their instruction and less frequently focus on the local. Hayden (2006) made a similar observation as she suggested that globally mobile students may be more hesitant to truly invest in local communities because they are already thinking about their next transition. As she noted, they might struggle to involve themselves in the local community or recognize the intimate relationships between global and local issues. While international school students tend to focus on they global, they do not always see the role that they play in these global issues. For example, as Roberts (2013) pointed out, one of the key challenges involved in cultivating global understanding is to help affluent students recognize the role that the economic elite of the world plays in global economics. Vaccaro (2011) articulated a similar idea. She explained, “Changing deficit thinking, debunking the myth of meritocracy, and questioning the culture of poverty are not easy
tasks” (p. 49). Vaccaro highlighted the challenge that students have to understand not only global issues, but also the potentially oppressive role they inadvertently play within these complex issues.

Thus far, I have introduced tensions between local and global understandings as something specific to international schools. Yet local-global tensions have been cited in national contexts as well. Al Farra (2000), for example, lamented that national schools tended to focus on understanding the local context and had a harder time situating knowledge in international contexts. In short, scholars, whether they have examined national or international schools, have recognized that schools have an obligation to help students recognize the nuances of both local and global contexts. I argue this as well.

To some extent, there have already been recognitions that there are specific skills and knowledge involved in these sorts of local-global understandings. For example, Hill (2007) argued that “IB students in internationally-minded schools should acquire, from a global perspective, knowledge about world issues, social justice and equity, interdependence, sustainable development, cultural diversity, peace and conflict, and languages” (p. 33). Meanwhile, Haywood (2007) described the nature and expression of international-mindedness around understandings of different themes: diplomatic, political, economic and commercial, spiritual, multicultural, human rights, pacifist, humanitarian, environmentalist, and globalization. Skelton (2007) acknowledged that it is very difficult, from a psychological level, for students to come to deep levels of international-mindedness. This recognition implied that there are things that must be done to help students reach these deep levels, or skills involved in this process.
In short, by including a global issues domain of knowledge, I reaffirm key sentiments expressed by scholars such as those included above. Just as Zsebik (2000) argued that schools and students are simultaneously influenced by and influencing their local and global communities, I, too, recognize that each individual is an actor in complex global phenomena. Just as scholars like Drennen (2002) or Hayden (2006) pointed out the complex nature of related understanding, I argue that it is both important and difficult for students to understand the intersections of the self, the local, and the global.

Understanding of the School Context

Defining the Domain

Community engagement efforts happen in the context of specific school communities. Every school has its own structures, procedures, expectations, norms, interests, values, and history. As a social space, the nuanced politics and dynamics of a particular school are always evolving. This domain recognizes that, in order for community engagement efforts to thrive, teams need to be able to navigate the nuances of the school context. They need to draw on the expertise of those with institutional knowledge. Experts in the school context might know key school “gatekeepers”: the secretary that knows all the bus drivers, the teacher that everyone listens to in faculty meetings, the administrative assistant who controls school calendars, or the student leader that all the twelfth graders respect. They might be well-versed in the school’s field trip or security procedures or might be attune to the parent community’s priorities. In short, this domain acknowledges that understandings of the school context, such as those captured
in Figure 6, can play an important role in community engagement efforts. Not only can such understandings help with the logistical implementation of projects, they can also help teams recognize ways to cultivate enthusiasm for a particular effort, align projects and school initiatives, maximize school resources, etc.

**Figure 6.** Sample understandings involved in the domain of knowledge, school context.

This domain seems especially important to international schools or other highly transient spaces. As I noted in Chapter Three, international schools are characterized by high turnover rates with both students and faculty. This means that those facilitating service-learning projects may be fairly new to their school settings. They may be
passionate service-learning facilitators, but relatively unfamiliar with school-specific protocols or expectations. Facilitators may be new to the IB’s philosophy or unfamiliar with the challenges of working with Third Culture Kids. They may have little understanding of the school’s traditions or the community nerves to carefully circumvent. They may not be accustomed to the dynamics of students, administrators, or faculty. Yet projects depend on facilitators’ ability to work within the school-specific expectations to rally enthusiasm and foster collective ownership or projects. Accordingly, it seems especially important for facilitators to solicit the expertise of those who are familiar with the school community.

**Domain in Action**

*Understandings of the school context as perceived resources*

While the understandings in this domain were less explicitly discussed than some of the ones related to other domains, facilitators nonetheless seemed to benefit from nuanced understandings. They demonstrated these understandings through subtle actions or words. For instance, an AISJ student alluded to a service-learning fund that he thought his peers should tap into for their project; this demonstrated that he knew the process of securing related funding. Another AISJ student clearly recognized students’ logistical constraints as he organized a meeting time around sports’ practices, despite the fact that he was not an athlete himself. An ICS student understood that special attention had to be paid to the school’s highly transient population; she described how the first questions leaders asked as they considered their potential predecessors were: “Are you going to graduate here? Are you gonna be here next year?” By preemptively addressing transiency
concerns, she and other leaders could help make projects more sustainable. Meanwhile, an adult facilitator showcased her understandings of the school’s parent culture as she recognized that parents’ were not able to immediately pick up their students on demand. Accordingly, she prompted students on their way back from service trips to call their parents well before arriving to campus. She explained that this helped reduce the time she had to wait for parents to pick up their children. The understandings that these examples illustrate are subtle. However, such detailed institutional knowledge seemingly enabled projects to run more smoothly and efforts to be more time-efficient.

Formal school-specific documentation that overviewed service-learning expectations, procedures, key players, and related forms also implicitly recognized the complexity of navigating the school-specific protocols and procedures. There was a wealth of formal documentation at both AISJ and ISK. For example, AISJ had a service-learning site that housed many of the related forms and documents such as the bus manifest form, incident report, service-learning activity checklist, and the service project proposal form. The school also had a service-learning handbook that detailed the school’s approaches and expectations. This document also explained who did what (related to service-learning) on campus and offered contacts for each individual. ISK also had substantial documentation including a service-learning handbook and a CASL handbook (see Chapter Four). The former detailed things like school-specific expectations and job descriptions for the different sorts of people involved (e.g., service-learning coordinator or parent chaperones). The existence of these sorts of documents suggested that every school’s protocols, approaches, and expectations are particularistic. These documents also suggest that it is important for teams to understand school-specific elements.
**Perceived obstacles related to understandings of the school context**

Students or teachers often recognized that they lacked the institutional knowledge, especially when they first arrived at their schools, which allowed them to intuitively tailor their efforts to match school cultures or expectations. For example, a student facilitator recalled her first semester at the international school after transferring from a homogeneous (all black) national school. She explained that she had a hard time adjusting to the school’s multicultural and Third Culture Kid student body and described her initial culture shock and withdrawal:

[There were] so many different colors! I know it sounds really weird, but so many colors! It's so weird. And they're like, "Oh hi!" and all enthusiastic and friendly. And I was like, “Why are you talking to me?!? You're scaring me. Stop. Stop.”

[By second semester] I'm like, yes! Gonna see my friends. I'm used to their faces. Waves of different people—Asians and Europeans. And I'm like, oh my goodness! Indians that consider themselves Canadian. And you're like, this is so cool! But so weird!

This quote suggests that the school’s unique student culture was jarring for this student at first. As our interview continued, this student explained how her culture shock caused her to initially avoid school activities. However, as she adjusted to the school’s subculture and was increasingly familiar with her peers and their communications styles, she gradually got more involved and eventually assumed leadership roles in a variety of school groups, including service clubs. In a different instance, a fairly new teacher described his own adjustment process to the school’s subculture. He explained that when
he first arrived at the school, he expected students to be as independent as his students at a former international school. However, he found that some of his students lacked the inquiry skills needed to be able to effectively explore issues or set up meaningful service projects. He and another new teacher chatted about how challenging it was to change their approaches to match the students’ experiences and cultures. This second example illustrates the challenge of understanding the needs, interests, and experiences of particular school communities.

Institutional knowledge gaps are not only restrained to new teachers, though. Even facilitators who had been at schools for a long time occasionally were surprised to find holes in their knowledge of school procedures, protocols, or logistics. For example, one student facilitator who had been at her school for years described a particular project that she had previously helped with. As a part of their project, students hosted a group of local youth on campus. The project’s leadership team had assumed that the cafeteria would be able to help supply items such as spoons and forks for their catered lunch, but no one realized that all cafeteria facilities would be locked during the weekend. The facilitator described how, because they did not realize this small detail, student leaders had to scramble at the last minute to find another alternative.

**Related Literature**

This domain focuses on facilitators developing their understandings of subcultures or procedures that are school-specific. There is some recognition that this is an important task for all service-learning facilitators. For example Keene and Reiff (2012) note that it is important for community engagement facilitators to “know your campus
culture, and use it” (p. 83). They stressed the potential of institutional knowledge as an asset towards community engagement programs. Keene and Reiff acknowledged the value of understanding school politics, the approval process, and key gatekeepers and their interests. They recognized that every campus is unique.

This domain primarily stresses team members’ understanding of their particular school context. However, because of the peculiarities of international schools’ collective culture (as introduced in Chapter Three) and because many people newer to international schools lack understanding of globally mobile students, the growing body of literature on this population is highly relevant to this domain. Teams could turn to this literature as they strategize the best approaches for working with international school populations. For example, facilitators could consult texts on Third Culture Kids (TCKs) that explore the unique attributes of globally-mobile youth including their attitudes towards their own identities, towards each other, and towards members of the local communities (McKillop-Ostrom, 2000; Oto, 2014; Pollock et al., 2009). If service-learning teams are to work effectively with Third Culture Kids, it seems important that they recognize common attributes of these individuals. Zilber (2009) described the unique attributes of a special group of TCKs that are common in international schools: the children of international educators. Hayden (2006) spoke at length about the characteristics of different constituents in international school communities including teachers, students, parents, board members, and administrators. Blandford and Shaw (2001) also described the peculiarities of leadership cultures within international schools. Many such resources could be consulted as teams attend to this domain. At the same time, this domain recognizes that people need to understand the specifics of the spaces they are in. This is
not always easy. For example, Caffyn (2013) described the complicated social dynamics of international school communities, calling them complex spaces of boundary negotiation. I acknowledge the complexity and peculiarity of each school context through my inclusion of this domain of knowledge

**Understanding of the Local Context**

**Defining the Domain**

Just as service-learning teams relied on school community insiders, so too did they depend on those who understood the contexts of their respective projects. In general, service-learning projects partnered school members with members of the local community. As one student in South Africa so aptly put it, teams strove to foster “dignity aware relationships.” Yet as many facilitators noted, in order for relationships with community partners to be respectful, teams needed to understand their partner’s culture, expectations, and needs. Many explained that this can be more of a challenge in international schools than in national schools, for more students and faculty members may be culturally, linguistically, or economically disconnected from the local community. However, they also suggested that these gaps are not insurmountable when facilitators are equipped with the right understandings. Figure 7 offers a sampling of the sorts of understandings involved in this domain.
Figure 7. Sample understandings involved in the domain of knowledge, local context.

Domain in Action

Understandings of the local context as perceived resources

I saw many instances where individuals capitalized upon their local understandings. For example, I watched students fluent in Amharic act as translators for the soccer program that ICS students hosted for local teens. Staff members at ISK acted as liaisons between community partners and students by offering linguistic and cultural navigation support. Students at AISJ who were familiar with the local school curriculum helped tutoring groups adapt their instruction to be more aligned with local approaches. A facilitator in Kenya, who also ran an NGO outside of the school, recognized a community partner’s needs through his NGO work and brought a team of ISK students to
help with the construction of a school library and computer lab. A facilitator in South Africa described his South African heritage as an advantage in community interactions and explained how he knew about customs, dynamics, and local history. He described his ease at navigating social protocols in contrast with an expatriate colleague’s initial difficulty as an example of the benefits of local understanding. Another South African native described how his personal struggles as a black man under the nation’s apartheid rule gave him greater insight into the power dynamics lurking below the surface of daily interactions. As I spoke to him, it became clear that he recognized things in the local community that might not be obvious to others who were newer to Johannesburg or not impacted by the features. For example, he pointed out a large pipe that ran alongside the main road I had passed regularly but had never thought much about. He explained that this pipe carried sewage from a well-off suburb that many of the school’s students and faculty lived in, dumping it right beside one of the large townships in the city. While this South African faculty member was highly aware of inequalities within the immediate community, newer community members were likely less aware of their surroundings. Yet these sorts of insight into the particularities of the local context seem highly relevant to teams that wish to have meaningful community engagement efforts.

Perceived obstacles related to the local context

A teacher described a student effort that he had observed that seemed uninformed about community dynamics. He once chaperoned a cleanup project where students collected rubbish from a field beside a nearby slum. The students were disappointed when a week later they returned to find the field piled high with trash again and observed
them grumbling that community members did not seem to care about keeping the space clean. But the teacher, who knew the challenges within the particular community well, explained to me that if the students had taken to time to solicit more community feedback in advance, they would have understood there were many reasons that trash got disposed of in that particular spot. He described the lack of rubbish collection system in that neighborhood and explained some of the particularities of the environmental, economic, and health concerns related to garbage disposal.

A different teacher described a service project that she felt was also out of touch with actual community needs. In this project, which was linked to one of the weeklong school service/cultural trips, students taught community members how to type on iPads. While students hoped to provide empowering technological training for community members, the teacher I spoke to felt that this effort was extremely shortsighted. She explained that community members would likely never have access to iPads again, as they were living in remote areas and had no means to obtain these devices. She explained how this project, which she deemed to be highly out of touch with local needs or desires, prompted her to solicit more community feedback in her designs for the next year’s trip.

**Related Literature**

This domain recognizes that teachers and students need to understand the communities that they live in. In a discussion of social justice initiatives in an international school in Colombia, Tarc (2013) noted that, “Teachers need to step back, listen and learn to understand the new context and to be reflective on the partiality of the framings he or she brings to it” (p. 73). In other words, those who are globally mobile
cannot expect to automatically apply their understanding of global phenomena in local contexts. They need to recognize and acknowledge the perspectives that they bring into their understandings of local contexts and take the time to learn the particularities of the locality. Chisholm (2003), in a chapter focused on international service-learning, stressed that students who might not be familiar with the local context need to have opportunities to learn about customs, culturally appropriate communication, and behavioral expectations.

This domain, in the context of international schools, also relates to academic discussions of intercultural relations. Scholars generally agree that positive intercultural relations are not necessarily easy to foster. For example, Cantle (2012) wrote at length about the messiness of concepts of interculturalism, noting that the legacy of multicultural frameworks at times masks import concerns about power and prejudice. While he offers various cautions regarding its potential executions, he nonetheless advocates for a focus on interculturalism and its potential. Luckily, there is an increasing body of literature that examines ways to foster positive intercultural proficiencies (Byram, Nichols, & Stevens, 2001; Deardorff, 2009; Savicki, 2008), or develop what Molinsky (2013) refers to as “global dexterity.”

Additionally, this domain connects to a growing recognition in service-learning literature that emphasizes the importance of local voices in project planning. I will explore this final connection in far greater detail in Chapter Six. However it still seems worth noting that there is a small, but increasing, body of literature that suggests that local insiders are crucial to a project’s effectiveness. Much of this has centered on increasing local voices within the context of international service-learning ventures. For
example, a recent collection edited by Larsen (2015), focused on a range of issues related to community partner organizations’ views and needs. Larsen’s collection presented compelling reasons why host community members’ views need to take a central place in service-learning projects. While her book focused on international service-learning efforts, its implications could easily extend to efforts within international schools.

In this dissertation, I do not advocate for any particular intercultural approaches. Rather, I echo Tarc’s urging for teams to intentionally seek out local understandings. I encourage educators to turn to the literature on interculturalism. I encourage teams to reflect on ways to increase community members’ voice.

**Leadership and Organization**

**Defining the Domain**

The large majority of community engagement efforts that I observed were co-curricular and primarily student-run. These efforts often involved anywhere from five to a hundred students and often a dozen or more community members. This domain recognizes the skills and understandings involved in the facilitation of groups, particularly diverse groups. Teams require structures, management, vision, and accountability. Leaders need to know how to manage personnel, communicate effectively, motivate individuals, and navigate intercultural dynamics. In this study, student and adult facilitators alike alluded to the wide range of skills they relied on to coordinate, steer, and inspire cohesive and effective groups. Many individuals described their own process for developing these skills through formal and informal training,
through mentorship models, or through trial and error approaches. Figure 8 captures some of the understandings related to this domain that facilitators most frequently alluded to.

![Figure 8. Sample understandings involved in the domain of knowledge, leadership and organization.]

**Domain in Action**

*Understandings of leadership and organization as perceived resources*

I saw quite a few examples of formal leadership training. For example, in Kenya, student leaders received formal training from an external group called JUMP. While I did not observe the actual training, I observed student leaders referencing a binder of warm up and reflection activity ideas that they received from this organization. Meanwhile in
South Africa, student leaders from AISJ service groups and from student groups at a South African school called TigerKloof participated in a weekend-long leadership training camp. At the camp, student leaders self-assessed their leadership style and strategies, they reflected together on ways to better lead groups, and they swapped stories of successes and challenges. Student and adult facilitators from all three schools attended the annual Global Issues Service Summits (GISS), where they exchanged ideas with peers from other schools in the African region. Similarly, student service leaders at AISJ facilitated a conference called South African Service Summit for Youth (SASSY) that drew on GISS models and brought together service leaders from across South Africa to share leadership strategies.

I also saw considerable evidence that student and adult facilitators had developed leadership and organizational expertise. For example, one of the head student leaders for the 2015 SASSY conference described above divided the large planning committee (30+ students) into small committees. He explained to me that clear leadership and organizational structures were key. As a student that was preparing to graduate, he explained how he intended to pass on leadership of the massive event to future leaders: all committee heads were expected to document their step-by-step process and create detailed to-do lists for their respective responsibilities. The leader described how these formal structures would enable future committees to more effectively tackle the complex task of planning a massive regional conference. The scope of this particular project was very large and the organizational strategies involved were quite nuanced. However, even in much smaller projects I saw evidence that students were creating and using organizational approaches to ease transitions and orchestrate efforts. For example, in
several ISK service groups, I observed apprenticeship models, where key leaders informally trained their successors. By beginning the transition process early, they helped ensure that leaders were prepared to assume their duties in the next academic year.

**Perceived obstacles related to understandings of leadership and organization**

Many of the struggles I saw were related to transiency issues and a lack of long-term planning. For example, one student described how a project that she was a part of suddenly collapsed when the effort’s primary leader graduated. She explained that there had been a team of four main leaders in charge of the project’s direction, but that three out of four students moved and the fourth graduated. While there were still students interested in the project, it completely disintegrated in the wake of the mass exodus of leaders. Transiency challenges also impacted adult facilitators. For example, one described the challenges “acquiring” a project with little preparation. She explained that, as a new teacher to the school, she took on leadership of a student group. The previous facilitator had moved and left little documentation to ease the transition. The facilitator I spoke with described the challenges of making sense of the prior leader’s notes, structures, and approach. She lamented the fact that they had not been deliberate in planning for this transition and recognized that a lot more could have been done from an organizational perspective to make the project more sustainable.

I also observed student leaders grapple with the management of human resources. For example, on more than one occasion I watched large teams of students wait at a service site for leaders to scramble to create tasks to keep them occupied. Four students fumbled around moving books that only needed two people’s worth of manpower. Two
friends sat at the back of a classroom and chatted rather than getting involved in their
team’s tutoring tasks. Students would sign up to help with a particular project and then
fail to arrive at the bus. These sorts of examples highlight the complexity of peer
management and also underscore the need for relevant training.

**Related literature**

There are many leadership models described in academic literature. For example,
within the literature on school leadership, Mullen and Schunk (2012) offered a model for
mentoring that included four overlapping stages: initiation, cultivation, separation, and
redefinition. While their chapter focused on mentorship relationships amongst teachers,
similar principles could be extended to mentoring relationships amongst students.
Meanwhile Eisner’s (2016) study, which explored characteristics of innovative leaders in
different fields, identified ten key aspects of innovative leaders. They are:

- Passionate about vision and committed to its attainment, […] focused, towards,
fueled by, and fully engaged in work, […] reflective and experiential; curious
about and in tune with self, industry, and times, […] cognitively, emotionally, and
politically smart, […] authentically and visibly present, […] responsible for own
performance […], (the) embodiment of character […], (able to) balance between
heritage and innovation, […] leadership ready, willing, and able, […] (and)
determined to make an essential difference and seen as doing. (p. 197)

Each characteristic detailed in Eisner’s list could be deliberately fostered. Others, too,
detail collaborative leadership attributes. For instance, one of the figures in Rubin’s
(2002) text listed about a dozen dimensions of collaborative leadership:
Strategic thinking, asset-based perspective, professional credibility, timing the launch, recruiting the right mix, interpersonal communication skills, consensus building, diplomacy, understanding the rudiments of each sector, data-driven leadership, psychosocial- understanding people, institutionalizing the worry, group process, resource development, marketing/communications, technological savvy, managerial skill, systems thinking, entrepreneurism, vision-centered leadership, integrity, spirituality, commitment to diversity, and charisma. (p. 86)

Again, this detailed list highlights many aspects of effective leadership that teams could deliberately attend to. These characteristic lists by Eisner and Rubin are hardly the only models. There are thousands of texts focused the topic of leadership. There are even texts focused on ways to coach developing leaders (Wahl, Schriber, & Bloomfield, 2008). In short, there is an abundance of literature that explores different aspects of leadership. My study primarily directs practitioners to this existing body.

At the same time, by acknowledging the centrality of leadership skills within community engagement efforts, I intentionally highlight a gap in most current framings of service-learning ventures. Only a select few authors highlight the importance of related knowledge. The small body of existing literature tends to focus on the potential of service-learning experiences to cultivate students’ leadership skills (Eyler & Giles, 1999). Rubin (2002) was one of the few academics to allude to leadership capacities as requisite skills for effective community engagement efforts. Rubin acknowledged that instruction on collaboration and teamwork is often overlooked:

We send [students] out to sink or swim [in service-learning projects] with, perhaps, some preliminary substantive training (to acquaint them with the content
of the work) but not the skills of working in teams, building consensus, designing structures that support collaborative decision making, and the like. (p. 33)

This framing underscores the importance of coaching students deliberately on their leadership skills prior to commencing projects. I echo Rubin’s concerns and suggest that teams need to be more attentive to the cultivation of leadership-specific skills.

Communications/Public Relations

Defining the Domain

There are many people involved in and/or interested in school’s community engagement efforts including students, teachers, administrators, parents, community partners, IBO representatives, and accreditation teams. In order to optimize efforts and garner widespread support, facilitators needed to be attuned to the expectations, communication preferences, interests, and goals of all these different constituents. This domain acknowledges the challenges of effectively communicating with such different parties; it recognizes the complexity of fostering “buy in” from such diverse stakeholders. As one participant, Kerrie, explained, ultimately service-learning facilitators are striving for more than “buy-in” from these school and local community members; they are hoping for collective “ownership” of efforts. This degree of buy-in depends on the ability of teams to frame projects as worthy investments of energy and resources for each group. Accordingly, they depend on a wide range of communication and public relations understandings to do so. See Figure 9, which captures some such understandings.
Figure 9. Sample understandings involved in the domain of knowledge, Communications and public relations.

**Domain in Action**

**Understandings of communications/public relations as perceived resources**

I saw considerable evidence that facilitators considered ways to communicate within teams. For example, ISK student facilitators tailored to their peers’ preferences by frequently using Facebook groups to organize project logistics. In South Africa, I observed a meeting with a community partner and two AISJ facilitators (one adult, one student) where the AISJ facilitators deferred to the community partner’s agenda. I watched student leaders use varied communication strategies; they posted flyers on
bulletin boards, submitted notices for daily announcements, and reminded their friends in the hallways about project logistics.

I also saw considerable evidence that facilitators relied on understandings of public relations. For example, I saw celebrations of student accomplishments at assemblies in Ethiopia. Newsletters, including student-written articles and photos, showcased projects within both ISK and AISJ communities. Some students shared their CAS blogs with family members or friends. AISJ hosted a large service-learning celebration event shortly after I left, where students from all school divisions were able to showcase their learning to their peers, families, and members of the local community. The ISK handbook described several service-related awards that provided public recognition for exemplary service-learning projects.

**Perceived obstacles related to understandings of communications/public relations**

Facilitators still recognized areas for potential growth within their communication or publicity efforts. For example, I heard a group of students brainstorm ways to better cultivate administrative buy-in for their project proposal. They recognized, after an administrator initially rejected plans they had recently submitted, that they needed to reconsider both their approaches and also their marketing strategies. They acknowledged that the rejection of their plan was partially because they did not attend to the attributes of their project that were most important for administrators. They needed to make their plans sound more “admin-friendly.”

Teachers at a different school brainstormed how informal means could be used to raise their peers’ awareness of service-learning efforts; for example, they noted that their
peers rarely used the far away teacher’s lounge. Several reflected on the potential of a closer teacher lounge to increase informal water-cooler talk; teachers might naturally share their experiences within a particular project over a cup of coffee. These informal conversations could help faculty become more aware of and invested in one another’s efforts.

**Related Literature**

There has been some recognition that communication skills are a central part of community engagement efforts. Rubin (2002), for example, emphasized this relationship. As he put it, “Communication sits at the center of all human relationships. Collaboration, as relationship management, demands the skillful use of interpersonal communication” (p. 62). Rubin continued to discuss different aspects and functions of communications. For example, he described internal purposes, such as a group’s need to clearly document team decisions. Rubin also described communication for the purpose of marketing, making a careful note that successes should emphasize the combined efforts of collaborative partnerships rather than the efforts of any single individual. He suggested that technological savvy may play an important role in these efforts. Allen (2000), too, acknowledged the importance of communication. He noted different and sometimes competing desires and demands of different stakeholders in community in relation to community engagement efforts. Rather than offering a clear strategy of approach, he highlighted the complexity of navigating diverse stakeholder demands. My inclusion of this domain reiterates the points made by these sorts of scholars.
I also point practitioners towards the existing literature on communications and public relations. There are many who have explored effective interpersonal communication (Hargie, 2011; Knapp, Vangelisti, & Caughlin, 2014), public relations (Grunig et al., 2008; Ki, Kim, & Ledingham, 2015; Kitchen, 1997; White & Raman, 1999), and intercultural communication (Asante, Miike, & Yin, 2008; Gudykunst, 2005). Practitioners could turn to these texts to identify specific skills involved.

By acknowledging the centrality of communication issues in community engagement efforts, I intentionally highlight an aspect of service-learning that has received only cursory consideration in the literature. At the same time, I point practitioners to a deep body of existing literature on communication and public relations.
CHAPTER SIX: BREAKING DOWN DOMAINS OF KNOWLEDGE INTO COMPETENCIES; SERVICE-LEARNING PEDAGOGY AS AN EXAMPLE

Introduction

Chapter Five introduced the domains of knowledge framework as a way to capture the sorts of understandings that facilitators implied were important to community engagement efforts; it overviewed each domain, showed the domain in action, and offered a sampling of related literature. While that chapter offered a broad view into the process, this one adopts a more micro-level focus. This chapter takes a single domain, service-learning pedagogy, and describes in detail twelve related competencies. Although I offer a highly detailed view into the sorts of skills involved in this pedagogy, this chapter does not offer an exhaustive exploration of the competencies involved. The competencies I include align with those most heavily stressed by the facilitators in my study. Through my detailed exploration of these competencies, I intentionally demonstrate the range and complexity of competencies involved in any given domain. Note that I could have attended to each domain of knowledge with similar detail.

A Note on this Chapter’s Structure

In order to offer more clarity on the positioning of various competencies in the service-learning process, I use sub-sections that are aligned with the “five stages of service-learning” first coined by the educational consultant Kaye (2010): investigation, planning, action, reflection, and demonstration. Facilitators on all three campuses referenced these stages. Additionally, the five stage rhetoric has recently been adopted by
the IBO in its newest Creativity, Activity, and Service (CAS) guide (2015b). The IBO (2015) justifies this framework,

> These CAS stages represent a process and sequence that can assist students in many aspects of their life. They follow a process whereby they investigate an interest that often raises questions and curiosity, prepare by learning more, take some form of action, reflect on what they have done along the way, and demonstrate their understandings and the process. (p. 16)

Considering the pervasiveness of the five-stage rhetoric in IBO classrooms, it seems logical to describe competencies as they are related to each respective stage.

However, before I delve more fully into the different proficiencies required to effectively carry out each part of the process, I wish to step back and remind readers of the diversity of opinions regarding service-learning introduced in Chapter Two. I do so, for I do not wish for the structure of this chapter to suggest a commitment to any given approach. As afore-mentioned, the literature on service-learning reveals a wide range of philosophical stances towards the pedagogy. There is no single definition of service-learning that is universally recognized by academics, nor is there a single approach advocated (Eyler & Giles, 1999). There is a healthy debate between scholars about the nature, effects, and appropriate structure of service-learning efforts. In the practitioner realm, by contrast, there are relatively few models that have been presented to international educators. Kaye’s (2010) book has been widely circulated and schools have employed her consulting services. However, few competing models have been offered to educators in international schools. The pervasiveness of a single approach is likely to be reinforced by the IBO’s recent adoption of Kaye’s “five stage” model, which
institutionalizes her rhetoric and strategies. By choosing to structure the service-learning portion of this chapter around these five stages, I intentionally recognize the potential of her model to offer some structure to practitioners’ understandings. At the same time, I do not wish to minimize the wide range of philosophies held by individual facilitators, or the stances that individuals expressed that either problematized or strayed from her model. Thus, I intentionally introduce alternative perspectives, even as I operate within her framework.

I explore service-learning related competencies within this chapter that emerged as key themes in my data. As I do so, it seems important to remind readers of the diversity of perspectives that facilitators’ expressed. Through my research, I found that philosophical differences were rampant between educators. I alluded to these differences in Chapter Four. Some teachers conceptualized service-learning primarily as traditional volunteerism while others emphasized the connections between projects and curriculum. Some were eager to help their communities and quick to jump into projects. Others were more hesitant to get involved in direct service projects, citing concern over potential power imbalances or intercultural issues. Some educators focused on logistical constraints such as scheduling or curricular demands as they discussed reasons why the five-stage model was not always the best fit for their circumstances. Much like adult facilitators, student leaders also differed in their philosophies about service-learning. Some student facilitators spoke of wanting to give back to communities they felt deep connections to. Others described their goals in relation to more concrete personal goals: IBO diplomas or college admittance.
Chris’s comment in one of our interviews emphasized the spectrum of beliefs and approaches at ICS:

I get the sense, from the way (some of my colleagues) present (service-learning), that it’s not something they would implement in the way that I would implement it. It would be implemented more as a community service model versus a service-learning model.

Anand’s interview comments reflected a similar recognition of varying philosophical stances amongst faculty at AISJ:

There's a lot of politicking in service learning itself. Just the nature of the beast is there's going to be politics. Not just external factors, but internal factors. Of people, and things, and visions, and philosophies, and values, and beliefs.

These two quotes illustrate the wide variation in educator perspectives on service-learning.

In light of the contested nature of service-learning, I intentionally avoid prescribing single models in the remainder of this section. Rather, I attempt to adopt a somewhat neutral stance as I introduce skills, theories, and understandings that facilitators involved in this study perceived as important to service-learning endeavors. In other words, even as I describe commonly agreed upon competencies, I avoid advocating particular paths to these outcomes. This allows flexibility and acknowledges diverse beliefs and approaches.

Stage One: Investigation
In the five-stage service-learning model, the service learning process begins with a phase where students investigate their personal skills and community needs. This is also the stage where students identify appropriate community partners (Kaye, 2010). Note that within IBO CAS programs, investigation is typically framed as a process undertaken by students (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2015b). Considering the CAS program’s emphasis on student independence, ownership, and responsibility, it is not surprising that students are the primary focus within IBO documentation. However, they are not the only ones who investigate—adults who are service-learning facilitators also expressed the need for their own investigative process. This is especially true of those who oversee efforts that are not exclusively CAS focused. Accordingly, the competencies outlined below could be skills developed by students or adults alike. I use the term facilitators to describe both students and adults.

Competency: Recognize Individuals’ Skills and Resources

Students have many skills that could benefit communities. For example, they might have language skills. At ICS, several Ethiopian scholarship students described how they intentionally joined an English tutoring project at an orphanage because they recognized the potential of their bilingualism to support the kids’ learning. They might have creative talents. Theater students at AISJ used their Theater of the Oppressed training to facilitate drama workshops with local youth. Artists in Kenya brought creativity into a local children’s hospital and shared their love of art with sick and injured kids. Students might have exposure to academic content that is less accessible to others with different educational background. For example, IB Diploma Program biology
students at AISJ were able to share the knowledge they had gained of reproductive systems and sexual health with their peers in workshops with local youth.

**Competency: Recognize the Availability and Limitations of School Resources**

Schools often have physical resources that could be used to support projects. For example, in Ethiopia, school fields were available for students to use to coach weekly soccer practices with local youth. Similarly, ISK’s fields and playgrounds were the perfect venue for the Interact club to host a holiday party for kids from a nearby orphanage. Sometimes schools own tools or specialized equipment that can be used for projects. For example, AISJ’s extensive service-learning supply closet had many gardening tools that students were able to use as they developed a community garden. Similarly, ISK’s “Under Construction” team collected a range of building tools that they could bring to construction sites.

It is also important for adults to recognize where resources are limited. For example, even though busing was readily available at ISK to support service projects, Nairobi traffic restricted its functionality. As a result of the excessively heavy afternoon traffic, something far beyond the control of anyone affiliated with the school, transportation for projects was limited to sites in fairly close proximity to the campus.

Even the availability of “protected” blocks of time is an important consideration. On all three campuses, students described their schedules as having a profound impact on their choices of involvement. Students and teachers are all incredibly busy and struggle to balance their time between competing demands. While in South Africa, I sat in on an activities meeting where faculty members contemplated ways to structure their schedule.
to minimize scheduling-related tensions between academics, service, athletics, and the arts. Meanwhile Kenya was piloting a new approach where certain early mornings were protected time for the three largest service groups.

It seems important that coordinators and facilitators critically consider the time resources available as they help oversee project design. Enos (2012), for example, recognized the requisite resources involved in service-learning: “Engaging with the larger community requires resources, including time, energy, and attention paid by faculty, staff, students, and community partners, to create service opportunities and develop relationships” (p. 41). This suggests that facilitators need to be attentive to such resources and discover means for securing them on their respective campuses.

**Competency: Recognize Resources Available Within the Greater School Community**

In addition to school resources, facilitators can explore resources in the greater school community. For instance, parents can support service-learning programs. I saw several examples of different ways that parents could get involved through my research.

One major resource that parents are often able to contribute is their time. I saw this clearly at ISK, where parents frequently chaperoned the service trips that students took. I was especially surprised by the great lengths that some parents took to get involved. For example, one ISK mother, who was a full time worker outside the school, told me how she intentionally negotiated weekly release time into her newest contract. She explained that she cherished the time she got to spend serving alongside her
daughter. She was not the only parent who dedicated her time; rather, each week I observed about a half a dozen (non-ISK staff) parents participate in efforts as chaperones.

Parents may also have unique backgrounds or skills that could support efforts. At AISJ, one student leader described how a peer’s father supported her role as a fundraising chair for the South African Service Summit for Youth. The father, who was a banker by trade, advised this student through her quest for corporate sponsors for the event. The father offered the student leader strategies for appealing to large organizations and mentored her throughout the process. In Ethiopia, one student leader described a mother who played an important role in the start of their service club. The student explained that several of her peers began the club with a vision: they wanted to create re-usable feminine products that might help keep young women in school and might offer more hygienic solutions for women in the community who could not afford traditional products. However, the students lacked the sewing expertise to carry out their vision. This is where the mother, who was a talented seamstress, played an important role—she taught several student leaders how to use sewing machines and advised them on sewing design. These student leaders were then able to share the skills she taught them with their peers to design and create feminine products. In Kenya, a mom who was a trained psychologist was able to help coach ISK students on developmentally appropriate interactions with young kids in a children’s hospital. This mother facilitated formal reflection discussions after each service experience to help students reflect on their actions and problem-solve any challenges that they encountered. On site, I also watched this mom offer subtle support for students by modeling appropriate behaviors or by asking questions about what other students were doing to facilitate positive relationships.
with the kids in the hospital. Likewise, because of their occupational backgrounds, parents might also be able to help liaise between schools and community partners. In all three settings, parents were deeply connected to regional NGOs and community efforts.

In short, there is a lot of potential for parental involvement in students’ service-learning efforts. Accordingly, facilitators may want to poll the parent population on their skills, resources, and willingness to participate.

**A controversial resource: Money**

School community resources cannot be explored within the context of international schools without addressing the role of money. The students who attend private international schools in the African region are often fairly affluent. This is certainly not the case for all students; some are offered full scholarships, others attend the school because their parents are employees. However, by and large, international school students are fairly wealthy. There seemed to be several dominant thoughts regarding money and fundraising in the three schools I observed.

First, there seemed a general interest in students becoming increasingly aware of their relative material wealth. A student-facilitated lesson in a sustainable development class in Kenya illustrated both the need for intentional exposure and one attempt to do so. The student’s lesson focused on the topic of poverty. The student leader began by prompting her peers to raise their hands if her statements applied to them. Her statements included: “I don’t have to worry about whether I can access food or water,” “I can go to a doctor when I’m sick,” “I take at least one trip a year,” and “I own a computer.” Hands consistently went up. However, part way through the activity, she prompted, “I am rich,”
and only the teacher raised her hand. This implied that students either did not perceive themselves as rich or felt uncomfortable acknowledging it. The lesson continued. The student leader further described categories of wealth and poverty. She facilitated several activities including one involving disproportionately distributed candy to illustrate wealth imbalances. At the end of the lesson, a return to the “I am rich” prompt yielded entirely different responses from the class: all the students in the class raised their hands to recognize that they were, in fact, wealthy compared to most of the world. This example highlights that explicit instruction coupled with self-reflective activities can help students become more aware of their privilege. I heard facilitators on all three campuses strategizing ways to continually expose students to their respective positionality.

The attempt to expose students to differences seems tied to a second dominant thought: as individuals become increasingly aware of resource gaps, they become motivated to act. Facilitators seemed to think this was especially true in their specific school contexts, where wealth gaps may be more pronounced than they had experienced in other regions and opportunities for service involvement abound. One student leader, Camilla, who had lived in other parts of the world before getting involved in service-learning efforts at ISK, described how going to school in a city with pronounced gaps between the rich and poor created a different sense of urgency: “You’re surrounded by so many opportunities where you could help out. For example, in Europe it was a lot harder to do so… there’s not so many poorer areas surrounding you. I think that if you realize there are a lot of poorer kids around you, a lot of the kids here feel the need to go and do something. And a lot of them do.” Camilla’s words emphasized that the constant
visibility of resource gaps can be a strong incentive for student involvement. In other words, the palpability of needs can inspire action.

It seems that international students who become aware of their material wealth naturally default to fundraising and donation collections. I have heard many conversations amongst international educators in AISA gatherings about the commonality of fundraising efforts. As one ICS teacher, Isabelle, put it, “How do you live with yourself and not give everything away? The middle class guilt issue.” This quote highlights a common response pattern amongst students in international schools, they see gaps, feel guilty about imbalances, and give material resources away. Yet in this quote, Isabelle also raises one of the many issues that makes fundraising efforts so contested: guilt as a motivation. There are acknowledgments in the literature that students often feel guilt regarding the economic gaps they observe in service-learning efforts (Jones & Abes, 2004). In fact, guilt is quite a common marketing strategy that charity organizations use to garner support (Basil, Ridgway, & Basil, 2008). At the same time, the relationship between guilt, individuals sense of personal responsibility, and pro-social responses are murky (Basil, Ridgway, & Basil, 2006). Perhaps the skepticism that facilitators noted is tied to this ambiguity.

Other concerns were expressed as well. For instance, I heard considerable resistance towards money being framed as a panacea for all community problems. There was an overwhelming sentiment amongst facilitators that students should do more than throw money at problems. As one ICS teacher expressed, fundraising is “the lowest level of involvement.” An ISK facilitator described haphazard fundraising efforts with equal disdain. In so doing, she drew comparisons between random fundraising in schools and
Western charity models: “That’s mazungu\(^1\) charity. And that’s not what we are.” She explicitly suggested that efforts should entail more than charitable giving. This sentiment was echoed by other facilitators as well. In her survey, one ICS teacher, Zoe, described her greatest challenge as a service-learning facilitator as getting her students to move beyond fundraising. I saw exactly what she spoke of as I observed a global issues class where students struggled to think of anything they could do to impact poverty or its symptoms in their community apart from organizing a fundraising effort. Even with heavy prompting to brainstorm alternative forms of action, students kept defaulting to fundraising.

Another common concern about fundraising related to an underlying goals of community engagement efforts, namely relationship-building. Money may be one of the things international school students have to offer, but it is not necessarily a relationship building resource. Most of the facilitators I spoke to were deeply vested in fostering relationships between students and community members. A facilitator in Ethiopia captured the tension between giving and relationship-building:

The point is to really get our kids delving into issues through that community lens and through that (service learning) experience. We want them to grow as individuals and understand poverty first hand, because they know the ins and outs of it. And it's not an ‘us versus them’ thing. It's a condition that exists. We (individuals in African international schools) happen to be at schools that happen to be very privileged and of a socio economic status well above our local

---

\(^1\) Mazungu is a Kiswahili term for white foreigner
communities. So... making a connection that's more than just I'm going to give you stuff.

Chris’s quote recognizes the palpable resource gap between school populations and local populations. He emphasizes, though, that relationships are the ultimate aim and that charity models can be detrimental to relationships. This idea, that relationships can be better fostered when money is not their foundation, was echoed by a teacher in Kenya, LeeAnne. In an interview, LeeAnne explained how a shift away from fundraising efforts had a positive impact on school-community relationships: “People aren’t focused as much on fundraising; they’re focused on creating authentic partnerships and interactions.” This quote demonstrates her sentiment that relationships should be the central focus, not fundraising. Another ISK faculty expressed a similar vision. According to Pierina, service-learning is: “Not about money. It’s not about privilege. It’s about love. And empathy. That is my goal.”

In response to concerns over fundraising, schools can create systems to make fundraising deliberate and meaningful. I observed efforts at all three schools to moderate fundraising campaigns. For example, AISJ facilitators created a proposal form that students or project facilitators need to fill out to justify fundraising efforts. Such a proposal process prompts students to carefully consider the purpose of their efforts. AISJ has also dedicated school-wide funds to support student service projects; this enables students to focus their attention on other aspects of community participation. ISK honed fundraising efforts through slightly different mechanisms. The service-learning facilitator screened potential community partners to ensure they were interested in relationships, not just fundraising. The school also permitted fundraising efforts only in conjunction with
“sustained involvement.” For instance, they allowed the “Under Construction” service club to fundraise for the building tools that they then used while they worked with local construction teams on school building projects. The facilitator for this club told me about his intentional efforts to help students recognize the impact of their contributions, both financial and physical. I watched him joke aloud with students in a planning meeting I observed that they had already done what they were good at (fundraising) and now they got to focus on what was more challenging for them (physical labor). He pointed to the tools that were purchased with their fundraising dollars and helped guide them through strategies for using these tools effectively.

Literature on the role of fundraising in service-learning captures some of the tensions involved in fundraising efforts. Grusky (2000) reflects on fundraising issues involved in international service learning. While the students in my own study were doing service-learning projects in their cities of residence and were citizens of many nations, Grusky’s descriptions of some of the underlying tensions still seem to fit:

Most service-learning programs start from the premise that giving of oneself, giving one’s time, energies, and enthusiasm, and sharing one’s own culture and learning about the culture of others is more significant than making monetary donations. However, North Americans are viewed as having great economic resources, and requests for donations for various causes may be made directly or indirectly to the students. These situations are important topics for discussion, analysis and reflection. What are the politics of U.S. foreign-aid programs? How can the power of economic privilege be abused? Are most North American
students economically privileged? What does that mean? How can economic privilege be used responsibly? (p. 864)

Just as international service-learning students face these sorts of questions, so too do students in international schools.

**Competency: Identify a Genuine Community Need and an Appropriate Community Partner**

There is another major component of the investigation phase—the exploration of genuine community needs and the identification of appropriate community partners. Most of my discussion of this will be saved for sections on dignity aware relationships and meaningful actions. In particular, these sections will address how to approach community partners with respect, how to understand fit between resources and needs, and how to recognize the complexity of issues and solutions. As Chris put it, “It’s a matter of finding an appropriate project and not exploiting those relationships.”

**International school specific challenges to investigating community needs**

Numerous facilitators suggested that the investigation process of service-learning projects might look different in international schools than in North American settings. Considering that the majority of the literature readily available to facilitators in international schools on service-learning comes from the United States, this seems an important caveat. In service-learning literature, there is very little discussion of self-reflection on intercultural competencies. Yet international educators suggest that intercultural skills play a large role in their students’ service-learning experiences.
As an example, Kaye (2010) emphasized the mechanisms involved in the investigation process. She suggested that students’ investigations into community issues should be multifaceted and encourages them to use multiple media: media, interviews, surveys, and interviews. This multi-faceted research approach can certainly help students gain a more nuanced view of specific community needs. However, international educators voiced concerns that students may not be adequately prepared to use these mediums—to ask culturally relevant questions or to interpret what they are seeing. In other words, they worried that globally mobile youth may be far more out of touch with the local context than their North American peers and may need far more intercultural training and introspection in order to be prepared for community investigations.

This idea was raised on numerous campuses. At AISJ, Anand described a student-led interview he observed several years ago. Several students questioned a member of the local community in what both he and the community member interpreted as highly insensitive and offensive manner. At some point during this interview, the community member directly, and angrily, confronted the students’ prejudicial comments. Anand explained to me that he attributed the students’ behaviors to a lack of self-knowledge. While they needed to be more aware of local conditions before launching into their interviews (related to the domain of knowledge, understanding of the local context, that I described in Chapter Five), Anand was primarily concerned that students were not aware of their own prejudices or existing beliefs. He described how he created a full unit in his global citizens class to address this. In the unit, students go through a rigorous process of exploring their own identity and preconceptions about the local community. Anand explained how this process was an integral precursor to explorations of specific
community projects or local needs. A conversation I had with several ICS teachers also
highlighted similar concerns. Three teachers were taking an online service-learning
course through an American university. Several expressed frustrations that the
coursework did not seem to address the extensive intercultural and self-reflection needs
of international school students.

**Stage Two: Preparation and Planning**

In the five-stage model, after students select an appropriate partnership, they need
to plan what they will do through their project. Kaye (2010) frames preparation and
planning as the continued investigation into the identified community need, reflection on
skills needed to address the need, and the planning of what students will actually do (p. 16). The IBO (2015) explains that in this stage “students clarify roles and responsibilities, develop a plan of actions to be taken, identify specified resources and timelines, and acquire any skills as needed to engage in the CAS experience” (p. 17).

**Competency: Anticipate and Plan the Logistics of Projects**

When planning a project, there are many different logistics that have to be taken
into consideration. Service-learning activities typically involve students responding to
unpredictable human interactions and dynamic community needs. Many require off-
campus travel and a range of materials. Accordingly, logistical concerns range from
transportation to safety issues, from scheduling to availability of physical materials, and
from on-site job allocations to permissions. Service-learning literature has highlighted
that logistics is a common source of anxiety for educators (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002;
Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007). Facilitators in this study also alluded to the multitude of logistical challenges involved in service-learning ventures.

Some logistical pieces can easily be anticipated; for example, facilitators likely know that buses will be required to get to off-campus sites, work gloves needed for community clean up projects, or shovels needed for gardening projects. I saw countless examples of the benefits of detailed planning with these sorts of logistics. For example, in Kenya hundreds of ISK students were involved in their weekly co-curricular service program; teens would stream to the parking lot as school released. This could have been an extremely hectic scenario, as students were heading to numerous sites and boarding different buses. However, the busing system, chaperone check-in procedure, attendance sheets, and communication system were like a well-oiled machine. Most students seemed aware of the logistics and quickly found their respective vehicles. Knowledgeable adults checked students in and pointed any confused students in the appropriate directions. Because of the system’s established logistics, coordinators were able to account for students and get hundreds of kids en route to their respective sites within minutes.

The logistics in the situation described above were somewhat predictable and well understood by facilitators, so systems and protocols could be anticipated and developed. However, other logical challenges or project needs may be more difficult for facilitators to anticipate. This may especially true for student facilitators, who are typically less experienced planners. For example, I observed a meeting for a student-run service group that offered weekly tutoring in a local school. In this meeting, student leaders had assembled their peers to address concerns about the group’s lax planning for tutoring sessions, which in their perspective was resulting in weak lessons. They recognized that
more pre-planning was required. The group collectively spent time finding material resources they could bring to assist their instruction, researching related lesson plans online, and discussing ways to add structure to their approaches. In this example, students were fairly new to instructional roles and had not initially anticipated all the related logistics. As they gradually recognized logistics within their control, however, they could more adequately prepare.

Adults can play a key role in helping students recognize some of the logistical challenges implicit in their projects. For example, I observed a group of students planning a fundraiser to benefit a local Ethiopian NGO. The students had created coin drops for the school community with the hopes that their peers and teachers would deposit their loose change for a good cause. However, it was not until an adult prodded to consider why coin drops are so effective at airports that the students realized donation boxes may be less effective on a campus where coins still serve a function to their holders, where loose change can buy a snack or beverage at the school shop. Students then realized they would have to be extremely strategic about placement of any coin drop and creative with their marketing; meanwhile, they also recognized they would likely need other fundraising approaches as well.

One of the difficulties in planning complex projects is to keep perspective, with a balance of attention to both the macro and micro components. An AISJ teacher, Kayleigh, described the challenge of helping students balance demands:

I think there need to be short term goals, so that kids can actually see what they’re doing. But you know, as much as we know the bigger picture, students don’t.
Some of them lose their way along the way. So you need to have your bigger goal.

As Kayleigh highlights here, it can be a challenge for facilitators to simultaneously consider short- and long-term objectives. This also relates to the logistics of each objective. Some students, for instance, get fixated on immediate challenges and lose focus on longer-term goals. Later in our conversation, Kayleigh described how student leaders can help direct their peers back to long-term objectives and macro logistics. In her words, facilitators should “keep directing [their peers] to- this is what we’re doing, this is why we’re doing it.” In other words, facilitators can help others recognize the relationship between logistics and aims, and between short-term approaches and long-term goals.

**Competency: Foster Dignity Aware Relationships**

One of the ultimate goals of service-learning projects is to cultivate relationships between members of the school community and members of the local community and to address local needs. This section focuses on the challenge of doing so in a respectful, empowering way. The term *dignity aware relationships* was first used by a student leader in South Africa, and is a phrase that captures what most facilitators are striving for. Whether students are collaborating with national park representatives on forest preservation, teaching literacy skills to HIV positive orphans, socializing with burn victims in a hospital, or assisting with horse care at an equestrian therapy center, they can strive for relationships with community members are respectful and collaborative.
The role of self-reflection

In part, the process of fostering dignity aware relationships requires the critical self-reflection process I alluded to at the end of the previous section. It is about directly addressing bias and expectations. It is about confronting attitudes of superiority that might accompany positions of privilege. As one teacher in described, facilitators have the difficult job of “trying to figure out how to make an impact without it just feeling like you’re being paternalistic.”

Perhaps international schools point to a need for critical introspection that is relevant to all schools. It has become increasingly acknowledged that people’s experiences, including their power and privilege, profoundly influence their interpretations of the world around them. Accordingly, power and privilege are necessarily issues that need to be addressed and navigated in service-learning projects, especially as students form relationships with individuals who might have different backgrounds (Mobley, 2011; Sandmann, Moore, & Quinn, 2012). There have been some concerns, for instance, over whether weak service-learning projects can perpetuate deficit models or reinforce stereotypes:

Without reflection on one’s privilege or an understanding of social inequalities, privileged students have the potential to see community members as “others” and to selectively attend to stereotypes and misinformation about those whom they serve. (Vaccaro, 2011)

Meanwhile, Butin (2010) articulates a similar concern,

Everyone can agree that the impact of service-learning on both students and the communities serves depends greatly on its quality. We also know that the current
quality of service-learning teaching varies a lot, so much so that people speak of a norm for community collaboration of ‘do no harm.’ There is danger in providing students with a ‘drive by’ community experience that does not address issues of power and privilege. (p. xi)

Note that these academics still generally support service-learning pedagogy within the texts these quotes have come from. However, both Vaccaro and Butin stress the importance of critical reflection and intentional design.

Formal activities can help students and adults reflect on the attitudes that they carry into projects. For example, I observed a training session for about 40 students involved in one of AISJ’s largest teaching service projects. The adult facilitators showed a series of satirical YouTube videos that underscore the prevalence of western savior complexes and stereotypical approaches to service in Africa. These videos included: “Radi-Aid: Africa for Norway” (SAIH Norway, 2012), “Let’s Save Africa! Gone Wrong” (SAIH Norway, 2013), and “Who Wants to be a Volunteer?” (SAIH Norway, 2014). The students went through a series of activities in small groups that helped them to deconstruct the messages implicit in the videos. These activities prompted students to consider their own attitudes and how these videos spoke to their own future participation in service activities. An adult facilitator, Monica, described to me later the shift she saw in her students as they watched one of the videos. She alluded to a scene where white foreign volunteers literally threw loaves of bread at African children, many of whom were not hungry:

It was interesting for me to see. When we looked at those RadiAid videos, (students) were laughing and whatever. But it was also kind of… oh, but wait…
we don’t want to give them food? Why are we not giving them clothes? And it was like, it’s not about what you’re doing (...) You’re not here to rescue the world.

This facilitator’s statement recognized that students may naturally have attitudes or approaches that could be interpreted as condescending. Yet this facilitator’s words also suggest that such attitudes are malleable and that critical reflection activities can help students question their motives or assumptions. She implies that students are eager or willing to explore ways to be more respectful in their interactions.

While the example described above represents a deliberate reflection activity, not all opportunities for critical self-reflection are pre-planned. Rather, facilitators can react to the things they see and hear around them to foster respectful dispositions. For example, in one of the AISJ Global Citizens classes I observed, a student used the phrase “people you help” to describe community partners. The teacher recognized a potential moment of learning and diverged from his intended lesson. The teacher asked the class what attitudes such language implied about the relationship between school and community members. Students then discussed the implications of various phrases and decided that verbs like “assist” or “help” held condescending connotations. They collectively decided that if they wanted to adopt more respectful demeanors, they should adjust their rhetoric to reflect this aim by using phrases like “contributing to” or “collaborating with” to describe both their own actions and community partners’ actions. I also watched these sorts of informal reflective practices within groups of adults. For example, I sat in on a grade-level planning meeting in Ethiopia where teachers were planning an upcoming WWW student trip that included a service-learning component. The group discussed how they were
interested in making the service-learning portion more meaningful and respectful. Many of the teachers contributed to the conversation by posing suggestions for service projects; some of which framed community members as recipients rather than partners. I watched an experienced service-learning facilitator, Chris, pose questions that helped his colleagues reflect on the nature of their proposed plans. Through subsequent discussion, they were able to recognize aspects of their plans that might be interpreted as condescending. As the conversation continued, they also recognized that their community partner needed to play a more central role in this planning process. It was clear to me, as I listened to their conversation, that the group of teachers collectively desired to engage in “dignity aware relationships.” With prompting, they were able to reflect on ways to better align their actions with these goals.

**Collaborating with community partners**

In part, the aim of “dignity aware relationships” implies working in collaboration with community partners throughout the planning process. Community partners are far more aware of the actual needs in their community. As one teacher at AISJ, Kabelo, described:

You don’t just carry a bus of people and say, “Hi. We’re here to help.” You need to start with understanding their culture. You need (students) to understand how (community partners) operate. Know what they want.

Know what they need.

He continued to describe an instance in the past where a group of students organized a clean up effort near a South African township. The students picked up rubbish from a
field and then were surprised to find the field piled high with garbage just a day later. Kabelo explained that there was nowhere else for community members to deposit waste, and that students had not worked closely enough with members of the adjacent community to understand the root causes for the garbage. He told me that he frequently cites this example as he mentors students in service project design. Community members need to be part of the discussion, in his perspective.

A substantial body of service-learning literature points to the importance of working with community partners in the planning process. For example, Eyler and Giles (1999) suggest that,

When students have the opportunity to work with community members in planning service, they can move beyond the rather patronizing role of charity giver to the role of partner. And working together in the planning process increases respect for community partners. (p. 47)

Birge, Beaird, and Torres (2003) also point to the importance of collaborative planning and clear communication of goals and expectations.

**Designing respectful projects**

The fostering of dignity aware relationships is also about designing projects that respect community members. For example, one of the student leaders of an AISJ service group that hosts sexual health workshops with local teens, Mariam, explained how the group intentionally shifted their workshop design from a “we’re just gonna teach people,” direct teaching format to a “we try to facilitate sharing and everyone putting in information” form, where teens sit in circles and swap understandings. Mariam described
the benefit of this shift: “When you make someone feel like charity, the interaction between people is not at the same level as when you go in as a peer and just try to communicate.” This shift that Mariam described may sound subtle, but it facilitated dramatically different relationships between participants. An adult facilitator at AISJ also described how she tries to get students to subtly shift their projects to be more respectful. She facilitated the AISJ club where the phrase “dignity aware relationships” originated and explained to me how she now uses that phrase to re-focus students in the planning phase:

I’m like, ‘Okay, how does this fit into our dignity aware service?’

(And they respond) ‘Ms., I just want to collect stationary!’

I’m like, ‘Okay. But even collecting stationary, I need you to be conscious of how you’re maintaining the dignity of the people in Soweto. And ultimately, it’s about maintaining your own dignity too. It’s a mutual thing.

This quote suggests that respect needs to be a prominent feature in all service projects, including those that may seem removed from direct community interaction. Even in a collection drive, attention can be paid to positive framing of community members and to the quality and appropriateness of items collected.

Service-learning literature often advocates for reciprocal relationships or partnerships that are beneficial for all parties (Dorado & Giles, 2000). As Jacoby (2003b) puts it, in reciprocal relationships:

Service-learning thus stands in contrast to the traditional, paternalistic, one-way approach to service, where one person or group has resources that they share with
a person or group that they assume lacks resources. Reciprocity also eschews the traditional concept of volunteerism, which is based on the idea that a more competent person comes to the aid of a less competent person. In the old paradigm, volunteers often attempt to solve other people’s problems before fully understanding the situation or its cases. Service-learning encourages students to do things *with* others rather than *for* them. (p. 4)

This idea of reciprocity seems naturally easier for students when they work with peers towards mutual aims. I saw numerous examples of teens working with other teens in South Africa and the nature of these activities seemed to facilitate friendships and respectful relationships. For example, one co-curricular service group, “Drama Connect” involved teens from both a local school and AISJ coming together to use theater to explore topics of interest (ranging from romantic relationships to the South African government). AISJ students had been trained by Jennifer Hartley in *theater versus oppression* techniques and facilitated theater exercises for the group. While a few AISJ student leaders modeled the exercises, all the students participated in the activities together, as peers. They used theater as a means to understand one another’s views and to express their individual perspectives. The nature of this project helped facilitate respectful peer relationships. One of the student leaders involved described the power of this:

> We actually are interacting with students in our age range… and we’re able to interact about things that are not only concerning us, like the internet and stuff,
but in this community—Diepslot, Fourways\textsuperscript{2} kind of community. And like, there were rape cases and we were talking about that the other time. And we were able to connect and see each other’s perspectives on big issues that are happening in our lives.

In this quote, Aisha described how age-level peers collaboratively addressed issues of mutual concern. Aisha’s comment implicitly recognized the unique perspectives that different members of the group brought to the project (that a teen living in a rich suburb, for example, might have a different vantage than a teen in a township). However, her statement emphasized the peer connections that took place over things that were meaningful in their lives. By interacting with peers, it seemed that it was easier for teens to develop relationships. In the same interview, Aisha explained how important she thinks that reciprocity is. She perceived that peer discussions promoted positive relationships:

> Most of the time (local peers) also want to come and bring something to the table. Because you don't want them to feel like they're just taking. So, being able to allow them to help you as well is really important to establish relationships that will last with them.

As this quote suggests, powerful relationships can form when everyone has opportunity to contribute. This may be easier in the context of interactions amongst age-level peers.

Another AISJ project also highlights the potential of teen-teen efforts. While I left the country before the event itself, I watched AISJ students plan for the second annual

\textsuperscript{2} Diepslot is a large slum that is directly adjacent to Fourways, a fairly rich suburb. Note that many AISJ students lived in Fourways and the students from the school they partnered with for this project lived the Diepslot area.
South African Service Summit for Youth (SASSY). AISJ students coordinated the several-day-long conference for service leaders from schools all over the country. It was clear as I spoke to the AISJ students that they recognized that they could learn a lot about service from their local peers. They structured the conference in a way that students from all schools offered workshops for their peers, thus all participants had opportunities to adopt the roles of both expert and learner. Accordingly, it seems that the project promotes reciprocity and mutual respect—not just because it positions teens with its peers, but it intentionally structures opportunities for all individuals to contribute something to the group.

In short, this section highlights that respectful relationships are crucial. As one facilitator put it, “Respecting the community you go into is paramount.” This sentiment is reflected in the literature as well. While there is still little agreement on exactly what positive partnerships should look like, academics repeatedly point to the importance of positive partnerships (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Jacoby, 2003a; Jones, 2003). As Jacoby (2003b) puts it, “Service-learning is philosophy of reciprocity, which implies a concerted effort to move from charity to justice, from service to the elimination of need” (p. 5).

**Competency: Create Sustainable Projects**

When discussing goals for service-learning, nearly every facilitator used the term *sustainable* at some point. Discussions of *sustainability* included many different aspects of long-term involvement and planning. I explore several below.
**Sustained involvement/ongoing participation**

In some instances, the term *sustainable* was used primarily to describe students’ ongoing participation in a project. In this sense, students had sustained involvement with communities by visiting the same site every week or by consistently working with the same community partner. All three schools pushed for these sorts of ongoing involvements. For example, in Kenya, students committed to working with the same community partner every week for a semester at a time. Similarly, at both ISC and AISJ, co-curricular service projects happened on a regular basis, typically for several hours once a week or once a month for longer activities. Students generally committed to projects for at least a semester at a time.

Facilitators, especially adult facilitators, often spoke about the importance of regular commitments. Pierina, an ISK faculty member, suggested that ongoing participation is “all about sustainability. [Service-learning] doesn’t work if it isn’t sustainable.” This framing underscores the centrality of ongoing efforts. As Zoe, a facilitator in Ethiopia, put it, students should avoid “one-offs” where they are “not committing to something long-term.” Again, an emphasis on students’ regular involvement is clear.

**Attainable goals**

There is not a prescribed definition for “sustainable” that dictates if any given project should last one month, one year, or one decade. However, facilitators need to carefully consider their goals and the scope of their project to make sure that they have enough structure to carry projects through to completion. One student facilitator in South
Africa, Sabal, captured this well. He was talking about how smaller projects within a group could be designed to last a year or, if they aligned well with the group’s aims, to last for years to come. However, he cautioned that planning was required either way:

If you try to do something individually or as a pair, you need to make sure that either you can achieve it before that school year ends or at the least, convince the rest of your group that this is something you need to continue doing even after. It’s the only way it can become sustainable.

As Sabal highlights, it is important for facilitators to consider feasibility of any given project’s plan from a sustainability perspective.

An anecdote that Sophia, a student facilitator at ICS, recalled during an interview, highlighted the role of long-term planning. Sophia described a student-initiated project that involved using water bottles to create a community garden. She recalled that the student took many of the initial steps to set things up and get the garden running. However, he failed to account for the amount of time it would take to finish the project and graduated before other people could be trained in how to maintain the garden. Despite the fact that construction was complete and the garden functioning, the project dissolved after he graduated. Sophia described this student’s disappointment. She recognized that his story exemplified a need for long-term planning.

**Promoting sustained relationships**

Discussions of project sustainability also included a focus on the projects’ proposed action plans. Many times, this conversation centers on the question: are projects proposing action that promotes sustained relationships? One student leader, Mariam,
described a project she was involved in that distributes feminine products designed by a local NGO, Subz pads, to teen girls in nearby South African townships. She recalled that during the initial planning process for this project, an adult facilitator prompted student leaders to think about how to set things up so it was not “just like dumping pads on people.” Accordingly, Mariam said the group decided on an approach that established a more extensive relationship with the eventual pad recipients. They decided to hold weekly sexual health workshops, with the assistance of a local social worker. At the end of the workshop series, they distribute the feminine hygiene pads. In Mariam’s words, this structure promotes long-term relationships: “That’s going to be how we’re going to create sustainability.”

The personality-driven project dilemma

One of the central challenges in creating projects that are sustainable from year to year, from a school management perspective, is to avoid dependency on single individuals. As my pilot study for my dissertation project, an exploration of service-learning efforts in a different international school highlighted that it is easy for projects to fall victim to what I called “the shooting star syndrome” (Lillo, 2013). The shooting star syndrome refers to the tendency for dynamic and charismatic leaders to foster large enthusiasm for a project and then, as soon as these individuals leave, projects rapidly disintegrate. All secondary schools have personnel transiency; students graduate, teachers join or leave the faculty, administrators shift. International schools have a higher level of transiency than most settings, a characteristic that I alluded to as I described the domain of knowledge, understanding of school context (Chapter Five). In light of such
transiency, it seems especially important to consider questions of long-term sustainability when designing projects. As LeeAnne, an ISK teacher, described, there is a real challenge in transient international schools with things being “personality driven.” She offered an illustration of this by describing a colleague who facilitates a service project involving construction. She told me about his willingness to drive all over town to get equipment and supplies—he put hours into preparing for every build and was passionate about what he did. She laughed that that her skill set would not match these demands well at all. She then suggested that the personality-specific demands of certain projects could impact their long-term sustainability potential:

In terms of sustainability some of the projects are a little tenuous. Some of them are totally solid—no matter who is here, that club or service trip will continue.

And it’s not tied to an individual. But every international school has this problem.

This quote recognizes the challenge that service-learning facilitators have of fostering projects that can last, even as individuals with unique skills transition. It also suggests that this is a common problem, one that she has seen across numerous international schools. As Chris, an ICS teacher, put it, personality-driven projects often fail to become sustainable in the long-term when schools are “not yet systematic” and lack “sufficient infrastructure.”

**Considering school-wide sustainability issues**

I also heard many discussions of sustainability that were related to school-wide feasibility. In these conversations, the following sorts of questions were raised: many projects can faculty members reasonably support simultaneously? How do we create
enough opportunities for students to choose their involvements without stretching our resources (personnel, time, transportation, etc.) too thin? How do we minimize facilitator burnout? How can projects be “handed off” to rising leaders? Many of these questions are closely related to skills involved in the leadership/organizational development domain of knowledge (introduced in Chapter Five). This demonstrates the interconnected nature of competencies—domains are not discrete entities. Rather, skills in one area may support competencies in another. In this case, organizational elements may impact sustainability of efforts. Accordingly, service-learning facilitators may want to step back and consider the sorts of sustainability questions above.

Let me offer a few examples of what macro-level sustainability decisions might entail. For example, there is usually a limit to the fundraising contribution potential of any given community. Accordingly, for fundraising efforts to be sustainable, there cannot be an endless number of simultaneous efforts. Isabelle, an ICS facilitator, described a shift during her time at ICS that impacted the sustainability potential of fundraising efforts. When she first arrived at ICS, she characterized fundraisers as both “massive” and “divergent.” However, the school made the decision to create a single larger fundraising event to help consolidate efforts for 3 major school supported groups; in Isabelle’ words this helped “to hone huge fundraising efforts.” In a later conversation, Isabelle returned to this idea of channeling school resources into a select few organizations. She suggested that a focus on fewer community partners in general, not just with fundraising, could help deepen those relationships: “So building more cohesive partners that we use across the entire school, and not just for CAS or just for this or that. It’s kind of building that cohesion.” In other words, by consolidating efforts into fewer
organizations, Isabelle felt that school members could focus more. It seems that this could enhance the potential of impact within each respective project.

Let me offer a completely different example of a school’s consideration of sustainability on a macro-level. At AISJ, a system has been created to help ensure that numerous people are invested in service-learning efforts and thus help combat the personality-driven sustainability challenges I described above. As I mentioned in Chapter Four, AISJ’s service-learning team includes a full-time service-learning coordinator and divisional representatives for the elementary, middle, and high schools. By establishing a shared-leadership model, responsibilities, institutional memory, and decisions can be shared. One of the members of this team, Kerrie, offered the following definition sustainability. In her words, it is, “The ability of a system to continue working (and evolving) over a long period of time. It involves systems thinking, long-term planning, accountability and evaluation, professional development, managing change and collaboration.” In Kerrie’s definition, she stresses that collaboration and systematic planning are involved in long-term efforts. The school’s intentional shared-leadership model seems highly correlated with this interpretation of sustainability.

I will offer one final example of school structures that impact sustainability on a macro-level. In Kenya, there are many NGOs that wish to establish relationships with ISK. As the service-learning coordinator told me at one point, she is approached by at least ten people a week who want to start new projects. It could be easy for the number of community partners and existing projects to quickly escalate to a level that is not sustainable. To mediate this, the coordinator is tasked with sifting through interested community partners to find projects that align well with the school’s vision and students’
abilities. As the principal individual who vets potential projects, the service-learning coordinator is thus able to monitor the number of community partners that students are working with at any given time. By establishing a mechanism, such as this coordinator position, the school is thus able to regulate the growth of the program to keep it within the scope of feasible.

**Sustainability as a long-term investment in global citizens**

One participant framed sustainability in a particularly interesting way. Kabelo, a facilitator in South Africa, described how involvement in “attitude-changing projects” can foster students’ long-term investment in communities, and thus yield a different kind of sustainable action. He described the long-term shift he sees in students who engage in meaningful service-learning:

They will start to see that its not just about getting your diploma. You know, the objective is to help people. And I see them doing this even beyond high school, even beyond college, when they start working…they will become global citizens. They will come back here or wherever help is needed.

In this framing, the ultimate goal for students is a sustained commitment to service.

*Caveat: Is sustainable always desirable?*

While many aspects of “sustainable projects” are desirable, projects are rarely intended to last forever. Partially, this is linked to the goals of service-learning. Service-learning is meant to address genuine community needs, needs that evolve. Certain needs are likely to persist for a long time. For example, the protection and maintenance of our natural environment is a life-long task. Other needs may be more temporary, such as
immediate famine relief. Since service-learning is intended to benefit communities, ideally, projects promote communities’ self-sustainability and lack of reliance on external supports. Thus, if projects include an element of aid, sustainability may eventually involve turning the project over to local partners. Chris describes this,

If you’re doing a good [service-learning project], you’re going to work yourself out of a job and you’re going to have to pick something new. If you’re doing it well, you’re going to make in impact in a way that you become obsolete almost. Or that’s the ideal.

As Chris’s words suggest, many projects focus on empowering others. Accordingly, self-reliance is the goal rather than long-term projects involving the school. This sentiment aligns with trends in the field of development towards community-based or community-driven efforts; though it should be noted that the study of these sorts of efforts have shown mixed results (Mansuri & Rao, 2004).

Stage Three: Action

Kaye (2010) describes the third stage of the service-learning process, action, as “the direct result of preparation and planning” (p. 16). In this phase, students implement their plans, adapting as the situation demands. As they carry out their plans, students continue to develop different sorts of proficiencies. As Kaye puts it,

By taking action, young people identify themselves as community members and stakeholders and, over time, learn how to work within social institutions. Transforming plans into action enables [students] to use what is inherently theirs—ideas, energy, talents, skills, knowledge, enthusiasm, and concern for
others and their natural surroundings—as they contribute to the common good. (p. 17)

This description of action emphasizes student development of both skills and understandings. Kaye stresses that action helps students recognize the roles that they can and do play in their communities. As is clear from Kaye’s description of action, many of the choices regarding form of action are actually made in the planning phase of the process. Note that the IBO’s (2015) CAS guide frames the action stage in the following way: “Students implement their idea or plan. This often requires decision-making and problem-solving. Students may work individually, with partners, or in groups” (p. 17). This also stresses the connection between planning and action. Accordingly, the competencies described below are also tied to that stage.

**Competency: Develop Projects that “Make a Difference”**

Service-learning efforts are intended to make an impact. As the ISK (2011g) website described,

The overarching aim of our service learning program is to develop students who are confident and competent in contributing to and learning from their community. Students will be able to apply these learned skills and dispositions, starting with their home and family and working towards impacting the global community.

Sentiments that this description captures, namely that service-learning influences both the community and the student, are central in service-learning pedagogy. In service-learning literature, scholars suggest that the hyphen in service-learning implies that efforts should
be designed with equal attention to service as to students’ learning. As Holland, the
director of the U.S. National Service-Learning Clearinghouse puts it: “Service-learning is
all in the hyphen. It is the enrichment of specific learning goals through structured
community service opportunities that respond to community-identified needs and
opportunities” (Kenworthy-U'Ren, Petri, & Taylor, 2006, p. 121). Holland’s description
highlights the balance of intended outcomes, a balance that many facilitators in my study
also expressed. Accordingly, my discussion of project goals considers both the nature of
the service action itself and the learning process for students.

*Meaningful community efforts*

Let me first explore the service portion. As alluded to above, there is a prevailing
view that service-learning efforts should make meaningful contributions towards
community needs. Facilitators expressed this sentiment both as they described service-
learning efforts and as they considered the larger civic aims of the pedagogy. While
individuals used slightly different phrasing, I flagged a total of 113 explicit references to
goals of “making a difference” in communities during my first round of coding. As one
student explained, he aspires “to do something where I will be making a legitimate
change in the world, no matter how big or small.” Another student, in the context of
describing his duties as a global citizen, expressed that global citizens “should participate
in the community around them to improve it in any way they are able to.” A teacher, also
describing a global citizen’s role, also framed engagement around meaningful community
contributions: “A global citizen should be informed, engaged and passionate about
effecting change. Global citizens don’t just talk about issues at work in the world; they
act on what they know and care about. They make things better.” Similarly, a teacher who facilitates many service projects said he hopes “to become an educator in which I am able to influence not only students, but schools and communities—that would be able to facilitate effective social change.” All four of these descriptions stress that efforts should result in positive impacts on communities. These sentiments also extended into school documentation. For example, AISJ’s Service Learning Handbook describes the aim of service-learning in the following way: students should “have a positive impact on our host country and community,” including “bring[ing] about authentic social change through community collaboration and development.” This description emphasizes that the influence of projects should be both positive and authentic.

The concept of authentic action implies that some forms of action are preferable to others. Numerous facilitators hinted at this idea, though they may not have all defined “authentic” or “meaningful” in the same way. As one adult facilitator explained to me: “I see so many things being done, but I also see so much being done that is not totally effective. So it is important to me to become involved in a way that has a positive impact for the community.” This critique emphasizes that ineffective efforts should be avoided. Another teacher expressed similar disdain for what she perceived to be weak efforts: “That notion of, whatever I have to give is good enough… I have a really hard time with that. And so, part of my ongoing goal has always been for us to show up, to care, AND to be authentically adding to these kids’ lives.” Again, this excerpt highlights that facilitators are deliberately striving for projects that are authentic, meaningful, and that result in positive impacts on their communities.
In many ways, it is difficult to generalize on the shape of these efforts because students target such varying community needs through their projects; needs can range from pressing environmental issues to community health or safety concerns. The aims of intervention also vary. Some projects may be designed to alleviate pressing immediate needs, for instance students may partner with a local NGO to feed homeless people. Meanwhile other efforts target root issues, for example by planting trees to actively offset carbon footprints.

Regardless of the nature of the need or the level of intervention implicit in students’ chosen course of action, it seems crucial that facilitators seek out the expertise of those who know both the need and its context well (Chisholm, 2003). Only by including the perspectives of insiders can facilitators design effective projects and monitor the impact of efforts on an ongoing basis. It should be noted that an “insider” or “expert” distinction varies from project to project; for instance a park ranger might have insight into effective ways to combat deforestation, a teacher could speak to the alignment between a tutoring program and classroom instruction, a teen from a partner school could help students navigate the social landscape at that school, or an NGO employee could help students develop projects that reinforce rather than duplicate existing approaches.

I observed numerous examples of formal mechanisms designed to position partners as experts and key contributors. For example, at AISJ service-learning project facilitators are expected to regularly meet with their respective community partners, as was described in the school’s Service-Learning Handbook. Meetings are supposed to happen not only during the initial planning phase, but throughout the action phase as
well. In these latter meetings, it is expected that input from community partners will shape subsequent student action. I observed one such meeting in which a student and adult facilitator met with the head of a local NGO to discuss their ongoing partnership with the organization. The facilitators asked the community partner about his perceptions of the effectiveness of their prior action, the changing needs of his organization, the ways that students could support these needs, and expectations/goals for future interactions. The facilitators’ questions and comments demonstrated that they were listening carefully to the partner’s opinions. The course of action that the facilitators and community partner collectively determined respected the partner’s perceptions and needs. As Kerrie, an adult facilitator in South Africa described, service-learning is “not just about going out and doing something to others. It’s working collaboratively to solve [problems].” Again, this quote suggests a framing that elevates the perspectives of community partners.

Another thing to consider when addressing the idea of meaningful and appropriate action is the question: are efforts forced or authentic? In other words, are actions impacting genuine needs in a natural manner? Some facilitators expressed concern that service projects can become forced when people feel pressured to put service-learning into the curriculum but struggle to find meaningful links. A story that an ISK teacher, Robin, recounted in an interview captured this tension. Robin described her participation in a recent meeting where teachers were collaboratively planning for an upcoming InterCultural trip. As I described in Chapter Four, these trips included service components. Accordingly, one of Robin’s colleagues asked the group if they should integrate some sort of service component into the trip. Another teacher expressed a caution that really resonated with her. In Robin’s words, he said:
Yeah (ideally we’d do service), but that just gets so ridiculous. ‘Cause you’re on this bike ride, and then you just stop into this school and read a book. It just seems so fake. How useful really is that? It makes me angry when people do things like that, you know?

After sharing this story, Robin continued to describe her frustrations with the pressure to “tick the boxes” in IBO schools. Robin explained expressed disappointment in forced efforts and a desire for more authentic links. Yet in our discussion, Robin recognized that both teachers and students were both stressed and stretched thin; they were under pressure to do many things, including meet service-learning curricular requirements articulated by both the IBO and the school itself. She could empathize with forced efforts accordingly.

Student leaders also voiced skepticism towards efforts that they perceived as insignificant or forced. In an interview, one student facilitator explained how a prior, somewhat negative service experience in her former school motivated her to pay attention to authentic community needs:

Growing up in South Africa and seeing the issues that persist in it makes me want to help. Cause I've also had a background in service, but I wouldn't say significant service. In grade 7, I was in [a regional honor society] where each school, I know it's kind of an elite thing, each school would nominate two representatives. It would be a huge competition and you would serve for one year. So from October of grade 6 to October of grade 7, you would serve on the mini council. And a major thing we'd have to do—we used to do the Easter egg collection where during Easter we would get Easter egg chocolate things and we'd give them to
kids. [...] And if you think about it... it's not the priority...it's great for Easter and Christmas to be giving kids chocolate. But if they don't even have pop on an everyday basis, I wouldn't say that's as influential! So I have a background of going to these situations and I was used to it. But it felt, more gratifying knowing that [my current project] is actually influential service that we're doing.

In this explanation, Naomi chastised service projects that are primarily for show and instead suggests that service should be “influential.” Her explanation recognized that some needs are more pressing and certain contributions more helpful than others. Naomi’s concern that projects address genuine needs was a common one amongst facilitators. While my research was in no way intended to evaluate the actual community influence of any given effort, it nonetheless established that facilitators were deeply concerned with the meaningfulness of their projects. It should be noted, however, that this seems an important area for further research. There are numerous pleas in the literature for a greater focus on community perspectives. For example, Cruz and Giles (2000) argue that community partnerships themselves should be the primary unit of analysis in evaluating service-learning success. They call for continued dialogue on ways to approach the challenge of defining, researching, and measuring community impacts.

Meaningful learning experiences

The paragraphs above have focused on the service portion of service-learning, yet service-learning is also intended to contribute to students’ academic and personal development. Accordingly, the aim of “projects that make a difference” includes the question: how do projects foster student learning? There are IBO frameworks that shape
this discussion, particularly with regard to co-curricular efforts. The IBO (2015) CAS guide describes seven learning objectives that students are expected to meet through their involvement in co-curricular creativity, activity, and service experiences (pp. 11-12). These objectives are lofty and abstract; students are to recognize their own strengths and weaknesses, undertake new challenges and develop new skills, use the five stage model to initiate and plan a CAS experience, work collaboratively with others, engage in “issues of global importance,” and consider the ethical implications of their actions. According to the CAS guide, students are expected to demonstrate their achievement of the seven learning objectives through reflections and portfolios.

*Considering co-curricular learning*

By explicitly defining specific learning aims, the IBO shapes the way that facilitators and participants conceptualize students’ co-curricular experiences and learning. In some ways, the CAS framework ensures that students’ learning remains an integral focus in service-learning projects. Some might even argue that the student-centered framing elevates student learning to the principal focus of such endeavors. This is a common issue in service-learning ventures (Butin, 2010; Stoecker & Tryon, 2009). At the same time, students’ demonstrations of learning vary considerably; some students’ portfolios and reflections suggest a high engagement in the learning process, meanwhile other students’ reflections only include superficial allusions to learning objectives. For example, to demonstrate perseverance in a service project, one student might write numerous reflections throughout the process describing his ways of approaching daily challenges; meanwhile, another student might write a single reflection after the project
ended in which he claims that he persevered, but with minimal evidence or elaboration. The IBO’s monitoring process of the CAS program seems to have some bearing on the variability of reflections. While students are expected to demonstrate that they have met all learning objectives to some degree, schools are not allowed to grade or evaluate students’ participation or reflections. In other words, students’ fulfillment of CAS requirements fall into one of two possible categories: complete or incomplete. Positively, by adopting such a holistic fulfillment framework, the IBO allows students to focus on their experiences and the learning process rather than grades or evaluations. The CAS program’s objectives also capture many of the abstract and idealistic learning goals that drive facilitators’ passion for service-learning. At the same time, the CAS framework also impedes facilitators’ ability to hold students accountable to high levels of engagement with any specific objective. Accordingly, facilitators may struggle to get students to take their related learning seriously, and students may be able to get away with superficial, tick-the-box only, attitudes towards meeting the IBO’s CAS learning objectives. The reflection process seems to play an important role in this. I will explore this in detail in a subsequent section (“Stage Four: Reflection”).

_Considering curricular-based service-learning_  

The IBO CAS framework described above offers some structure for considering students’ learning within co-curricular service-learning projects. However, many service-learning efforts are also integrated into curriculum. How do facilitators (mainly teachers in this instance) ensure that service-learning results in meaningful student learning in
such efforts? There seem to be two main types of learning that teachers expect service-learning to augment: subject-specific learning and cross-disciplinary skills.

The first of these, subject-specific learning, frames service-learning primarily as a tool to help enrich students’ understanding of subject matter. Teachers are accustomed to monitoring students’ learning related to existing academic objectives. One of the key benefits that facilitators described related to service-learning as a teaching strategy is that it ties academics to real life situations. As Chris, a teacher in Ethiopia, described: “The importance of service-learning for me is that it connects to the community and connects to learning. Kids don’t learn in isolation or out of context. I’m a huge proponent of experiential learning.” Chris’s statement emphasizes that service-learning, as an experiential learning strategy, can help academic learning feel more authentic for students.

Many academics also suggest that service-learning can deepen students’ understanding of subject matter. There have been many studies that have associated students’ participation in service-learning activities with heightened academic achievement (Astin et al., 2000; Conway, Amel, & Gerwien, 2009; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Scales, Roehlkepartain, Neal, Kielsmeier, & Benson, 2006; Simons & Cleary, 2006) or that have emphasized the potential of service-learning to reinforce academic objectives (Cumbo & Vadeboncoeur, 1999). Some also attribute students’ increased attitudes towards school or particular subjects to their participation in service-learning (Astin et al., 2000; Billig, Root, & Jesse, 2005; Leong, 2007). In short, teachers can use service-learning to help students master traditional subject-level content and can foster positive dispositions towards learning this subject matter.
Students can also learn cross-disciplinary skills through their participation in curricular-based service-learning projects. These skills might include research, planning, organizational, communication, cross-cultural, time management, interpersonal, or reflective skills. One of the schools I visited, AISJ, had a unique way of approaching the cross-disciplinary skills that are implicitly part of the service-learning process. As I described in Chapter Four, the AISJ team developed service-learning standards and benchmarks and performance rubrics. These documents captured many of the specific areas of learning within each stage of the service-learning process. AISJ teachers were expected to integrate specific standards into their units. Accordingly, they were held accountable for teaching and assessing these cross-disciplinary skills. Additionally, the service-learning coordinator could track related instruction from pre-K through twelfth grade and could reflect on the school-wide approaches to each respective skill.

The sentiment that service-learning can promote cross-disciplinary skills is one that is supported by the literature. For example, Vogelgesang and Astin (2000) suggested that one of the key differences in outcome between service and service-learning participation is that the later promotes cognitive skills. Similarly, in an article exploring the broader category of experiential education, Raelin (2010) described the intentional fostering of broad “megacompetence,” or “those principles that promote skill development across a range of circumstances” (p. 44).

Broader learning aims

One final area of student learning seems important to mention: moral/character development. This category of desired learning is neither restricted to curricular nor co-
curricular service-learning. Rather, it is related to the idealistic goals that many facilitators have for the pedagogy more broadly. In general, teachers were more explicit about character development aims than students, though numerous students alluded to their own shifts in thinking over time.

A look at responses to my Phase Two questionnaire demonstrates the commonality of references to desired moral or character development. One item asked facilitators: “What motivates you to be involved in community engagement efforts?” While facilitators used different terms to describe their ambitions and defined their desired character/moral outcomes through their respective lenses, they consistently pointed to their hopes of related student learning. Zoe, a teacher in Ethiopia, explained that she is driven by a desire to

Help to open our privileged students eyes and minds to have a more global view, to see others as equals and humans who deserve opportunity. Help them care and realise they need to make good choices for the planet and the people on it.

Zoe’s answer focuses on abstract moral outcomes, such as expanded worldviews and global responsibility. Anand, a teacher in South Africa, phrased his motivations in this way: “My belief in social change and the learning that occurs - and the development of the students in their academic, social and emotional learning.” This response includes an allusion to emotional learning, a type of learning that is often associated with character development. An ICS teacher, Isabelle, described her motivations,

The benefits [service-learning] provides for student learning and how it motivates students authentically to work towards creative problem-solving. Lots of great
critical thinking is involved and deep discussions about human nature and/or overcoming personal barriers and prejudices.

The latter part of Isabelle’ response highlights the potential of service-learning to shape students’ attitudes and beliefs. LeeAnne, a teacher in Kenya, was perhaps the most explicit about how service efforts might be tied with moral aims. She responded to the survey question by saying that she was motivated by:

A personal sense of commitment to love and service. This has been a long-term commitment that started with my desire to live a life of service in a way that would allow my kids to engage with tangible, hands-on ideas about living out faith in a complex world.

In this response, LeeAnne described her desire to intentionally model some of her core beliefs. In my observations, LeeAnne never overtly proselytized. However, her deep commitment to service (that aligned with her understanding of Christianity) was both modeled and shared. In her quote above, LeeAnne implied that she hopes her involvement in community engagement efforts will inspire students’ to reflect upon their morality and to act on their commitments. Much like the other teachers, who expressed character goals through their own respective religious and cultural lenses, LeeAnne’s answer emphasized the character development aims implicit in community activities.

In many ways, discussion of character or moral development is murky territory. There are questions about who should provide instruction, what values they are to encourage, and how to do it. There is some skepticism over the political nature of service-learning accordingly (Butin, 2010). However, there seems a general consensus that service-learning can attribute to students’ personal growth and moral understanding.
For example, Eyler and Giles (1999) pointed to a wide range of interpersonal and personal outcomes that can result from service-learning. These included students’ developing a more positive perception of field partners, feelings of greater connection to community members, a heightened tolerance of others, a perception of greater self-knowledge, a perception of heightened spiritual growth, increased sense of self-efficacy, improved ability to work with others, increased leadership skills, communication skill development, relationships with other students, increased reflective discussions, and close faculty-student relationships (pp. 54-56). Similarly, Yeh (2010) suggests that service-learning can help students develop a sense of self, coping skills, self-reflective skills, and even the sort of critical consciousness that Freire (1993) advocates. Service learning can serve as “an important vehicle for exploring the internal contradictions associated with living in community and creating democracy in our daily lives” (Mobley, 2011, p. 98). In short, service-learning has great potential to influence students’ understanding of themselves as individuals and as members of society.

A balancing act: Striving for positive benefits for communities and students alike

In sum, as the discussion of this competency has demonstrated, there are many different types of “meaningful” outcomes that can result from service-learning efforts—benefits for communities and for students. Ideally, projects include both types of results. Facilitators strive to balance these different aims. Yet Anand, a teacher in South Africa, described the challenges of meeting both aims at once:

Service-learning fundamentally deals with change. And the role, the big role of us as educators is two fold: we're activists by promoting and creating social change,
but we have responsibility to also guide and help kids articulate learning. It's
difficult because some people either end up just about the social change, some
people just about the learning… and, it's difficult to find that balance. Because I
sometimes end up looking very much like the activist community worker, and I
have to remind myself to go back to the learning and reframe my thinking. Or
reframe what I'm going to approach with the learning and how you create the
platform for learning.

As Anand explained above, it is a challenging and ongoing process for educators to focus
simultaneously on creating authentic benefits for communities and students. Yet his
explanation also captured his desire to do so. Anand’s words captured a sentiment that I
heard again and again from facilitators across all three sites.

**Competency: Match Students’ Skills and Resources with the Task**

In some ways, this competency is closely related to the previous one. In order for
projects to be meaningful, there must be a careful consideration of the degree to which
projects align with students’ skills and resources. There are many related questions that a
facilitator could ask: what sorts of specialized skills are implicit in projects? What is the
balance between students acquiring new skills and students having sufficient experience
to effectively carry out their projects? Are project goals achievable? What about instances
where community needs do not neatly align with student skills or resources? How can
projects focus on student talents and interests without feeling forced? In my observations,
facilitator approaches varied considerably for how they helped students identify a strong
fit between their abilities and projects and how they developed students’ proficiencies
with related skills. Yet, it seems that facilitators can become increasingly adept in helping students identify forms of action within their skill sets and can help them cultivate the relevant requisite skills.

In many instances, especially when students have many co-curricular options to choose from, students can be encouraged to get involved in projects that draw on existing skills. They can choose ways to serve their communities that correlate with their prior experiences and backgrounds. During my fieldwork, I saw many examples of students intentionally doing this. For example, a student in Kenya described how her background as a DP art student made her a strong match for an art therapy project. A student in South Africa told me that she chose to help at an equestrian therapy center because she was familiar with horse care. Similarly, an avid soccer player in Ethiopia described how he could use his talents to help coach soccer clinics for students from a local school. In other words, students intentionally chose projects that built upon existing passions, interests, and skills. As one ICS student described her process of deciding which service activity to get involved in, her words showed the centrality of this idea of good fit. She said she chose to get involved in an English language tutoring program with youth at a local orphanage because she felt that it was “real service.” As I pressed her to explain what she meant by this, she described her bilingualism and how her fluency in Amharic and English allowed her to support students’ linguistic development. In other words, what made service “real” for her was the match between her talents and the community needs.

In cases where students are matched with projects based on skills, interests, or experiences, a certain degree of self-awareness is required. While some students may be highly aware of their skills and talents, others may be less cognizant of ways that their
abilities can be matched with community needs. For example, one AISJ student leader, Naomi, described a friend’s initial reluctance to get involved in a tutoring project, because she perceived herself as a weak math student. However, as the project continued, the friend realized that she still had a solid enough background in the subject to assist with grade five students. In Naomi’s words, her friend was surprised and “felt so gratified! Like, oh wow! I’m actually making a difference. I can just take what I’m learning at school each day and change a community.” Naomi’s friend, in this example, learned about the potential value of skills she had underestimated. She was surprised to realize that her math abilities, which she had always been self-conscious of, were still valuable for tutoring projects with younger students. There are many instances where students, much like Naomi’s friend, minimize their skills or are unaware of the usefulness of talents that they possess.

Facilitators can play a role in helping students recognize their skills and talents and match these with projects and community needs. Kerrie, an experienced service-learning facilitator at AISJ, described a colleague’s strong ability to help students see potential matches: “He knows each (student) on a personal level and knows how to tap into their skills and their interest to be able to come up with a meaningful community service project.” In this statement, where she compliments her peer’s approach, Kerrie implies that student-centered approaches are important and that strong facilitators help students recognize good fits between their talents and community needs. This sort of one-on-one coaching is advocated in the literature as well; Stelljes (2008), for example, points to the importance of individualized mentoring throughout the entire service-learning process.
This concept of “good fit” can be considered at different levels. For example, students in all three settings had opportunities to be involved in long-term projects. Students might select a service site based on their broader interests or skills. For example, one ICS student talked to me about her choice to join an orphanage project because of her love of babies. She enjoyed being able to rock infants at the orphanage and felt like she was good at caring for them. In this instance, Ciara’s commitment to an ongoing project was based primarily on broad skill sets she perceived herself to have. However, there are also opportunities for students to consider fit within projects for more specific tasks. For example, in South Africa, I watched a planning meeting for Project Dignity (the group of biology students that focused on facilitating sexual health workshops with their peers in the local community, described in Chapter Four). Facilitators assigned every student a specific task for the week based on their skills and talents. For example, several students that were especially tech-savvy were assigned to work on a website. Another student, who was especially articulate, was supposed to write letters to local corporations to try to secure sponsors. Meanwhile, several especially organized students were responsible for securing resources for the next workshop: obtaining boxes of free condoms, printing information leaflets, etc. As I chatted with an adult facilitator about this role assignment, she said that students’ talents, personalities, and interests were factors in their designated tasks. Student and adult facilitators had collaborated to determine the best fits for project participants.

Note that students can always learn new skills and community needs can motivate them to do so. I saw many examples of this. For example, a student at ICS talked about how one of her peers knew that girls in the local community lacked access to feminine
products. She wanted to create reusable pads to meet this need; however, she did not have
the technical skills to do so. This motivated her to learn these skills and launch a related
school club. At the group’s start, a parent taught several students how to use the sewing
machines. Students gradually acquired technical skills that they could apply to the
project and could teach each other. As I observed a sewing session with this group, now
well established, I watched student leaders patiently teach their peers new sewing
strategies. Students had acquired enough technical ability to problem solve together when
they hit both literal and metaphorical snags. In Kenya, I watched a planning meeting for
students who were going to be involved in a construction project for a school in a nearby
slum. While students were eager to contribute manpower to the project, few had
extensive experience with construction. Accordingly, adult facilitators ran a training
session to help students learn how to use different types of tools. Students practiced using
the tools on scrap wood and they practiced digging in fields behind the school. They also
learned Swahili terms for the tools so that they could more effectively communicate with
local partners that would be directing their actions. In South Africa, I watched a training
workshop for students involved in a tutoring project. The workshop taught students
teaching strategies and ways to create effective lesson-plans. An adult facilitator later
described the benefits of this training: students recognized that they “actually need to
have lesson plans that are relevant to what these kids are doing in their schools.” In her
view, as students gained greater understanding of the lesson planning process and the
grade-level objectives of the students they worked with, AISJ students could “go in and
truly offer supplemental tuition and not just random lessons on nouns.”
In all three examples I describe above, students learned new skills to meet specific project needs. It seems important to note, though, that all three examples included opportunities for students to acquire skills before they had to apply those skills within communities. In other words, the learning process begins at school. Students ideally are not going out into communities and doing projects that they lack the skills to do effectively. There is some discussion in the literature on the complexity of service learner training. Gonzalez and Golden (2009), for example, spoke at length on the challenge of properly training students. They recognized that it takes time and resources to do so, and suggested that schools try to bear the burden as much as possible to reduce the strain on partnering agencies. Chisholm (2003) also suggested that facilitators need to carefully consider the skills involved and refine students’ relevant skills well before they are needed in a given project. Roberts (2013) put it, “Action must be informed and provision made for acquisition of appropriate knowledge” (p. 137).

**Stage Four: Reflection**

The reflection portion of service-learning, while it is often called the fourth stage, is actually an ongoing action that is integrated into the entire process. In other words, reflection is expected to happen throughout all the other stages, as students investigate, plan, act, and demonstrate their learning. Kaye (2010) frames reflection as the following:

[Reflection] is a vital and ongoing process that integrates learning and experience with personal growth and awareness. […] In the course of reflecting, students put cognitive, social, and emotional aspects of the experiences into the larger context of self, the community and the world. This helps them assess their skills, develop
empathy for others, and understand the impact of their actions on others and on themselves. (p. 17)

This description emphasizes the range of things students can reflect on and the potential outcomes of these reflections.

Reflection is, in some ways, a vaguely defined practice. As Butin (2010) puts it, reflection:

Is seen as a key component in service-learning; yet any definition of its duration, scope, placement, mode, and structure remain frustratingly absent. Every teacher of a service learning course must either implicitly or explicitly decide, among other things, what students should reflect on; how long and how often they should reflect; whether reflection should be in class, out of class, or some combination thereof; what mode of reflection is valid (e.g. monologue, dialogue, performance, written); the level of descriptive, analytic, and reflective detail; and the means by which such reflection will be assessed (e.g., self-, criterion-, or norm-referenced). (p. 16)

This quote highlights how many aspects of the reflection process are ambiguous or undefined.

Accordingly, it seems important to consider the IBO’s framing of reflection. This is especially the case, because reflection plays a large role in the evaluation portion of the CAS program. While students’ reflections are not formally assessed, students’ reflections and portfolios are the primary way that they demonstrate that they have met the seven
CAS learning outcomes. As it laid out the five stages in the CAS process, the IBO’s (2015) CAS guide used the following explanation of reflective behaviors:

Students describe what happened, express feelings, generate ideas, and raise questions. Reflection can occur at any time during CAS to further understanding, to assist with revising plans, to learn from the experience, and to make explicit connections between their growth, accomplishments, and the learning outcomes for personal awareness. Reflection may lead to new action. (p. 17)

The first sentence of this explanation details the four elements the IBO expects to find in students’ reflections. The description continues to explain the positioning of reflective practice and the IBO’s idealistic goals for students’ reflection. The CAS guide offers several pages of related guidelines for students’ reflections and emphasizes student choice in when/how they reflect. It also stresses that student reflections are not to be assessed.

It seems important to note that the reflection stage is closely connected to the IBO’s central aims. The IBO CAS guide notes that the reflection stage is linked to one of the IBO’s guiding documents, the IB Learner Profile (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2014c). This Learner Profile describes ten characteristics that the IBO hopes students will develop throughout their studies. “Reflective” is one such attribute. In the IB Learner Profile, reflective students are characterized as the following: “We thoughtfully consider the world and our own ideas an experience. We work to understand our strengths and weakness in order to support our learning and personal development.” (p. 7) This description alludes to the close connection between students and their communities. It suggests that students should constantly consider their strengths in
relation to real-world contexts. The CAS guide’s allusion to the Learner Profile also
reminds adult facilitators, the intended audience of this document, of the centrality of
reflective practices to the IBO’s aims.

**Competency: Foster Meaningful Reflective Practices**

As the section above suggests, meaningful reflection is a key goal of service-
learning, especially in IBO schools. Just as scholars have called reflection the core of
service-learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 1999), so too have facilitators stressed its centrality.
As LeeAnne, an ISK teacher put it, “If you miss that step [reflection], you miss the
consolidation of what you have learned and how that affects your worldview.” Students
recognized the centrality of reflection as well. One AISJ student, Evan, described his
experiences with formal instruction of reflection. He described how his grades 9-10
Global Citizens class taught him basic reflection skills and how to think through the
elements of a project proposal. At the end of his explanation he made the following
statement: “They're really just focused on this is how you reflect, this is how you
demonstrate what you've done. Cause it's not just service.” The end of this quote suggests
that Evan recognizes that service without reflection has less meaning. Instead, he ascribes
importance to the reflective practices associated with the action. Yet the process of
fostering reflective practices is complex, and I explore several related elements below.

**Teach reflective skills**

Experienced adult facilitators stressed again and again that students need support
in learning how to reflect, and that students do not intuitively know how to reflect in
meaningful ways. As one facilitator put it, “Reflection is a skill. It is taught and practiced.” Kerrie, a facilitator in South Africa, explained that reflection can help students move from being warm bodies to genuine contributors on service projects. She explained that, “I think you can encourage [genuine contributions] through reflection, through asking kids questions. That’s totally teachable.” As she continued, Kerrie stressed that teachers need to deliberately plan their instruction and allocate time and energy to the teaching of reflective practices. She put it this way: “It’s about teachers planning and discussing how we’re going to do reflection this week… let’s focus on this technique. It’s about making sure that it’s explicit in unit plans so everyone is clear how they’re doing it.” In this quote, Kerrie recognized that by documenting intended instruction on reflection in unit plans, teachers might have both clarity and accountability. They might also be more deliberate about reserving time in their units to focus on reflection skills. Another teacher emphasized the importance of this, “You need to have a clearly allocated time to actually [teach the skills].”

The most recent edition of the IBO’s (2015) CAS guide seems to bolster these sorts of arguments, as it explicitly states that reflective skills should be taught and modeled (p. 26). The IBO offers several suggestions for actions that teachers could take to help students understand reflection: “define,” “model,” “lead,” “share,” and “provoke reflections” (p. 29). Yet adults may not have much experience teaching reflective practices. Anand described teachers’ ability to support reflective practices as a “specialized skill” and “not ordinary teaching. There’s so much more to that.” Accordingly, in the upcoming sections, I break down some of the key elements of reflective practice that are included in the IBO’s description of reflection.
**Teach students to think for themselves**

As the IBO (2015) CAS guide noted, reflection involves students describing what happened, expressing feelings, and generating ideas (p. 17). Accordingly, students need to learn to think for themselves and articulate their individual thoughts. A facilitator in an environmental group in Ethiopia explained how some of his students were struggling to reflect critically on these sorts of things. He described his own approach to help his students develop their reflective and inquiry skills—he asks his students questions and lets them fill in the gaps. He intentionally uses open-ended questions and prods his students to continually consider things more deeply. Kayleigh, an adult facilitator in South Africa, described a similar practice. She explained that she encourages individual students to periodically stop and re-examine their efforts by asking questions like, “Why are we actually doing something like this?” She suggested that such reflective practices could take students’ good intents and help them think about ways to refine their practices; as she put it, “the kids want to do something (meaningful)” but sometimes “need that direction.” Anand, a teacher at AISJ, described a different tactic. He suggested that dialogue and discussions could help students create their own opinions and understand their own experiences. He explained that he uses story telling, group work, and discussion forums to have them explain their experiences because “normally when you see group work interaction, that's when I actually see them less filtered […] the dialogue overtakes their filters.” In other words, as students have discussions with a peer, someone who they might naturally open up to, they come to a deeper understanding of their own views and experiences. Eyler and Giles (1999), in a study of service-learning in
university courses, found a similar thing: “Discussion was a predictor of both self-
knowledge and growth in personal efficacy over the course of the semester” (p. 40).
Though they offer the caveat later in their book that the depth of discussion matters and
that facilitators need to deliberately encourage discussions to go beyond simple
conversations about feelings. In short, it seems my study participants and academics alike
find value in well-facilitated discussions.

The literature stresses the importance of students exploring their own thoughts
through the reflection process. For example, Morton (2012) explains that this process has
benefits for both students and the partnerships that they form. Morton states,

The importance of cognitive dissonance and values clarification in our reflection
process. While these are important for the personal growth of students, we are
also convinced that experiencing cognitive dissonance and practicing values-
clarification are essential building blocks for relationship building, crossing
cultural boundaries, and community organizing. (p. 99)

This explanation suggests that students’ values clarification has greater meaning than
personal self-discovery—it shapes relationships and influences projects. There are some
suggestions that written reflections seem the most powerful in this process (Eyler and
Giles, 199). For example, Eyler and Giles’ study revealed that “writing was in fact a
consistent predictor of self-knowledge, spiritual growth, and findings reward in helping
others” (p. 40).
Teach students to pose questions

Students also need to learn to pose questions (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2015b, p. 17). This sentiment was expressed by facilitators on all three campuses. Teachers spoke of the relevance of inquiry skills. Some focused on how students’ could use questions to explore their own thinking, others focused on how questions could help students understand the communities they serve in.

Most service-learning literature emphasizes that reflection spills into all phases of the process; in other words students reflect as they investigate, plan, and act. As the IBO’s (2015) CAS guide puts it:

Reflection can occur at any time during CAS to further understanding, to assist with revising plans, to learn from the experience, and to make explicit connections between their growth, accomplishments, and the learning outcomes for personal awareness. Reflection may lead to new action. (p. 17)

Teachers spoke of the relevance of questioning in these different phases. For example, an ICS teacher considered how experienced service-learners “ask the right questions to sort of alleviate problems to make their things more and more successful every time.” In this description, the teacher captures how good questions can help students deconstruct their plans before they act. Questions can help students anticipate challenges. Other facilitators described the importance of questioning in later phases of the service-learning process. For example, an AISJ teacher considered the reflective practices that occur after action is already underway, “How do you, yourself, as a student, interrogate your experience to make it more meaningful?” Eyler and Giles (1999) emphasize that questioning can also
originate with meaningful experiences and a simple curiosity, “Learning begins with curiosity, with wanting to know” (p. 85).

Teach students to make connections

The IBO (2015) CAS guide also noted that reflection is partially about making connections: “Service learning builds upon students’ prior knowledge and background, enabling them to make links between their academic disciplines and their service experiences” (p. 21). Students can learn to recognize links between what they learn in class and what they see in life. They can reflect on connections between what they see on their service sites and their own experiences. Students can connect classroom content to projects, and vice versa. For example, I also observed students making connections during a bus ride to a service site in Kenya. Students noticed a bootlegging operation going on in a ravine that was adjacent to the road. One student immediately asked the teacher supervisor if this was the sort of project they had discussed in class earlier that week. The teacher answered affirmatively. The students continued to discuss amongst themselves what they had learned about why these sorts of operations exist and the dangers for those involved.

A facilitator in Kenya, LeeAnne, modeled connection-making skills during a class lesson. In this lesson, a student was in the process of giving a presentation on poverty. As the student explained different descriptors used to categorize different wealth levels, LeeAnne linked these descriptors to students’ lives by making comments like, “That would be your house help,” or “That would be your parents.” As she did this, she prodded students to reflect on the relevance of the issue to their own lives. While she was
not explicitly teaching reflective skills in this instance, her questions reinforced that connections could be made.

The sorts of connections I describe to above are also addressed in service-learning literature. For example, Eyler and Giles (1999) suggest that one of the benefits of service-learning is that it brings together academic content and its real-life context. They explain the importance of this, “Acting and thinking cannot be severed; knowledge is always embedded in context, and understanding is in the connections” (p. 66). In other words, students’ reflections on connections are a crucial part of the service-learning process.

*Teach students to use reflections to assess and influence action*

Finally, the IBO’s CAS (2015) guide noted that reflection includes considering progress, revising plans, and potentially taking new actions (p. 17). This includes students’ ability to evaluate strengths and weaknesses and the progression of a given project.

Students, while occasionally resistant to the effort that reflection takes, still recognized that reflection could improve their practice. For example, I observed a student service group meeting in Ethiopia where the student leaders facilitated a reflection period. The students collectively recognized that their tutoring efforts were not as effective as they could be. The students discussed how they should meet more regularly to both reflect on their prior actions and plan for the future. In this example, students realized that their efforts could be improved by focusing more on reflective practices. A student in South Africa also articulated the central role of reflection in a project she was involved in:
It is important to think about what you do. Cause you don't want to just go out there… the thinking behind what we're doing has actually changed our project, and shaped it into what it is now. Which is great. So we need that reflection.

In short, student facilitators recognize that reflection can shape action.

I saw numerous examples of reflection fitting into ongoing planning. For example, Daniela, an AISJ teacher, described a reflective strategy that she uses to help students consider: “[We] do a SWOT analysis—strengths, weakness, opportunities, and threads. So every now and again, you pull everyone together and say what works? What doesn't work? Why?” In Addis Ababa, I watched student leaders of a service group facilitate a team reflection on a recent advocacy campaign. They discussed what they could learn from their last experiences to better their upcoming ones. In Kenya, I observed a group of students planning for an upcoming holiday party for kids from a nearby orphanage. As they thought ahead, they reflected on their prior experiences hosting this event. They decided that things felt too rushed last time, so decided to simplify the schedule. They made their decisions about the agenda for the upcoming party based on their reflections of the prior.

A teaching challenge: The individualized nature of reflection

One of the key challenges in teaching reflective practices is that reflection, by its very nature, is personal. There is no formula for a perfect reflection. People have unique ways of processing information, unique learning preferences, unique experiences, and unique understandings. The IBO (2015b) in many ways acknowledges this by allowing considerable variation in reflection form. Considering the highly personal nature of
reflection, students require individual coaching. One of the teachers I observed in Ethiopia, Zoe, seemed especially good at personalizing reflection support. Zoe met with small groups of students who were behind on their CAS reflections. As each student discussed their progress with her, Zoe offered individualized feedback and support. For example, she used sports analogies to help a track runner understand what it would mean to “reflect on the ethical implications” of her actions (one of the CAS expectations). She modeled questioning for a student who said he was “stuck” on a reflection regarding his first time to a nearby orphanage: “Was it your first time holding a baby that small? What were you feeling?” She prompted a student who was writing a reflection on his experiences on a recent Week Without Walls trip to consider parts of his weekend that he may have naturally overlooked. She asked, “What were the challenges of sleeping in a tent with 20 other guys? What did you learn about how you fit into groups?” Again and again Zoe reiterated to students that reflection should be genuine. While she prompted them to think about their experiences more deeply, she encouraged them only to write reflections if they actually had something to write about. In this, she recognized the individual nature of reflection.

Facilitators also raised a related challenge to instruction—reflection is a process that depends on students’ individual engagement. Engagement can be encouraged, but not forced. LeeAnne, an ISK teacher, described students’ buy in to the reflection process,

You can have 90% of kids on board, and what do you do about the 10% who aren't? Well, you try your best. But ultimately it's their personal choice as to whether they engage or not engage. And maybe for whatever reason at that point in their life, they're just not ready. But maybe that bears fruit later.
This framing suggests that genuine reflection is something that students ultimately need to take ownership of. While facilitators can teach reflective skills, students have to be open to learning them if genuine reflections are to result. This is true of most learning. However it seems even more relevant to the instruction of abstract and largely unmeasured skills involved in service-learning. As Eyler and Giles (1999) put it, “Service-learning practitioners have long viewed knowledge as something actively constructed by the learner, not simply given from the learner to master” (p. 64). This all suggests that students must choose to take an active role in their learning.

A teaching challenge: “Good” vs. “bad” reflection

While most facilitators alluded to wide variations in quality of different reflections, this is a messy topic in the context of the IBO CAS program. The IBO takes a fairly firm line against any assessment of reflections; they state that reflection is not supposed to be marked, graded, or judged (2015b, p. 29). Accordingly, any discussion of “bad” reflections is taboo. Instead, the IBO advocates for students to have freedom in their reflections. The IBO describes their reasoning,

When overly prescribed, students may perceive the act of reflection as a requirement to fulfill another’s expectations. Students may then aim to complete “a reflection” quickly since the value is unrealized. By contrast, the student who understands the purpose and process of reflection would choose the appropriate moment, select the method and decide on the amount of time needed. With this greater sense of autonomy and responsibility, the student may be encouraged to
be more honest, forthcoming and expressive, and develop insights including those related to the learning outcomes. The ultimate intention is for students to be independently reflective. (p. 28)

In theory, the openness and non-assessed nature of CAS reflections offers students both ownership and freedom. The IBO’s approach is thus idealistic, hopeful, and empowering. In some ways, by de-regulating CAS participation and its corresponding reflections, the IBO promotes genuine engagement. For example, while the IBO used to include specific hour counts for expected participation, now they encourage sustained involvement more loosely: “When possible, interactions involving people in a service context best occur with a regularity that builds and sustains relationships for the mutual benefit of all” (2015b, p. 22). As the IBO opts for more abstract descriptors they provide flexibility and room for students to individualize their experiences.

However, what happens when busy students perceive written reflections primarily as a set of hoops to jump in order to fulfill their IBO Diploma requirements? What happens when teachers frame reflections more as boxes to tick than opportunities for the “honest,” “forthcoming,” and “expressive” thoughts the IBO hopes for? How can students be held accountable for investing thought if reflections cannot be evaluated? If teachers cannot assess students’ work, how can students recognize whether they have actually developed reflective skills? These sorts of questions lurk below the surface and were frequently expressed by both students and teachers alike.

Teachers frequently bemoaned the overemphasis on completing reflections rather than the emphasis on quality. One described an instance where several students were
trying to force out reflections on an experience that held little value for them. She explained,

I'm like, “Can you actually write a reflection on this?” And they're like, “No.” I said, “Well then don't. Don't just BS it for the sake of....” But then they're like, “But we've been told we're meant to write reflections.” I said, “No. You can write as few or many as you want. And if you don't think they're genuine don't do them. There's no point!”

This teacher’s words emphasize the tensions between requirements and meaningful experiences. Another teacher explained that he thinks reflection is often treated as a box-ticking exercise and is disconnected from students’ practices. As he described, “Often what happens is that reflection doesn’t have any context and it's just reflection for the sake of reflecting. Or there's just action. And [students] haven't made the connection to reflecting about their action.” This description stresses that reflections can become disconnected and meaningless activities if students’ fail to connect them to their action. A teacher at a different school also highlighted this gap between action and the formal reflection activities. In her words,

[Students] grumble a little bit about the documentation. Because a lot them really enjoy doing what they're doing, but then it feels like a bit of an assignment to have to actually keep up with doing [written reflections]. And then some of the kids won't, and then they'll have to basically like totally do them all at the last minute to try to meet the requirement, which isn't really the point.
Again, this stressed the downside of formal requirements and students’ emphasis on completion rather than meaningful reflection. Another adult facilitator echoed the sentiment that reflections can easily become meaningless:

\[
\text{You can't just say, go and reflect. Cause kids will just do the same comfortable reflection that they always do. They need to be able to do a variety of reflections and in meaningful ways. So to be able to recognize that is not just about checking a box.}
\]

Yet another teacher described how busyness and academic stress exacerbate the issue:

\[\text{“[Students] are busy with all their academics and all their activities, it's hard for them to carve out the time to do it. And some of them don't legitimately see the point in it. You know what I mean? It feels like just jumping through a hoop.” As all these quotes demonstrate, the concept of ticking a box came up again and again on all three campuses, and seems partially rooted in both the strain of the DP program and the framing/treatment of CAS reflections.}\]

Adults were not the only ones who noticed students’ box-ticking issue. Students spoke of this tendency too and recognized that some of their peers focused more on completion than on the act of reflecting. One described it in this way,

\[\text{Generally people that are academically inclined will take it seriously. No, no, let me rephrase that.... generally people who are hard working will take it seriously. Because it requires constant commitment, constant follow up. It requires you to be focused on it. The people who take it serious are the people who enjoy service. And you actually enjoy reflecting on it once you start the process. But people who}\]
just kind of want to get it over with, they won't take it as seriously. They'll do the bare minimum to pass.

This quote highlights the range of attitudes that students hold towards their CAS reflections. While she recognizes that many students care about their reflection, she also suggests that some students put more of a genuine effort into their reflections than others. Another student noted a similar tendency, “Essentially it's really up to you. Even when they force people to reflect, there are still people who don't reflect well. You know, they just say anything just to get it done.” As this highlights, some students are able to fulfill their requirements yet they put little genuine thought into their reflections. This highlights the challenge of a system that disallows assessment—there is little that adult facilitators can do to formally differentiate between those that are actually invested and those that are putting in minimal effort. Some students say what they think teachers and the IBO want to hear rather than genuinely reflecting. This is not necessarily a strictly-IBO challenge. For example, Eyler and Giles’ (1999) study of university students suggested that students cater their reflections to match what they think their teachers want to hear. In short, it seems that students are prone to please and do what they perceive to be important to get the outcomes that they want, whether that is to fulfill their CAS requirements or get a good grade in a course.

In some ways, the IBO acknowledges that resistance to formal reflections is commonplace. A chart in the IBO (2015) CAS guide includes the following descriptors of what “reflection is not”: “forced,” “right or wrong,” “good or bad,” “to be judged by others,” “done to please someone else,” or “a waste of time” (p. 29). By including these descriptors, the IBO in some ways acknowledges that some students may gravitate
towards these ways of thinking. In CAS training sessions there are brainstorming opportunities for facilitators to swap strategies for combatting these sentiments. However, the prevalence of student and faculty concerns noted above certainly suggest that student resistance and skepticism are still momentous challenges. Other studies have also pointed to students’ resistance to the compulsory elements of CAS (Kulundu & Hayden, 2002).

At the same time, resistance towards reflection is not a challenge that is unique to students in IBO schools. Eyler and Giles (1999) for instance, recognize that students often have a love-hate relationships with reflections, especially written ones. Their study of college students noted that students simultaneously disliked writing reflections and recognized how meaningful the practice was. This suggests that reflection, while occasionally perceived as laborious, can be meaningful. It also implies that students grumble because genuine reflections are not easy.

On the topic of “good” vs. “bad” reflection, it seems important to note that some scholars suggest that the quality of project influences the quality of student reflections. For example, Eyler and Giles (1999) stated that,

A key element of an educative experience is engagement in a worthwhile activity. The student who is trying to solve a real problem with real consequences sees the need to look up one more case, to understand just how a similar a similar policy failed elsewhere, to learn a new technique for dealing with a child’s reading problem. Genuine problems provide the most powerful need to know and are thus motivating for many students. (p. 91)

In other words, students find genuine, complex, and pressing issues stimulating. The context of reflections matter.
A teaching challenge: The requisite expertise involved in teaching reflection

In many ways, this entire chapter highlights the range of specialized skills involved in service-learning facilitation. However, it seems important to note that I heard more explicit concern over the specialized nature of reflective skills than some other skills. A quote from Anand epitomizes this concern:

When people hear you can't assess a reflection, they think that that means that you can't advise someone on how to develop deeper meaning within the reflection or you can't advise them in terms of how to grow from that reflection.

You say to [students], you did this... but what about this? And next week, can you take that theme and try to take it to your service project in your thought? So when you come back you've put this in the forefront of your mind… But [such coaching] means structure [...] there's a lot of scaffolding. Which I don't know that the people involved in CAS are necessarily equipped to be able to do it. They're willing. Fundamentally willing. I don't think they’re necessarily equipped. […]

So it comes down to how are we trained as reflective practitioners. It's a skilling thing. I feel, I believe the assumption is that you don't need to have specific skills or you don't need to have specific knowledge to be a CAS or service learning person. And in some ways you do have to! But it's often not seen as that. It's seen
as generic skills. The word "reflection" gets thrown around. But reflection in the classroom context, and reflection in service learning can be really different. Reflecting on learning activity, and reflecting continuously as you grow, every week, in your service experience… it is very different to a classroom.

This quote stresses that it takes considerable effort and skill to foster students’ reflective skills. This quote also alludes to the underestimation of these skills. While facilitators themselves often recognize that it is quite difficult to scaffold students’ experiences in ways that they gain meaning from them, outsiders may be less aware of the challenges in doing so.

While this section has primarily focused on reflections within a CAS context, it is important to recognize that schools also facilitate service-learning programs in the grades leading up to the Diploma Programme (DP) and some students in grades 11-12 do not undertake the DP. Accordingly, the skills discussed in this section are ones that are ideally being addressed in the younger grades or in the wider school as well.

**Build habits of reflection**

The previous section stressed the importance of explicitly teaching students how to reflect. This one addresses the issue of building habits where students practice those skills. The IBO (2015) CAS guide describes the importance of habits in the following terms,

Developing a culture of reflection helps students recognize and understand how to be reflective as well as deciding the best methods and appropriate timing. Student learning is enhanced by reflection on choices and actions. This enables students to
grow in their ability to explore skills, strengths, limitations and areas for further
development. Through reflection students examine ideas and consider how they
might use prior learning in new contexts. Reflection leads to improved problem-
solving, higher cognitive processes and greater depth of understanding in addition
to exploring how CAS experiences may influence future possibilities. (p. 26)

As this descriptor emphasizes, reflection can be especially meaningful when it happens
regularly; ideally schools help foster a “culture of reflection.”

Strategies for building reflective habits

Ultimately, most facilitators hope for more than students’ ability to reflect in
short, structured experiences. Instead, they aim to develop habits that persist. They hope
that students develop long-term commitments to their communities and consistently
reflect upon their roles and actions. Eyler and Giles (1999) captured this sentiment. As
they contrasted short-term structured projects and reflections with ongoing projects
coupled with consistent reflections, they explained, “While a brief encounter with another
can have an effect, we were also struck by the power of more intensive relationships to
generate a long-lived questioning approach to social issues” (p. 88). This suggests that
patterns and habits are a central goal. There were quite a few strategies that I observed
that facilitators used to help cultivate reflective habits. I will offer a few as examples.

Numerous individuals discussed how regular group reflection activities, for
example, after each visit to a service site, could assist in building a culture of reflection.
For example, Chris described the debrief meetings that student leaders facilitate after
service trips: “They have been very valuable, and I think the kids that are actively
involved in [these sessions] are getting a lot out of [their projects]. You can hear it in your conversations with them." LeeAnne, an ISK teacher, described reflection activities in a group she advised:

We had kids on the floor with big pieces of paper, markers, and sticky notes mapping out successes, room for improvement, goals for the following year. And the kids had time. We really brought everyone together… in small and then larger circles. And that was cool. We need to do more of that actually.

She recognized how powerful these experiences were and craved more time for them. At ISK I observed one of the service groups do a guided reflection after their visit to a children’s hospital. A parent chaperone prompted the students to consider different aspects of their experience. Students considered what worked well, what they wanted to improve on in the future, and how they felt throughout the process of interacting with the kids.

Several others suggested that early instruction might be key. In other words, schools can start building reflective practices into students’ experiences before they enter the Diploma Programme. Sophia, a student in Ethiopia, offered a compelling rationale for doing so. She suggested that students should start doing reflections in ninth or tenth grade:

Instead of having eleventh grade be the stage where you're told, “Oh now you have to do this.” [Reflection] shouldn't be something that you're required to do. But something that's already built upon and you enjoy doing. And you don't mind now writing reflections for it. It shouldn't be like, oh now you have to write reflections because you go to this place every Wednesday.
Sophia’s comment recognizes that if reflective practices are introduced in the context of
the CAS program, they are more likely to be perceived as requirements than useful
habits. She argues for habits to be cultivated sooner. A teacher at ICS, Chris, offered a
similar sentiment. Chris suggested that students could even start practicing reflective
skills and documenting their reflections in middle school. By maintaining an e-portfolio
throughout their entire secondary experience, he believed that students would be able to
follow their growth and share that with their parents or others. Also, he thought it would
reinforce the idea that, “You gotta do some sort of community engagement and you need
to reflect on it.”

There were allusions made to the role that formal requirements can play in the
process. For example, Pierina, an adult facilitator at ISK, recognized that students
initially tend to grumble about formal reflection requirements. Yet she saw that, through
the development of reflective habits, students eventually changed their attitudes towards
reflections: “When kids start reflecting, and really thinking about it cause they have to,
you find 90% of the kids really like doing it.”

Others discussed how part of the process involves creating opportunities for
reflections to be shared or expanding the audience for students’ work. For example, some
students grumble about a lack of an authentic audience for their written reflections. One
teacher put it, “It’s like they know it doesn’t really mean anything. They just get a check
mark if they do it. They’re smart. They’re like, if I just turn something in… That is
something to consider. How we make the reflection part of it more valuable?” Students
articulated similar ideas. One phrased it,
Most of the people I've seen don't take it seriously at all. They just do it because they know [a teacher] is gonna eventually check to see if there's anything on there. But there is the feeling that, it doesn't really get checked. Only to see if something is actually on there.

In short, when student reflections are only read by a single individual (who is perceived to primarily be checking for completion), students see little incentive for putting full effort into their reflections. However, when reflections have a wider audience, they are perceived as more meaningful. For example, a student at ISK suggested that part of why she personally found her reflections so engaging was that they had an extensive audience—her parents and grandparents regularly read her reflection blog. Hazel noted that even strangers had started reading her reflections. Accordingly, she felt responsible for maintaining a high caliber of work and appreciated that others read it. As she described, “I mean, I'm proud of my work. And I'd like it to be recognized.” Hazel’s comment suggests that the audience matters. A teacher noted a similar idea as she said, “[Students] might be more inclined to [reflect] if there was a genuine audience.” As a different adult facilitator put it, that in order for reflections to feel meaningful to students, she believes that “teachers have to make the kids feel their reflections are being valued.”

Others noted that part of the fostering of reflective habits involved teaching students that reflection can take many forms. The IBO emphasizes that students should have freedom to document their reflections through different mediums (e.g., through video, photos, scrapbooks, or formal written reflections). Student facilitators acknowledged that their peers were less resistant to reflective practices than to formal reflections. For example, an AISJ student, Mariam, described her own dislike of formal
reflections. However, she enthusiastically spoke of oral team reflections on the bus rides back from service projects. In her words, “I don't mind talking about [my experiences], and talking with a group. But when it comes to actual CAS reflections, I'm just like... no.” She further explained that the form of reflection, which she called its “methodology,” influenced her attitude towards it. She explained student resistance to reflection as being tied to this: “But I guess just the methodology that we're using is not the best for teenagers who feel like they have better things to do…” Mariam’s statement implies that a greater emphasis on reflective practices than on specific reflective forms might yield greater openness towards the sorts of habits facilitators want students to develop.

**Modeling reflective habits**

In many ways teachers need to be just as intentional as students. Several adult facilitators recognized that part of the process of fostering reflective habits in students involved teachers building reflective habits into their own practices. One laughed with me that the questions I asked in my study’s survey prompted her to reflect on her own role in community engagement efforts. She described how, after taking the survey, she discussed with one of her colleagues how they do not pause as often as they would like to think about, “Okay, how did I start? Why here? Why this?” In these comments, she recognized that even as a passionate facilitator, she could further refine her own reflective practices.

It is especially important that teachers reflect on their own practices because students pointed to the importance of adult role models. Mariam, for instance, described
how one of her teachers “gave tons of opportunities to reflect” and how much she appreciated that. But she acknowledged that it was not just the opportunities that he offered, but his own involvement and modeling that encouraged her to make the most of these reflective moments. As she explained, “It was also coming from [specific teacher]. I don’t even know how that would have come from some of the other teachers who aren’t really involved in service.” This quote implied that students are more inclined to take reflective practices seriously if they see teachers placing similar value in those activities.

*Cultivating collaborative reflective habits*

There were quite a few allusions to the value of collaborative reflection. In other words, facilitators recognized the benefits of group reflections.

Some spoke of the value of hearing multiple perspectives. Especially in culturally diverse groups, individuals experience situations quite differently. For example, one ICS student described how she was initially startled by the attention she got in the streets of Addis Ababa for her skin color, which was noticeably darker than the Ethiopian norm. She described how strangers would call out “African” as she passed. An adult facilitator later reflected that she had not been aware of this sort of attention. As a white woman, she was accustomed to being called “China” (a common slang descriptor for fair-skinned individuals), but had never noticed darker students getting attention as well. By collectively reflecting, individuals could discuss their experiences and brainstorm ways to deal with these sorts of intercultural dynamics.

An AISJ student, Mariam, discussed one of her service group’s strategies for navigating cultural sensitivities through multiple forms of collaborative reflections. She
explained that several students are responsible for regularly seeking out their local partners’ views and bringing those opinions to the AISJ group. She explained that the group, which taught mini lessons as a part of their project, also did “practice runs” of any of their presentations. They intentionally watched for things that might be misinterpreted. Finally, she explained that they relied on a local social worker to help them identify concepts or terms that might have different connotations for their local peers. She gave the following example of the nuances that they were concerned with in these reflections:

[The AISJ students] are supposed to be going out and seeing if the words we're using are things that like correlate with local South African dialect. Cause if [our peers] have no idea what we're saying, then it's just not effective. And just trying to make sure, we're communicating to the best of our abilities. And I know for a lot of the South Africans, we have really weird accents. They may not be able to understand us. Maybe we're talking too fast. Maybe we're moving too much while we're talking, they can't focus. Or something like that. So we're just trying to work on those little things to make the communication as effective as possible.

This example shows how intentional collaborative reflection can help students recognize aspects of their projects that could be further refined. Mariam highlighted the subtle aspects of their actions that might be interpreted differently by a local peer. She acknowledged the importance of her peer’s perspectives, accordingly.

Numerous facilitators stressed the importance of including community members in the ongoing reflective process. One AISJ student, Aisha, described the important influence of collaborative reflection on students’ attitudes as actions. Aisha spoke of a
project she was involved in and described how AISJ students intentionally solicited feedback from their service partners in their reflection process. She told me about regular reflective conversations she had community partners both in person and through social media. She described the benefits of this collaborative reflective process:

People [AISJ students] are aware of their actions. And that's a really, really important thing. Cause when you're serving the community, it's not just about what you feel. It's also about how the community feels about what you're doing and how they perceive your help. Some people might not like it. Or prefer you to do something else.

So what I like about the people in [our service group]... they always reflect and they see what they did wrong... like if they were too bossy. Or it felt like they're being more like teachers than facilitators... um, they're able to recognize their actions and try to adjust accordingly.

Cause when we reflect and we practice, it gets better and that's what I think is a really good thing about it.

Aisha’s description emphasizes that community partners might perceive things differently than AISJ students. She recognized that their opinions were highly valuable. Aisha’s description also highlights the importance of student openness during the reflective process. She described AISJ students actively seeking out and then responding to criticisms. In her views, students were able to refine their practice because they
listened and reacted to community perspectives. An AISJ teacher described some students’ efforts to solicit community feedback:

   The 10th graders already are collecting data, creating surveys. They are, you know, asking the kids [on their service sites]... so, you think it's okay what we're doing? What can we improve on? They’re really trying to show that their projects mean something by improving.

This quote, much like Aisha’s, shows students actively seeking out perspectives from their community partners and then using those perceptions to shape future action.

   Different perspectives were not only linked to cultural differences. For example, one student in South Africa alluded to the different points of view that students might have based on how long they were involved in the project. She argued that everyone should be involved in reflections accordingly. As she explained, “It's not just like a leader meeting only. It's everyone. We can all reflect! Cause a leader's point of view- it can be different from a newcomer. So we like to have a holistic view on everything.” This suggests that there is value in multiple perspectives.

**Stage Five: Demonstration**

In Kaye’s (2010) five-stage framework, the demonstration phase is the final step in the service-learning process; as she described,

   During this stage, students make explicit what and how they have learned and what they have accomplished through their community involvement. They exhibit
their expertise through public presentations—displays, performances, letters to the editor, photo displays, podcasts, class lessons—that draw on the investigation, preparation, action, and reflection stages of their experience. Presenting what they have learned allows students to teach others while also identifying and acknowledging to themselves what they have learned and how they learned it—a critical aspect of metacognitive development. Students take charge of their own learning as they synthesize and integrate the process. (p. 18)

Note that Kaye’s framing heavily emphasizes the role of this phase from a students’ perspective. In this sense, the phase is framed primarily as a part of students’ learning and development. By carefully considering and then sharing their learning and accomplishments, students internalize their learning and experiences.

The IBO (2015) has a similar framing. They describe the demonstration phase as the following:

Students make explicit what and how they learned and what they have accomplished, for example, by sharing their CAS experience through their CAS portfolio or with others in an informal or formal manner. Through demonstration and communication, students solidify their understanding and evoke response from others. (p. 17)

Again, the demonstration phase is primarily articulated as a crucial step in students’ learning process. The focus is on students recognizing their development and communicating that towards others.

Both Kaye and the IBO express this stage primarily in terms of act(s) of public
demonstration. The private, introspective, and/or collaborative thinking that students communicate through this phase are assumed to have been completed through the reflective process described in the last sub-section. Accordingly, the competencies described in this sub-section focus on communication and demonstrative actions rather than on the prerequisite cognitive tasks.

One final note before delving into the competencies involved in this stage: I find that both the IBO and Kaye’s explanations lack explicit concern for community voice. While both recognize community contributions elsewhere, the rhetoric surrounding this phase minimizes the sense of shared accomplishment. Accordingly, as I discuss the demonstration phase I intentionally expand the phase’s parameters to more fully integrate partners’ perspectives and contributions. In other words, while students may be the primary individuals involved in the demonstration process, it seems crucial that their celebrations recognize collaborative efforts in addition to students’ personal growth. Thus, the framings of community roles in this phase seem of paramount concern and opportunities for partners to give input are crucial. Whenever possible, community partners can be given opportunities to express their own sentiments about projects.

**Competency: Communicate Accomplishments to Different Stakeholders**

As noted, the demonstration phases focuses on students’ communication of accomplishments to others, but which “others” should these demonstrations target? There are many different stakeholders involved in service-learning projects: students, teachers, staff, community partners, parents, school administrators, and even the IBO itself. I suggest that communication to these different groups allows students to reflect more fully
on the significance of their efforts to these respective audiences. In other words, in Chapter Five, as I discussed the public relations/communication domain, I explained that communications with each of these different sub-groups requires different sorts of language. Here, I suggest that demonstrating learning or accomplishments to these different sub-groups requires different sorts of thinking. As students consider the framing of their demonstrations, they explore the values and interests of each respective audience. In the process of deciding what to share, they consider their projects from different angles and understand their experiences more deeply.

Through my study, I saw many examples across the three campuses of that targeted different audiences. For example, I observed efforts targeting students: I watched facilitators’ post encouraging statements to social media pages, heard celebratory announcements at school assemblies, and saw posters heralding accomplishments posted on classroom walls. I observed efforts aimed specifically at faculty and staff, such as congratulatory announcements in teachers’ meetings or informal discussions in teachers’ lounges. Regular updates on service projects aimed at teachers, parents, and administrators alike took the shape of student-written articles in school newsletters. Students used formal reflections to demonstrate their accomplishments to the IBO. I heard allusions to contributions that students had made to NGO newsletters aimed at community partners.

I noted that demonstrations aimed at different stakeholders yielded different sorts of expressions. For example, I observed one of the study participants, Hazel, share her impressions of a recent service group’s fundraising event, that she had helped lead, in two forms: in an oral update to her peers during the group’s next meeting and on her CAS
reflection blog. In the meeting with her peers, Hazel focused on collective achievements. She noted, for example, how many people attended the event. She shared some of the positive feedback she received from school community members and communicated positive sentiments that a community partner had expressed to her after the event. With her peers, Hazel largely focused on the success of the event and the role of the whole group in making it successful. Meanwhile, in her CAS reflection, Hazel was more introspective about her personal accomplishments and growth. She critically considered her role as a facilitator and reflected on her evolving communication skills. In her reflection, Hazel still considered a community partner’s impressions and the event’s attendance. However, her focus was less on the group and more on herself. As I viewed these two different demonstrations, I noted that Hazel adapted to her different audiences. In the case of the meeting, it seemed that Hazel recognized that her peers were personally invested in the event and accordingly, concerned with their collective accomplishments. In the case of the CAS reflection, Hazel recognized that the IBO or her blog’s readers (mostly family) were most interested with her own personal development, so tailored her reflection accordingly.

**Competency: Use Demonstrations to Foster a “Culture of Service”**

Early on in this chapter I suggested that facilitators aimed for a “culture of service.” Numerous facilitators implied that this demonstration phase is crucial for garnering programmatic support and for cultivating buy-in to service-learning programs. In other words, demonstration is perceived not only as a demonstration of learning, but also an opportunity to celebrate accomplishments and spread enthusiasm.
I saw numerous examples of school efforts to publically celebrate students’ roles and accomplishments. In Kenya, for example, I was told about an annual school-wide awards ceremony where students were recognized for their roles in their respective service projects with medals and certificates. This public demonstration not only recognized student accomplishments but reinforced to members of the school community that service-learning was something of value. At AISJ, I observed the planning process for a large public event where students from both the Johannesburg campus and their sister school in Pretoria would come together to celebrate their service projects. The plan included students’ showcasing art, audiovisual materials, performance pieces, and written work for their peers, school administrators, parents, and community partners. In both these examples, demonstrations aimed to both celebrate individual accomplishments and foster community buy-in.

**Concluding Chapter Thoughts**

This chapter offered a detailed view into one of the domains of knowledge introduced in Chapter Five. By providing a close examination of the range of skills and understandings involved in the process of planning and carrying out service-learning projects, I intentionally highlighted the complexity of efforts. It hopefully illustrates the breadth of knowledge that teams can be attentive to. Yet, even with the detail offered, this chapter still only skimmed the surface of the nuanced domain. It focused more on skills to be cultivated than paths to their development. It considered broad competencies rather than the complexities of individual circumstances. In other words, there is still much to be explored about service-learning pedagogy and related practices in secondary schools.
CONCLUSION

Legitimizing the Struggle, Recognizing Complexity, and Turning Toward Teams

I started this dissertation with my own story. As an international educator dedicated to the global citizenship and community engagement ideals that the IBO lauded in rhetoric, I faced many obstacles in their implementation. I was frequently frustrated as I tried to establish and develop related programs. In many ways, I felt alone in my struggles and discouraged that the efforts I engaged in fell short of my own standards and ideals. Yet, as this study showed, frustrations amongst facilitators are commonplace. Even in the most developed service-learning programs in the region, facilitators described challenges they navigated on a daily basis. They acknowledged that their respective schools were committed to service-learning. They expressed their own dedications to community engagement ideals. Yet, again and again, facilitators were frustrated by gaps between rhetoric and practice and between their goals and their realities. Even as they proudly celebrated their accomplishments, they consistently recognized aspects of their programs that could be further refined.

I highlight the frequency of facilitator frustrations, neither to criticize the facilitators nor their respective programs, but rather to legitimize their experiences. As Chapters Five and Six emphasized, community engagement efforts rely on many, many skills and understandings. By recognizing the range of domains of knowledge that are involved in efforts, one can begin to understand the momentous task that idealistic facilitators and teams face. By acknowledging all the competencies involved in each domain, one can sympathize with the strain of cultivating all these areas simultaneously. This is especially the case when one recognizes that teachers and students alike are
burdened with countless other school demands. In short, this study suggests that community engagement efforts are very complex. Facilitators must engage in complicated work—work that is frequently underestimated.

By highlighting all the skills involved in these tasks, I hope to free facilitators from the pressure to do it all. It seems unreasonable to expect a single individual, for example a service-learning coordinator, to carry the burden alone. Instead, I advocate for shared leadership models where groups of differently skilled individuals can pool their expertise and work collectively to cultivate meaningful community engagement efforts. As Chapter Four showed, efforts at all three schools involved teams of leaders. As Chapter Five described, team members can complement one another’s strengths and weaknesses to create effective collaborative efforts.

**A Framework Enables Intentionality**

This study set out to identify strategies and supports that might help improve schools’ community engagement efforts. In many ways, the framework that I proposed in Chapter Five has the greatest potential to impact practice. By offering structure to the dozens of related understandings that facilitators identified, I created a conceptual model that enables intentionality. In other words, if teams deliberately cultivate and refine their understandings of the six domains of knowledge, they can approach practice strategically.

**A Framework for Focused Reflection**

First, a framework allows focused reflection. Individuals can reflect on their own competencies related to each of the different domains. If individuals understand their own
strengths, they can recognize assets they can contribute to teams’ efforts. If individuals are aware of gaps in their understandings or areas that could be further developed, they can intentionally target these skills. Meanwhile, they can look to others’ expertise in those areas. Similarly, teams can attend to their collective assets and vulnerabilities. By reflecting on their collective strengths and weaknesses through the lenses of each domain of knowledge, teams can identify leaders in different areas. Facilitators can recognize existing gaps in their collective knowledge and intentionally recruit team members with related understandings; they can intentionally assemble teams with complementary abilities. In short, the six-domain framework enables reflection, which in turn helps teams clarify areas to develop or strengths to capitalize upon.

A Framework for Deliberate Instruction

A second key implication of the framework offered in Chapter Five is that it encourages deliberate instruction. Students and teachers alike need to cultivate understandings related to service-learning pedagogy, global issues, the school context, the local context, leadership/organization, and communications/public relations. One cannot assume that the related competencies spontaneously develop; rather, schools must provide time and instruction dedicated to the intentional advancement of these skills.

In the case of teachers, schools should provide targeted professional development. As I argued in Chapter Five, facilitators of community engagement efforts relied on proficiencies across all six domains of knowledge. Yet, as I noted in Chapter Two, many teachers were likely trained in and more experienced with more traditional teaching strategies. I observed that some lacked familiarity or comfort with service-
learning pedagogy. Other teachers explained that had little formal training in the interconnectivity of global economics and environmental issues or of education and health. Some teachers told me that they felt unprepared to foster student leadership or coach student leaders through the process of organizing complex projects or teams. Thus, intentional professional development seems essential. Powell (2000) stressed the importance of reflection, teamwork, and intentionality in school’s professional development practices. Hayden (2002) in a discussion of the vague ideal, international-mindedness, noted that teachers are often expected to be role models of the ideal but are frequently not given training in how to do so. I suggest the sort of intentionality advocated by Powell should be applied to the sorts of under-addressed skills noted by Hayden. In other words, schools should purposefully offer professional development around the sorts of competencies I identified in Chapter Six.

There may be experts within schools that could share their knowledge with other faculty through professional development workshops, peer coaching, or through other professional development opportunities. For instance, a service-learning coordinator might have expertise in the competencies involved in planning sustainable projects that she could share in a workshop, a geography teacher might be able to offer mini-lessons on the global politics surrounding access to healthcare, a sports coach might be equipped to share leadership-building strategies at the start of a faculty meeting, or a local staff member might be able to run a session to orient his colleagues to culturally appropriate communication. Alternatively, schools could bring in external trainers to support development related to specific competencies. For instance, a consultant might help teams learn to align their efforts with IBO requirements or a leadership trainer might
offer a collection of strategies for engaging novice leaders. In short, teachers need to be equipped with knowledge of the various domains and gain confidence in applying their understandings. Professional development is key in this.

In the case of students, schools need to deliberately attend to the range of related competencies and can do so either formally or informally. Formally, competencies could be approached within courses. For example, as an environmental science teacher explains the devastating environmental toll of deforestation, she could simultaneously discuss the economic influences that motivate the use of forest resources. By helping students recognize the interconnectedness of global issues, a teacher could thus expand students’ knowledge in that domain. Formal instruction could also happen through co-curricular workshops or trainings, such as leadership retreats or service-learning conferences. Instruction on specific competencies could also happen informally. For example, adult facilitators could informally mentor student leaders on ways to increase accountability for their peers within projects. Experienced student leaders could model communication strategies for rising student leaders. In this dissertation I do not argue for a specific mode of instruction. However, I do argue that it is important that students gain intentional instruction related to the six domains identified in Chapter Five.

While the framework I offer can be instrumental in identifying skills that need to be taught, it does not explain how to do so. It does highlight that this task is a momentous undertaking, though. Accordingly, schools need to consider ways to incentivize students and teachers to invest the time and effort required to both teach and learn all the different skills involved in community engagement efforts. The IBO has taken some strides in its newest CAS guide (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2015b) to advocate for
explicit instruction related to service-learning competencies. Nonetheless, there are still few institutionalized accountability measures that position instruction on implicit domains of knowledge or related learning as priorities. I recognize that the IBO intentionally removed evaluative elements of the CAS program (as described in Chapter Four) in order to stress individualized and meaningful experiences, their decision to do so came at a cost—students no longer have the fear of assessment to drive the quality of their work. As I have alluded to numerous times throughout this dissertation, teachers and students are often under tremendous pressure to juggle many IBO demands. As Wilkinson and Wilkinson (2013) noted, IBO educators are often forced to choose between various conflicting educational aims and tend to prioritize teaching that they perceive will yield the highest test scores in their students. This tendency of educators to teach to the test is one that has been noted in many other contexts as well. For example, McTighe, Seif, and Wiggins (2004) described the pressures that many American educators feel to cover too much content or teach to high-stakes tests. When students and teachers are overstretched, they tend to focus on the pieces of their work that they are held most accountable for. At present, the IBO holds neither students nor teachers accountable for cultivating high quality community engagement efforts. Accordingly, if individual schools genuinely wish to move beyond lip service to community engagement ideals, they need to carefully reflect on ways to increase both accountability and intrinsic motivation for related learning. This is an area that the IBO could continue to reflect upon as well.
A Framework Encourages Intentional Resource Allocation

At the end of the prior section, I suggest that facilitators’ strain from juggling too many roles coupled with institutional prioritization of other elements of instruction can hurt community engagement efforts. If school administrators want to minimize these potential obstacles, they should be intentional in their allocation of personnel and time resources. It seems that intentional allocations of resources can ease some of the strains that students and teachers feel and can also incentivize investment.

If schools dedicate personnel to community engagement efforts, such personnel can ease the strain that efforts place on other faculty. It does not seem coincidental that the international schools in the African region with the most established programs all had full or part-time staff dedicated to their supervision. This dissertation has underscored the breadth of demands on community engagement teams. While I certainly argue that a coordinator alone should not carry the burden of being in expert in all domains, the allocation of a full-time position dedicated to these efforts can ease the strain placed on other faculty members. A coordinator might oversee the professional development schedule, map the teaching of related competencies, or facilitate some of the trainings.

Administration can also dedicate resources including time towards the fostering of related competencies. For example, in many cases, teachers have to create time in their personal schedules to develop their own understandings of the domains of knowledge introduced in my framework. However, if administration were to intentionally integrate related instruction into existing professional development structures, teachers may be less stressed and more motivated to learn. Other incentives, such as small stipends for
facilitators or certificates acknowledging particular content knowledge, could also help validate the dedicated learning involved in the different domains.

Schools can also allocate resources to support students’ learning. For example, by allocating time in students’ schedule for related instruction, schools signal that related knowledge is equally important to other content knowledge. By creating school funds to financially support students’ projects, schools can free students’ time from fundraising concerns to allow more time for deeper planning and learning. In short, resources can help ease some of the logistical burdens and add incentives to individuals’ investment in related competencies.

**A Framework Justifies Deliberate Hiring and Job Assignments**

One final area worth noting—a framework enables intentionality in both hiring and job assignments. If schools recognize that they need faculty members who are skilled in the different areas, they can intentionally hire candidates with these proficiencies. As teams reflect on their strengths and areas for development, intentional hiring can help fill identified voids. Similarly, administrators can use the framework to help them consider best fits for job assignments. For example, the framework suggests that individuals with local knowledge or school knowledge might be key assets to community engagement teams. Administrators could deliberately encourage faculty members with these strengths to help facilitate school programs accordingly. In short, by recognizing the specialized skills involved in community engagement efforts, administrators can use hiring and job assignments to intentionally equip teams with knowledgeable facilitators.
Broader Implications: Re-visiting Concepts of Global Citizenship

In my literature review, I highlighted the messiness of discussions around concepts of global citizenship. I explained that there are hundreds of divergent descriptions of an ideal global citizen; very few scholars seem to agree on what a global citizen looks like or does. Accordingly, I turned to the IBO’s framing to contextualize this study. In Chapter Two, I highlighted three key IBO stances towards global citizenship: global citizens demonstrate intercultural understanding and global awareness, global citizens are actively involved in their local and global communities, and global citizens are critical thinkers and life-long learners. I originally anticipated that my study would primarily explore the second of these stances, as I was explicitly interested in community involvement. However, I found that community engagement relied on many other areas of knowledge as well. For instance, community involvement depended on global awareness, which I originally conceptualized as a discrete characteristic of a global citizen. Community engagement relied on intercultural competencies in communication, sensitivities to local cultures, and culturally sensitive leadership.

This study suggests that “community engagement” cannot be conceived as an isolated attribute of a global citizen. Rather, it shows that one’s engagement in his community is reliant on dozens of seeming discrete understandings and skills. It highlighted how incredibly complex any given characteristic of a global citizen can be. Accordingly, more work must be done to disentangle the knowledge involved in various concepts of global citizenship.

The framework I offered in Chapter Five highlights some of the understandings implicit in the commonly cited global civic duty, community engagement. For instance,
the service-learning domain implies that global citizens need to learn how to investigate needs, identify root issues, and collaboratively problem-solve. They need to develop critical reflection skills. The global issues domain suggests that a global citizen needs to be knowledgeable in the interconnectedness of people, the environment, and the economy. It implies that students need to recognize their role in both local and global phenomenon. The school context domain recognizes the value and influences of institutional cultures. It suggests that global citizens need to learn to navigate their respective environments. The local context domain emphasizes that global citizens need to reflect on intercultural dynamics and need to critically examine issues related to power, privilege, and stereotypes. It also suggests that global citizens need to respect the perspectives of others. The leadership/organization domain implies that global citizens need the skills to lead, collaborate, organize, and effectively use resources. Meanwhile, the public relations/communication domain suggests that global citizens need to learn to communicate with different groups. They need to recognize the priorities, expectations, and interests of different stakeholders in projects.

In short, the framework offers some clarity in the requisite skills involved in a particular global civic duty. However, far more research is needed to tease out the skills and understanding involved in other global civic actions. Only as key attributes of global citizenship are further unpacked can schools begin to be more intentional in their approaches to them.

**Broader Implications: The Value of Implementers’ Voices**
This study shows the benefit of examining educational initiatives from the ground level. In this study, I focused on the perspectives of facilitators. Because I did so, I was able to see parts of their experience that might not be readily apparent to an administrator or the IBO. Facilitators were highly aware of the pragmatic demands of community engagement efforts and were sensitive to all the requisite domains of knowledge. An examination of their implementation practices helped illuminate essential components of a vaguely defined educational ideal.

Similar methodological approaches could be used to better understand the implicit knowledge and skills involved in other educational initiatives. This study suggests that efforts may be far more complex than they initially seem. If policy-makers wish to understand the implementation of educational initiatives, it seems that the ground-level implementers have unique perspectives and insight into the process.

**Limitations of this Study**

I chose to approach this topic through a series of qualitative case studies. This allowed me to get a nuanced understanding of the experiences and perceptions of the facilitators involved at the three schools I visited. However, I recognize that there are limits to the generalizability of this study because of my design choices. As Marshall and Rossman (2011) note, “A qualitative study’s transferability or generalizability to other settings may be problematic, at least in the probabilistic sense of the term” (p. 252). Each facilitator’s perceptions and experiences were intrinsically particularistic, each school’s context and approaches unique. I acknowledge that the standpoints that emerged from these facilitators were rooted in their particular experiences. The substantial similarities
between their respective stories may have been augmented by the attributes that these schools shared. For instance, the transient multinational communities that fill such “Type A” international schools (Hayden & Thompson, 2013) might be more detached from the local community than international schools that are filled primarily with national students. The diverse student populations in these schools might have more insight into global issues or more practice navigating diverse cultural contexts than their more stationary peers in other schools. Likewise, issues of power and privilege in service-learning efforts might have been more profoundly felt, and accordingly more widely acknowledged, in these private IBO schools than they would be in public IBO counterparts. I acknowledge that service-learning ventures are always profoundly influenced by their geographic location (Garton, 2002). At the same time, the trends I observed across three distinct schools were significant. I suspect many of the sentiments expressed by facilitators would resonate with facilitators in different settings as well.

My adoption of standpoint approaches, as described in Chapter Three, also enabled in-depth exploration of facilitators’ perceptions. In that chapter, I justified the use of this theoretical lens. Accordingly, I intentionally elevated the perspectives of those that grappled with the IBO’s “global citizenship” and “service-learning” rhetoric in their daily work, those that struggled to cultivate community engagement efforts whilst simultaneously juggling dozens of other teaching or student demands. However, I recognize that by elevating their perspectives, I minimized other important viewpoints. I acknowledge that this study only superficially considered the perspectives of community partners, administrators, parents, or IBO representatives.
In my study, I explored the perceptions of facilitators. I did not try to evaluate the validity of their views or, in any concrete way, measure the impact of their efforts. Instead, I assumed that their perceptions were grounded in their lived experiences and captured their own truths. I strongly believe this approach was important, for as standpoint theory recognizes, different epistemological lenses tend to be privileged (Harding, 2004a). Teachers and students’ voices are rarely the primary measurement of “reality” in schools or larger educational institutions. Yet, as this study showed, they can offer unique insights into phenomena. By elevating the knowledge that adult and student facilitators held, I was able to recognize the range of skills and understandings they felt they relied on. I was able to construct a framework to capture their concerns and perceptions. At the same time, this standpoint approach rejects more traditional ways of capturing knowledge. For instance, I did not use externally created scales to measure or test their understandings or knowledge. Rather, I relied on themes that emerged from facilitators’ expressions of their own experiences; I used interpretive analysis and coding to establish patterns in their thinking. I recognize that this sort of research approach makes it difficult to readily explore facilitators’ thinking more systematically across schools.

It also seems important to note that my work focused on the process of cultivating efforts within schools rather than the impact of these efforts. In Chapters Five, Six, and Seven, I imply that better understandings of the process might improve the quality of related outcomes. Yet, this study only superficially considers the influence of community engagement efforts on students or on communities. I intentionally avoided the evaluation
process in this particular study. I can trust facilitators’ perceptions of effectiveness, or causality. However, I did not focus on program analysis in this study.

Areas for Further Research

This study attempts to disentangle the complex process of cultivating community engagement projects within secondary schools. However, there is still considerable work to be done in understanding all the requisite skills and understandings involved. In Chapter Five, I identified six domains of knowledge that facilitators frequently alluded to. Each of these domains could be further explored in future studies. As Chapter Six demonstrated, each domain is highly complex. Studies could focus on the cultivation of particular competencies. This research could include a pragmatic element: a focus on the strategies used to cultivate given skills or understandings. It could also continue to explore the range of proficiencies involved in any given portion of the process.

As noted in the limitation section, this study focused heavily on the perspectives of facilitators in “Type A” IBO international schools. Future studies could attend to others’ perspectives with equal attention. For instance, studies should be done that elevate the perspectives of community partners in these projects. Future research could also focus on perceptions of facilitators from a broader range of IBO or international schools. Researchers could investigate the experiences of facilitators in local schools or other regional contexts. Studies could further explore the role of the IBO in community engagement efforts by comparing IBO and non-IBO experiences for facilitators, students, or community partners. In short, there are countless other views that could be considered.
to enrich our understandings of this complex and nuanced process. Each epistemological lens offers new insights into these efforts.

I also noted above that my study focused primarily on process rather than outcomes. Accordingly, more research could be done that attempts to measure outcomes. As Hayden (2002) described,

From an ideological viewpoint, students in many international schools are encouraged to develop at an affective level those attributes found in many mission statements, including open-mindedness, empathy, respect and interest in others, sensitivity, tolerance and flexibility. Too little research has been undertaken as yet with respect to the ‘ideological’ dimensions of international education to know to what extent such claims are actually realized in practice, and whether students emerge from schools that promote such values actively demonstrating the desired characteristics. (p. 116)

My own study began to address the first portion of Hayden’s call for research on practice by exploring some of the pragmatics of implementation. However, as Hayden has pointed out, more work could and should be done to assess the effectiveness of these sorts of efforts. Future research could focus on the development of measurement tools that allow more systematic study of soft skills. Studies could delve into the effects of community engagement efforts on students and community members alike, in both the short and long term.

Finally, more research could be done related to similarly vague and idealistic educational initiatives. I suspect that exploratory research of these sorts of initiatives
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would reveal an equally wide range of requisite skills involved. However, future studies are needed to explore the implementation process for other initiatives.

The Ongoing Task of Refining Efforts

I met many passionate facilitators over the course of this study. They spoke vehemently of the value of community engagement efforts and their deep desires to positively impact the world. These facilitators’ investment in their work and in their communities was clear. Administrators, too, expressed genuine interest in community engagement ideals. I saw many exemplary efforts on the campuses I visited. This study, in many ways, offered hope for the sorts of ideals that the IBO promotes.

Facilitators recognized that their efforts were ongoing. They acknowledged that their work was never finished—that communities, contexts, and needs were constantly evolving. They recognized that their efforts could always be refined to better target particular needs, to promote dignity aware relationships, or to yield deeper student learning.

I hope that the framework I offer in this dissertation assists them in their process and encourages them to persevere. The competencies involved in their efforts are many, the areas of understanding, complex. By reflecting on assets and areas of growth, by inviting experts in particular domains into shared leadership teams, and by intentionally cultivating understandings in each particular area, teams can continually refine their work.
APPENDICES

Appendix A: Pseudonyms vs. Actual names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pseudonym?</th>
<th>Adult v. Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AISJ</td>
<td>Aisha</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISJ</td>
<td>Anand</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>Chris McBride</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISK</td>
<td>Camilla</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>Ciara</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISJ</td>
<td>Daniela</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISJ</td>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISK</td>
<td>Hazel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>Isabelle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>Jamal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISJ</td>
<td>Kabelo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISJ</td>
<td>Kerrie</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISK</td>
<td>LeeAnne Lavender</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISJ</td>
<td>Mariam</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISJ</td>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISK</td>
<td>Naitik</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISJ</td>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISK</td>
<td>Pierina Redler</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISK</td>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISJ</td>
<td>Sabal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>Zoe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Survey Items

Introductory note at the start of the survey:

Please note that this survey consists of the following:

- 10 background questions
- 5 questions about your role in community engagement
- 3 questions about leadership approaches
- 6 questions related to your definitions of global citizenship and the community

*Expect that the survey might take 15-60 minutes to complete.*

Items related to background information:

1. Where in the world have you lived? How long were you in each place?
2. What languages do you speak?
3. Which people in your life have had the greatest impact on your views of community engagement?
4. What has influenced the way you view the world? Rank the top 5 contributing factors (and please be specific)
5. What are you passionate about?
6. What are your career goals?
7. What are your personal goals?
8. How long have you been at this school?
9. How similar or different is this school to your past school experiences?
10. What things (besides community engagement) are you involved in at the school or in the community?
Items related to individuals’ role in community engagement efforts:

1. What is your role in community engagement at this school? (Please describe any responsibilities that you have)

2. How did you initially become involved in community engagement at this school?

3. What motivates you to be involved in community engagement?

4. What have been your greatest challenge(s) as a leader/organizer of community engagement?

5. What have been your greatest successes as a leader/organizer of community engagement?

Items related to leadership:

1. Describe your leadership style.

2. What other experiences do you have with leadership? (These could be formal or informal roles)

3. How did you learn how to lead? (Have you had positive role models? Negative role models? Formal leadership training? Etc.)

Items related to definitions of global citizenship and the community:

1. How do you define “global citizenship”?

2. What sorts of things should an active global citizen do?
3. Which communities do you identify with most? (List as many as you feel appropriate and briefly explain each)

4. What do you see as your role in relation to the community?

5. What role does the school currently play in the community?

6. What role should the school play in the community, in your view?
Appendix C: Interview Protocol

**Interview #1.** The first interview is somewhat exploratory in nature; it will be quite informal and may prompt the participant to discuss some or all of the following (not listed in any particular order):

- The individual’s role in community engagement efforts
- His/her motivations for involvement
- Perceived benefits of community engagement
- Prior experiences with community engagement
- Prior experiences with leadership
- Future goals
- Sense of identity
- Global citizenship definitions
- Prior experiences with the IBO
- Perceptions of the IBO
- Perceptions of the community
- Prior experiences in the school
- Perceived challenges (to community engagement efforts)
- Perceived supports (to community engagement efforts)
- Extended discussion of ideas from the survey

**Follow up interviews.** Based on an analysis of the prior interview(s) and the PI’s knowledge of the field site from Phase One research, topics for subsequent interviews will be determined. Ideally, most of the topics listed under interview 1 will be explored
during some stage of the interview process. The PI will regularly consider the degree to which the interviews are addressing the central research questions and will modify the interview topics accordingly.
Appendix D: Demographic Overview on Formal Participants

Table D1
*Number of Formal Participants at Each Site*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D2
*Roles of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service learning and/or CAS coordinator</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher leader of individual service groups</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student leaders of service groups</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the AISA service learning work force</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISS attendee</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of a course focused on global issues, global citizenship, CAS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runs their own NGO or foundation outside of school</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* This is collective representation of participants from all three field sites; individual participants may fit more than one descriptor.

Table D3
*Countries of Citizenship Combined Across All Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual citizens (both countries included above)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D4

*Backgrounds of participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of residence</th>
<th>Students Adults Both</th>
<th>Students Adults Both</th>
<th>Students Adults Both</th>
<th>Students Adults Both</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>- 40 40 -</td>
<td>- 25 25 -</td>
<td>- 1 1 -</td>
<td>- 33 33 -</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>3 - 3 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>7 - 7 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td>- 7 -</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>4 - 4 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>- 36 36 -</td>
<td>- 25 25 -</td>
<td>- 1 1 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curacao</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>- 2 -</td>
<td>- 2 -</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td>- 2 -</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>- 10 4 14 2.5 -</td>
<td>- 2.5 -</td>
<td>- 2.5 -</td>
<td>- 16.5 -</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>18 12 30 13 -</td>
<td>- 13 -</td>
<td>- 4.5 -</td>
<td>- 4.5 -</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>- 5 -</td>
<td>- 5 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>- 8 8 -</td>
<td>- 8 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>- 8 -</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>- - 8 -</td>
<td>- 8 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>- 8 -</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2 2 2 -</td>
<td>- 2 -</td>
<td>- 6 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>6 6 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>- 6 -</td>
<td>- 6 -</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1 - 1 - 234.5 -</td>
<td>- 4.5 -</td>
<td>- 4.5 -</td>
<td>- 5.5 -</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>18 12 30 13 -</td>
<td>- 13 -</td>
<td>- 4.5 -</td>
<td>- 4.5 -</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>- - 4 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>- - 224.5 -</td>
<td>- 24.5 -</td>
<td>- 24.5 -</td>
<td>- 24.5 -</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>- 2 2 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>- 1.5 -</td>
<td>- 1.5 -</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- 6 -</td>
<td>- 6 -</td>
<td>- 6 -</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>- - 1 -</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>2 2 - 3.5 3.5 -</td>
<td>- 3.5 -</td>
<td>- 58 -</td>
<td>- 171 -</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>- 4 4 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>- - 4 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>- 2 2 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>- 4 -</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>- - 3 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>- 2 2 -</td>
<td>- 2 -</td>
<td>- 2 -</td>
<td>- 2 -</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- 0.5 -</td>
<td>- 0.5 -</td>
<td>- 0.5 -</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2 23 25 3 -</td>
<td>- 28 -</td>
<td>- 31 -</td>
<td>- 12 -</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>- 3 3 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>6 - 6 -</td>
<td>- 6 -</td>
<td>- 6 -</td>
<td>- 6 -</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>- - 3 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>- - 2 -</td>
<td>- 2 -</td>
<td>- 2 -</td>
<td>- 2 -</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap year-moving</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Length of residence in each respective country (rounded to the nearest 0.5 year)
Table D5
*Average Length of Time in the Host Country per Participant (At each respective site)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Years (to the nearest 0.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D6
*Gender Breakdown of Participants (Combined across all 3 field sites)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D7
*Languages Spoken by Participants in Addition to English (Combined across all 3 field sites)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th># of participants with some degree of fluency (self-disclosed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amharic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepedi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesotho</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seswati</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setswana</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swahili</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tshoga</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tswana</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venda</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xhosa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoruba</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the number of languages spoken by each individual varied. **Adults:** 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9 (average= 2.9); **Students:** 1, 1, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 4, 7, 7 (average= 3.5)
Table D8

*Length of Time at the Institution (Combined across all 3 field sites)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of time at the respective school</th>
<th># of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year or less</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 4 years</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D9

*Average Length of Time in Respective Institution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Years (to the nearest 0.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D10

*Student Grade Levels (Combined across all 3 field sites)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade level</th>
<th># of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E: First Round Code Descriptors and Frequency Charts

Table E1

**Round 1 Code Application: Kenya**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Code description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“American” “North American”</td>
<td>Use of the term “American” or “North American”</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“awareness”</td>
<td>Use of the term “awareness” or closely related terms (e.g., “aware” or “recognize”)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“bubble” “isolated”</td>
<td>Use of the terms “bubble,” “isolated,” or closely related terms (e.g., apart from)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“CAS”</td>
<td>Use of the term “CAS”</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“comfort” “discomfort”</td>
<td>Use of terms “comfort,” “discomfort,” or closely related words (e.g., comfortable)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“community”</td>
<td>Use of the term “community”</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“critical thinking”</td>
<td>Use of the term “critical thinking” or closely related terms (e.g., “thinking” or “analyze”)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“culture”</td>
<td>Use of the term “culture”</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“development”</td>
<td>Use of the term “development” or closely related terms (e.g., “develop”)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“embassy” “UN” “NGO”</td>
<td>Explicit references to embassies, diplomacy, the UN, or NGOs (Not including direct field partners)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“empathy” “understand”</td>
<td>Use of the term “empathy” or related terms (e.g., “understand” when used to describe cultures)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“empower”</td>
<td>Use of the term “empower”</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“engage”</td>
<td>Use of the term “engage”</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“enjoy” “fun” “interesting”</td>
<td>Use of terms expressing enjoyment (e.g., “enjoy,” “have fun,” “interesting”)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“expected” “required”</td>
<td>Use of terms “expected,” “required” or related terms (e.g., “obligatory”)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“global citizen(ship)”</td>
<td>Use of terms “global citizen,” “global citizenship,” or related terms (e.g., “global participation”)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“IB” “DP”</td>
<td>Use of terms “IB” or “DP”</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“important” “valued”</td>
<td>Use of terms “important,” “valued,” or related terms (e.g., “prioritized”)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“intentional”</td>
<td>Use of the term “intentional” or closely related terms (e.g., “deliberate” or “planned”)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“interdependent” “connected” “network”</td>
<td>Use of terms expressing the connectivity of people or issues (e.g., “connected,” “related,” “linked,” “network”)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“international” “international mindedness”</td>
<td>Use of terms “international,” “international mindedness,” or closely related terms (e.g., “global”)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“justice” “rights”</td>
<td>Use of the terms “justice,” “rights,” or closely related terms (e.g., “human rights”)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Kenya” “Nairobi” “East Africa”</td>
<td>Use of the terms “Kenya,” “Nairobi,” or “East Africa”</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“leadership”</td>
<td>Use of the term “leadership” or “leader”</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“make a difference” “participate”</td>
<td>Use of the phrase “make a difference” or closely related phrases (e.g., “make an impact on” “help”)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“make a difference” “participate”</td>
<td>Use of the term “participate” or closely related terms/phrases (e.g., “be involved in” or “show up to”)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“respect” “open-minded”</td>
<td>Use of the terms “respect,” “open-minded,” or closely related terms (e.g., “tolerant”)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“responsible”</td>
<td>Use of the term “responsible”</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“service learning”</td>
<td>Use of the term “service learning”</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“service”</td>
<td>Use of the term “service”</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“sustainable”</td>
<td>Use of the term “sustainable”</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of involvements</td>
<td>References to the number of school activities an</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
individual is (or is expected to be) involved in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(In) efficiency</td>
<td>Explicit references to things being either efficient or inefficient</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>References either to accountability measures (e.g., school requirements, attendance policies, accreditation demands) or the need for such accountability measures</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity descriptions</td>
<td>Descriptions of service learning projects and observed activities</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISA or regional network</td>
<td>References to regional networks such as AISA, GISS, African MUN, etc.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of campus efforts</td>
<td>Indicators that individuals are either aware or unaware of other people’s community engagement efforts</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy in</td>
<td>General references about the role of “buy in” to campus engagement efforts</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy in: Administrative</td>
<td>References to the role of administrative support/“buy in” to campus engagement effort</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy in: Faculty</td>
<td>References to the role of faculty support/“buy in” to campus engagement effort</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy in: Field partner</td>
<td>References to the role of field partner support/“buy in” to campus engagement effort</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy in: Parent</td>
<td>References to the role of parent support/“buy in” to campus engagement effort</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy in: Staff</td>
<td>References to the role of staff support/“buy in” to campus engagement effort</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy in: Student</td>
<td>References to the role of student support/“buy in” to campus engagement effort</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues or peers</td>
<td>References to relationships with colleagues or peers (as they impact projects)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>References to conference attendance or the role of conferences in engagement efforts</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular ties</td>
<td>References to curricular service learning efforts (either existing, past, or future)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing organizations</td>
<td>References to partnerships with existing organizations (note: I only applied this code once per organization within each respective data file)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Allusions to the role of family members in shaping perspectives or involvements</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>The physical presence of food at gatherings (e.g., in faculty planning meetings, in club meetings, etc.)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising, money</td>
<td>References to money or lack thereof, as it relates to projects (e.g., fundraising efforts, budget constraints, socioeconomic status of students relative to the community)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future (allusions to)</td>
<td>Allusions to future goals for projects</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>Explicit reasons stated for participating in projects</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in starting</td>
<td>Explicit reasons given for starting particular projects</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal organization</td>
<td>Descriptions of the internal organizational structure of clubs, service projects, etc.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International travel</td>
<td>References to international travel (including family or conference trips)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in focus</td>
<td>A list of project focus areas (e.g., a list of all projects in a handbook with short descriptions of what issues they address)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in focus: children</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on children (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in focus: creativity</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on creative expression (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
projects, not as a frequency indicator)

<p>| Issues in focus: development | Allusions to projects that focus on development projects (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator) | 6 |
| Issues in focus: education   | Allusions to projects that focus on education (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator) | 20 |
| Issues in focus: environment | Allusions to projects that focus on environment (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator) | 19 |
| Issues in focus: gender      | Allusions to projects that focus on gender (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator) | 3 |
| Issues in focus: health      | Allusions to projects that focus on health (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator) | 2 |
| Issues in focus: human rights| Allusions to projects that focus on human rights (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator) | 6 |
| Issues in focus: international understanding | Allusions to projects that focus on international understanding (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator) | 8 |
| Issues in focus: peace       | Allusions to projects that focus on peace-making efforts (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator) | 6 |
| Issues in focus: poverty     | Allusions to projects that focus on issues surrounding poverty (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator) | 9 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>References to technology being used in projects or related IT issues</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language issues</td>
<td>References to the role of language fluency (or lack thereof) in projects</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>References to leadership (that do not fit into one of the categories below)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: coaching</td>
<td>References to leadership development via coaching (could include peer or adult)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: descriptions of leaders</td>
<td>Descriptions of leaders in action</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: JUMP or formal training</td>
<td>Allusions to some form of formal leadership training (including training provided by JUMP) or the role of formal training</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: learning by doing</td>
<td>Allusions to the role of experience as it relates to leadership development</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: perceptions of leadership</td>
<td>Individual perceptions of what leadership could, does, or should look like</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: role models</td>
<td>Allusions to role models (including predecessors) and how they impact leadership development</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: strategies</td>
<td>Descriptions of specific strategies that student leaders are using in leadership roles</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission or aims Orientation</td>
<td>Allusions to the school’s stated mission or aims References to orientations or formal trainings prior to projects beginning</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>References to orientations or formal trainings prior to projects beginning</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (international) schools</td>
<td>References to other schools, international or local</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>References to other countries (e.g., prior residence in, peer networks with, issues impacting)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental</td>
<td>Allusions to parental involvement in community</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement engagement efforts</td>
<td>Allusions to personal growth (e.g., moral, emotional, academic)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal growth</td>
<td>Allusions to personal passions or individual interests</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior experiences</td>
<td>References to the role of prior experiences in individuals’ participation in current community engagement efforts</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td>Allusions to the role and means of publicity within the school community regarding larger community efforts</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>References to reflective activities (including their current form, attitudes towards them, or the role they do or should play)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Instances that suggest how individuals view their relationship with the community are, or should be</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Square</td>
<td>References to the Round Square model (as it pertains to campus efforts)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School culture/ethos</td>
<td>References to the school culture or instances that are especially revealing about the school ethos</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/teaching demands</td>
<td>Direct allusions to demands on teachers or students by the school (apart from engagement in community projects)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Allusions to security issues or related precautionary measures</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifts</td>
<td>Allusions to shifts (e.g., in personnel, in school approaches, in partners)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skepticism</td>
<td>Instances where an individual or group expresses concern or skepticism about some aspect of a community project</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media use</td>
<td>References to the role of social media in projects</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff involvements</td>
<td>References to the role of staff members in community engagement projects</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress (or other negative emotion)</td>
<td>Instances where an individual expresses stress or another negative emotion (apart from skepticism)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student centered</td>
<td>Allusions to the role or presence of student-centered projects</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student initiated</td>
<td>Allusions to the role or presence of projects initiated by students</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Allusions to the sustainability of projects</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team building</td>
<td>References to team building exercises</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms used to describe ISK</td>
<td>Terms that ISK members use to describe themselves</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms used to describe local community</td>
<td>Generalizations that are used to describe people in the local community (by ISK members)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (or lack of)</td>
<td>Allusions to individuals having time or a lack thereof</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of activity</td>
<td>Allusions to the significance of activities happening in a specific timing</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westgate</td>
<td>References to the Westgate attacks</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World view or value system</td>
<td>Allusions made to individuals’ world view or values systems (including religious views)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E2  
Round 1 Code Application: Ethiopia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Code description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“American”</td>
<td>Use of the term “American” or “North American”</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“authentic” “appropriate”</td>
<td>Use of the term “authentic,” “appropriate,” “meaningful,” closely related terms (e.g., “genuine”) or terms that express the converse state (e.g., “inappropriate”)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“meaningful”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“awareness”</td>
<td>Use of the term “awareness” or closely related terms (e.g., “aware,” “recognize”)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term(s)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“bubble” <strong>or</strong> “isolated” <strong>or</strong> converse, “integrated”</td>
<td>Use of the terms “bubble,” “isolated,” or closely related terms (e.g., “apart from”). Also applied this code for the use of converse terms (e.g., “integrated”)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“CAS”</td>
<td>Use of the term “CAS”</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“comfort” <strong>or</strong> “discomfort”</td>
<td>Use of terms “comfort,” “discomfort,” or closely related words (e.g., comfortable)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“community”</td>
<td>Use of the term “community”</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“connected” “interconnected” “network”</td>
<td>Use of terms expressing the connectivity of people or issues (e.g., “connected,” “related,” “linked,” “network”)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“critical thinking”</td>
<td>Use of the term “critical thinking” or closely related terms (e.g., “thinking” or “analyze”)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“culture” “ethos”</td>
<td>Use of the terms “culture” or ethos, or direct reference to the school’s climate</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“easy”</td>
<td>Use of the term “easy” or related terms (e.g., “least required effort”)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“embassy” <strong>or</strong> “UN” <strong>or</strong> “NGO”</td>
<td>Explicit references to embassies, diplomacy, the UN, or NGOs (Not including direct field partners)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“enjoy” <strong>or</strong> “fun” <strong>or</strong> “interesting”</td>
<td>Use of terms expressing enjoyment (e.g., “enjoy,” “have fun,” “interesting”)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ethiopia(n)” “Addis” “expected” “required”</td>
<td>Use of terms referring to Ethiopia, Addis, or Africa</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“global citizen(ship)” “IB” <strong>or</strong> “DP”</td>
<td>Use of terms “IB” or “DP”</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“important” “valued”</td>
<td>Use of terms “important,” “valued,” or related terms (e.g., “prioritized”)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“international”</td>
<td>Use of terms “international,” “international”</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“international mindedness”</td>
<td>“mindedness,” or closely related terms (e.g., “global”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“make a difference”</td>
<td>Use of the phrase “make a difference” or closely related phrases (e.g., “make an impact on” “help”)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“participate”</td>
<td>Use of the term “participate” or closely related terms/phrases (e.g., “be involved in” or “show up to”)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“respect” “open-minded”</td>
<td>Use of the terms “respect,” “open-minded,” or closely related terms (e.g., “tolerant”)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“responsible”</td>
<td>Use of the term “responsible”</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“service learning”</td>
<td>Use of the term “service learning”</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“service”</td>
<td>Use of the term “service”</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“sustainable”</td>
<td>Use of the term “sustainable”</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of involvements</td>
<td>References to the number of school activities an individual is (or is expected to be) involved in</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>References either to accountability measures (e.g., school requirements, attendance policies, accreditation demands) or the need for such accountability measures</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity descriptions</td>
<td>Descriptions of service learning projects and observed activities</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISA or regional network</td>
<td>References to regional networks such as AISA, GISS, African MUN, etc.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background knowledge</td>
<td>References to students or teachers either having or not having sufficient background knowledge to effectively participate in or organize community engagement efforts (e.g., students recognize how multiple global issues relate; teachers understand cultural expectations for gender relations in the community)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy in: Administrative</td>
<td>References to the role of administrative support/ “buy in” to campus engagement effort</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy in: Faculty</td>
<td>References to the role of faculty support/ “buy in” to campus engagement effort</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy in: parent</td>
<td>References to the role of parent support/ “buy in” to campus engagement effort</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy in: Student</td>
<td>References to the role of student support/ “buy in” to campus engagement effort</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>References to conference attendance or the role of conferences in engagement efforts</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular ties</td>
<td>References to curricular service learning efforts (either existing, past, or future)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>References for the need to differentiate programs or curriculum to fit individual student needs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>References to multiculturalism, diversity of experiences, racial or ethnic differences, etc.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing organizations</td>
<td>Partnerships with existing organizations (Note: typically only used once per organization referred to in each respective data file)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Allusions to the role of family members in shaping perspectives or involvements</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>The physical presence of food at gatherings (e.g., in faculty planning meetings, in club meetings, etc.)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising, money</td>
<td>References to money or lack thereof, as it relates to projects (e.g., fundraising efforts, budget constraints, socioeconomic status of students relative to the community)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government, bureaucracy</td>
<td>References to the role of the local government or bureaucratic features on daily life or on projects</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11/12</td>
<td>References made specifically about students in grades 11/12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 6-10</td>
<td>References made specifically about students in grades 6-10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth mentality</strong></td>
<td>Indicators of a faculty and student mindset that emphasizes growth and improvement</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity</strong></td>
<td>References to how individuals view their own identity as it relates to projects (e.g., “Third Culture Kids are good at…”)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incentives</strong></td>
<td>Explicit reasons stated for participating in projects</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal organization</strong></td>
<td>Descriptions of the internal organizational structure of clubs, service projects, etc.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues in focus</strong></td>
<td>A list of project focus areas (e.g., a list of all projects in a handbook with short descriptions of what issues they address)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues in focus: animals</strong></td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on animals (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues in focus: children</strong></td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on children (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues in focus: creativity</strong></td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on creative expression (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues in focus: cultural exchange</strong></td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on cultural exchanges (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues in focus: development</strong></td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on development efforts (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues in focus: education</strong></td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on education (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in focus:</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on environment (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on gender issues (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on health issues (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language learning</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on language instruction (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poverty</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on poverty-related issues (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sport</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on connecting via sports (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>References to technology being used in projects or related IT issues</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language issues</td>
<td>References to the role of language fluency (or lack thereof) in projects</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>References to leadership (that do not fit into one of the categories below)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: coaching</td>
<td>References to leadership development via coaching (could include peer or adult)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: descriptions of leaders</td>
<td>Descriptions of leaders in action</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Allusions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: formal training</td>
<td>Allusions to some form of formal leadership training or the role of formal training</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: learning by doing</td>
<td>Allusions to the role of experience as it relates to leadership development</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: perceptions of leadership</td>
<td>Individual perceptions of what leadership could, does, or should look like</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: role models</td>
<td>Allusions to role models (including predecessors) and how they impact leadership development</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>Allusions to things that are or should be long lasting (e.g., projects that have endured, students who have stayed at the school for years, etc.)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (international) schools</td>
<td>References to other schools, international or local</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>References to other countries (e.g., prior residence in, peer networks with, issues impacting)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>References to the role of professional development in efforts</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peers</td>
<td>References to relationships with colleagues or peers (as they impact projects)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal growth</td>
<td>Allusions to personal growth (e.g., moral, emotional, academic)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal passions</td>
<td>Allusions to personal passions or individual interests</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior experiences</td>
<td>References to the role of prior experiences in individuals’ participation in current community engagement efforts</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td>Allusions to the role and means of publicity within the school community regarding larger community efforts</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport building</td>
<td>Descriptions of activities that seem to intentionally foster group rapport</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>References to reflective activities (including their current form, attitudes towards them, or the role they do or should play)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (reciprocal, one way, etc.)</td>
<td>Instances that suggest how individuals view their relationship with the community are, or should be</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/teaching demands</td>
<td>Direct allusions to demands on teachers or students by the school (apart from engagement in community projects)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Allusions to security issues or related precautionary measures</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifts</td>
<td>Allusions to shifts (e.g., in personnel, in school approaches, in partners)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skepticism</td>
<td>Instances where an individual or group expresses concern or skepticism about some aspect of a community project</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress (or other negative emotion)</td>
<td>Instances where an individual expresses stress or another negative emotion (apart from skepticism)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student centered</td>
<td>Allusions to the role or presence of student-centered projects</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student initiated</td>
<td>Allusions to the role or presence of projects initiated by students</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>Examples of teamwork and collaboration in the preparation of and leadership of projects</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms used to describe ICS</td>
<td>Terms that ICS members use to describe themselves</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms used to describe local community</td>
<td>Generalizations that are used to describe people in the local community (by ICS members)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (or lack of)</td>
<td>Allusions to individuals having time or a lack thereof</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Code description</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“American”</td>
<td>Use of the term “American” or “North American”</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“authentic”</td>
<td>Use of the term “authentic,” “appropriate,” “meaningful,” closely related terms</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“appropriate”</td>
<td>(e.g., “genuine”) or terms that express the converse state (e.g., “inappropriate”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“meaningful”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“awareness”</td>
<td>Use of the term “awareness” or closely related terms (e.g., “aware,” “recognize”)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“bubble”</td>
<td>Use of the terms “bubble,” “isolated,” or closely related terms (e.g., “apart from”)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“isolated,”</td>
<td>Also applied this code for the use of converse terms (e.g., “integrated”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“suburb”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“integrated”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“CAS”</td>
<td>Use of the term “CAS”</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“comfort”</td>
<td>Use of terms “comfort,” “discomfort,” or closely related words (e.g., comfortable)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or “discomfort”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“community”</td>
<td>Use of the term “community”</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“connected”</td>
<td>Use of terms expressing the connectivity of people or issues (e.g., “connected,” “related,” “linked,” “network”)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“interconnected”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“network”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“critical thinking”</td>
<td>Use of the term “critical thinking” or closely related terms (e.g., “thinking” or “analyze”)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“embassy”</td>
<td>Explicit references to embassies, diplomacy, the UN, or NGOs (Not including direct field partners)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“UN”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“NGO”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“empathy”</td>
<td>Use of the term “empathy” or related terms (e.g., “understand” when used to describe cultures)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“understand(ing)”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term/Phrase</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“empower”</td>
<td>Use of the term “empower”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“engage”</td>
<td>Use of the term “engage”</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“enjoy” “fun” “interesting”</td>
<td>Use of terms expressing enjoyment (e.g., “enjoy,” “have fun,” “interesting”)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“expected” “required”</td>
<td>Use of terms “expected,” “required” or related terms (e.g., “obligatory”)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“global citizen(ship)”</td>
<td>Use of terms “IB” or “DP”</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“IB” “DP”</td>
<td>Use of terms “important,” “valued,” or related terms (e.g., “prioritized”)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“important” “valued”</td>
<td>Use of terms “important,” “valued,” or related terms (e.g., “prioritized”)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“international” “international mindedness”</td>
<td>Use of terms “international,” “international mindedness,” or closely related terms (e.g., “global”)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“make a difference”</td>
<td>Use of the phrase “make a difference” or closely related phrases (e.g., “make an impact on” “help”)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“participate”</td>
<td>Use of the term “participate” or closely related terms/phrases (e.g., “be involved in” or “show up to”)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“respect” “open-minded”</td>
<td>Use of the terms “respect,” “open-minded,” or closely related terms (e.g., “tolerant”)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“responsible”</td>
<td>Use of the term “responsible”</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“service learning”</td>
<td>Use of the term “service learning”</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“service”</td>
<td>Use of the term “service”</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“South Africa” “Johannesburg” “Southern Africa”</td>
<td>Use of terms “South Africa,” “Johannesburg,” or “southern Africa”</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of involvements</td>
<td>References to the number of school activities an individual is (or is expected to be) involved in</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>References either to accountability measures (e.g., school requirements, attendance policies, accreditation demands) or the need for such accountability measures</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
<td>Allusions to either the presence of or desire for external recognition/acknowledgement of service learning efforts</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity descriptions</td>
<td>Descriptions of service learning projects and observed activities</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims or mission</td>
<td>References to school or organizational mission statements/ explicit aims</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISA, GISS, SASSY, etc.</td>
<td>References to regional networks such as AISA, GISS, SASSY, etc.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background knowledge</td>
<td>References to students or teachers either having or not having sufficient background knowledge to effectively participate in or organize community engagement efforts (e.g., students recognize how multiple global issues relate; teachers understand cultural expectations for gender relations in the community)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy in</td>
<td>References to the role of support/ “buy in” to campus engagement effort in a general sense (not of a specific group)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy in: Administrative</td>
<td>References to the role of administrative support/ “buy in” to campus engagement effort</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy in: Faculty</td>
<td>References to the role of faculty support/ “buy in” to campus engagement effort</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy in: Field partner</td>
<td>References to the role of field partner support/ “buy in” to campus engagement effort</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy in: parent</td>
<td>References to the role of parent support/ “buy in” to campus engagement effort</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy in: Student</td>
<td>References to the role of student support/ “buy in” to campus engagement effort</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Allusions to communication concerns around</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conferences/ retreats</td>
<td>References to conference/retreat attendance or the role of conferences /retreats in engagement efforts</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular ties</td>
<td>References to curricular service learning efforts (either existing, past, or future)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberate, planned, intentionality</td>
<td>References to intentional efforts to plan, organize, or prepare for service projects</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement or conflict</td>
<td>Allusions to conflicts or disagreements (philosophical or personal) related to service or service learning projects</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>References to multiculturalism, diversity of experiences, racial or ethnic differences, etc.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Allusions to the formal articulation of service learning expectations, procedures, standards and benchmarks, curricula, etc.</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing organizations</td>
<td>Partnerships with existing organizations (Note: typically only used once per organization referred to in each respective data file)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Allusions to the role of family members in shaping perspectives or involvements</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising, money</td>
<td>References to money or lack thereof, as it relates to projects (e.g., fundraising efforts, budget constraints, socioeconomic status of students relative to the community)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11/12</td>
<td>References made specifically about students in grades 11/12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 6-10</td>
<td>References made specifically about students in grades 6-10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High expectations</td>
<td>Individuals’ references to their own high expectations</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>References to how individuals view their own</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
identity as it relates to projects (e.g., “Third Culture Kids are good at…”)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>Explicit reasons stated for participating in projects</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Understanding/culture gaps</td>
<td>References to individuals’ intercultural competence (could be positive or negative)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal organization</td>
<td>Descriptions of the internal organizational structure of clubs, service projects, etc.</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in focus</td>
<td>A list of project focus areas (e.g., a list of all projects in a handbook with short descriptions of what issues they address)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in focus: animals</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on animals (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in focus: children</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on children (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in focus: community development</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on community development (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in focus: creativity</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on creative expression (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in focus: education</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on education (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in focus: environment</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on environment (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in focus: health</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on health issues  (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in focus: hunger</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on poverty-related issues such as hunger  (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in focus: language</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on language learning  (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in focus: service</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on the value of service or service-learning  (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in focus: social issues</td>
<td>Allusions to projects that focus on social issues, including teen-specific issues  (note: I only applied this code once per project; I intended to use it to track related projects, not as a frequency indicator)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language issues</td>
<td>References to the role of language fluency (or lack thereof) in projects</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>References to leadership (that do not fit into one of the categories below)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: coaching</td>
<td>References to leadership development via coaching (could include peer or adult)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: descriptions of leaders</td>
<td>Descriptions of leaders in action</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: formal training</td>
<td>Allusions to some form of formal leadership training or the role of formal training</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: learning</td>
<td>Allusions to the role of experience as it relates to</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by doing leadership development</td>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: perceptions of leadership</td>
<td>Individual perceptions of what leadership could, does, or should look like</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: role models</td>
<td>Allusions to role models (including predecessors) and how they impact leadership development</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>Allusions to things that are or should be long lasting (e.g., projects that have endured, students who have stayed at the school for years, etc.)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientations, trainings</td>
<td>References to orientations or formal trainings on service learning (including trainings by external consultants)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (international) schools</td>
<td>References to other schools, international or local</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>References to other countries (e.g., prior residence in, peer networks with, issues impacting)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental involvement</td>
<td>Allusions to parental involvement in community engagement efforts</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>References to the role of professional development in efforts</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer or colleague relations</td>
<td>References to relationships with colleagues or peers (as they impact projects)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal growth</td>
<td>Allusions to personal growth (e.g., moral, emotional, academic)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal passions</td>
<td>Allusions to personal passions or individual interests</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior experiences</td>
<td>References to the role of prior experiences in individuals’ participation in current community engagement efforts</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity/visibility</td>
<td>Allusions to the role and means of publicity within the school community regarding larger</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Examples and Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>References to reflective activities (including their current form, attitudes towards them, or the role they do or should play)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (reciprocal, one way, etc.)</td>
<td>Instances that suggest how individuals view their relationship with the community are, or should be</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School culture/ethos</td>
<td>Use of the terms “culture” or ethos, or direct reference to the school’s climate</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/teaching demands</td>
<td>Direct allusions to demands on teachers or students by the school (apart from engagement in community projects)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Allusions to security issues or related precautionary measures</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifts</td>
<td>Allusions to shifts (e.g., in personnel, in school approaches, in partners)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skepticism or resistance</td>
<td>Instances where an individual or group expresses concern or skepticism about some aspect of a community project</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress (or other negative emotion)</td>
<td>Instances where an individual expresses stress or another negative emotion (apart from skepticism)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student centered</td>
<td>Allusions to the role or presence of student-centered projects</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student initiated</td>
<td>Allusions to the role or presence of projects initiated by students</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Allusions to the sustainability of projects</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>Examples of teamwork and collaboration in the preparation of and leadership of projects</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>References to technology being used in projects or related IT issues</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen-to-teen</td>
<td>References to projects where students interact directly with other teenagers in the local</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms used to describe AISJ</td>
<td>Terms that AISJ members use to describe themselves</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms used to describe local community</td>
<td>Generalizations that are used to describe people in the local community (by AISJ members)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (or lack thereof)</td>
<td>Allusions to individuals having time or a lack thereof</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of activity</td>
<td>Allusions to the significance of activities happening in a specific timing</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transiency</td>
<td>Allusions to the regular changes within the school related to personnel, policies, etc.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World view or value system</td>
<td>Allusions made to individuals’ world view or values systems (including religious views)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix F: Second Round Code Descriptions and Frequency Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Code description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain of knowledge: Communication/public relations</td>
<td>Explicit references to the role of communication or public relations skills/knowledge; actions that demonstrate related understandings or lack thereof</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain of knowledge: Global issues</td>
<td>Explicit references to the role of global issues skills/knowledge; actions that demonstrate related understandings or lack thereof</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain of knowledge: Leadership/organization</td>
<td>Explicit references to the role of leadership/organization skills; actions that demonstrate related understandings or lack thereof</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain of knowledge: Local context</td>
<td>Explicit references to the role of local context skills/knowledge; actions that demonstrate related understandings or lack thereof</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain of knowledge: School context</td>
<td>Explicit references to the role of school context skills/knowledge; actions that demonstrate related understandings or lack thereof</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain of knowledge: Service-learning</td>
<td>Explicit references to the role of service-learning skills/knowledge; actions that demonstrate related understandings or lack thereof</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionate</td>
<td>Allusions to the centrality of passion in service-learning or community engagement efforts</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance inevitable/counter-normative</td>
<td>Allusions to the counter-normative, controversial, and/or political nature of community engagement efforts</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit references to dependency</td>
<td>Allusions to the dependency of projects success on those perceived to have more power (such as administrators or the IBO)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on documentation/formal</td>
<td>Allusions to the role of documentation and/or formal articulation of aims, expectations, etc. in community engagement efforts</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>articulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated resources</td>
<td>Allusions to the role of resources (time, physical resources, funding) in community engagement efforts</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring</td>
<td>Allusion to the role of hiring in community engagement efforts</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing effort</td>
<td>Allusions to the ongoing process of reflecting on and adapting/improving efforts</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: American International School of Johannesburg’s Service Learning Standards (preK-12)

**Note:** The standards below are included with permission from the school. While formatting of the tables below was shifted for this publication, the tables’ contents match those in the original document. As noted in that document, standards were created at the American International School of Johannesburg (AISJ) Service Learning Team in collaboration with AISJ Teaching and Learning, and Cathryn Berger Kaye, M.A., [www cbkassociates com](http://www.cbkassociates.com), Based on The Complete Guide to Service Learning by Cathryn Berger Kaye, M.A. (Free Spirit Publishing 2010). They were created October 2013.

*Italicized* = Trans-disciplinary and Disposition standards (*Trans-disciplinary and disposition standards apply to more than one subject and will be used/taught in a cross-curricular manner. This standard is, however, explicitly taught in this subject.)*

|= Taught and assessed
|= Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1: Investigate Learners will understand that investigating the needs of the community makes service effective</th>
<th>PK</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Understand how our interests, skills and talents can be applied to community need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Identify community cause or concern that helps advance our knowledge, skills,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Use action research methods, to authenticate a community need;
   - Media
   - Interviews
   - surveys
   - observation

1.4 Identify reciprocal community partnerships

1.5 Demonstrate collaboration by working with a variety of partners, for example;
   - youth
   - educators
   - families
   - community members
   - community based organisations

### Standard 2: Preparation and Planning
Learners understand that preparation and planning ensure that the goals and needs are met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PK</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Develop questions for a deeper understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Examine preconceptions and assumptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Understanding social and civic issues related to this cause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Make connections to my learning and the world around us</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Identify and analyse different points of view of all involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Identify and develop specific skills needed to apply knowledge toward the community need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Generate ideas and develop a plan of action with specific roles and responsibilities for all involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Identify learning and project goals and recognize the difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard 3: Action
Learners understand that implementing a plan of action generates change and results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PK</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Implement, monitor and adjust the action plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Direct
- Indirect
- Advocacy
- Research

3.2 Fulfill, adjust and augment our roles and responsibilities as needed

3.3 Develop skills in decision making and problem solving throughout the process

3.4 Document the process to collect evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 4: Reflection (trans-disciplinary)</th>
<th>PK</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learners understand that reflection is ongoing, prompting deep thinking and analysis about oneself, and one’s relationship to society</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Understand the meaning and value of reflection in learning and in life</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Select the appropriate modality to reflect based on purpose and preference</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kinaesthetic</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Artistic</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Verbal</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Written</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Articulate and demonstrate understanding</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Reflect to increase understanding of self and others by: describing what happened (cognitive), expressing feelings (affective), generating ideas (taking initiative), asking questions (ongoing inquiry)</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Reflect on the implementation of our plan of action</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Make explicit connections between the learning, dispositions and outcome</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 5: Demonstration/Communication (trans-disciplinary)</th>
<th>PK</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learners recognize that through demonstration and communication they solidify their understanding and evoke response from others</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Consolidate ongoing evidence of the learning and the service</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Articulate to an audience what I learned,</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
how I learned, and how we contributed to meeting a community need

- Performance
- Blogging
- Presentations
- Conclusive Journal entry
- Photos
- Illustrations
- Newspaper articles
- Letter
- Scrap book
- Video

5.3 Make suggestions for ongoing collaborative improvement

5.6 Receive and reflect on responses on the responses from the targeted audiences
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AISA</td>
<td>African International Schools Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISJ</td>
<td>American International School of Johannesburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Creativity, Activity, Service (an IBO term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASL</td>
<td>Creativity, Activity, Service, and Leadership (a term used at ISK and AISJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWW</td>
<td>Classroom Without Walls (an AISJ term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Diploma Programme (the IBO program for students in eleventh/twelfth grade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>Global Issues Leadership and Action (an ICS Course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISS</td>
<td>Global Issues Service Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB/IBO</td>
<td>International Baccalaureate Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Intercultural trips (an ISK term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>International Community School of Addis Ababa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEALS</td>
<td>Internationalism, Democracy, Environmentalism, Adventure, Leadership, and Service (a Round Square concept)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISK</td>
<td>International School of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO</td>
<td>Learning Outcome (as used by the IBO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>Model United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASSY</td>
<td>South African Service Summit for Youth (an AISJ hosted event)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCK</td>
<td>Third Culture Kid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWW</td>
<td>Week Without Walls (an ICS term)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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