

Review of: "Integrating Community Service in Language Education: Fostering Social Change via Inclusive and Transformative Learning Experiences"

Shauna de Long¹

¹ Kent State University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is a topic of immense importance in education systems throughout the world, and I am excited to see research conducted in this area. However, the paper as currently presented requires major revisions before it can make any meaningful contribution to the field. There is substantial information missing from the paper which makes it difficult to make any evaluation of the strength of the research. I look forward to reconsidering this paper once the following concerns have been addressed:

Major concerns:

- The author identified some guiding theories near the end of the introduction section. The theories are well-cited and described, but the author never goes on to integrate those theories into their research question, nor to explain how those theories were used to guide the current study.
- The research question, while engaging and necessary, does not seem to align with the methodology used (secondary). It might be more appropriate to ask what kinds of community service-based pedagogies are currently used in language education or to compare the efficacy of different kinds of community service in education.
- There is effectively no method section included in the paper. While method sections can look drastically different between papers that use different research methodologies, they should always, no matter the methodology, include a detailed description of exactly how the research question was addressed. To simply identify the method as using secondary data tells readers nothing about how the secondary data (whether qualitative or quantitative) were accessed, what the inclusion criteria were, and what specific method of analyses (again, whether qualitative or quantitative) were applied.
- The findings are presented as simple lists of information with nothing to indicate how the researchers arrived at those results. There was no discussion or integration of those findings with the rest of the paper.
- There are arguments to be made that generative AI can be very helpful in supporting certain types of summary-style writing. However, I have some concerns that ChatGPT may deserve first author credit here.

Minor concerns:

- This paper (and its abstract) needs another writing quality edit--there are a number of ambiguous antecedents that make it difficult to parse the meaning and purpose of sentences at times.

- There are several inconsistencies in the formatting of the citations (both in-text and in the references page) that lead me to suspect they were AI-generated without any follow-up editing. It is also curious that nearly all of the citations were published in the past year, and none seem to have been published further back than 2022. Citing older research in addition to newer research would give a fuller understanding of the state of the field (culturally responsive pedagogy may be new, but it's not that new).