

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Heather L. Burns for the degree of Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies in Speech Communication, Adult Education, and Women Studies presented on June 21, 2000.

Title: Critical Pedagogy Abroad: A Case Study of the Center for Global Education in Mexico

Signature redacted for privacy.

Abstract approved: _____

Natalie Dollar

This study examines the critical pedagogy utilized by the Center for Global Education's study abroad program in Cuernavaca, Mexico. The Center for Global Education (Centro de Educación Mundial en America Latina-CEMAL) facilitates two semester long study abroad programs per year as well as a variety of short term programs, all of which focus on teaching learners about issues of social justice. This thesis is based on an ethnographic case study of CEMAL's fall semester program, Women/Gender and Development: Latin American Perspectives, which focuses on social justice issues specifically pertaining to women. This study looks particularly at the communication between the members of this study abroad program in order to discover the instructional communication and instructional methods used to teach about social justice. Ethnography of communication serves as a theoretical and methodological foundation for this study. The first article examines the importance of community in teaching social justice issues at CEMAL. Participants each developed their own meaning of social justice through their unique experiences within the program's living and learning environment and through their contact with the

local community. The meaning of social justice emerged through participants' communicative experience within these communities, a process that was transformative and empowering for participants. The second article examines the speech events and instructional strategies used to implement critical pedagogy within this program. Four different classroom speech events as well as out of class speech events served as spaces in which to teach students about gender justice. Within these speech events, instructors used critical analysis, instructional weaving, and a student-centered approach to craft an educational experience that was interdisciplinary and transformative for participants. This case study provides insight as to how pedagogy is used within one study abroad program and offers communication research that focuses on social justice. In addition, this study provides evidence of specific instructional strategies that are used to implement critical pedagogy and their effects on learners.

©Copyright by Heather L. Burns
June 21, 2000
All Rights Reserved

Critical Pedagogy Abroad: A Case Study of
the Center for Global Education in Mexico

by

Heather L. Burns

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies

Presented June 21, 2000
Commencement June 2001

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Augsburg College and the Center for Global Education for allowing me to undertake this study of their program in Cuernavaca, Mexico. Without your consent, this study would not have been possible. I also want to thank all who were a part of WADLAP '99 for being open to my presence and participation in this program. I thank the intern and instructors for your willingness to make time for this study, for your enthusiastic support, and for providing me with powerful role models. I thank the student participants for your friendship, for your honesty, and for your immense and contagious energy. I learned so much from all of you and admire your strong commitments to social justice.

In addition, I thank the faculty of the Speech Communication department at Oregon State University for being supportive of my leave of absence during the undertaking of this research project. Particularly, I thank Dr. Dollar for your strong support and tremendous energy for this entire project. Your enthusiasm was a great source of motivation for me. I would also like to thank Dr. Shaw, Dr. Prickel, and Dr. Lach for your participation and guidance in this project.

Finally, I would like to thank my friends and family for your encouragement and support during the development of this thesis. Thank you Mom for your expert editing, your help was invaluable. Thanks especially to Jeffrey, I couldn't have done it without all your tremendous love and support. Te amo mucho.

Thanks everyone!

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Why Study Abroad?.....	2
Why the Center for Global Education?	3
Focus of the Study: Research Questions.....	5
Overview of the Articles	6
Teaching Social Justice Abroad: The Importance of Community at the Center for Global Education in Mexico	8
Literature Review.....	10
Study Abroad	10
Social Justice Research in Applied Communication	11
Critical Pedagogy	12
Theory: Ethnography of Communication	15
Methodology	17
Data Collection and Analysis.....	17
Program Overview	19
Results: What does Social Justice Mean to Participants?.....	21
Social Justice Within the CEMAL Community	22
Social Justice Within a Local Mexican Community.....	29
Discussion.....	35
References.....	39
Critical Pedagogy Abroad: A Consideration of the Instructional Methods Used to Teach Social Justice at the Center for Global Education in Mexico.....	42
Literature Review	43
Study Abroad	43
Instructional Communication.....	45
Educational Theory.....	46
Critical Pedagogy	47

Table of Contents (Continued)

Methods	51
Methodological Theory	51
Data Collection and Analysis	52
Research Questions	54
Description of the Program	55
Participants	56
Results: In What Speech Events is Social Justice Taught?	56
Four Speech Events: Facilitated Classroom Instruction	57
Other Speech Events: Non-facilitated out of Class Learning	62
What are the Instructional Methods Used to Teach about Social Justice?	64
Critical Analysis	64
Instructional Weaving and the Interdisciplinary Nature of the Program	69
A Student-Centered Approach	72
Discussion	81
References	86
Conclusion	89
Bibliography	94

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my grandmother, Audrey, who made a path for me to follow.

Critical Pedagogy Abroad: A Case Study of the Center for Global Education in Mexico

Introduction

When I arrived in Mexico in September 1999, I faced a daunting task. For the next three months, I would be conducting an ethnographic case study of a study abroad program. As I traveled from the airport in Mexico City to the city of Cuernavaca, where the Center for Global Education is located, I tried to envision what I would encounter. I knew that the Center brought students from all over North America to study social justice in Mexico and I was excited to meet the diverse group of faculty and students who were to be the participants in my study. I suspected that the semester would be challenging and full of learning experiences. Looking back, nothing could have prepared me for the richness and intensity of the study I was about to undertake. By going through this study abroad program with the participants, I did indeed share with them a multitude of significant academic and personal learning experiences. But, by also examining the teaching and learning that was taking place within this speech community, I became acutely aware of the critical pedagogy that was being utilized there. The articles included here articulate my findings from this study and provide new and necessary research about critical pedagogy within study abroad in higher education. Before previewing these articles in more detail, however, I feel it is first necessary to provide some background and explanation as to why I chose to research a study abroad program and why I chose to study this particular program.

Why study abroad?

My interest in study abroad has grown directly from my own personal and professional experiences. I lived abroad for many years as a child and teenager and later studied abroad as an undergraduate student. In addition, I worked for a number of years professionally as an educator and counselor of international students within the United States. From these experiences, I came to understand the great potential for learning that can arise from living and studying outside of one's home country and culture. Furthermore, I found myself at times immensely dissatisfied with the predominant system of teaching and learning within higher education. Study abroad was one piece of my undergraduate education that was stimulating and transformative. After my study abroad experience, I realized that the conventional methods of teaching and learning that I was most often subjected to in college did not give me the educational experience I desired. My later experiences as a trainer and instructor gave me the opportunity to experiment with various theories and methods of teaching and to expand my vision of education. My graduate work in women studies and adult education led directly to my interest in critical pedagogy specifically.

When I began to pursue my interest in study abroad academically, I found very little research on teaching and learning within study abroad. In fact, I found little research on study abroad at all. Most of the research on study abroad that does exist has been quantitative in nature and deals with the impacts and outcomes of participation in education abroad generally with little attention to the processes that produce those outcomes (Laubscher, 1994). In addition, study abroad research has been mostly conducted within the United States using participants as the sole informants. Although I found the existing study abroad research to be interesting and necessary, often describing the positive effects of study

abroad on participants, I was interested in knowing more about the educational processes driving these positive effects. Although it has been ignored by research, I feel that an awareness of pedagogy within study abroad is very important in understanding the educational experience that study abroad can provide. In order to understand how a student learns from their experience abroad and what happens during that learning process, it is necessary to examine the pedagogy of study abroad programs. I felt that to do this would require examining the teaching and learning of a study abroad program from within. By observing and experiencing this program with the participants, and by questioning them about their experiences, I learned a great deal about the pedagogy of this particular program that may otherwise have gone unnoticed, or been unaccounted for.

Why The Center for Global Education (CEMAL)?

The Center for Global Education is based at Augsburg College in Minneapolis, Minnesota. The Center oversees sites in Mexico, Central America, and Namibia. The Mexico site, also known as CEMAL (Centro de Educación Mundial en America Latina), hosts two semester-long study abroad programs per year as well as a variety of short-term travel seminars. The fall term study abroad program is known as WADLAP¹ (Women/Gender and Development: Latin American Perspectives) and its purpose is to help students "explore the connections women are drawing among issues of race, class, and global economics" (Center for Global Education website, 1999).

¹ The name of this fall program has since been changed to Crossing Borders: Gender and Social Change in Mesoamerica

I chose to study CEMAL particularly because of its location in the two-thirds world,² because of its focus on educating participants about issues of social justice, and because of its fifteen year history of managing a variety of study abroad programs. First, it is significant that CEMAL is located in the two-thirds world and seeks to educate students about social justice. Up to this point, most of the academic research and review on the topic of study abroad in higher education has been conducted about traditional study abroad destinations such as European countries (Kauffmann, Martin, Weaver, & Weaver, 1992). Because of CEMAL's location and purpose, the participants are confronted with different issues than students who may choose to study in Spain or England, for example. Students are confronted with difficult issues such as extreme poverty, striking gender inequality, economic crises, globalization, and war. While this program does include elements of language acquisition and intercultural communication, this is not the primary focus of the program as it is in many study abroad programs. Rather, the program seeks to facilitate experiential education and critical reflection concerning issues of social justice that support personal transformation and social change. In addition, it is significant that this program focuses specifically on women's issues. As a feminist, I am interested in education that looks critically at the situation of women on a global scale. I also find education that focuses on personal transformation for the goal of social change to be consistent with my own philosophy of education.

The fact that CEMAL has been managing study abroad programs for fifteen years is important as well. CEMAL is well established in its local Mexican community, with a myriad

² Instead of using the term "third world" or "developing world" I use the term "two-thirds world," as is used by the Center for Global Education. "Two-thirds world" refers to the fact that so called third world countries make up two-thirds of the world's population while so called first world countries make up only one third

of connections and resources with which to create a diversity of rich experiences for its participants. Additionally, the work of the diverse and experienced faculty members at CEMAL has resulted in the development of a distinct critical pedagogy.

Focus of the study: research questions

This study is interdisciplinary. I drew from three areas of study in order to define the research questions for this study. These are communication, specifically ethnography of communication, adult education, and women studies. The following research questions were developed to draw connections between these disciplines and to narrow the focus of this study: What does social justice mean to the participants? In what speech events is social justice taught? What are the instructional methods used to teach about social justice? Are the courses at CEMAL interdisciplinary?

The first research question, "What does social justice mean to the participants?" is important because the meaning of social justice is an integral part of the teaching and learning of this program, especially in regard to gender justice. Students chose to participate in this study abroad program specifically because of its focus on social justice issues. In order to understand the significance of social justice and specifically gender justice education to the participants, the meaning of social justice must come from within the speech community, defined and internalized by the participants (Hymes, 1972).

The second and third research questions, "In what speech events is social justice taught?" and "What are the instructional methods used to teach about social justice?" are important because of what the answers can tell us about the instructional communication and teaching methods used within the context of this study abroad program. Understanding

where and how social justice issues are taught gives insight into critical pedagogy and its meaning for participants.

The last research question, "Are the courses at CEMAL interdisciplinary?" is important because the connectedness of the program curriculum, instructional communication, and teaching methods and styles of the program instructors indicate the consistency of the pedagogy of the program as a whole.

Overview of the articles

Both of the articles included in this thesis are based on my ethnographic case study of the Center for Global Education in Mexico conducted during the fall of 1999. It is therefore natural that these articles are interconnected and build on one another. However, each article has a distinct focus and includes the literature review and discussion necessary to stand alone.

The first article focuses specifically on the first research question. In this article I illustrate how the meaning of social justice arises from experiences within both the CEMAL living and learning community and within an expanded local community. The meaning of social justice emerged within communities in which dialogue, participation, and experience were highly valued. Learning about social justice in this way was empowering for students and proved to be highly effective in helping them to discover the meaning of social justice in their own lives. This article also highlights the importance of community to learning about social justice issues within various teaching and learning environments.

The second article looks primarily at the second, third, and fourth research questions and discusses the ways that critical pedagogy is used within this program. Looking specifically at the speech events in which social justice is taught, I identify and describe four

distinct speech events considered the "university classroom" at CEMAL. In addition to these classroom events, I discuss the role of out of class speech events in teaching about social justice. This article also explores the instructional strategies used to teach about social justice which include critical analysis, instructional weaving, and using a student-centered approach that gives attention to the personal voices, learning styles, and personal growth processes of the students. The interdisciplinary nature of this program is also addressed, showing the interconnectedness of the three academic courses to be another important element of its instructional strategy. The discussion section of this article looks at the importance of speech events and instructional strategies to critical pedagogy. I discuss some of the challenges and rewards of critical pedagogy and how it may be used to create transformative educational experiences for students in a variety of instructional settings.

Clearly, this study is important because it begins to fill a research gap regarding pedagogy within study abroad and it provides much needed information about the instructional communication and teaching methods used within a study abroad program that utilizes critical pedagogy. I also believe it has far-reaching implications for teaching and learning that is meaningful for students and promotes social responsibility and justice.

Teaching Social Justice Abroad: The Importance of Community at the Center for Global Education in Mexico

Based on an ethnographic case study of the Center for Global Education's fall term study abroad program in Cuernavaca, Mexico, this article examines the importance of community in teaching social justice issues. Participants developed their own meaning of social justice through their experiences within the program's unique living and learning environment and through their contact with the local community. By specifically examining communication within this speech community, this study finds that participants of this program learned about social justice through dialogue and active participation within communities and were transformed and empowered by this process.

Study abroad has long been thought of as an important and often necessary component of higher education. Students are readily encouraged to study abroad with promises that the experience will be an important part of their academic experience and professional future. This is because some of the traditionally expected benefits of study abroad include learning another language (Kauffmann, Martin, Weaver, & Weaver, 1992), the creation of a global world view (Burn, 1980), personal growth especially in the area of communication (Kauffmann et al., 1992; Ostrand, 1986), thinking about values and U.S. American identity, increased involvement with other cultures, and an improved decision making process (Abrams, 1979). Students who study abroad are also likely to learn to be more independent, self reliant, and to acquire survival skills for coping with new environments (Kauffman, et al., 1992). In addition to these benefits, social justice learning has recently been acknowledged as another important reason to study abroad (Crabtree, 1998). Study abroad is a natural place for social justice learning to occur because of the transformational nature of cross-cultural experience. The stress of living within another culture can bring about a growth process that can leave one's identity open to transformation and growth (Kim & Ruben, 1988). Contact with another culture however, is not necessarily enough to result in increased awareness or a transformation in identity. There must be

respect and participation in the learning process in order for learning to go beyond superficial differences and stereotypes (Hanvey, 1979). Thus, a cross-cultural learning environment that is respectful and participatory can be an atmosphere that is ideal for learning about systems of oppression and exploitation and for developing solidarity with those who are underresourced.

This article provides a case study of social justice education within a study abroad program that seeks to transform and empower participants through respect, trust, supportive communication, and participation within a community of learners. The Center for Global Education in Cuernavaca, Mexico is rooted in critical pedagogy and educates students about social justice through participation in a living and learning community and through participation in cross-cultural relationships within the local community. This study contributes a much-needed example of using critical pedagogy to teach about social justice within a study abroad setting, with implications for any teaching and learning setting.

In this article, I begin with a look at relevant research in several areas of inquiry. Areas of literature that help to provide a context for this study include research on study abroad, social justice and applied communication, critical pedagogy, and ethnography of communication. This literature serves to provide evidence of the academic contribution of this study to these areas and to illustrate the link between communication and social justice teaching and research. Next I describe the methodology used, give an overview of this study abroad program, and provide my findings regarding social justice teaching and learning. Finally, I discuss the importance of this case study to higher education, specifically to instructional communication. I also consider the implications of this study for teaching and learning about social justice within other educational settings.

Literature Review

Study abroad

As an undergraduate, I studied abroad and benefited from my study abroad experience in many typical ways such as learning Spanish, gaining valuable cross-cultural communication skills, and developing a new sense of independence. However, more importantly, my own study abroad experience turned what was until then a conventional education on its ear and sent me into the process of a paradigm shift. While studying abroad, I was asked to critically question what I had been taught up to that point, to examine my values and those of my home community and country, and to think for myself. I was introduced to a variety of social perspectives and asked to strategize social change. While this outcome was perhaps the most important element of my own study abroad experience, there is no study abroad research to indicate what sort of pedagogy may have produced such an outcome.

It is indeed curious that most of the research on study abroad to date has dealt with the impacts and outcomes of participation in education abroad generally, with little attention to the processes that produce those outcomes (Laubscher, 1994). Study abroad is considered a form of experiential education (Katula & Threnhauser, 1999), yet research is virtually silent as to the educational methods that may bring about a positive learning experience, let alone social justice learning within the context of study abroad.

Research and review on the topic of study abroad in higher education has been mostly conducted within the U.S. using participants as the sole informants. This research has focused almost exclusively on measuring the impact of the study abroad experience on the student, has been mostly conducted about traditional study abroad destinations such as

European countries, and has been mostly quantitative in nature (Burn, 1980; Kauffmann et al., 1992; Laubscher, 1994). We are left wondering what the experience of study abroad is like in non-traditional locations and how the intended results of study abroad are produced.

Identifying the pedagogy within a study abroad program is a very important step in understanding the overall educational opportunity that such a program can provide. In order to determine how a student reflects on and learns from their experience abroad or whether or not study abroad is an enriching experience for students (Katula & Threnhauser, 1999), we must look at the instructional communication and pedagogy of education abroad. This is particularly important to consider when seeking to understand the communicative process of social justice education abroad.

Social justice research in Applied Communication

Social justice research within the discipline of communication has recently received a fair amount of attention and is a growing area of study. The communication discipline has in the past theorized interaction primarily within traditional hegemonic models and has, as a result, marginalized different communication experiences (Ross & Ray, 1996). Recently, however, the communication discipline has acknowledged that most of the communication research published up to this point has been for those who have many resources at their disposal (e.g., managers of for profit organizations), while relatively little applied communication research has been done about and for those who are marginalized and/or underresourced (Frey, Pierce, Pollack, Artz, & Murphy, 1996). A social justice approach to research within the discipline of communication has been defined as "engagement with and advocacy for those in our society who are economically, socially, politically and/or culturally underresourced" (Frey et al., p. 110). Engagement with those who are underresourced

means that communication researchers must acknowledge that we are entangled within systems of oppression and exploitation and that we can choose to stand beside or against domination, but not beyond it (Conquergood, 1995).

One example of recent communication research with a focus on social justice is a study of two service learning projects for North American students located in underresourced communities within Nicaragua and El Salvador (Crabtree, 1998). Although this study focuses on service learning specifically, it offers evidence that international experiences can empower higher education sojourners, promote their personal growth, and create pedagogical tools for promoting education in citizenship. Service learning can be a model of empowerment for all participants including the host community (Crabtree, 1998). Based on this example, study abroad in general should not be overlooked in its potential to provide opportunities for social justice research in the area of communication.

It is important to note that the present case study focuses on the communication and teaching of social justice issues. The North American students and instructors in this particular study, however, are not necessarily underresourced or marginalized as a whole. The fact that the student participants were economically able to participate in this study abroad program at the level of higher education announces their privileged status. The program, however, focuses on teaching students to recognize that privilege and how it relates to others in society who have been marginalized. As such, this research is focused on social justice.

Critical pedagogy

Critical pedagogy, sometimes referred to as transformative or progressive pedagogy (Freire, 1998), can be seen as a social and educational practice that "generates new

knowledge, opens up contradictions, and challenges all hierarchical structures of power that demand reverence at the expense of dialogue and debate" (Giroux, 1996, p. 77). Critical approaches to pedagogy focus on power relationships (Gore, 1993) and are designed to disrupt the canon of the academy in order to bring about social change (Bell, Morrow, & Tastsoglov, 1999). Critical pedagogy also attempts to analyze the relationship between identity, culture, and difference, and examine how issues such as race, class, and gender can be analyzed in their historically specific inter-relationships (Giroux, 1996).

In order for critical pedagogy to be successful it requires critical teachers. Critical educators can be transformative intellectuals who help students discover the moral and political dimensions of a just society and the means to create it (Giroux, 1988). The actualization of critical education, however, depends on the communication and teaching skills of the instructor. Attention to teaching methods and practices are extremely important to critical pedagogy (Bell, Morrow, & Tastsoglov, 1999). A transforming educational experience is less likely to occur if a teacher bases their instructional communication on the teacher-centered model of education. However, according to Sprague (1992), previous research in the field of instructional communication has suggested that the creation of knowledge comes from teachers who make decisions about what is to be taught, how it is to be taught, and how to evaluate whether or not it has been taught. Most research in the discipline of instructional communication has focused solely on this teacher-centered information-transmission model of instruction, which suggests that instructors simply transmit information to students and learning takes place (Sprague, 1992). Freire (1970) refers to this teacher-centered, information-transmission model of instruction as the "banking" model of education. It is a traditional form of education often seen in higher education today, including study abroad. According to Freire, the "banking" method of

education serves to indoctrinate, teaching students to adapt to reality rather than question it. It is "depowering" for students because teachers make "deposits" which the students receive, memorize, and repeat. (Freire, 1970). In contrast, Freire (1998) suggests that to teach is not to transfer knowledge but to "create possibilities for the production or construction of knowledge" (p. 30). This approach to education is liberating because it attempts to remove the teacher/student, active/passive dualisms and create education in which students are active agents of their own learning (Freire, 1970).

In addition to fostering emancipatory aims, critical pedagogy has several other important characteristics (Bell, Morrow, & Tastsoglov, 1999). Critical pedagogy highlights knowledge or the ways of knowing that have previously been invalidated or that arise from socially marginalized positions, such as those of women, indigenous peoples, or the working class. Critical pedagogy also helps students develop critical thinking skills and places high value on subjective experience as a route to understanding our lives and the lives of others.

Critical pedagogy is not only liberating but is also empowering for students. According to Vogt and Murrell (1990), empowerment is a process that starts with the self. Trust, communication, and participation moves the self toward an empowered state which in turn brings commitments to people, institutions, projects, and experiences. Since participation and empowerment are intrinsically linked, experiential education is clearly a method that can be used by critical educators to empower students as active agents of their own learning. Kolb (1984) suggests that learning takes place when knowledge is created through experience. This does not mean, however, that an experience automatically creates knowledge or that any experience, including study abroad, can be considered experiential education. Experiential education occurs when students are asked to reflect critically on their experience (often initially structured by the educator), make sense of the experience

through abstract conceptualization, and take action based on the experience (Kolb, 1984). In education that is experiential, the emphasis of education is placed on the experience, conceptualization, and action of the student and is thus learner-centered.

Freire (1970) also emphasizes the importance of community and dialogue in critical pedagogy saying, "Authentic thinking that is concerned with reality takes place not in isolation, but in communication with others" (Freire, 1970, p. 64). In agreement with Freire, bell hooks (1994) states that education can be transformative for students when they are asked to reflect on their experiences, past and present, and dialogue with one another as a community of learners. Freire (1998) goes so far as to say that there is no understanding that is not grounded in dialogue. This dialogue should not only take place among students but must occur between educators and students as well. Freire (1998) suggests that learners should be engaged in "continuous transformation through which they become authentic subjects of the construction and reconstruction of what is being taught, side by side with the teacher, who is subject to the same process" (p. 33). Thus, the teacher and the student are in constant dialogue within a community of learners, constructing and reconstructing knowledge. All participants can be teachers and learners in a non-hierarchical community structure.

Theory: Ethnography of Communication

This study relies on an ethnographic theoretical framework, specifically ethnography of communication (Hymes, 1962), because of its usefulness as an approach that is descriptive, cultural, focused, comparative, and theoretical (Philipsen, 1989). The study presents an ethnographic description of a particular way of speaking used in a particular

speech community. By looking at the communicative conduct of the members of this study abroad program, I sought to better understand what social justice meant to the participants of this program.

The ethnography of communication is grounded in three assumptions regarding the nature of communication (Hymes, 1962). The first states that the speech of a speech community comprises a system. This implies that the interaction of language with social life is based on a knowledge that enables persons to use language. That is, speech within a community is not random but is culturally organized and guided by a system of indigenous rules and norms. Hymes uses the term speech to refer to all culturally relevant communication.

The second assumption is that speech and language vary cross-culturally in function. This suggests that communication varies between different speech communities. Speech community is defined by Hymes as "a community sharing rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech, and the rules for the interpretation of at least one linguistic variety" (Hymes, 1972, p. 54). This definition illustrates two aspects of a speech community. First, there is at least one shared linguistic code within a speech community such as in this case, U.S. American English. Second, within a speech community, there are shared rules for the appropriate use of language in social life. Since these rules come from within the speech community, they must be understood from the perspective of the members of that speech community. The use of a particular linguistic code is not enough to describe a speech community because the meaning of the linguistic code may be different based on the shared rules and norms for using that linguistic code.

The third assumption suggests that the speech activity of a community is the primary object of attention. In the case of this study, the speech community consists of the

members of this study abroad program. Within the context of this speech community, this study focuses primarily on examining speech events that were used to teach about issues of social justice. A speech event is an event that is "directly governed by the rules or norms for the use of speech" (Hymes, 1972, p. 56). A speech event may occur within different contexts and may include one or more speech acts, such as a greeting or a question.

By examining speech events within this study abroad program that were specifically used to teach about social justice and in which speech about social justice issues occurred, I sought to discover what social justice meant to the participants of this program. This question was important because the meaning of social justice was an integral part of this study abroad program and its pedagogy. In order to understand the significance of social justice education within this program, the meaning had to come from the communication within the speech community, defined and internalized by the participants (Hymes, 1972).

Methodology

Data collection and analysis

I began the study with an observational period of about three weeks. During this time, I familiarized myself with the participants of this speech community and attended a variety of speech events within this community. I identified speech events in two ways. First, I relied on the program's weekly calendar, which identified classes, field trips, and social events. Secondly, I discovered speech events in the field by observing when participants talked about social justice issues. Once noted, I observed the event in which this speech was situated. I took notes of the communication I observed within these speech

events, documenting my observations according to the SPEAKING³ framework. During this period of observation and description, I began to look for common themes in the communication of this speech community. I coded the data I collected into first order concepts, or indigenous ways of interpretation within the speech community, and into second order concepts, my explanation of the patterning of the first-order data (Van Maanen, 1979). From these second order concepts I began to develop themes that characterized concepts, beliefs, practices, or relationships (Lindolf, 1995). For example, I noted that instructors structured many interactive activities for students in class (first order concept), and I began to hypothesize that instructors were pushing students to build relationships with one another and to dialogue (second order concept).

I then began to conduct individual interviews with students and instructors. I did this in order to explore the themes that I developed based on the analytical coding of the observation period and to test the hypotheses I had generated while coding second order concepts. I audiotaped these interviews and transcribed them in order to code the data using first and second order concepts. Over the course of the semester, I conducted a total

³This ethnography of communication study uses a descriptive framework, the SPEAKING mnemonic, conceptualized by Hymes (1972) in order to organize observational data. This framework begins with the isolation of a speech event which is then analyzed according to various components. Within this framework, *S* refers to the setting, or time and place of the speech event, and to the physical and psychological setting. *S* also refers to the scene, the cultural or insiders' definition of the occasion. *P* represents participants who are involved in the speech event in various capacities. *E* addresses the ends or the goals of the speech event, both the purpose of the event from the community standpoint, and the actual outcome of the event for all participants. *A* refers to the act sequence or all forms of communication that are taking place during the speech event including verbal and nonverbal, while *K* refers to the key of the event. This may also be considered the tone or spirit in which the event is conducted. *I* points to the instrumentality of the speech event which may include oral, written, or other medium of speech transmission. *N* recognizes the norms of interaction for participants of the speech event, as all rules for speaking have a normative character. Norms of interpretation are also important to examine, as an account of norms of interaction still leaves open the interpretation of those norms. *G* refers to the genre or category of the speech event such as class, poem, lecture, narrative, etc. (Hymes, 1972).

of 27 interviews with 12 participants ranging in length from approximately half an hour to an hour and a half. Throughout the semester, I observed over 320 hours of speech events within the speech community and documented these speech events using the SPEAKING framework. I also collected written documents and assignments from instructors which I coded using the aforementioned process. Using these various sources allowed for data triangulation and thus a solid body of evidence from which to describe the meaning of social justice for participants of this program. Throughout the data collection process, I used the constant comparative method of analysis, continually reviewing existing data and comparing and categorizing new data based on the coding of that data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Program overview

Over the fall semester of 1999, I conducted an ethnographic case study of the Center for Global Education (Centro de Educación Mundial en America Latina or CEMAL) in Cuernavaca, Mexico. The Center for Global Education in Mexico is administered by Augsburg College in Minneapolis, Minnesota and offers two semester programs each year and a variety of travel seminars. The fall program was entitled Women/Gender and Development: Latin American Perspectives (WADLAP)⁴. I chose to study this program particularly because of its location in the two-thirds world⁵ and its focus on educating participants about issues of social justice, specifically how women are affected by issues such as poverty, war, gender inequality, religion, and globalization. In addition, I chose to study

⁴ The name of this fall program has since been changed to Crossing Borders: Gender and Social Change in Mesoamerica

⁵ I use the term "two-thirds world", as is used by the Center for Global Education. "Two-thirds world" refers to the fact that the so-called "third world" makes up two-thirds of the world's population while the so-called "first world" makes up only one third.

this program because of its fifteen-year history of managing study abroad programs.

The purpose of the fall program was to help students "explore the connections women are drawing among issues of race, class, and global economics" (Center for Global Education website, 1999). In order to do this the program was organized into a variety of learning components. For example, students spent the first week of the program at the Mexico/U.S. border in both Tucson, Arizona and Nogales, Mexico learning about issues there that related to gender justice. After this first week, students traveled to Cuernavaca, Mexico where they settled into the CEMAL program house, a large comfortable house with a courtyard garden that served as the students' home and classroom as well as an administrative center for the program. Students lived and studied at the CEMAL house for the rest of the semester with the exception of a three-week homestay with Mexican families, a two-week learning trip to Chiapas and Guatemala, and a four-day learning trip to the town of Valle de Bravo.

WADLAP consisted of three academic courses: Church and Social Change (REL 366), Development Processes (INS 311), and Women in Comparative Politics (POL 359). Each of these courses was taught two times per week. During most of the semester, students were also enrolled in Spanish language classes at a nearby language institute. In addition to course work, students were asked to be active members of the CEMAL living and learning community, participating in house meetings and doing house chores. They were also given the option of participating in weekly volunteer activities and a variety of other community events.

The ten student participants of this study abroad program were U.S. Americans who came from universities all over the United States including the University of California in Los Angeles, James Madison University, and Indiana University among others. They

received academic credit for their participation in the program through Augsburg College. The participants ranged in age from 20-24 and were diverse in gender and sexual orientation, as well as ethnic, socio-economic, and religious backgrounds. The fall program began with 10 students, two of whom were unable to complete the program for personal reasons. There were three WADLAP instructors who, in addition to teaching courses, occupied the roles of academic director, administrative director, and program coordinator. The instructors were U.S. American with diverse backgrounds who had been educated at U.S. universities. All three of the instructors had lived in Mexico for many years and had traveled and worked in a variety of locations in Mexico and Central America. They were involved in various community organizations and projects outside of CEMAL that kept them connected to the larger Cuernavaca community. In addition to students and instructors, the program consisted of a Mexican gardening, cleaning, and cooking staff, a Mexican administrative assistant, and a U.S. American intern who lived with and worked closely with the students at the CEMAL house offering academic and administrative support for the program. In this article, all the names of participants have been changed to protect their anonymity.

Results: What does social justice mean to participants?

Over the course of the semester, it became clear that even as this study abroad program sought to teach participants about social justice, the purpose of this program was not to define or explain social justice for students. Although social justice was discussed both directly and indirectly, its meaning was something to be discovered by each individual, both within the context of the CEMAL living and learning community and within a larger local community. Within this program, students were provided with a variety of learning experiences that emphasized social justice. Students were then guided and supported in

creating a forum in which to critically analyze these experiences and dialogue with one another. Finally, students were given the opportunity to practice what they were learning about social justice within the communities in which they lived and to apply this knowledge to their own lives. The critical pedagogy at work within this study abroad program empowered students to discover the meaning of social justice in personally meaningful ways and in the process created a learning experience that was transformative for students.

Social justice within the CEMAL community

The CEMAL living and learning environment was extremely important for students, as it was their primary home and classroom while in Mexico. Because of this, the living and learning environment at the CEMAL house was intentionally structured to promote the growth of a learning community in which students could learn about social justice. Meagan, the CEMAL intern explained, "[What we] intentionally build is a place where people feel comfortable voicing their opinions and making sure everyone's voices are heard...[we] create a comfortable environment for people to get to know each other and learn together " (interview, 12-14 -99). Because students both lived together and took classes together in the CEMAL house, a comfortable environment that was conducive to learning was extremely important to their overall experience abroad. From the beginning of the semester, trust-building and personal openness were fostered in orientation meetings, weekly house meetings, and class discussion and reflection sessions in each of the three courses. The goal of creating an open and trusting learning environment was to promote dialogue through which students could learn from each other about social justice. The CEMAL intern explained,

The philosophy is that within the living and learning community, [we're] actually building [a] community according to the values that students bring with them. Since all the students have made a commitment to social justice by being in the program, the living and learning community gives [them] a chance to build a microcosm of the community that [they] would like to see in a just world. Also it gives [them] a chance to learn from the diversity of voices of the [other] students. And in that, it forces [them] to think about power and privilege (Meagan, interview, 12-14-99).

As a result of the group work they did, students were gradually able to confront, discuss, and explore social justice issues such as racism, classism, sexism, and heterosexism that they encountered within their own CEMAL community. Katherine, a CEMAL instructor, further explained the rationale behind fostering such a community by saying,

One of the reasons we spend so much time in this program focusing on group dynamics and group issues is that in order to have dialogue take place within the classroom, I think we need to address issues of race, class, gender, and sexuality as they come up in the group and express respect for voices, having people's voices heard and valued because without that then there's not true dialogue. There may be discussion going on and conversation taking place, but it's not dialogue in the sense of people being heard, hearing each other, and engaging with each other (interview, 10-8-99).

Over the course of the semester, the CEMAL living and learning environment increasingly provided opportunities for identifying, analyzing, and dialoguing about social justice issues within this community. Exploring social justice became one of the norms for the use of speech within this speech community. Social justice was discussed in a variety of speech events, not as something academic or unrelated to students' lives, but rather on a personal level within this community because students came into direct contact with these issues in their relationships with each other. Students began to dialogue, for example, about how they were marginalized by others in the group and how they themselves acted as oppressors. In one class session an instructor asked specifically, "In what ways have patterns of oppression been repeated here [within the CEMAL living and learning community]?" One student spoke of being marginalized in class discussions

in which references to being American were actually references to being white. Another student admitted to openly dismissing another's problem of sexual harassment. Yet another student spoke of second-guessing herself in class and not speaking up based on previous experiences of feeling silenced (field notes, 10-28-99).

The group also discussed issues of identity and voice, such as who got to talk more and why, and how some people were expected to be the voice for certain marginalized groups such as African Americans or Lesbians/Gays. In addition, students began talking about how they internalized issues such as racism, classism, sexism, and heterosexism and how this internalization contributed to the censorship of their own unique voices and communication barriers and conflicts between each other as friends and classmates. One student reflected,

I [knew the other students had] stereotypes about me and what I represented. So, I had to be beyond their expectations. I didn't know exactly what they would expect but I just knew from how TV portrays people that it's like automatic. And so I was very on guard at first but as [the semester] rolled on I started to express myself more and started to express my experience...it was a requirement that we express how we feel. In a normal situation I think people would just like, if something upsets them they just blow it off and don't even bother talking about it, especially like in a campus situation, yeah just like let it ride. But here it was different because you have the person looking right in your face and so you get to express yourself. [There was] constant expression (Chris, interview, 12-10-99).

Throughout the semester, experiences were structured within the CEMAL living and learning community in order to promote dialogue and personal learning about social justice. For example, at one point in the semester as part of an orientation for a two-week study trip to Chiapas and Guatemala, the instructors and intern structured a session that would promote the open discussion of social justice issues within the group. First, one instructor asked students to "write down a time when you felt silenced, judged, disrespected or ridiculed" (field notes, 11-9-99). Students wrote down their responses and

these were then read anonymously. The instructor asked for students' responses to the activity, and this sparked an emotional discussion about how people were relating to one another in the group. After this discussion, Meagan asked participants to write down an attitude or action that had been hurtful to themselves or others. Each person then went to the front of the room, read what they had written, and symbolically burned their responses which included "self doubt," "prejudgment," and "not listening." Another instructor then asked the group to brainstorm a list of things that "we need from the group" during the trip. Together, students created a comprehensive list which included "respect," "forgiveness," "active listening," "honesty with feelings," "hugs," "acceptance," "space for different people's communication styles," "patience," and "trust." In a final activity, a third instructor asked students to write down what they felt they could contribute to the group during the trip. Students created and read their contributions and put these responses in an envelope to be taken along on the trip (field notes, 11-9-99). All of these activities within this session served both as a way to formally address social issues that already existed on a personal level within the group and to further promote communication and trust in preparation for an emotionally intense travel trip.

One student reflected on the structured experiences that served to promote personal learning about social justice issues saying,

I think it's interesting because I think we've been able to explore our differences, our social kinds of differences and cultural stuff...In our interactions we've been more aware, [at least] I have been more aware, of those differences and what those social meanings [are] by knowing each other in different ways and still being in class together (Cody, interview, 12-7-99).

As part of social justice learning within the CEMAL living and learning environment, students examined the issue of privilege.⁶ The meaning of privilege was not defined for participants but emerged for each individual through a variety of experiences over the course of the semester. The instructors and intern consistently invited participants to reflect critically on themselves and their own lives and relationships with others, especially in regards to privilege, whether it be privilege of gender, ethnicity, nationality, class, sexual orientation, or religion. Students were pushed, at first through structured activities and later through informal discussions with each other, to examine their own privilege and how it related to other CEMAL community members. According to one instructor, addressing issues of privilege and power was important because,

It gets people in touch with their own issues but at the same time it really gives people a chance to realize that not everyone's the same. [Students] tend to affiliate with friends who have similar types of class backgrounds. So when they come to CEMAL and just one student happens to break that mold, then all of the sudden it changes the whole panorama and the way things are discussed. So I think those kinds of discussions on power and privilege also enable people to communicate more and respect other people's differences. It kind of breaks a lot of assumptions (Janel, interview, 12-10-99).

Discussions of power and privilege helped students to not only understand each other better, but themselves as well. One student expressed what she learned about privilege saying,

Something that I learned...is that when you recognize both your privilege and your oppression, 'cause there are things about being a woman that I never really thought about [before]...if you recognize those, and your connectedness both to privilege and to oppression, then I think it puts you in a better position to be an activist or to address those issues. And you see fighting social fights as fighting your own fight (Chloe, interview, 12-8-99).

⁶Privilege has been defined as "an invisible package of unearned assets that [one] can count on cashing in each day, but about which [one] was meant to remain oblivious...Privilege is like an invisible weightless knapsack of special provisions, assurances, tools, maps, guides, codebooks, passports, visas, clothes, compass, emergency gear and blank checks" (McIntosh, 1988 p. 7).

Instructors not only initiated discussions about issues of power and privilege within the CEMAL living and learning community but pushed students to see their own connections to these issues. Instructors modeled the creation of personal connections to these issues by sharing personal opinions, emotions, and experiences with students. Instructors were considered part of the living and learning community, teaching classes and eating meals at CEMAL as well as participating in out of class activities with students such as going dancing or going to movies. In participating in the community they earned the respect of the participants. Instructors considered this active participation and role modeling to be important and necessary to the creation of a healthy learning community, especially in regard to the issue of privilege.

The development of trusting relationships between members of the living and learning community at CEMAL fostered the respect and communication necessary in which issues of power and privilege could be explored, understood, and processed on an intimate level. According to Katherine, an instructor, this environment was extremely important because it enriched the overall semester learning experience for students. She explained,

We...spend a lot of time building a community of learners here because we think that that enriches the learning process. [We try to make students] aware, not only of where they're coming from and the biases they bring, but also of each other's experiences. So we're bringing attention to the diversity that exists...I think the extent to which we can create a positive learning environment in which people feel comfortable with difference, are willing to argue and disagree with each other in a respectful way, the more people are able to learn (interview, 10-8-99).

Indeed, students of this program did find the development of an open and trusting learning community in which they could explore social justice issues on a personal level to be beneficial to their overall learning experience. One student reflected,

It's pushed me in ways that I had to think about a lot of things, actually think about them and not just ignore them. So I mean, everything from like living with people of different sexual [orientations], to like different ethnic

backgrounds and cultural backgrounds. [There are] things I've never thought about before like being a first world child from a third world family...it's making me redefine my own things. So, I learned a lot from [the CEMAL students] (Rose, interview, 12-14-99).

All students ultimately found the CEMAL living and learning environment enriching to their overall learning experience. However, the process of developing this community was not always smooth. At times, students were hurt by others in the group and found the community difficult to live and learn in. One student reflected on her experience within the CEMAL community this way:

It really sucked at first and I hated it for a really long time... It was stressful in class and then stressful during the day. I did feel silenced I think because I felt like they thought since I wasn't saying anything in class then I must not have anything to say out of class (Claire, interview, 12-13-99).

Although living and learning at CEMAL was difficult at times, this student as well as others later found that working through these difficulties within this community allowed them to learn more about themselves and to strengthen their understanding of social justice issues.

Another student reflected on her experience within the community saying,

I think we share a lot of commonalities...but we're very different people from very different places and backgrounds so it helped me to learn that you don't have to love each and every one of them the same and hold them in the same kind of esteem or anything like that. But I learned to relate to everybody in a positive manner...it was very very good to make such good friends [with] people that do share, like I said, a lot of things, in terms of their will to make social change (Carla, interview, 12-13-99).

By building relationships with diverse CEMAL community members and learning from each other through a variety of activities within this speech community, a new understanding of social justice emerged for participants. Within the CEMAL living and learning community each participant made meaning of their shared experiences and applied this meaning to their own lives. Meagan, the CEMAL intern, reflected,

I think creating that environment for them to really get to know each other and learn from each other in a microcosm of society within the house has

been something that they have really enjoyed figuring out. Not just looking at Mexican society as problematic, or American society as problematic, but their own microcosm as having all those different unhealthy dynamics going on too. But I feel like they've really dealt with them this semester. I'm really proud of them for doing that (interview, 12-14-99).

Students not only discovered social justice issues within their own living and learning community but were forced to deal with these issues, confronting what they found and strategizing change. The living and learning community at CEMAL was an essential starting point in the development of the meaning of social justice for participants. As participants began to confront social justice issues within the local community, they could reflect on and compare these to their experiences within the CEMAL community.

Social justice within a local Mexican community

Participants also discovered the meaning of social justice within an expanded learning community. This was achieved by incorporating a variety of perspectives on social justice into the program. These perspectives arose in the form of guest speakers from many backgrounds and in the form of host families. Other perspectives were gained by traveling and speaking with people in various geographical locations. One of the basic principals of the Center for Global Education was that liberating, or critical education takes place within an experiential curriculum which includes dialogue with people whose voices are under-represented in traditional education. One instructor explained this philosophy saying,

We try to expose people to many different sides of issues and perspectives. At the same time the center is very honest and open about the fact that it has a bias towards underrepresented voices. I think that's very important because I think in mainstream academia, there's not enough attention given to underrepresented voices, voices of women, people of color, people who are the poorest of the poor, and academics tend to be people who have privilege or access in some way. To me it's been really important to work in a program where students spend a lot of time hearing directly from people whose voices aren't normally taken into account in academia. And having an

opportunity to have an encounter directly with folks, hear their stories, hear their perspectives and reflect upon those. At the same time, while there is a particular emphasis on underrepresented voices, we also do listen to some of the voices that are traditionally heard, and not just neglect those (Katherine, interview, 10-8-99).

This emphasis on hearing a variety of perspectives was a large part of what made the program experiential. One instructor explained that often students expect experiential education to be about taking immediate action to make change. However this is not necessarily the only form of experience. She explained,

We spend a lot of time in our classes trying to look at the root causes of poverty, to understand a lot of different causes of social injustice, and to look at strategies for social transformation before pushing students out there. So even though sometimes I think people would just prefer to just feel that they are doing something, I don't think that's always necessarily the best. There may be ways, I think we're always looking for ways, to have students be involved in appropriate engagement, but I really do think it's important for them to spend a lot of time simply hearing from people, hearing people's stories. For me, hearing people's experiences and reflecting on your own experiences is a very important part of experiential education. It's every bit as much experiential education as going on a hiking trip, or every bit as much experiential education as getting your hands dirty helping somebody build a house. It's not to say that it's better than the other but I think it's been an often-neglected piece. So that's one of the challenges. Getting students to realize, when you're going to people's homes and hearing their stories or they're coming here and sharing their perspectives... that it is experiential education because you are broadening your own experience, you are having a direct encounter, a direct engagement with someone else and you're learning from their experience (Katherine, interview, 10-8-99).

By exposing students to experiential education, instructors encouraged an understanding of various perspectives on social justice issues. One student reflected,

[We get a] good first hand look at things from other people's perspectives. We move around a lot and talk to people instead of just like looking at books and hearing like all kind of strange philosophies from people that may be outdated or dead or whatever, or may have just been sitting in their little glass house analyzing [stuff]. But, yeah, you actually talk to the people and how it affects them in their everyday life at work and in the family situation and I think that's important. I think that's wonderful. I think that's probably the best part (Chris, interview, 9-29-99).

In the same way, host families of the CEMAL students provided alternative viewpoints that taught students about social justice. Host families were working class families who lived in a newly developed neighborhood. Students were given the opportunity to understand their host families both by experiencing three weeks of daily life with them and through structured class assignments during their homestay. For example, in Development Processes class students were asked to work in small groups to interview their host families and neighbors, create a map of community development, and present this map to the rest of the class. This map was to be based on questions such as: "What are the social and economic needs of this community?" "What organizing efforts exist in this community?" "What are the roles of women in the community and what local, national or international agendas have affected the development of this community?" (Family stay project assignment, 10-29-99). The instructor of this course said of this assignment,

We've always tried to do something during family stay that first gives them an opportunity to get a deeper insight into the community and what's going on there. Also, to give them a tool to sort of interact more with their family and their neighbors and thirdly to encourage them to reflect on themselves and how they're understanding all of this (Janel, interview, 11-4-99).

Indeed, when students presented their community development maps in class in the form of dramas, drawings, and group discussion, these reflected a new understanding of their host community. For example, students were able to examine economic issues, such as structural adjustment, at a personal level. They saw its effect on their host families such as increased work hours and men leaving for the United States in search of work. They noted that the community had no regular trash service and that some women were forced to carry all their garbage up to a main street, a steep ten-minute climb. Students learned about host brothers and sisters who could not get into university because their parents could not afford the entrance bribes. They learned about the inadequate health care in the community and the

earlier organizing efforts of the women to bring running water to the community. In creating their community development maps, students examined issues of social justice through their own personal experience with host families and began to strategize social change.

Students also had very personal and individualized experiences with their host families that affected their concept of social justice within the local community. One student said of her personal experience with her host family,

It was interesting for me to go through a crisis with people in poverty...to know really what happens when they need something. My sister was really sick and she still is...to learn about the whole idea of how [screwed] up the whole health care system is...was a good learning experience. I think it's hard to get a concept of everyday poverty if you don't live it (Hannah, interview, 12-9-99).

This student was strongly impacted by living in a situation in which she felt that her family was not getting adequate health care due to their economic situation. She learned that poverty can affect people in a variety of ways, something she may not have considered before.

Another student expressed the hope she gained from the experience with her host family,

Living with my host family and the extended host family was really cool, especially the women. It was more than just like learning the language.... [I was surprised that my host mother would] have this American girl come into her house and she was so open with me and just made me feel absolutely wonderful. She made me feel hopeful (Rose, interview, 12-14-99).

As this student had learned about issues of social justice in the local community over the semester, she had grown increasingly hopeless about social change and her own role in that change. This personal experience within her host family allowed her the opportunity to feel the hope and strength of the people who lived in this "hopeless" situation.

Learning from and living with Mexicans in the local area also allowed students to examine their own privilege. Students reflected on their feelings about how it felt to live in their host communities as privileged U.S. Americans. One instructor commented that this affected the success of the homestays. She explained,

Successful doesn't mean they all liked [their homestays] but it means they learned what life is really like and they had to struggle with issues related to their own culture and cross cultural communication and facing new realities and facing their own privilege and I think all of them did that to different degrees (Paula, interview, 12-9-99).

Facing their own privilege within the local Mexican community was important to students' understanding of social justice. Another student commented on what she learned about privilege from the experience of living within a Mexican community,

I've learned about privilege...it's so true how everything comes back to privilege...one of my favorite songs is about this baby-sitter and it starts saying...they make popcorn and they watch a movie. It's like that doesn't pertain to these people at all. They don't have a microwave to make popcorn; they don't have a video. They don't have a babysitter. They can't afford it. Their parents don't even go out to eat, you know (Hannah, interview, 12-9-99).

Increasingly as students began to understand social justice within the local community, they began to identify areas within their own lives in which they were privileged. They began to critically compare their own lives with those of the people they met and lived with and to understand the myriad of ways in which they were privileged. The issue of privilege began to enter their thinking in all areas of life, even musical choices.

After the homestays, one student reflected on the standard of living at the CEMAL house and her feelings about the CEMAL living and learning community in relationship to the local community,

I think that it's a really interesting position to be in, to be living in such a more privileged life than we live at home really, having people cook for us, having a beautiful garden, going to a swimming pool, all this stuff...if we drive by houses like [CEMAL] we're like *Ah [those] rich Mexicans*, and I feel

like that's been interesting. But I've definitely needed [CEMAL] sometimes. It's been really nice to go home [to CEMAL] and just for it to be a safe space (Cody, interview, 12-7-99).

Yet another way that students learned about social justice within a widened learning community was by traveling to different geographical locations and hearing from a variety of speakers in those locations. Traveling to areas such as Chiapas, Mexico where a low intensity war was taking place gave students the opportunity to examine social issues within another social and cultural context. Students were exposed to somewhat different, although connected, social issues than what they had experienced at the U.S./Mexico border or in Cuernavaca. Paula, an instructor explained, "[The trip to Chiapas and Guatemala] is more experiential, it's more different from reality as they know, it's more of a contrast. It's a more highly politicized situation in both places which tends to be more exciting...it's kind of sexy, sexy in a political sense" (interview, 12-9-99). By traveling, students saw first hand the oppression of indigenous groups, war, and extreme poverty.

Throughout the semester, participants were encouraged to synthesize what they were learning about social justice from the diversity of the CEMAL living and learning community as well as the larger local community and to relate it to themselves. As part of this synthesis, instructors worked with students individually and asked them to set learning goals for themselves. Students were also asked to develop integrative semester projects that would synthesize and personalize what they had learned about social justice over the course of the semester.

Consequently, within this program the meaning of social justice was different for each participant. This is because each individual's experience differed somewhat within the CEMAL living and learning community and within the larger local community. Each person's understanding and synthesis was different depending on the meaning of social

justice they brought with them to the program, personal interests, past and present experiences, and vision of social action and change. However, all students were exposed to an intentional living and learning community in which structured activities were provided to encourage reflection on issues of social justice such as racism, nationalism, sexism, classism, and heterosexism. In addition, students were provided with a variety of perspectives on the issues they were learning about, including perspectives of those such as women, indigenous, and the poor that are not traditionally recognized in higher education. Experiences of living with local host families and traveling to different geographical locations also provided learning opportunities in which to explore social justice issues including privilege, international economics, and war.

Discussion

Participants' meaning of social justice, particularly in a Mexican context, developed within specific learning communities. As critical educators, the instructors at CEMAL carefully planned a variety of activities and experiences that would introduce students to social justice within their own lived experience. This program was different than most study abroad programs, where the emphasis of learning is often entirely placed on the cross-cultural experience with members of the local community. This often means that students live with host families throughout the study abroad experience. These results show that organizing the CEMAL house as a living and learning community, however, served to give instructors and participants a shared responsibility for learning, breaking down the active/passive, teacher/student dualisms described by Freire (1970). This living and learning community also served to develop personal relationships that promoted trust and true understanding of and dialogue about issues of social justice.

According to Giroux (1996), critical pedagogy should generate new knowledge, open up contradictions, and challenge all hierarchical structures of power. As shown in this study, the community structure did indeed generate new knowledge by drawing on the knowledge and experiences of all learners and of an expanded local community. In addition, the community structure challenged hierarchical structures of power by confronting social injustice that was repeated within the CEMAL speech community and within the local community. This critical attention to what is often left unspoken in education is one of the elements that made this community experience powerful for students. They were able to analyze the relationship between their own identities, cultures, and differences, and examine how issues such as race, class, and gender could be analyzed within those relationships.

This learning experience abroad was transformative and empowering for students. Within the CEMAL community, participants went through an empowerment process in which instructors provided guidance in developing trust, communication, and participation. Instructors modeled supportive communication in and out of class, showing that they cared about each student and her or his learning process. Instructors also modeled trust building by initiating discussions on difficult topics and by being open about their own lives. Active participation was always encouraged, and the instructors and intern looked for ways to incorporate the experiences, interests, knowledge, thoughts, and feelings of learners in speech events such as classes and house meetings, which were often led by students.

Students were empowered by having their own lives incorporated into their learning. They experienced holistic education at CEMAL, in which they were seen as a whole individual within a community context. Rose, a student, commented, "this experience is making me reflect on who I am personally and how I fit into this idea of reality...where I've

come from, who I am, where I'm going, and how me as a whole is going to get there" (interview, 12-14-99).

Students were also asked to reflect critically on their experiences which empowered them to make connections between how they felt about their host family, for example, and what they were learning in their each of their classes. The sense of empowerment gained by students transformed the way they saw themselves, education, and social change. They were empowered to take action based on what they had learned. One student remarked,

It made a lot of problems that were in the back of my head totally clear and more important than that, it showed me a lot of things, simple things, that people are doing...it made paths to addressing [social issues] clear. So I think that when I go home I would feel more confident in joining an organization or doing something (Chloe, interview, 12-8-99).

Although the CEMAL context is specific, this study provides implications for other teaching and learning environments as to the importance of community for social justice learning. Developing a community within a classroom or encouraging students to connect to a larger local community can be an important method in fostering the relationships, trust, and shared sense of purpose and understanding necessary for learning about social justice. Fostering the development of a community of learners can be a learning enhancement for almost any course, from one that is clearly conducive to community learning, such as interpersonal communication or group processes, to a more skills-based course. From my own experience as a public speaking instructor, I find that even this skills based course can be an environment that is extremely conducive to facilitating a community of learners. It is also a location in which many social justice issues arise and can be critically examined and safely addressed within a community of learners.

Communication educators need to address the often silent issues which block true dialogue between learners. Issues such as racism, classism, sexism, and heterosexism are not

checked at the door of the classroom. Instead these issues pervade all learning and should not be restricted to a program that specifically seeks to teach about social justice. Because of the personal nature of these issues, instructors may choose to avoid such sensitive topics, afraid of the repercussions of addressing them. However, this study showed that not only addressing social justice issues, but working through them within the context of an academic course, can be highly beneficial to students' overall learning process. Students valued the connection between what they were learning and their personal lives, and they valued meaningful connections with other learners and instructors. Instructors should educate themselves about how to develop communities of learners and address social justice issues through communication that is sensitive, meaningful, and connected to the context of the course they are teaching.

This study abroad program is not perfect, nor is it an educational paradise. But it is an example of an educational program that uses critical pedagogy and courageously seeks to move towards what bell hooks (1994) refers to as the practice of freedom. It can be seen as model for any educational setting because it promotes transformation and empowerment in learners and social justice learning through the development of a living learning community and connection to a larger local community. Communication research can (and should) be about communication and liberation (Crabtree, 1998), and education should be a place where communication opens the doors to freedom. bell hooks (1994) reminds us,

The academy is not paradise. But learning is a place where paradise can be created. The classroom, with all its limitations, remains a location of possibility. In that field of possibility, we have the opportunity to labor for freedom, to demand of ourselves and our comrades, an openness of mind and heart that allows us to face reality even as we collectively imagine ways to move beyond boundaries, to transgress. This is education as the practice of freedom (p. 207).

References

- Abrams, I. (1979). The impact of Antioch education through experience abroad. Alternative Higher Education, 3, 176-187.
- Bell, S., Morrow, M., & Tastsoglov, E. (1999). Teaching in environments of resistance: Toward a critical feminist and antiracist pedagogy. In M. Mayberry & E. Cronom Rose (Eds.), In meeting the challenge. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Burn, B. (1980). Expanding the international dimensions of higher education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Center for Global Education (1999). <http://www.augsburg.edu/globaled/mexsem.html> (4-20-99).
- Crabtree, R. D. (1998). Mutual empowerment in cross-cultural participatory development and service learning: Lessons in communication and social justice from projects in El Salvador and Nicaragua. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 26, 182-209.
- Conquergood, D. (1995). Between rigor and relevance: Rethinking applied communication. In K.N. Cissna (Ed.), Applied communication in the 21st century (pp. 79-96). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Foss, S.K. & Berlin Ray E. (1996). Theorizing communication from marginalized perspectives. Communication Studies, 47, 253-256.
- Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York, NY: Continuum Publishing Corp.
- Freire, P. (1998). Pedagogy of freedom. (P. Clarke, Trans.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Frey, L.R., Pierce, W.B., Pollack, M.A., Artz, L., & Murphy, B. A. O. (1996). Looking for justice in all the wrong places: On a communication approach to social justice. Communication Studies, 47, 110-127.
- Giroux, H.A. (1988). Schooling and the struggle in public life: Critical pedagogy in the modern age. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (1996). Living dangerously. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Glasser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. New York, NY: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Gore, J. M. (1993). The struggle for pedagogies. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Hanvey, R. (1979). An attainable global perspective. New York, NY: Center for Teaching International Relations.
- hooks, bell. (1994). Teaching to transgress. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hymes, D. H. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin & W. Sturtevant (Eds.), Anthropology and human behavior (pp. 99-137). Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). Models of interaction of language and social life. In J. J. Gumperz & D. H. Hymes (Eds.), Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication (pp. 35-71). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Katula, R.A. & Threnhauser, E. (1999). Experiential education in the undergraduate curriculum. Communication Education, 48, 238-255.
- Kauffman N., Martin J., Weaver H., & Weaver J. (1992). Students abroad: Strangers at home. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Kim, Y. Y., & Ruben, B. D. (1988). Intercultural transformation: A systems view. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), Theories in intercultural communication (pp. 299-321). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Kolb, D. (1984). Experiential learning as the source of learning and development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Laubscher, M. R. (1994). Encounters with difference: Student perceptions of the role of out-of-class experiences in education abroad. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Lindolf, T.R. (1995). Qualitative communication research methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
- McIntosh, P. (1998). White privilege and male privilege. In M. L. Anderson & P. Hill Collins (Eds.), Race, class, and gender. (pp. 94-105). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Ostrand, K.D. (1986). Trips and tours: Combining theory and reality through educational travel. New Directions for Continuing Education. 30, 83.
- Philipsen, G. (1989). An ethnographic approach to communication studies. In Dervin, Grossberg, O'Keffe, Wartella (Eds.), Rethinking communication volume 2 (pp. 258-268). Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publication.
- Sprague, J. (1992). Expanding the research agenda for instructional communication: Raising some unasked questions. Communication Education, 41 (1), 1-25.
- Van Maanen, J. (1979). The fact of fiction in organized ethnography. In J. Van Maanen (Ed.), Qualitative Methodology [special issue]. Administrative Science Quarterly 24, 535-550.

Vogt, J. F. & Murrell, K.L. (1990). Empowerment in organizations: How to spark exceptional performance. San Diego, CA: University Associates.

**Critical Pedagogy Abroad:
A Consideration of the Instructional Methods Used to Teach Social Justice at the
Center for Global Education in Mexico**

Based on an ethnographic case study of the Center for Global Education's fall term study abroad program in Cuernavaca, Mexico, this article examines the speech events and instructional strategies used to implement critical pedagogy within this program. Four different classroom speech events as well as out of class speech events served as spaces from which to teach students about gender justice. Within these speech events, instructors used critical analysis, instructional weaving, and a student-centered approach to craft an educational experience that was interdisciplinary and transformative for participants.

Every class is either 100% discussion or at least in some way incorporates discussion whereas my classes [in the US] are just...lectures. You listen and observe and don't participate. Some of my upper division classes have been smaller and more participatory but not really, cause [they tell you] what you need to learn. Here [they say] we want to learn from you and you want to learn from us, so let's incorporate it all. It's been a little difficult to get used to too because I'm not used to having to participate at all...instead of just thinking something while somebody's talking [I'm] actually allowed to say things (Kate, interview, 10-1-99).

As instructors, whether we recognize it or not, we are constantly making pedagogical decisions that affect the kind of learning that happens in our classrooms. This is important to consider because the instructional strategies we use and the philosophies behind them directly affect our ultimate goals- what we want students to walk away with at the end of a course. In the above statement, a senior majoring in communication expresses her first encounter with critical pedagogy as a participant in a study abroad program through the Center for Global Education in Cuernavaca, Mexico. In this short statement made after only a month of participation in the program, we find this student intrigued by the elements of participation, cooperative learning, and self expression that she did not experience in the mostly teacher and content-centered classrooms of her large university. Later, near the end of the semester, the same student observed,

[This program] has changed the way I see education...it's been interesting to me and a surprise to me that I can be so interested in what I am learning...it's exciting to learn. Education is exciting, it's not just this thing that you have to do because that's what's been...pre-programmed for you to do (Kate, interview, 12-6-99).

What does it take for a student's perception of learning and education to be transformed in one semester? How do we create environments where meaningful learning can take place? Practically speaking, how can instructors give students a participatory and instructional role in the classroom, provide learners with individual support, and ultimately increase the chances that applicable learning takes place? This article examines pedagogical questions based on an ethnographic case study of a study abroad program by looking specifically at the speech events and instructional strategies used to implement critical pedagogy within this program. In addition, this article provides suggestions for using critical pedagogy in other teaching and learning settings.

This study is important for a variety of reasons, and it draws from and contributes to research and knowledge in several areas of inquiry. First of all, this study contributes to the field of study abroad in higher education, providing a behind-the-scenes look at the teaching and learning process in one study abroad program. Secondly, this study contributes to the discipline of instructional communication and adult education, providing new information about the implementation of critical pedagogy in one university setting.

Literature Review

Study abroad

Currently, there is little research in the area of study abroad in higher education and even less on the topic of pedagogy within study abroad. Up to this point, most of the

academic research and review on the topic of study abroad in higher education has concentrated on traditional study abroad destinations such as European countries, has been quantitative in nature, and has focused almost exclusively on measuring the impact of the study abroad experience on the student (Burn, 1980; Kauffmann, Martin, Weaver, & Weaver, 1992; Laubscher, 1994). In fact, most study abroad research has been conducted within the U.S. using student participants as the sole informants. Research has shown that some of the traditionally expected benefits of study abroad include learning another language (Kauffmann, et al., 1992), the creation of a global world view (Burn, 1980), and personal growth especially in the area of communication (Kauffmann et. al., 1992; Ostrand, 1986). In addition, service learning has recently been acknowledged as another important reason to study abroad and as a source of mutual empowerment for participants (Crabtree, 1998). But while most of the research on study abroad to date has dealt with the impacts and outcomes of participation in education abroad generally, there has been little attention to the processes that produce those outcomes (Laubscher, 1994). Questions have been raised as to the processes that produce the expected or desired outcomes of study abroad, such as: How do students reflect on and learn from their experience abroad, and how we can determine whether or not study abroad is an enriching learning experience for students. (Katula & Threnhauser, 1999). As of yet, there is no data to show that a university-sponsored study abroad program leads to heightened learning any more than a personal trip abroad, or to support the idea that universities are doing more than providing structure for and managing study abroad (Katula & Threnhauser, 1999). We need more information about how students learn and are taught while studying abroad. Examining the pedagogy within one study abroad program begins to answer some of the questions regarding the process of education abroad.

Instructional communication

Surprisingly, there is little research within the discipline of instructional communication that directly addresses pedagogy. Rather, instructional theory is usually suggested or implied in instructional communication research and discourse. According to Sprague (1992), previous research in the field of instructional communication has suggested that the creation of knowledge comes from teachers who make decisions about what is to be taught, how it is to be taught, and how to evaluate whether or not it has been taught. Most research in instructional communication has focused solely on this teacher-centered information-transmission model of instruction, which suggests that instructors simply transmit information to students and learning takes place (Sprague, 1992).

A recent review of undergraduate communication education has shown that current instructional trends include interactive instruction, the emphasis of using groups or teams, and the use of computer technology (Shelton, Lane, & Waldhart, 1999). This current emphasis on participatory, community oriented, and self-directed instructional strategies could at first glance be evidence of a shift away from a teacher-centered paradigm to one that is more student-centered. For example, Brunson and Vogt (1996) discuss the use of interactive instruction using a liberal democratic approach in the classroom and the resulting empowerment of student learners. However, the majority of research surrounding these popular instructional strategies gives little indication of this shift and appears to remain grounded in the assumption of a teacher-centered model of instruction. There is little that brings attention to or questions the dominant pedagogical paradigm of teacher-centeredness within instructional communication. In addition, instructional communication is lacking in research that focuses on critical pedagogy.

Educational theory

There is a vast literature on educational theory. Here I attempt to give a brief overview of some dominant theories in order to provide a context for examining critical pedagogy in more detail. It is important to note that while it is sometimes useful to label and categorize theory, I am not suggesting that educational theory is so clear cut in practice. Any instructor most likely draws from a variety of educational theories, depending on the needs and goals of the learners in any particular learning situation.

A behaviorist or liberal philosophy of education emphasizes behavioral change, compliance with educational and societal standards, and the development of the intellectual mind. These theories of education consider the teacher to be the "expert" and the controller of learning, while successful students master the information or skills set forth for them (Galbraith, 1998). A constructivist theory differs from a behaviorist or liberal approach in that it emphasizes the idea that knowledge and understanding arise from the learner's experience and that learners are active and construct knowledge for themselves (Geary, 1995). Similarly, social constructivism recognizes that knowledge evolves through the experience of negotiation and discourse with others in which real-life issues are addressed (Prawatt & Floden, 1994). With a slightly different emphasis, social cognitive theory stresses personal and social change through the empowerment and self-efficacy of the individual (Bandura, 1995). Social-cultural theory is similar to social cognitive theory but puts more emphasis on the social context that is critical to learning (Vygotsky, 1978). Likewise, social-critical theory also focuses on a social learning context but emphasizes that learners must achieve freedom from forms of domination in society through critical reflection. This theory posits that communication, critical thinking, reflection, and reasoned analysis engage a learner in the learning process and empower her/him to seek truth and justice in making

personal and social changes (Merriam, 1993). By the same token, transformational theory holds that learners are capable of change and that learning is a process that uses previous experiences and learning to construct new meanings, determine future action, and promote personal development and growth (Mezirow, 1985).

Critical pedagogy

Critical pedagogy, sometimes referred to as transformative or progressive pedagogy (Freire, 1998), is a social and educational practice that "generates new knowledge, opens up contradictions and challenges all hierarchical structures of power that demand reverence at the expense of dialogue and debate" (Giroux, 1996, p. 77). Critical approaches to pedagogy focus on power relationships (Gore, 1993) and are designed to disrupt the canon of the academy in order to bring about social change (Bell, Morrow, & Tastsoglov, 1999). Critical pedagogy also attempts to analyze the relationship between identity, culture, and difference and examine how issues such as race, class, and gender can be analyzed in their historically specific inter-relationships (Giroux, 1996).

The actualization of critical education depends on the communication and teaching skills of the instructor; thus teaching methods and practices are extremely important to critical pedagogy (Bell, Morrow, & Tastsoglov, 1999). The role of the critical educator is to be a transformative intellectual who helps learners discover the moral and political dimensions of a just society and the means to create it (Giroux, 1988). This involves addressing the complex politics of identity in political and pedagogical terms that refuse the comfortable discourse of essentialism and separatism (Giroux, 1996).

Critical pedagogy is often contrasted with the banking model of education. Freire (1970) refers to the teacher-centered, information-transmission model of instruction as the

"banking" model of education. It is a traditional form of education often seen in higher education today, including study abroad. According to Freire, the "banking" method of education serves to indoctrinate, teaching students to adapt to reality rather than question it. It is "depowering" for students because teachers make "deposits" which the students receive, memorize, and repeat. (Freire, 1970). In contrast, Freire (1998) suggests that to teach is not to transfer knowledge but to "create possibilities for the production or construction of knowledge" (p. 30). This kind of education is liberating because it attempts to remove the teacher/student, active/passive dualisms and create education in which students are active agents of their own learning (Freire, 1970).

In addition to fostering emancipatory aims, critical pedagogy has several other important characteristics. These include highlighting knowledge, or the ways of knowing that have previously been invalidated or that arise from socially marginalized positions, and helping students develop critical thinking skills (Bell, Morrow, & Tastsoglov, 1999). Critical education also places high value on subjective experience as a route to understanding our lives and the lives of others. According to Kolb (1984), learning takes place when knowledge is created through experience. Experiential education occurs when students are asked to reflect critically on their experience, make sense of the experience through abstract conceptualization, and take action based on the experience (Kolb, 1984). In education that is experiential, the emphasis of education is placed on the experience, conceptualization, and action of the student and thus should be learner-centered.

Learner-centered education, however, is more than just a focus on the experiences of the learner; it is a holistic approach to education that encompasses knowledge of the student and knowledge about learning. Learner-centered education has in fact been defined as the "perspective that couples a focus on individual learners (their heredity, experiences,

perspectives, backgrounds, talents, interests, capacities, and needs) with a focus on learning (the best available knowledge about learning and how it occurs and about teaching practices that are most effective in promoting motivation, learning, and achievement for all learners)" (McCombs & Whisler, 1997 p. 9). Critical education, according to Giroux (1996) "needs to affirm and critically enrich the meaning, language and knowledge that different students actually use to negotiate and inform their lives" (p. 26). In order to do this, critical educators must know who their students are, what is important in their lives, and how to help them learn in meaningful ways. Freire (1998) suggests that educators take advantage of students' life experiences and establish an intimate connection between knowledge that is considered basic to the curriculum and knowledge that is the lived experience of students' lives.

Freire (1970) also emphasizes the importance of community and dialogue in critical pedagogy. In agreement with Freire, bell hooks (1994) states that education can be transformative for students when they are asked to reflect on their experiences, past and present, and dialogue with one another as a community of learners. This community of learners must include educators as well as students. According to Freire (1998), learners should be engaged in "continuous transformation through which they become authentic subjects of the construction and reconstruction of what is being taught, side by side with the teacher, who is subject to the same process" (p. 33).

In addition to dialogue and community, critical analysis and problem posing are important elements of critical pedagogy because they refer to a student's place in society. According to Boston (1974), Freire's problem posing strategy empowers students to either accept their life situation or challenge and change it. Through problem posing education, students go through conscientization which "means an awakening of the conscience, a shift

in mentality involving an accurate, realistic assessment of one's locus in nature and society, a capacity to analyze the causes and consequences of that, the ability to compare it with other possibilities, and finally a disposition to act in order to change the received situation" (Boston, 1973, p. 163). Critical pedagogy places students at the center of education and encourages them, through dialogue and problem posing, to look critically at their place in society.

Feminist pedagogy is sometimes considered, and shares many characteristics with, critical pedagogy (Gore, 1993). Feminist pedagogy acknowledges structured inequalities and oppression, focuses on people as thinking, feeling individuals requiring multiplicity and acceptance, and combines the personal and the political. It also seeks to include voices of those (women) who have traditionally been marginalized. Similar to critical pedagogy, feminist pedagogy focuses on a participatory mode of learning, the development of a community of growth and caring, critical thinking, and a respect for differences, recognizing that this takes place within a patriarchal framework (Sikes Scering, 1997). Within feminist pedagogy, personal change is a central goal, achieved through encouraging students to draw connections between class material and their own lives and to use personal experiences as a valid form of evidence (Hoffman & Stake, 1998).

But, feminist pedagogy differs from critical pedagogy in its emphasis on the oppression of women as a class and the overlapping systems of oppression that women face. (Gore, 1993). Feminist pedagogy focuses on creating learner awareness of their own relationships within a dualistic, hierarchical, and patriarchal paradigm.

Methods

Over the fall semester of 1999, I conducted an ethnographic case study of a study abroad program in Cuernavaca, Mexico. The fall program, which was called Women/Gender and Development: Latin American Perspectives (WADLAP),⁷ is administered by the Center for Global Education (CGE) of Augsburg College in Minneapolis, Minnesota. I chose to study this program particularly because of its location in the two-thirds world,⁸ and its unique focus on educating participants about issues of social justice, specifically how women are affected by issues such as poverty, war, gender inequality, religion, and globalization. In addition, I chose to study this program because of its progressive pedagogy and its fifteen-year history of managing study abroad programs.

Methodological theory

I used an ethnographic theoretical framework for this study, specifically ethnography of communication (Hymes, 1962), because of its usefulness as an approach that is descriptive, cultural, focused, comparative, and theoretical (Philipsen, 1989). This study presents an ethnographic description of a particular way of speaking used in a particular speech community. By looking at the communicative conduct of the members of this study abroad program, I sought to better understand the instructional strategies used to teach social justice within various speech events.

⁷ The name of this fall program has since been changed to Crossing Borders: Gender and Social Change in Mesoamerica

⁸ Instead of using the term "third world" or "developing world" I use the term "two-thirds world", as is used by the Center for Global Education. "Two-thirds world" refers to the fact that the so-called "third world" makes up two-thirds of the world's population while the so-called "first world" makes up only one third.

The ethnography of communication is grounded in several assumptions regarding the nature of communication (Hymes, 1962). The first is that speech within a community is not random but is culturally organized and guided by a system of indigenous rules and norms. Hymes refers to speech as all culturally relevant communication. The second assumption is that speech and language vary cross-culturally in function and thus vary between different speech communities. Speech community is defined by Hymes as "a community sharing rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech, and the rules for the interpretation of at least one linguistic variety" (Hymes, 1972, p. 54). This study abroad program fits this description because the community shares one linguistic code (U.S. American English) as well as rules for the appropriate use of language in social life. Since these rules come from within the speech community, they must be understood from the perspective of the members of this speech community.

The third assumption suggests that the speech activity of a community is the primary object of attention. Within the context of this speech community, this study focuses primarily on describing the speech that occurs within various speech events that are used to teach social justice. A speech event is an event that is "directly governed by the rules or norms for the use of speech" (Hymes, 1972, p. 56). A speech event may occur within different contexts and may include one or more speech acts, such as a greeting or a question.

Data collection and analysis

I began the study with an observational period of about three weeks. During this time, I familiarized myself with the participants of this speech community and attended a variety of speech events within this community. I identified speech events in two ways. First, I relied on the program's weekly calendar, which identified classes, field trips, and

social events. Second, I discovered speech events in the field by observing when participants talked about social justice issues. Once noted, I observed the event in which this speech was situated. While observing these speech events, I took notes documenting my observations according to the SPEAKING⁹ framework. During this period of observation and description, I began to look for common themes, such as teaching strategies, in the communication of this speech community. I coded the data which I collected into first order concepts, or indigenous ways of interpretation within the speech community, and into second order concepts, my explanation of the patterning of the first-order data (Van Maanen, 1979). From these second order concepts I developed themes that characterized concepts, beliefs, practices, or relationships concerning critical pedagogy within this program (Lindlof, 1995). For example, I noted that instructors asked students a lot of questions (first order concept), and I began to hypothesize that instructors were pushing students to go deeper, make connections, and to practice critical analysis (second order concept).

I then began to conduct individual interviews with students and instructors. I did this in order to explore the themes regarding critical pedagogy that I developed based on the

⁹ This ethnography of communication study uses a descriptive framework, the SPEAKING mnemonic, conceptualized by Hymes (1972) in order to organize observational data. This framework begins with the isolation of a speech event which is then analyzed according to various components. Within this framework, S refers to the setting, or time and place of the speech event, and to the physical and psychological setting. S also refers to the scene, the cultural or insiders' definition of the occasion. P represents participants who are involved in the speech event in various capacities. E addresses the ends or the goals of the speech event, both the purpose of the event from the community standpoint, and the actual outcome of the event for all participants. A refers to the act sequence or all forms of communication that are taking place during the speech event including verbal and nonverbal, while K refers to the key of the event. This may also be considered the tone or spirit in which the event is conducted. I points to the instrumentality of the speech event which may include oral, written, or other medium of speech transmission. N recognizes the norms of interaction for participants of the speech event, as all rules for speaking have a normative character. Norms of interpretation are also important to examine, as an account of norms of interaction still leaves open the interpretation of those norms. G refers to the genre or category of the speech event such as poem, lecture, narrative, etc (Hymes, 1972).

analytical coding of the observation period, and to test the hypotheses I had generated while coding second order concepts. I audiotaped these interviews and transcribed them in order to code the data using first and second order concepts. Over the course of the semester I conducted a total of 27 interviews with 12 participants ranging in length from approximately half an hour to an hour and a half. Throughout the semester I observed over 320 hours of speech events within the speech community and documented these speech events using the SPEAKING framework. I also collected written documents and assignments from instructors, which I coded using the same process. Using these various sources allowed for data triangulation and thus a solid body of evidence for each claim made regarding the critical pedagogy within this program. Throughout the data collection process I used the constant comparative method of analysis, continually reviewing existing data and comparing and categorizing new data based on the coding of that data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Research questions

In this study, I examined the following research questions specifically: "In what speech events is social justice taught?" "What are the instructional methods used to teach about social justice?" "Are the courses at CEMAL interdisciplinary?" The first and second questions are important in what they say about pedagogical decisions made within this context. Understanding where and how social justice issues are taught gives insight into the pedagogy of social justice education and its meaning for participants. The last question is important because of what it can answer about the connectedness of the program curriculum, instructional communication, and teaching methods and styles of the three instructors and, thus, the consistency of the pedagogy of the program as a whole.

Description of the program

The specific purpose of this study abroad program was to help students "explore the connections women are drawing among issues of race, class, and global economics" (Center for Global Education website, 1999). In order to do this the program was organized into a variety of learning situations. For example, during the first week of the program students visited the Mexico/U.S. border in both Tucson, Arizona and Nogales, Mexico in order to learn about local issues and to begin their exploration of gender justice. After this first week, students traveled to Cuernavaca, Mexico where they settled into the CEMAL (Centro de Educación Mundial en America Latina) program house, a large comfortable house with a courtyard garden that served as the students' home and classroom as well as an administrative center. Students lived and studied at the CEMAL house for the rest of the semester with the exception of a three-week homestay with Mexican families, a two-week learning trip to Chiapas and Guatemala, and a four-day trip to the community of Valle de Bravo.

WADLAP consisted of three academic courses: Church and Social Change (REL 366), Development Processes (INS 311), and Women in Comparative Politics (POL 359). Each of these courses was taught two times per week. During most of the semester, students were also enrolled in daily Spanish language classes at a nearby language institute. In addition to course work, students were asked to be active members of CEMAL living and learning community, participating in house meetings and doing house chores. They were also given the option of participating in weekly volunteer activities and a variety of local community events.

Participants

The ten student participants of this study abroad program were U.S. Americans who came from Universities all over the United States. They received academic credit for their participation in the program through Augsburg College. The participants ranged in age from 20-24, and were diverse in gender and sexual orientation, as well as ethnic, socio-economic, and religious backgrounds. Two of the student participants were unable to complete the program for personal reasons. There were three WADLAP instructors who, in addition to teaching courses, occupied the roles of academic director, administrative director and program coordinator. The instructors were U.S. Americans who had lived in Mexico for many years and had also traveled and worked in a variety of locations in Mexico and Central America. They were involved in various community organizations and projects outside of CEMAL that kept them connected to the larger Cuernavaca community. In addition to students and instructors, the program also consisted of a Mexican gardening, cleaning and cooking staff, a Mexican administrative assistant, and a U.S. American intern who lived with and worked closely with the students at the CEMAL house offering academic and administrative support for the program. In this article, all the names of the participants have been changed to protect their anonymity.

Results: In what speech events is social justice taught?

A speech event is defined by Hymes as event that is "directly governed by the rules or norms for the use of speech" (Hymes, 1972, p. 56). A speech event may occur within different contexts and this was true within this program. In this program, social justice was taught both within the more structured and facilitated context of the classroom, as well as

within many unstructured and/or nonfacilitated events. But, the classroom is where most of the teaching (although not necessarily learning) about social justice took place within the CEMAL speech community. However, it is important to note that the CEMAL classroom was not the typical university classroom that may be filled with desks, chalkboards, and an assortment of technological equipment. Nor was it a room in a building on a university campus. In fact, I have identified four distinct speech events that are considered "the university classroom" at CEMAL: An instructor-facilitated class at the CEMAL house or in another location, a guest speaker-facilitated class at the CEMAL house, field trips to hear guest speakers in other locations, and travel experiences. These speech events are distinct and are governed by rules and norms for the use of speech within this community. All are considered structured and facilitated university class experiences at CEMAL.

Four speech events-facilitated classroom instruction

The first speech event in which social justice was taught was an instructor-facilitated class at the CEMAL house or in another location. At the CEMAL house, class took place in the living room or on the front veranda. Couches and chairs were always arranged in a circle or semi-circle to promote discussion. Instructor-facilitated classes were most often discussion-oriented, although occasionally included some instructor lecture or student presentations. Sometimes instructor-facilitated classes took place at another location, such as an instructor's house, in a parking lot, or on a sidewalk. This was the case when instructors facilitated a discussion that took place immediately after a field trip to hear a guest speaker. The instructor would gather students together soon after leaving a children's hospital or an indigenous community, for example, and ask questions such as, "What are

your reactions to this visit?" or "What are the challenges that women face in organizing?" (field notes, Janel, 9-17-99).

Instructor-facilitated classes incorporated a wide variety of learning activities that were initiated by the instructor. In addition to discussion, lecture, or student presentations, learning activities included small group work, simulation games, and free writes in which students were asked to write spontaneously on a given topic. For example, in one Church and Social Change class, the instructor asked students "Imagine yourself as an indigenous person at the time of the Conquest. You were raised with a certain cosmovision ... How does the Spaniards coming change your life? Take 10 minutes and just do a free write" (field notes, Katherine, 9-23-99). Another time, in one session of the Development Processes class, students played "the debt game," an economic simulation game in which some students played the role of developed nations, others the role of developing nations, and still others the role of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) or the World Bank. After the game, the instructor facilitated a discussion of the game in relation to class material. Many students later commented that the debt game was highly instrumental in their understanding of international economics and development processes. In Women and Comparative Politics, students often broke into small groups to discuss questions related to their reading or guest speakers. Students were free to meet in small groups in the dining room, outside, or wherever they felt comfortable. Instructor-facilitated classes were the most common form of classroom speech event, although the content and structure of these classes varied depending on the learning goals for each class session. Each instructor-facilitated class was led in some way by the instructor and thus the communication that occurred within this type of speech event mostly depended on the leadership and facilitation of the instructor. This is

not to say, however, that the instructor always directed instructor-facilitated classes. In many cases instructors left the direction of the classroom learning in the hands of the learners.

The second type of speech event in which social justice was taught was the guest speaker-facilitated class at the CEMAL house. About once a week, guest speakers facilitated each course at the request of the instructors. Over the course of the 15 week semester (with the exception of the three and a half weeks that students were traveling), there were approximately 13 class sessions that were facilitated by guest speakers at the CEMAL house. Previous to the speakers' visits, instructors talked with guest speakers about the pedagogy of CEMAL and explained to them how their talk would fit into the particular course and the overall program. Paula, an instructor, explained that she tells speakers "what it means to be an experiential program...providing a variety of perspectives and that we really want to create an atmosphere of dialogue...and leave a lot of time for exchange" (interview, 11-10-99). Guest speaker-facilitated classes usually began with a talk by the guest speaker(s), followed by a period of discussion in which students asked questions. The instructor of the course was always present and acted as Spanish to English translator when needed and occasionally as a co-facilitator. Instructors encouraged students to ask questions specifically related to their own areas of interests, which included topics such as women's reproductive health, public health, and women's organizing. Examples of guest speakers who facilitated classes included leaders of Base Christian Community (BCC) groups, a panel of women who were elected officials of the three major Mexican political parties, a representative of Catholics for Free Choice, and health care specialists in alternative medicine. The guests spoke to students about their own personal and professional experiences in relation to social justice, especially concerning women. The communication within this kind of speech event was primarily determined by the guest speaker and the direction that she or he led the class.

Students often asked questions and participated in discussion with the guest speaker, and this was a communicative norm within this speech event.

The third speech event in which social justice was taught was local field trips to hear guest speakers. Over the course of the 15 week semester students took field trips to hear guest speakers approximately 13 times. For example, students visited the National Institute of Public Health in Cuernavaca to learn about development from a health perspective and a Benedictine retreat center in Cuernavaca to learn about the Virgin of Guadeloupe. Students also learned about neoliberalism by visiting a Cuernavaca businessman and about women in local politics by meeting with a local councilwoman in her office. In these situations, students were not only able to hear different perspectives but to actually see and experience a variety of realities by traveling to hear speakers within their own immediate environment. All of the speakers, whether they came to CEMAL or whether students went to visit them, were considered important elements of instruction. Instructors asked students to consider speakers as important resources. Students were encouraged to incorporate what they learned from speakers in class discussions, presentations, and in assignments and exams. Within this speech event, which is similar to a guest speaker-facilitated class at CEMAL, students were expected to communicate openly and respectfully, asking questions and participating in discussion. The direction of the speech was primarily determined and led by the guest speaker, although student questions and discussion also greatly influenced the direction of these speech events.

A fourth kind of classroom speech event was travel experience in which students spent more than a day away from CEMAL. During a weeklong stay at the border, a two-week travel trip to Chiapas, Mexico and Guatemala, and a four-day trip to Valle de Bravo, students met with a variety of guest speakers. Most often, a speaker would share their own

perspectives and experiences, then initiate a discussion with the students and answer their questions. In this way the setting of the speech event was very similar to that of local field trips. However, the physical and psychological setting and the scene, or the insiders' definition of the travel visits, were different. During these travel trips, students visited speakers who held a variety of political, social, or religious viewpoints, which helped them to obtain a holistic understanding of the issues they were studying and to be able to pose specific and pertinent questions to speakers. Guest speakers that students met with while traveling in Chiapas, Mexico, for example, included a director of a human rights organization, a priest working in a poor indigenous community, the municipal president of San Cristóbal de Las Casas, and a representative from the Center for Economic and Political Research and Community Action. In Guatemala, students visited the U.S. embassy, participated in a spiritual ceremony with a Mayan priestess, spoke with a representative from the United Nations mission to Guatemala, and visited FAMDEGUA, family members of the disappeared. As part of their coursework, students were required to write "reaction papers" while traveling in Chiapas and Guatemala. Reaction papers were used as a place for students to reflect on what they were learning while traveling and meeting with a variety of speakers. Travel trips were often emotionally taxing for students, and reaction papers also served as a space to vent and explore emotions. In addition, reaction papers aided students in the process of connecting what they were learning to their coursework and generating questions for further exploring topics with future speakers. Within this speech event, students often relied more heavily on instructors and guest speakers to express clear communicative norms and expectations. In Chiapas, for example, because of the extreme political situation, students were sometimes asked to keep their questions general, non-threatening, or to take their cue as to appropriate communication from the instructor.

Other speech events- non-facilitated out of class learning

In addition to being taught in the structured setting of "the classroom," social justice was also taught and learned within a variety of other speech events. As discussed in a previous article (Burns, 2000), the CEMAL living and learning environment was structured to promote dialogue and learning out of class as well as in class. Students lived together at the CEMAL house for most of the semester in order to focus on learning about social justice as a community. Students taught each other about social justice by sharing their personal backgrounds, breaking stereotypes, asking honest questions, and talking openly about issues such as sexism or racism they had encountered in their lives. Out of class speech events were important places for students to reflect on what they were learning. This reflection often happened over meals and in the evenings or on weekends at the CEMAL house. Students lingered over the dinner table discussing how it feels to be an "other" in U.S. society. They smoked on the front veranda and talked about how to incorporate what they were learning into their lives at home. They sat in the living room and watched a video about indigenous people in Chiapas or discussed globalization.

At the end of the semester, one student spoke about the importance of this non-facilitated learning environment to her own learning experience,

The communal living has been most meaningful to me and especially in the last two weeks. We don't even talk about anything anymore except politics. We eat, breathe and sleep it. And that's useful for me too, because a lot of the times I learn the most outside of class discussion... 'cause you're able to communicate maybe one-on-one or two-on-four or however you want to do it, over dinner or something that 's not so structured. And you're given the option of well, if you want to respond you can, if you want to leave you can, if you want to question somebody further about something they said in class you're able to do that. Or if you just need time to reflect you're able to do that too... And that's been very useful to me. I've learned a lot from just being around these [people] all the time (Kate, interview, 12-6-99).

Another student commented,

It's definitely nice that anytime one of us would want to talk about an issue that we had been thinking about or learning about or whatever, we could say it to someone and they'd be interested...someone's [not] going to be like oh that's [Cody] being political again, like lots of times it would be [at home] with my roommates or something like that (Cody, interview, 12-7-99).

Homestays with local families also taught students about social justice. Over the dinner table, at a party, or playing with kids, students talked with host families and learned about social justice in these speech events.

All the of the speech events, the four types of structured and facilitated classroom events and the non-facilitated out of class events were important to teaching social justice within this program. Within these speech events, communicative norms existed through which this speech community developed an understanding and interpretation of knowledge. The classroom speech events were structured in such a way as to introduce students to a variety of concepts, experiences, people, and places. The classroom also provided a place for questioning, reflecting, and synthesizing what students were learning. Non-facilitated out-of-class speech events worked well in conjunction with facilitated classroom experiences, providing students a forum for reflection, discussion, relationship building, and learning on their own. Both of these types of speech events were necessary and important in the process of learning about social justice.

What are the instructional methods used to teach about social justice?

CEMAL instructors used a variety of instructional methods in the classroom to teach about social justice. These include using critical analysis, instructional weaving that emphasized the interdisciplinary nature of the courses, and a student-centered approach. In addition to examining a student-centered approach in general, I identify three aspects of a

student-centered approach that were important methods used in this program. These include a focus on individual learning styles, giving students voice in the classroom, and focusing on the personal growth process of each student. These methods were important elements of the critical pedagogy used in this program. In addition to these methods, it is important to note that the continuous development of the living and learning community was also an extremely important method in teaching social justice issues (Burns, 2000).

Critical analysis

"Critical analysis" was used by all three instructors to teach about social justice and specifically gender justice. Critical analysis within this program involved exposing students to a variety of perspectives, asking them to reflect on what they experienced and to relate this experience to their own lives. Within the CEMAL context, the first element of critical analysis was exposing students to a wide variety of perspectives and experiences, especially underrepresented perspectives. One instructor explained,

We try to expose people to many different sides of issues and perspectives. At the same time the Center [for Global Education] is very honest and open about the fact that it has a bias towards underrepresented voices and I think that's very important because I think in mainstream academia, there's not enough attention given to underrepresented voices, voices of women, people of color, people who are the poorest of the poor, and academics tend to be people who have privilege or access in some way. To me it's been really important to work in a program where students spend a lot of time hearing directly from people whose voices aren't normally taken into account in academia. And having an opportunity to have an encounter directly with folks, hear their stories, hear their perspectives and reflect upon those. At the same time, while there is a particular emphasis on underrepresented voices, we also do listen to some of the voices that are traditionally heard, and not just neglect those (Katherine, interview, 10-8-99).

This emphasis on hearing a variety of different perspectives, particularly those of women, within each of the four types of classroom speech events played a large part in making the

program experiential. One instructor explained that students often expect experiential education to be about taking immediate action to make change. However, this was not the focus of experiential education within this program. Rather, instructors focused on hearing from many different perspectives. Katherine explained,

We spend a lot of time in our classes trying to look at the root causes of poverty, understand a lot of different causes of social injustice, look at strategies for social transformation before pushing students out there...it's important for them to spend a lot of time simply hearing from people, hearing people's stories...one of the challenges [is] getting students to realize, when you're going to people's homes and hearing their stories or they're coming here and sharing their perspectives, that it is experiential education because you are broadening your own experience, you are having a direct encounter, a direct engagement with someone else and you're learning from their experience (interview, 10-8-99).

By exposing students to experiential education, instructors encouraged students to understand various sides of an issue and get a thorough understanding of it. These perspectives came in the form of guest speakers and through student presentations, homestays, and travel experiences. CEMAL students also gained a variety of perspectives from books and academic reading packets that they were required to purchase for each course. One student commented that she appreciated the diversity of perspectives she was exposed to at CEMAL,

When we went to the border, we didn't just go to the maquilas, to the maquila workers, [we went to] the maquila supervisors and the boarder patrol, and it was like *uoooo* you know. It's taking into account that there's more than one point of view. And we may not agree with it and we may know we're not going to agree with it but to know that it exists (Carla, interview, 9-29-99).

The CEMAL intern agreed that experiencing a variety of perspectives was important and, in fact, made this program unique. She said, "I've never heard of any other [study abroad] program where you get to talk to so many people and get the voices

and opinions of so many different people. I think that's something that's really special about this program" (Meagan, interview, 12-14-99).

In addition to being exposed to a variety of perspectives, students were asked to reflect critically on their exposure to these perspectives. One instructor described it as,

really engaging in using critical thinking skills by analyzing the perspectives that are being either well articulated verbally or in written form; Why is this author saying what he or she is saying? Why is this speaker saying what he or she is saying? What are some of the root causes of some of the problems that we're addressing? It's getting to that kind of critical analysis level (interview Katherine, 12-3-99).

Within CEMAL education, critical analysis not only included being exposed to new and diverse perspectives and being asked to reflect critically on these, but also comparing this knowledge with previous knowledge to potentially create new theories based on this analysis. One instructor explained,

[Critical analysis] means taking the elements that they are hearing and seeing, and putting it together with what they're reading, prior knowledge, theoretical knowledge and sort of comparing the reality they experience with what has supposedly been proven through theoretical work, deciding whether or not their experience really backs what the theory they've been learning about says, and creating new theories relating to that experience. So, it's kind of a cycle. Learn the theory, have the experience, or vice versa it doesn't have to be in that order. They compare that experience to the theories they have learned about and either revamp those theories or create new theories based on their experience (Paula, interview, 11-10-99).

Students were asked to incorporate their own personal experiences, emotions and thoughts into their critical analysis. Without making connections to themselves, instructors considered the students' critical analysis to be incomplete. This meant that students had to not only reflect and theorize on the social justice issues they were learning about, but they had to incorporate their feelings and personal reactions into their analysis. This could sometimes be challenging for students according to one instructor:

I think for some students who are used to just being in their heads and being asked to use their critical thinking skills, it's a challenge to reflect on the question, Well what does this mean to me? or, How do I feel about this? or, What am I going to do about this? (Katherine, interview, 10-8-99)

Even though it was challenging, connecting what they were learning to themselves was an extremely important part of students' critical analysis. Another instructor commented,

If I don't see those connections made I call them on it. I've had students write papers that are like book reviews and with very good analysis of the literature but there is basically nothing about their own opinion or other experiences they've had so that to me is not a good paper regardless of how sound it can be. That's not what I look for. I think [student opinions are] very important because I don't think this class or this program is about regurgitating information. It's about critically analyzing things and thinking them through. There's no wrong or right answer (Janel, interview, 10-5-99).

Students found that connecting the learning experiences to their own lives was very helpful in the learning process. When asked what the most important part of the overall program had been one student reflected, "I think the most important thing from this semester is the personal reflecting and the connecting to me...I'm sure the majority of us have thought about this stuff before but I think the important part of this program was connecting [it] to me" (Chloe, interview, 12-8-99).

By asking students to look at a variety of perspectives, especially underrepresented perspectives, to reflect critically, to compare and contrast, and to relate what they were learning to themselves, instructors facilitated learning about social justice issues. One student reflected,

I think just the whole philosophy of encouraging us to think for ourselves instead of being recording boxes, you know, I think that's really important. Like today when we did the exercise and the categories really didn't fit, [the purpose] wasn't to make them fit, the purpose was to get us to think about it, to engage our minds. And also different activities that stimulate an understanding of the inner relationship between ourselves and society, like group activities, small numbers, [where] everybody gets a chance to express themselves [are important] (Chris, interview, 9-29-99).

Using a variety of learning activities in class and allowing students to express themselves was key to critical analysis. For example, in learning about development theories, students explored the topic through a variety of learning experiences. Students were introduced to a variety of perspectives on development including academic articles and speakers such as a local neo-liberal businessman, a health care worker, and a member of a union in a transnational company. Another perspective was gained by meeting people and staying with poor families in Valle de Bravo, a community that had been newly developed as tourist area. In addition, students were given opportunities to engage in group discussion about what they were reading and seeing regarding development theories. They were also given structured learning experiences to help them think critically about development models. For example, students created a visual model of a development cycle on a large felt board using key concepts such as globalization, poverty, debt, lack of national economic growth, and structural adjustment. This exercise was used as a tool for critical reflection of development theories from a systemic perspective. At the end of the term, students returned to the model and recreated a development cycle based on sustainable development theories.

Students were also asked to reflect critically on development through written essay questions such as the following:

What evidence have you read about, seen and heard this semester to support or refute the notion that globalization has led to the creation of a world system of stratification and an international economic structure which transcends national boundaries? Focusing on Mexico as a case study, please describe your understanding of the effects of neoliberal economic policies on different sectors of Mexican society (i.e. rural, urban, working class, middle class, men, women, indigenous, mestizo, foreigners, etc.) To what extent does Mexico's situation reflect the worldwide system of economic development? How is this reflection manifested in positive or negative effects on the health and well being of women worldwide? (Essay exam, 12/10/99)

Similarly, in each of the three courses, instructors encouraged and facilitated critical analysis of social justice issues through a variety of experiential learning experiences. Critical analysis was an important method used to teach about gender justice within this program. Students were introduced to a variety of perspectives in many settings, were asked to think critically and theorize based on these experiences, and relate them to their own lives and futures.

Instructional weaving and the interdisciplinary nature of the program

In addition to using critical analysis to teach social justice issues, instructors use what I will call "instructional weaving." This is based on the concept of instructional scaffolding, a process in which a teacher determines and controls the number of elements to be learned, introduces these elements, and, based on the progress of the learner, includes the next set of concepts (Bruning, Schraw, & Ronning, 1995). Rather than the more lateral, rigid, and perhaps teacher-centered structure that scaffolding implies, instructional weaving refers to the complex interconnection of abstract concepts and concrete learning experiences throughout the entirety of a course and across courses. Instructors first created learning experiences that introduced new concepts to students. These in turn served as anchors from which to spin additional concepts and experiences, allowing room for creativity and flexibility based on the needs and desires of the learners and any extraneous elements of the learning environment. The original concepts were referred to again and again throughout the course and were used as a point of understanding from which to jump to more complex concepts. For example, in teaching concepts such as liberation theology in the Church and Social Change course, the instructor first introduced students to basic theological concepts such as hermeneutics, ecclesiology, and Christology. From the instructor and guest

speakers, students then learned about concepts such as indigenous cosmovision, conquest theology, and Guadeloupe as a liberator. These experiences were then connected back to the basic theological concepts through class discussions and assignments. Learners gradually built upon their understanding of the original concepts and eventually were able to apply the basic concepts, such as hermeneutics, in their critical analysis of new theological concepts, such as liberation theology or feminist theology.

Instructors also consistently referred to past and future in-class experiences as points of reference to create a context for the present class period and the concepts being studied. For example, instructors made comments such as these: "I'd like to come back to this and talk about ways to solve this."; "When you go to Chiapas and Guatemala, you'll see this same thing in a different place"; "You will see this in your readings about Chiapas"; and "We saw a video on this same topic."

In addition, instructors "wove in" references to students' readings and students' personal experiences outside of class in order to expand the concepts they were learning about. Weaving all of these elements together, instructors taught students about social justice issues, not as isolated events or problems, but as complex systems connected to academic thought, real-world experience, and their own lives.

An important aspect of instructional weaving was the linking of the three courses at CEMAL. The three courses of WADLAP were designed to complement each other and indeed were interdisciplinary. Instructors communicated formally on a weekly basis and informally on a daily basis in order to coordinate efforts and bring students an interdisciplinary approach in which concepts and learning experiences in each course complemented the other courses. One student commented on the interdisciplinary nature of the courses saying, "It's all connected. They separate them enough so that we can see the

difference but they also keep us aware that it's definitely connected" (Chris, interview, 9-29-99). One instructor noted, "That's a success of the program that these issues, although they're three different courses and somewhat different perspectives, make sense together" (Janel, interview, 12-10-99). Another student commented, "There's always things that are overlapping... I think [the courses]...go together well" (Claire, interview, 10-4-99). The program was designed with an overall theme, the development of women in Mexico, and because of this, the issues that arose in each course were interconnected and often overlapped. One student described women's issues as the "glue that holds it all together" (Kate, interview, 12-6-99). For example, economic issues that affected women in Mexico were found to also impact their political or religious participation in Mexican society. By teaching the three separate courses with the overall theme of women in development in mind and by staying in communication with one another, the CEMAL instructors created courses that were interdisciplinary and connected.

Another important aspect of this connection between the three courses was an assignment that students were asked to complete at the end of the semester. The integrated semester project required students to pool the experiences and knowledge they had gained in the three courses and do additional research in the form of reading or interviewing people in the local community on a particular area of their own interest. Students then created a final product that represented the connection of all three courses to their own interest area and presented this product to the group in an interdisciplinary class session. For example, one student created a large painting that demonstrated what she had learned about women's reproductive health in Mexico. Two other students created a dramatic interpretation of a creative essay about women in Mexico. The integrative semester projects served to link the three courses together in a tangible way and strengthen the connections between them.

Because the courses were structured in a way that encouraged students to look at issues holistically, and because students were encouraged to think critically about the issues concerning women in development in Mexico, students were successful in integrating what they learned from all three courses.

A student-centered approach

The final method that I will discuss which was used to teach social justice within this program was using a student-centered approach. In general, using this approach at CEMAL meant an openness to, and an incorporation of, the students and their interests into the program. The intern and instructors of this program were readily available to students and were interested in each student individually. Over the course of the semester, all three instructors met together with each student three separate times in student-instructor meetings. The purpose of these meetings, according to instructors, was to check in with each student individually and find out how they were doing academically, physically, emotionally, socially, and to encourage and support each student in setting and reaching their individual goals. One student reflected on her first student-instructor meeting by saying,

It was really cool for me just to have them all there and like sincerely interested in me. They asked me to come to them and I've always had to go to my professors. So it's really nice to have your professor be like, well how is your boyfriend, or so your mom's coming...it's really neat to have them be incorporated into my life. So they understand us...I loved it (Rose, interview, 10-6-99).

In addition, instructors communicated with each other on a regular basis in order to coordinate their efforts in the best possible manner for the students. "We start every staff meeting with a student check in. So, [we ask] what's going on with this student and what's going on with that student"(Paula, interview, 11-10-99).

Besides being available to students and involved in their lives, instructors also incorporated what they called "generative themes," or themes which were generated by the students, into the courses. At the beginning of the semester, students were given an interest survey for each course to find out what their individual interests were. These interests were then incorporated as much as possible in the course curriculum. When an individual expressed an interest that was different from her or his classmates, instructors worked with that individual to incorporate those specific interests into the course. One instructor commented on this process saying,

So there's kind of two different strategies. The one strategy is to talk individually with students and help them find ways of adapting the course to their own interests. The other is when there are clear generative themes that are jumping out. If several people are interested in indigenous cultures, then saying OK we're going to spend even more time on that in the course. And for example this semester there's a lot of interest in Judaism and non-Catholic religions in Mexico. So I want to be able to make that a little bit more central part of the course than is necessarily in the original syllabus (Katherine, interview, 10-8-99).

Students appreciated this openness to their interests. One student reflected, " I think it's considerate that they want to kind of mold the class to people's interests and people's levels" (Claire, interview, 10-4-99). Using interest surveys was one way to get a feeling for what students really wanted to learn and to incorporate this into the course content. Students appreciated this openness to their interests and the instructors' willingness to be flexible.

Another student said of the interest surveys,

[They wanted] to know from the very beginning, what our interests [were]. 'Cause we all have different interests and they can, not necessarily cater to our needs and stuff, but kind of focus and lead us in a certain direction that perhaps is more interesting to us or that we're more concerned with. Then they went ahead and incorporated that into how they were going to approach teaching us certain things. So that was really important (Carla, interview, 9-29-99).

Another student expressed similar sentiments about the interest surveys saying, "I liked those. I thought it was a good idea 'cause...I didn't mind filling them out and I felt like they really read them, looked at them and took them into consideration. Once we had that [student-instructor] meeting I was like, oh wow, they're actually thinking about that" (Hannah, interview, 10-7-99).

Not only did instructors ask for student ideas and interests using interest surveys, they followed up on individual student interests in student-instructor meetings and during class sessions. Instructors offered suggestions such as additional experiences students could participate in or readings they could do to more fully explore their individual interests. Incorporating the interests of students continued to be an important element of each course and was often a deciding factor in which guest speaker students heard from or what the discussion topic was in class. Students recognized the value that was placed on their own interests and responded by opening up and engaging in the learning process.

Student interests were also incorporated into the CEMAL living and learning environment outside of the classroom. Students were actively involved in planning and leading weekly house meetings, according to their own interests. The CEMAL intern explained,

Part of what I do is help facilitate the house meetings. Every week two students volunteer to be in charge of the house meetings...They conduct the house meetings according to the issues that they decide on...each week a big piece of paper is put up on the wall and the students write down their concerns during the week, things they want to do. Sometimes we play games, [like] group building exercises that help us to get to know each other and sometimes we do other kinds of work that pertain more to social justice, like an exercise on exploring our racial identities...There's usually a presentation of something personal brought up by one or both of the facilitators and then [house] issues are brought up (Meagan, interview, 12-14-99).

Student concerns and interests were of importance to the instructors and intern throughout the semester. In addition to what has been discussed, a student-centered approach at CEMAL included a focus on the learning styles of the students, on giving students voice, and on the personal growth process of each student.

Learning styles

Instructors also showed that they were student-centered by acknowledging and encouraging different learning styles. During orientation, CEMAL students completed a learning inventory survey to help them understand how they learned best and then shared this information with each other. One instructor reflected, "I remember...before we crossed the border in Arizona, sitting out in the park and having people talk about their learning styles so everyone else understands, *I don't like to talk a lot, so if I don't talk a lot please don't feel bad*, things like that" (Janel, interview, 12-10-99). In addition to giving students learning style inventories, instructors also showed openness to different learning styles by incorporating a variety of learning activities into their courses. For example, instructors incorporated discussion, small group activities, songs, videos, games, student presentations, art, free writing, and drama in addition to guest speakers and lectures. This was because students learn differently and the idea was for each student to learn the most that they could.

One instructor explained,

Even though there is a syllabus and specific assignments, I try very hard to be open to talking with every single student and letting them know from the very beginning and reminding them over the course of the semester that things are always open to discussion and negotiation because ultimately, it's about them. It's their education. It's not for me, it's not for some academic department. It's for them. So they're the ones who often know best how they're going to learn. If an assignment isn't achieving their learning objectives, we need to be able to talk about it and find a way to make it work. I think that reflects the philosophy too, in terms of OK we're open to

student-centered learning, to students taking the initiative, and reminding them that they can take that initiative (Katherine, interview, 10-8-99).

So, not only did instructors structure class activities and assignments which encouraged a variety of learning styles, but they were also willing to work with students to change something that was not working. At the same time that instructors were willing to work with students, they also pushed students to find new and different ways of learning and provided opportunities for them to do so. Katherine described how she challenged students to learn:

Another thing I think is really important is respecting different learning styles and encouraging creativity, encouraging critical thinking skills, and encouraging people who sometimes perhaps who rely almost exclusively on their analytical skills to get in touch with their affective side and learn in that way. And for people who tend to be more on the affective side to also push them to really hone their critical thinking skills. [We try to] really work towards holistic education, in the sense of respecting people's learning styles but also recognizing that we can all learn in many different ways. And while each of us have perhaps preferred learning styles that to be holistic people it's good to learn in many different ways. So trying not to teach only in one way all the time but also trying to use different methods at different times. Knowing that some things are going to work really well with some people and are going to bomb with others, but hopefully it will be balanced at the end, and hopefully we all learn. And I think the same is true in terms of designing assignments and trying to have some kind of balance, some things that bring out the creative side of people, some that bring out their affective side, others focus more on critical analysis elements etc (interview, 12-3-99).

Thus, instructors strove to be conscious of students' learning styles, first by asking students to identify their own preferred learning style and then by attempting to incorporate learning activities that would be effective for various learning styles. At the same time, instructors attempted to push students and to try to learn in new ways as part of their learning process.

Student voice

Instructors were also student-centered by giving students a voice in the classroom and in the overall program. Students were constantly asked for their opinions, ideas, and questions and they were validated in return. Instructors did not consider themselves the only teachers in the classroom, but instead encouraged students to teach each other. Janel explained that she tells students, "I'm not the only teacher. Your classmate is also your teacher." She explained that she feels this way because, "When I write my comments on their papers I learn a lot and tell them. For me, that's very important to look at things that way. I guess that reflects a lot on my teaching style. I try not to be authoritative. I had problems with that kind of model as a student" (Janel, interview, 10-5-99). Students recognized and respected this philosophy. One student commented, "I think that the whole methodology of CEMAL and their whole idea of education is that...the teachers aren't to be looked at mostly as professors but as fellow learners" (Kate, interview, 10-1-99).

Students were also asked to voice their opinions by completing written evaluations of each course at midterm. Instructors then adapted their courses accordingly. For example, in one course, students commented that they needed more discussion time in order to process what they were learning. The instructor canceled a scheduled guest speaker and re-arranged the course in order to create more room for discussion. When asked for thoughts about students voicing their opinions, one student said,

I think that's very helpful as far as getting the most out of your students. Just asking someone what they think is enough to lower their guard and allow them to be like, *wow they really care*. And that's something that...I've sensed from this program that they kind of are concerned with our overall development and not just getting a paycheck like a lot of teachers at a lot of universities...this is kind of like a program that is...more holistic (Chris, interview, 9-29-99).

Another student commented that experiencing a student-centered approach in which she could voice her opinion was very enriching.

Just the fact that like, I have an option to say that I don't like the way something is going, or because I might say that I don't like the way something is going, it can be changed so that it can work for me and I can learn...completely has changed my idea of education in general. Because from my school and from my past educational experiences, it really doesn't matter...if you learn or not. Like if you come to the class and you take the notes, you have good attendance, your attitude is relatively OK, you can just turn in a bunch of crap sandwiches and get a decent grade. And whether the professor knows your name or knows anything about you doesn't really matter cause there's five hundred other people ready to take your place if you decide that's not for you. (Kate, interview, 10-1-99).

Giving students a voice in the classroom allowed students the space to safely ask questions, express their opinions, and debate critical and often controversial issues which enhanced their learning experience. Students felt valued as learners with thoughts, experiences and feelings that were worth incorporating in the classroom.

Personal process

Another strategy CEMAL instructors used to create a student-centered approach was to focus on the personal growth process of each student. As previously mentioned, students were encouraged to relate what they were learning to their own lives. Within this process, the student's whole self was considered important and worthy of consideration. A student was encouraged to explore and acknowledge their emotional and spiritual selves, for example, in addition to their intellectual and social selves. One of the ways this was encouraged was through creative assignments. Students were given creative options on almost any assignment. One student, when given the option, created a screenplay, which incorporated all the elements of a particular assignment into a creative format. This student found it an easier form of synthesis and self-expression, rather than simply writing an essay

or a paper. Another student commented, "The way that we're feeling is taken into account and we can sometimes have options of writing papers creatively or like in whatever...way we want to. We have a lot of technical freedom of expression" (Cody, interview, 9-29-99).

Another way to focus on the personal growth process of the student was to encourage students to explore their emotions in regard to what they were learning. One student remarked,

Here they actually take the time to sit down with you ask you how you feel about different things and you can tell them how you feel, you know, and they don't judge you, they just say OK this is where this person is at. And then they try to take you to the next level. So it's like they look at you from where you come, everybody comes with different experiences, different ways of understanding things and they just kinda look at where you are and they try to take you one step further (Chris, interview, 9-29-99)

In order to encourage each student's individual growth process, instructors asked students to voice their emotions. Instructors then often challenged students in an individually appropriate manner to work through their emotions and focus on personal growth. The trip to Chiapas and Guatemala was a particularly emotional time for students and one that fostered personal growth for students. One student remarked, "We got to talk to real people and got to see real tears and got to cry ourselves" (interview, Hannah, 12-9-99). During one of the instructor-facilitated group reflection periods in Guatemala, students were encouraged to explore their emotional reactions to what they had seen in Guatemala. One student wrote,

One of the reasons I feel depressed being here is that I feel that Guatemala is at the end of one long process-34 years of war and beginning another...the peace process. And how much has changed? How much have we learned? If the party responsible for most of the war crimes can win this next election, how much has changed? If President Clinton can admit to US error in Guatemala, say never again, and give military aid to Mexico, how much have we learned? If so many people fought to keep the memory of the Holocaust alive so it wouldn't be repeated, only so that it was repeated in Guatemala and people are fighting again for historic memory and genocide is being repeated in Africa, how much is changing?

Guatemala-with it's 34 years of abusive history, with the high crime rates and high illiteracy, with low voter participation, with selective amnesia, with criminals running for office-it just seems like such a desperate and pathetic situation that it drains me (Anonymous student reflection, field notes, 11-22-99).

In addition to encouraging students to explore their emotions, instructors pushed students to explore their spirituality. Especially in relationship to the Church and Social Change course, students were asked to reflect on their own religious and spiritual backgrounds and how what they were learning about gender justice in Mexico was influencing them on a spiritual level. For instance, one of the questions on a final exam provided students with the following question as one of their essay choices.

Write your own "creed"- a statement of the most important aspects of your own spirituality and theological or philosophical beliefs. What are your most sacred commitments? You may write in the form of a poem, song, or any other format. Then compare and contrast your ideas with those expressed in Claribel Alegra's "Creed" and by Latin American theologians and others with whom you have become acquainted over the semester. To what extent, if any, have your beliefs and commitments been affirmed, challenged, and/or changed by experiences this semester? Be sure to give examples from a few different articles and from as many speakers and experiences as possible (final exam, 12-14-99).

This essay question provides a good example of how instructors encouraged students to focus on their own personal growth process. The questions combines critical analysis with a focus on the personal growth of the student, asking them to explore their own spirituality and personal development in relation to course work.

Throughout the program, instructors made conscious efforts to not only acknowledge but to support the personal journey and learning process of each student. Instructors provided students with opportunities to explore their creative, emotional and spiritual selves, which encouraged students to look beyond the purely intellectual or social aspects of learning.

Each of the instructional strategies that were used to teach about social justice, critical analysis, instructional weaving, and using a student-centered approach, was significant to the overall critical pedagogy of this program. It is important to note however, that while I have separated these strategies here in order to discuss each one, in practice these strategies are interdependent and overlapping. These strategies are not mutually exclusive but instead are applied together to create a rich educational experience for students.

Discussion

Upon closer examination of the speech events in which social justice are taught within this program, we can learn more about this speech community and its pedagogy. According to Philipsen (1989), there are four assumptions which govern an ethnographic approach and these are important in relationship to speech events within this study. These are 1) shared meanings between interlocutors, 2) coordinated action in social life, 3) particular meaning and action, and 4) cultural particularity. All of the structured and facilitated classroom speech events previously described contributed to the development of the speech community in these four ways.

First of all, the classroom speech events served to create shared meanings between interlocutors. For example, in one class session that was a guest speaker-facilitated class, students were asked to write down their definitions of feminism. Students then read all the definitions of feminism and discussed the diversity of perspectives represented within the group and the implications for themselves as learners. Out of this discussion, a shared understanding of the meaning of feminism as something with a variety of definitions and meanings was developed. This understanding of the loadedness of this term became a cornerstone in future discussions of the topic of feminism.

Secondly, the classroom served to coordinate action or order in social life. In this program, classes were scheduled on a weekly calendar and all other events were structured around class times, as these were of primary importance to the participants of the program. This importance created order and coordinated action within this community. Within a class period, students understood that they could voice their opinions, ask questions, and agree or disagree with one another, instructors, and speakers. It was accepted that students could ask questions at any time during a class, could leave the class if they needed or wanted to, and that students would take notes or listen respectfully to whatever was going on in the class when they were not speaking.

Third, the classroom gave particularity in meaning and action to the community. Although the community took part in activities that were not unique to this community, such as a visit to a museum or an archeological sight, they established meaning and action that was particular to the CEMAL living and learning community. For example, when visiting one archeological site, the class session was guided by two guest professors from a university in Cuernavaca. These guest speakers focused primarily on speaking to students about how the original meanings of indigenous symbols found at the ruins have been marginalized in favor of a more Euro-centered popular interpretation of the ruins. In this way, the community developed an understanding and appreciation of "indigenous cosmovision," which was later a basis for community discussion and class assignments. Other groups visiting the same location would not necessarily have developed this perspective as they would have toured the ruins on their own or would have joined a guided site tour which would have emphasized traditional interpretations of the site.

Fourth, the classroom established cultural particularity or a community specific system of resources for making shared sense and coordinating action. Based on a variety of

experiences in the classroom, the community established cultural particularity for terms such as "liberation theology," "the feminization of poverty," or "structural adjustment." To this community, these terms became a culmination of a variety of class experiences including discussion, guest speakers, field trips, and travel which contributed to their development of a shared understanding of these terms. A community saying became "I am liberation theology," or "I am _____" (anything in substitution for liberation theology). This made reference to an instructor-facilitated class in which the instructor asked students to form a human thermometer based on how they felt they were relating to the concept of liberation theology. One student placed himself at the top of the thermometer because he explained, "I am liberation theology." This statement became a resource for the community to be used as an expression of their own personal involvement in, and relationship to, an abstract concept.

In many ways the speech events within this program, especially classroom events, served to define and give purpose to this speech community and the pedagogy used here. These speech events facilitated shared meanings between the students and instructors and served to coordinate the social life of the community that enhanced the learning process. In addition, communication within these speech events taught students about social justice by establishing particular meaning and cultural particularity.

The results of this study also show that the instructional strategies used within this study abroad setting provided learners with an educational experience that was ultimately highly rewarding. Each of the student participants reported that they felt transformed in some way at the completion of their semester abroad at CEMAL. Many reported a new understanding of concepts such as privilege, difference, liberation, education, and social justice. In addition, most students felt they learned a lot about themselves, and felt they had

new information, experiences, and confidence with which to educate others and work for social change.

This study shows critical analysis, instructional weaving and using a student-centered approach to be particularly effective elements of this transformative critical pedagogy. By using a student-centered approach, connecting a variety of concepts, experiences, and relationships through instructional weaving, and focusing on the student's personal growth process, this study abroad program stepped out of the traditional "banking" and teacher-centered educational paradigm. Students were empowered and supported in their learning process to take initiative, to be creative, and to express themselves as individuals engaged in a learning process.

The instructional methods used at CEMAL can be powerful tools in any learning environment. However, there are no doubt challenges to the implementation of these strategies or critical pedagogy in general. First of all, critical pedagogy requires an educational paradigm shift on the part of both educators and learners as to the ways that education is approached. Educators must be willing to give up a focus on covering content and move towards a learning process centered around and connected to the life of the learner. In addition, educators must be willing to confront destructive societal norms and challenge systems of oppression and exploitation. Assuming that instructors wholeheartedly embrace critical pedagogy, they may still face initial resistance from students who initially fear and reject taking initiative for their own learning or facing social justice issues and revert to a "just tell us what we need to know" stance. Another challenge for instructors may be time, both the preparation time and process time, that critical pedagogy requires. Hearing from a variety of perspectives and connecting course material to other courses, for example, may require lots of preparation time and may involve extensive networking. Empowering

students to dialogue with one another in class within a trusting community environment is a longer process than developing and delivering a lecture, or implementing a small group activity. In addition, being focused on the personal growth process of each student may require more time with students out of class. If the necessary time required to implement such a pedagogy is not supported by the educational institution, this may be extremely challenging to educators.

While there are significant challenges to critical pedagogy, the rewards where learning is concerned are great. This study shows that when the student becomes the center of learning, rather than the material or the teacher, she or he is empowered to become engaged in the learning process. Students are empowered by making decisions about what they learn and how they learn it. When instructors strategically weave material together in ways that connect it to past learning and personal experiences of the learner, as well as to other areas of academic interest, the material becomes more relevant for students. This is because instead of being isolated within one class period, learning is connected to the real life and interests of the learner. When instructors allow for flexibility and creativity based on the ability or experience of the learner, learning becomes even more personal and enriching. When an instructor focuses on the learner as a whole person, learning can be intensified because students feel that they matter, and that the learning they are doing is important, because they are important. When learning is guided so as to incorporate the whole student, including her or his experience, learning needs and interests, learning can become holistic. And finally, when learning seeks to confront destructive societal norms and challenge systems of oppression and exploitation, it not only positively impacts the learner, but education and society as a whole.

This study not only provides new evidence of pedagogy within a study abroad program; it also provides an example of a study abroad program that overcomes many of the challenges associated with critical pedagogy. The speech events and instructional strategies that are used within this study abroad program facilitate students' learning about issues of social justice in a meaningful way. Through hard work, a passion for the learning process of students, and a firm commitment to critical pedagogy, The Center for Global Education in Mexico has created a learning environment that empowers and transforms learners.

References

- Bandura, A. (1995). Self-efficacy in changing societies. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bell, S., Morrow, M., & Tastsoglov, E. (1999). Teaching in environments of resistance: Toward a critical feminist and antiracist pedagogy. In M. Mayberry & E. Cronom Rose (Eds.), In meeting the challenge. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Boston, B. (1973). The politics of knowing: The pedagogy of Paulo Freire. New Catholic World, Jan-Feb, 216.
- Bruning, R.H., Schraw, G.J., & Ronning, R.R. (1995). Cognitive psychology and instruction (2nd Edition). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill/Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Brunson, D.A., & Vogt, J.F.(1996). Empowering our students and ourselves: A liberal democratic approach to the communication classroom. Communication Education, 45, 73-83.
- Burn, B. (1980). Expanding the international dimensions of higher education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Burns, H. (2000). Teaching social justice abroad: The importance of community at the Center for Global Education in Mexico. unpublished manuscript, Oregon State University.
- Center for Global Education (1999). <http://www.augsburg.edu/globaled/mexsem.html> (4-20-99).

Crabtree, R. D.(1998). Mutual empowerment in cross-cultural participatory development and service learning: Lessons in communication and social justice from projects in El Salvador and Nicaragua. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 26, 182-209.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York, NY: Continuum Publishing Corp.

Freire, P. (1998). Pedagogy of freedom. (P. Clarke, Trans.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Galbraith, M. W. (Ed.). (1998). Adult learning methods (Second ed.). Malibar, FL: Kreiger Publishing Company.

Geary, D.C. (1995). Reflections of evolution and culture in children's cognition: Implications for mathematical development and instruction. American Psychologist, 50, 24-37.

Giroux, H.A. (1988). Schooling and the struggle in public life: Critical pedagogy in the modern age. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Giroux, H. A. (1996). Living dangerously. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Glasser, B. G., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. New York, NY: Aldine De Gruyter.

Gore, J. M. (1993). The struggle for pedagogies. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hoffmann, F. L. & Stake, J.E. (1998). Feminist pedagogy in theory and practice: An empirical investigation. NWSA Journal, 10 (1), 79-98.

hooks, bell. (1994). Teaching to transgress. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hymes, D. H. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin & W. Sturtevant (Eds.), Anthropology and human behavior (pp.99-137). Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). Models of interaction of language and social life. In J. J. Gumperz & D. H. Hymes (Eds.), Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication (pp. 35-71). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Katula, R.A. & Threnhauser, E. (1999). Experiential education in the undergraduate curriculum. Communication Education, 48, 238-255.

Kauffman N., Martin J., Weaver H., & Weaver J. (1992). Students abroad: Strangers at home. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Kolb, D. (1984). Experiential learning as the source of learning and development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Laubscher, M. R. (1994). Encounters with difference: Student perceptions of the role of out-of-class experiences in education abroad. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Lindolf, T.R. (1995). Qualitative communication research methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
- Merriam, S. B. (1993). An update on adult learning theory. In R.G. Brockett and A. B. Knox (Eds.), New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 57. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Mezirow, J. D. (1985). A critical theory of self-directed learning. In S.D. Brookfield (Ed.), Self-directed learning: From theory and practice. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 25. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- McCombs, B.L., Whisler, J.S.(1997). The learner centered classroom and school. San Francisco, CA: Josey Bass.
- Ostrand, K.D. (1986). Trips and tours: Combining theory and reality through educational travel. New Directions for Continuing Education. 30, 83.
- Philipsen, G. (1989). An ethnographic approach to communication studies. In Dervin, Grossberg, O'Keffe, Wartella (Eds.), Rethinking communication volume 2 (pp. 258-268). Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publication.
- Prawatt, R.S. & Floden, R.E. (1994). Philisophical perspectives on constructivist views of learning. Educational Psychologist, 29 (1), 37-48.
- Shelton, M.W., Lane, D. R. & Waldhart, E.S. (1999). A review and assessment of national educational trends in communication instruction. Communication Education, 48 (3), 228-237.
- Sikes Scering, G. E. (1997). Themes of a critical/feminist pedagogy: Teacher education for democracy. Journal of Teacher Education, 48 (1), 62-69.
- Sprague, J. (1992). Expanding the research agenda for instructional communication: Raising some unasked questions. Communication Education, 41 (1), 1-25.
- Van Maanen, J. (1979). The fact of fiction in organized ethnography. In J. Van Maanen (Ed.), Qualitative Methodology [special issue]. Administrative Science Quarterly 24, 535-550.
- Vogt, J. F. & Murrell, K.L. (1990). Empowerment in organizations: How to spark exceptional performance. San Diego, CA: University Associates.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Conclusion

In the process of conducting this ethnographic study, I learned a great deal about teaching and learning. I learned the value of using introspection, experience, and dialogue to confront social injustice in the classroom on a personal level. I was also able to observe and reflect on the implementation of a variety of creative and learner-centered teaching strategies, and to ask participants questions as to the effectiveness of these strategies. This has been invaluable to me in my own teaching experiences. One of the most important things I learned from this research was to see learning as a process rather than something that is content or product driven. I observed students within this program who were motivated to explore content in relation to their personal lives and a larger social structure. I noticed that course content became more meaningful to students as they were encouraged to become personally involved within a holistic learning process.

This research also raised many questions for me regarding teaching and learning. For example, one of the issues that instructors at CEMAL face is that of grading. Can liberatory education include grading? Are the two terms contradictory? Within this program the evaluative phase is often very process driven and it can be very difficult to place a grade on the learning process of a student. Yet this is what is required within the university system. Reflecting on this issue has led me to do more research in the area of authentic assessment and to explore assessment methods such as student self evaluation and peer evaluation. Another issue that has surfaced from this research is that of using critical pedagogy—a pedagogy that was developed in the two-thirds world for the purpose of liberating the oppressed—with privileged university students from the United States. Although this program engages much of the instructional philosophy and strategies of

critical pedagogy, should it really be named as such? Should we as privileged North Americans benefit from the underresourced in Mexico, learning about their suffering which we are conveniently able to leave? Fortunately, CEMAL does emphasize connectedness and solidarity, and encourages participants to involve themselves as informed activists upon their return to the United States. Emphasizing solidarity and continuing activism should indeed be an important part of study abroad that focuses on social justice in order to avoid an educational experience that is exploitative or opportunistic.

Despite these difficult issues that I confronted at CEMAL, I found this program to be a powerful place to learn. By exploring social justice issues within a cross-cultural setting, students learned about power, privilege, and solidarity. Experiencing culture shock as well as the shock of poverty, classism, sexism, heterosexism, nationalism, and racism in Mexico helped participants to really reflect on their lives and to renew their commitments to fighting social injustice.

This study provides a unique in-depth exploration of the pedagogy of one study abroad program, but it has several important limitations. The study abroad program examined here is one that is constantly changing and developing as instructors/administrators continually adjust the program to better meet the educational needs of the learners and improve the overall quality of the program. Thus, this case study is but a snapshot in the present life of this program, and this is one of its limitations. This study reflects only one semester of teaching and learning at CEMAL and took place during a term in which only a very small number of student participants were enrolled. In addition, because of budgetary concerns due to the small number of students, one of the regular CEMAL instructors was teaching in Central America rather than at the Mexico site. The small number of students and the absence of one instructor during the fall of 1999 may have

made this semester somewhat different than other semesters at CEMAL. Therefore, the results are limited and a study of this program during a future semester could potentially produce new information regarding its pedagogy. In addition, I chose to limit my pedagogical analysis to instructors at the Mexico site and did not include Guatemalan staff members who coordinate and lead the travel and learning portion of the program in Guatemala. I limited this study to the instructors I could observe and question over the entire semester. Despite these limitations, however, this study does give insight into the evolution of critical pedagogy within this program. It also shows that flexibility, creativity, and the ability to change and grow are some of the foremost strengths of this program.

Another limitation of this study stems from the research of speech events within this speech community. Classroom speech events were more easily identified and analyzed than non-facilitated out of class speech events. Classroom events were more predictable (scheduled on the program calendar) and could be easily observed and recorded in writing or on tape. Non-facilitated speech events, on the other hand, emerged at various times in a variety of locations and were more illusive in terms of analysis. These speech events were difficult to record as they occurred in informal settings and often unexpectedly. Non-facilitated out of class speech events were also more illusive because the communicative goals and norms were not usually openly identified by the members of the speech community and had to be discovered within the context of the speech. These speech events were thus more difficult to categorize and analyze in terms of their roles in the development and definition of the speech community. Therefore, in my discussion of speech events that served to create shared meanings between interlocutors, I limited my analysis to classroom speech events. Limiting the discussion in this way does not provide an entirely holistic

description of speech within this community but was more practical in terms of analysis and review.

This study abroad program serves as fertile soil in which to begin to cultivate new research regarding critical pedagogy abroad. It is significant that this study provides research concerning the pedagogy of a study abroad program, since up to this point research on study abroad in higher education has not focused on this aspect of the educational experience abroad. However, this study cannot indicate what pedagogies may exist within other study abroad programs. More research is needed as to what pedagogies are implemented in other study abroad programs and what instructional communication and methods are used in the development of higher education abroad generally. In addition, this study raises the question as to how the pedagogy at CEMAL, primarily an island program in which North American students spend the majority of their time with each other, may vary from an immersion program, in which participants' primary communicative interactions take place within the host community. Many participants of this study abroad program questioned whether or not more time spent living with host families, for example, would either negatively or positively affect the learning experience at CEMAL. Spending more time living in host families could potentially change the dynamics of education within this program, taking some emphasis away from learning about social justice within the CEMAL living and learning environment, and putting more emphasis on learning about social justice within the host community. This points to a need for more research about social justice education abroad, the instructional methods used by both island and immersion programs, and their effects on students.

This study also provides evidence that study abroad can be a valid location from which to undertake communication research focusing on social justice. The findings

suggest that learning about social justice using critical pedagogy is empowering and transformative for students. Much can be gleaned from the critical pedagogy of this study abroad program that can be applied in any course that seeks to teach students about issues of social justice. But, research is needed as to how the instructional communication and methods found at CEMAL can be applied within a course in the United States and what the benefits and limitations might be to this application. This is particularly applicable to communication courses as instructors seek to integrate social justice issues into the course material. How can communication instructors effectively apply critical/feminist pedagogy within the communication classroom? In what speech events (such as guest speakers, field trips, travel) can social justice be taught within the communication classroom? What instructional strategies can be used effectively to teach social justice within the communication classroom? More research is needed to answer these questions.

In closing, this interdisciplinary study opens the doors for further research in a variety of areas including study abroad, social justice education, critical pedagogy and instructional communication. By providing an insider's view of critical pedagogy abroad and how it can be used to transform and empower participants, this study offers an example of an educational program that is socially responsible, morally desirable, and academically enriching.

Bibliography

- Abrams, I. (1979). The Impact of Antioch Education through experience abroad. Alternative Higher Education, 3, 176-187.
- Bandura, A. (1995). Self-efficacy in changing societies. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bell, S., Morrow, M., & Tastsoglov, E. (1999). Teaching in environments of resistance: Toward a critical feminist and antiracist pedagogy. In M. Mayberry & E. Cronom Rose (Eds.), In meeting the challenge. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Boston, B. (1973). The politics of knowing: The pedagogy of Paulo Freire. New Catholic World, Jan-Feb, 216.
- Bruning, R.H., Schraw, G.J. & Ronning, R.R. (1995). Cognitive psychology and instruction (2nd Edition). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill/Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Brunson, D.A., & Vogt, J.F.(1996). Empowering our students and ourselves: A liberal democratic approach to the communication classroom. Communication Education, 45, 73-83.
- Burn, B. (1980). Expanding the international dimensions of higher education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Burns, H. (2000). Teaching social justice abroad: The importance of community at the Center for Global Education in Mexico. Unpublished manuscript, Oregon State University.
- Cnter for Global Education (1999). <http://www.augsburg.edu/globaled/mexsem.html> (4-20-99).
- Crabtree, R. D. (1998). Mutual empowerment in cross-cultural participatory development and service learning: Lessons in communication and social justice from projects in El Salvador and Nicaragua. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 26, 182-209.
- Conquergood, D. (1995). Between rigor and relevance: Rethinking applied communication. In K.N. Cissna (Ed.), Applied Communication in the 21st century (pp. 79-96). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Foss, S.K. & Berlin Ray E. (1996). Theorizing communication from marginalized perspectives. Communication Studies, 47, 253-256.
- Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York, NY: Continuum Publishing Corp.
- Freire, P. (1998). Pedagogy of freedom. (P. Clarke, Trans.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

- Frey, L.R., Pierce, W.B., Pollack, M.A., Artz, L., & Murphy, B. A. O. (1996). Looking for justice in all the wrong places: On a communication approach to social justice. Communication Studies, 47, 110-127.
- Galbraith, M. W. (Ed.). (1998). Adult learning methods (Second ed.). Malibar, FL: Kreiger Publishing Company.
- Geary, D.C. (1995). Reflections of evolution and culture in children's cognition: Implications for mathematical development and instruction. American Psychologist, 50, 24-37.
- Giroux, H.A. (1988). Schooling and the struggle in public life: Critical pedagogy in the modern age. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (1996). Living dangerously. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Glasser, B. G, & Strauss, A.L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. New York, NY: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Gore, J. M. (1993). The struggle for pedagogies. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hanvey, R. (1979). An attainable global perspective. New York, NY: Center for Teaching International Relations.
- Hoffmann, F. L. & Stake, J.E. (1998). Feminist pedagogy in theory and practice: An empirical investigation. NWSA Journal, 10 (1), 79-98.
- hooks, bell. (1994). Teaching to transgress. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hymes, D. H. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin & W. Sturtevant (Eds.), Anthropology and human behavior (pp. 99-137). Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). Models of interaction of language and social life. In J. J. Gumperz & D. H. Hymes (Eds.), Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication (pp. 35-71). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Katula, R.A. & Threnhauser, E. (1999). Experiential education in the undergraduate curriculum. Communication Education, 48, 238-255.
- Kauffman N., Martin J., Weaver H., & Weaver J. (1992). Students abroad: Strangers at home. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Kim, Y. Y., & Ruben, B. D. (1988). Intercultural transformation: A systems view. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), Theories in intercultural communication (pp.299-321) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.

- Kolb, D. (1984). Experiential learning as the source of learning and development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Laubscher, M. R. (1994). Encounters with difference: Student perceptions of the role of out-of-class experiences in education abroad. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Lindolf, T.R. (1995). Qualitative communication research methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
- McIntosh, P. (1998). White privilege and male privilege. In M. L. Anderson & P. Hill Collins (Eds.), Race, class, and gender. (pp. 94-105). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Merriam, S. B. (1993). An update on adult learning theory. In R.G. Brockett and A. B. Knox (Eds.), New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 57. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Mezirow, J. D. (1985). A critical theory of self-directed learning. In S.D. Brookfield (Ed.), Self-directed learning: From theory and practice. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 25. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- McCombs, B.L., Whisler, J.S.(1997). The learner centered classroom and school. San Francisco, CA: Josey Bass.
- Ostrand, K.D. (1986). Trips and tours: Combining theory and reality through educational travel. New Directions for Continuing Education. 30, 83.
- Philipsen, G. (1989). An ethnographic approach to communication studies. In Dervin, Grossberg, O'Keffe, Wartella (Eds.), Rethinking communication volume 2 (pp. 258-268). Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publication.
- Prawatt, R.S. & Floden, R.E. (1994). Philisophical perspectives on constructivist views of learning. Educational Psychologist, 29 (1), 37-48.
- Shelton, M.W., Lane, D. R. & Waldhart, E.S. (1999). A review and assessment of national eduational trends in communication instruction. Communication Education, 48 (3), 228-237.
- Sikes Scering, G. E. (1997). Themes of a critical/feminist pedagogy: Teacher education for democracy. Journal of Teacher Education, 48 (1), 62-69.
- Sprague, J. (1992). Expanding the research agenda for instructional communication: Raising some unasked questions. Communication Education, 41 (1), 1-25.
- Van Maanen, J. (1979). The fact of fiction in organized ethnography. In J. Van Maanen (Ed.), Qualitative Methodology [special issue]. Administrative Science Quarterly 24, 535-550.

Vogt, J. F. & Murrell, K.L. (1990). Empowerment in organizations: How to spark exceptional performance. San Diego, CA: University Associates.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.