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Abstract

In the fall of 2009, Princeton University launched the Princeton Bridge Year Program—a service-based, international, pre-freshman “bridge” or “gap” year for 20 accepted students sent to four different countries. Princeton chose the international social enterprise ProWorld Service Corps as its partner organization to run the Bridge Year Program in Urubamba, Peru. Princeton University and ProWorld Peru both state a very clear intention in running this program: to transform participants. Their explicit goal is to turn out students who have a global perspective and are compassionate, humble, aware, innovative and inspired.

But how should program-providers, out in the field, actually accomplish such a mission? This paper proposes that the key to success is reflection. It argues that an intentional, cohesive, regularly-scheduled period of group reflection, rooted in experiential education theory, is what sparks the desired shifts in student consciousness.

The bulk of the paper is a user-friendly curriculum that structures the student reflection component of international, service-based programs. Following a description of its theoretical underpinnings, the curriculum is divided into three modules—Culture, Service and Sustainable Development. Each module introduces a series of resources—articles, videos, quotations, documentaries—followed by provocative discussion questions. The curriculum is based on social justice pedagogy and promotes social justice perspectives. It is meant to incite positive discomfort in students, introducing often untouched issues, and pushing students to “un-learn” and “re-learn.” Ultimately, the curriculum aims to cultivate tough-minded, yet hopeful participants determined to join the fight for global justice.
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Introduction and Background

In the fall of 2009, Princeton University launched the Princeton Bridge Year Program—a service-based, international, pre-freshman “bridge” or “gap” year for 20 accepted students sent to four different countries. In 2008, a working group of Princeton faculty and administrators was formed to study the feasibility of such a program. In their report, they proposed that “The Princeton International Bridge Year will offer a truly innovative approach to university learning, one that is more experiential and, we expect, more profoundly transformational, than anything our entering students will have encountered in their high school years” (Tilghman, 2008, p. 1). They suggested that the Bridge Year program, “should challenge assumptions, encourage innovative thinking, and foster maturity. It will also provide a time of service, an opportunity for students to think about working with and for others, rather than simply with and for an ‘I,’ the psychological orientation characteristic of today’s intensely competitive pre-college experience” (Tilghman, 2008, p. 1-2).

Princeton chose the international social enterprise ProWorld Service Corps as its partner organization to run the Bridge Year Program (BYP) in Urubamba, Peru. ProWorld’s mission is “To promote social and economic development, empower communities, protect the environment, and to cultivate educated and compassionate global citizens” (About Us, ProWorld). More specifically, ProWorld Peru (PWP) says this about the BYP they have designed and implemented for two (going on three) years: “The BYP Program with PWP aims to cultivate global citizens by providing a 9-month, quality, safe, transformative, real-life, hands-on experience to five Princeton students before they begin their four-year university career. This bridge year includes: humble service work, profound cultural immersion and exchange, exploration of complex global issues and in-depth exposure to collaborative, grass-roots, sustainable development work.
Ultimately, the BYP with PWP seeks to inform and enrich the participants’ university career at Princeton and inspire them to passionately explore their role in addressing the world’s most pressing problems” (Kraemer, 2010).

Clearly, a common thread in Princeton’s and ProWorld’s aim with the Bridge Year Program is transformation. All actors involved in launching and implementing this program strive to make participants more global, compassionate, humble, aware, inspired, effective, innovative, and mature people. A tall order, indeed. This paper addresses the questions: How do we transform participants of international, service-based programs such as Princeton’s Bridge Year Program with ProWorld Peru? And, based on what values, principles and ideologies are we trying to make this transformation? What specific competencies are we attempting to cultivate?

In this paper, I propose these answers: We (program-providers) ensure transformative experiences by including a quality, regular, rich reflective component as part of all service-based programs we offer. This reflection should be intentional and cohesive, neatly designed around an agreed upon pedagogy, perspective and philosophy. Intentional reflection, a compliment to the usual service and cultural immersion components of international, service-based programs, becomes the necessary third leg of the stool. Without it, programs wobble in their attempts to be transformative. Many may claim that programs such as the BYP with PWP—living in a different country with a host family, integrating into the local community, taking trips to national cultural sites, all while doing service work on a regular basis—will naturally and inevitably transform students in profound ways. I beg to differ. I believe reflection is what lifts the experience from the realm of hands-on doing into the realm of mental stretching, sense-making, wondering, refining ideas and articulating positions. And this is what ultimately transforms individuals. Reflection makes the mundane meaningful. It connects practice with theory and
injects “ah-ha!” moments into daily life. It’s the difference between moving naively through our
days and genuinely striving to understand injustice in our world. Student reflection is the bridge
between implementation and transformation. *Doing* doesn’t guarantee change, *thinking* does.
The two must come as a package deal: *action must be coupled with reflection in order to truly
transform.*

As my practicum placement, I worked as the Princeton Bridge Year Coordinator with
ProWorld Peru starting in June of 2010, following the 2009-2010 pilot year of the program. As
part of my training and orientation, Bridge Year staff shared with me one of their goals for the
second year: to strengthen the program’s reflective component. In response, I implemented
“Friday sessions”—a weekly, 4-hour block reserved for the five students (with my guidance and
facilitation) to process their experience, think deeply, and ask the hard questions.

In the pages that follow, I’ve consolidated the content of nine-months-worth of “Friday
sessions” into a user-friendly curriculum that guides student reflection for an international,
service-based program. The paper begins with an explanation of the theoretical underpinnings of
the curriculum, followed by a description of the process of assessing the needs of this type of
curriculum and the content of it. Next, it describes the implementing organizations—Princeton
Bridge Year Program and ProWorld Service Corps—and their potential to lift this curriculum off
the page and actually institute it as a fixed component to their programs on a world-wide level.
Finally, in a general introduction to the curriculum, I lay out the overall competencies it aims to
instill in students. The introduction also describes the format of the curriculum and offers other
practical tips (time, materials and facilitation skills necessary for implementation) and words of
advice and caution to facilitators. Finally, an “Additional Resources” section lists several quality
sources that were not ultimately used in the curriculum.
The curriculum is divided into three modules—Culture, Service, and Sustainable Development. These topics were chosen as priorities for the curriculum based on a needs assessment (described later in detail) distributed to several people associated with the Bridge Year Program. Each module structures the exploration of these complex topics by presenting dozens of multimedia resources (videos, articles, books, quotations and documentaries) and providing suggested questions to guide discussion.

Philosophically, the curriculum promotes social justice perspectives and is based in social justice pedagogy and experiential education techniques. It focuses on structural, historical causes of poverty, injustice and inequality. It dissects topics and foments discussion by highlighting issues of power and oppression. It pushes students to ask hard questions, to dare to “un-learn” some of what they’ve been taught in traditional settings and “re-learn” based on new information and fresh experience. Ultimately, the curriculum urges students to form well-constructed stances on complicated issues and to think critically and act boldly in the face of daunting international issues. It aims to cultivate conscious, fiery, compassionate students determined to find their niche in the fight for global justice.

**Theoretical Underpinnings**

**Educating for Citizenship**

In the last few decades, many have come to believe that education is more than the transmission of knowledge. Instead, it has become more about the cultivation of civic responsibility in students, “melding the work of the mind with the welfare of the world” (McTighe Musil, p.5). McTighe Musil (2003) claims that our more interconnected, globalized world, with its increasing inequality and injustice, means that “students need to be prepared to
assume full and responsible lives in an interdependent world marked by uncertainty, rapid change and destabilizing inequalities…[with a] societal and cognitive development that results when students step out of their comfort zones into contact zones” (p.5). That is, as the world changes, education needs to keep step. International, service-based programs are ripe environments for this type of education. Programs such as the BYP with PWP pluck students from the classroom and place them into those “contact zones,” into the uncertainty of the rapidly-changing world, fostering civic responsibility and pushing students to focus on the common good rather than mere classroom success.

Yet, many claim that creating the space—offering the program—is just the beginning. Jeandron and Robinson (2010) insist that “creating a climate conducive to conversation, dialogue and deliberation is the next step” (p. 28). In order to truly advocate service and citizenship, programs must “emphasize student-centered pedagogies that foster engaged, participatory learning dependent on dialogue and collaboration” (McTighe Musil, p.5). McTighe Musil writes that a coherent strategy is needed in academia to foster civic responsibility and respond to the challenges of a globalized world. This curriculum can be a part of that strategy. By offering student-centered, discussion-based modules that structure quality reflection, the curriculum takes an international, service-based experience from an exercise in gaining practical skills to the formation of global, active, civically responsible citizens.

**Experiential Education**

The curriculum offered in this paper is justified and fueled by the principles of experiential education. The theory claims that experiences in and of themselves are not educational. Rather, education is rooted in and transformed by experience (Lutterman-Aguilar & Gingerich, p. 44).
While many may claim that study abroad programs are inherently experiential and will inevitably produce globally aware students, others insist that making programs experiential in nature requires “reflection, critical analysis and synthesis which are structured to require the learner to take initiatives, make decisions, and be accountable for the results” (Lutterman-Aguilar & Gingerich, p.43). That is, an experience in itself does not necessarily lead to increased knowledge, much less increased global awareness or transformed students. Meaning is not inherent in experience. Knowledge is socially constructed as we observe and interpret it. The processing, reflecting and interpreting is what turns experience into education, and a passive, naïve participant into a transformed, global citizen.

Experiential education theory also claims that we learn something best when we are moved by it. A program that follows experiential education theory, some say, must connect learning experiences with the lives of participants, encouraging emotional connections and therefore making learning come alive. Lutterman-Aguilar and Gingerich claim that “the experience should become an integral part of them, a chapter in their own broader evolution…the whole person should be caught up and involved; the identity of the person may be fundamentally challenged, all aspects of the person—mental, emotional, physical, are affected” (p. 49-50). The curriculum laid out in this paper reflects these principles. It helps students squeeze meaning out of daily experience. Through the resources and provocative discussion questions presented, it encourages personal, moving connections rather than distant, intellectual analysis.
Cognitive Dissonance

Social justice educator Paul Gorski (2009) uses “cognitive dissonance” in his teaching of such topics as racism, classism, sexism and white privilege. He explains that cognitive dissonance takes place when students receive new information that collides with old understanding or assumptions and therefore causes psychological stress. The theory claims that when presented with a new idea, such as the statement that “Columbus did not discover America” or “US foreign aid has done more damage than good over the last 50 years,” students will respond in different ways, but always with the ultimate goal of reestablishing cognitive balance after the mental disruption caused by the new idea. On one end of the spectrum, some students will willingly create mental space for the new information. On the other, students reject the new idea and stubbornly maintain old understandings. Gorski (2009) tries to bring students to somewhere in the middle of that spectrum. He aims to “foster an environment where students don’t automatically accept new ideas, but are willing to grapple with them, however painful or confusing it might be.” He calls this type of environment the “critical crossroads of learning” where “educational moments of truth” and “golden opportunities for learning” happen (p. 54).

This curriculum attempts to produce cognitive dissonance and bring students to that difficult—but healthy—“crossroads” of learning. It strives to incite healthy amounts of mental stress on students by presenting them with disturbing, perhaps confusing, information and asking them to dig deep in their analyses. Gorski claims that “…when we begin to recognize the ways in which we protect ourselves psychologically from understanding the complexities of the world around us, we open new intellectual windows for ourselves” (p. 55). This is the point of the curriculum. It doesn’t sugar-coat or evade the complex, controversial or confusing topics or questions for the sake of protecting students’ peace of mind. It goes right to the meaty and
disturbing material, following Gorski’s belief that it is within the dissonance that we learn best and most.

**Social Justice Pedagogy**

In his legendary book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (2010), the Brazilian educator and theorist Paulo Freire writes that the teacher-student relationship is suffering from narration sickness. He describes the traditional, “banking” method of education where a teacher “deposits” information into a passive student that becomes nothing more than a “receptacle” for that information. He claims that the content that students receive is “lifeless and petrified…detached from reality, disconnected from the totality that engendered them and could give them significance” (p.71). Students are asked to receive, fill and store. Creativity, transformation, inquiry and true knowledge are totally lacking in this system, Freire claims. “For apart from inquiry, apart from the praxis, individuals cannot be truly human. Knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry human beings pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other” (p. 72).

This curriculum is designed to turn the traditional “banking method” of education on its head. Drawing on the students’ real-life, daily experience interacting with the world and each other, the modules promote dialogue and discussion rather than “depositing” and “filling.” The modules are chalk-full of provocative discussion questions designed to spark restlessness and impatience and turn students into thinkers and doers rather than receptacles. After all, Freire (2010) writes, “The more students work at storing the deposits entrusted to them, the less they develop the critical consciousness which would result from their intervention in the world as transformers of that world. The more completely they accept the passive role imposed on them,
the more they tend simply to adapt to the world as it is and to the fragmented view of reality deposited in them’’ (p. 73). This curriculum aims to take students from passive adaptors to their world to active transformers of it.

Freire (2010) goes on to describe in detail the antithesis of the “banking method” of education, the “problem-posing method” where students are presented with the “problems of human beings in their relations with the world’’ (p.79). He writes:

Whereas banking education anesthetizes and inhibits creative power,

problem-posing education involves a constant unveiling of reality. The former attempts to maintain the submersion of consciousness; the latter strives for the emergence of consciousness and critical intervention in reality…Students, as they are increasingly posed with problems relating to themselves in the world and with the world, will feel increasingly challenged and obliged to respond to that challenge. Because they apprehend the challenge as interrelated to other problems within a total context, not as a theoretical question, the resulting comprehension tends to be increasingly critical and thus constantly less alienated. Their response to the challenge evokes new challenges, followed by new understandings; and gradually the students come to regard themselves as committed (p.81).

A service-based, international program offers incredibly fertile ground for problem-posing education. Students are faced with problems in their service work and interactions with people on a daily basis. Again, this curriculum draws from this ideal context and provides the type of
reflection that turns mundane daily life into powerful problem-posing education. What were once mere receivers and retainers of information become engaged thinkers and committed social activists.

**Social Justice Perspectives**

This curriculum is *not* politically or ideologically neutral. The modules that follow are based on Freire’s (2010) belief that “There is no such thing as a *neutral* educational process. Education either functions as an instrument that is used to facilitate the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity to it, *or* it becomes ‘the practice of freedom,’ the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world” (p. 34).

The curriculum, then, openly advocates social justice perspectives and proudly promotes social activism among students. Sleeter (1996) defines social justice perspectives as “having the perspective that allows one to take social action against social structural inequality and an understanding of oppression and inequality which allows greater insight into methods of eradicating them” (p. 239). The modules intentionally expose students to structural, historical injustices, forcing them to face reality and their role in it. The curriculum goes beyond asking students to recognize difference, celebrate diversity, examine “what we do” versus “what they do” and identify “what we can do to save them.” Instead, it encourages honest conversation about such issues as privilege, oppression, power, and imperialism—issues that often get left out of traditional curriculums.

The curriculum also promotes social justice perspectives in that it attempts to transform students’ outlook on the poor. Freire (2010) describes the psychological make-up of the
dominant, or oppressor culture that he came across in his work in literacy education with rural Brazilian peasants. He claims that people in this culture, which he also describes as exploiters, heirs of exploiters or indifferent spectators of injustice,

almost always bring with them the marks of their origin: their prejudices and their deformations, which include a lack of confidence in the people’s ability to think, to want, and to know…. [they] truly desire to transform the unjust order; but because of their background they believe that they must be the executors of the transformation. They talk about the people, but they do not trust them; and trusting the people is the indispensable precondition for revolutionary change. A real humanist can be identified more by his trust in the people, which engages him in their struggle, than by a thousand actions in their favor without that trust (p.60).

This curriculum attempts to shift students’ thinking from the oppressor’s mind-set to a real humanist’s perspective. It attempts to replace the deficit (“fixing” the people) stance with a profound trust in the people and deep relationships with them. It aims to break down the oppressor’s mindset, or what Paul Gorksi (n.d.) calls the “savior syndrome”—saving the “less fortunate” from their misery—and construct, instead, an attitude of partnership with the people in the fight for justice.
In sum, this curriculum aims to be what Freire (2004) calls a “radical educational practice” that “encourages critical curiosity,” is never neutral and is designed to cultivate “decision…world transformation and…critical insertion within the world” (p. 36).

Needs Assessment

After I had the initial idea for this curriculum, but before creating it, I designed and disseminated a needs assessment to answer the following over-arching questions: Is there a need for this type of curriculum? If so, what should its content be? What types of topics should students explore as part of a program like Princeton’s Bridge Year? I distributed the needs assessment over email to various people affiliated with the Princeton Bridge Year Program, including former participants, Bridge Year staff and ProWorld staff familiar with the program in Peru. The completed needs assessments are included as Appendices.

In alignment with much of the theory underlying this curriculum, 8 of the 9 respondents strongly believe that a structured reflective component is a necessary piece of a program like the BYP. One ProWorld staff member who helped develop the Bridge Year program in Peru commented that “…while Princeton students may be…adept at giving voice to their intellectual and critical mind, without guidance in a structured setting, they may not develop the global awareness and global citizenship that will come from guided conversation.” Another wrote that a reflective component is at the “crux of the experience…encouraging…students to employ systemic thinking that will ultimately help shape their convictions about the nature of the work that they want to do in the world.” In clear support of experiential education theory, a Bridge Year staff member stated that “reflection is a critical component of experiential learning...it is important for programs to facilitate reflection in a deliberate and structured way....Learning is
not automatic.” A second Bridge Year staff member wrote that structured reflection “pushes students when they might not otherwise have the skills, motivation or emotional energy to make sense of their experiences.”

Student participants of the 2010-2011 Bridge Year in Peru who responded to the survey reported that “a reflection component can provide meaningful perspective for volunteers. Service work, especially when done intensely, can often be disorienting and challenges many preconceptions in ways in which answers are difficult to grasp. A reflection component should help participants to begin to frame their experiences within a larger framework.” Another student wrote that the reflection component of the program gave her “a structure…to think about how to volunteer effectively, different ways to approach service, [the] context of service, and how to structure my life around civic engagement.” She went on to comment that structured reflection “made last year mean more to me than any other year. It is always important to do the service, but without reflection and introduction to developmental theory, I might not have realized how important it is to THINK about what will benefit the world. Now I want to study that!”

When asked to rate which of several topics they consider priorities for a curriculum that guides student reflection in an international, service-based program, respondents’ top three choices were Culture, Service and Sustainable Development, in that order. For this reason, these three topics have been chosen as the modules that make up the curriculum. In order to respect the page limit of this paper, only three modules were selected. For reference, however, the priorities of respondents beyond the top three were, in order of preference: Globalization, Indigenous Rights, Civic Responsibility, Wealth and Privilege, Income Inequality, Consumerism, Global Warming and Environmental Issues, and Sweat Shop and Labor Issues.
The needs assessment, although quite simple and effective, was perhaps limited in that the topics presented for ranking were listed without any description or context which may have led different respondents to perceive concepts in very distinct ways. What one person imagined the content of a “Civic Responsibility” module to be may have varied drastically from the next person’s, for example. If I had provided a short explanation of what a “Civic Responsibility” module would include, perceptions may have been more similar and the rankings could have turned out quite differently.

Nevertheless, the results of the needs assessment clearly demonstrate that people intimately involved with the BYP believe a reflective component is crucial to a quality program and that the most important modules to cover are Culture, Service and Sustainable Development.

Implementing and Collaborating Organizations

Ideally, ProWorld Service Corps and the Princeton Bridge Year Program will become the principal implementing organizations of this curriculum. The curriculum will be shared with high-level administrators in both organizations (the Executive Director and the Director of Programming of PW and the Director and Associate Director of the BYP) in hopes that they will disseminate it to field staff in their various country offices.

Princeton’s BYP office is clearly interested in student reflection. Since the kick-off of its second year and heading into its third, the BYP has worked closely with field staff to strengthen the reflective component of the program. In 2010, the BYP Associate Director provided all four on-site coordinators with a mini manual entitled “Catalyzing Meaningful Student Learning.” This packet of academic articles provided us with a theoretical launching pad for quality student reflection. Throughout the 2010-2011 program, the Associate Director was in frequent contact
with the four on-site BYP coordinators, gauging our level of commitment to the student reflection component, offering us advice and encouraging us to share resources. In preparation for the 2011-2012 program, in a recent orientation session regarding student reflection at Princeton University with BYP staff and the other on-site coordinators, there was discussion around the need for more concrete resources to structure reflection and spark quality discussions. This curriculum, then, seems to fall into very welcoming hands both in the BYP office and its implementing partner organizations.

The desire to implement a reflective component to ProWorld Peru’s programs dates back to 2009 when an SIT student doing her practicum with the organization wrote a capstone paper entitled “Experiential Education for Global Citizenship: A Program Design for Participants of ProWorld Service Corps.” The author of this paper, Bianca Anne Aguilar, argues that our increasingly interconnected world calls for educated, global citizens that are able to maneuver effectively in the era of globalization. She offers a short curriculum called the “Global Citizens Initiative” or GCI, designed to begin to cultivate global citizens and “connect the learning from their project contributions, cultural immersion, and personal reflections to new knowledge, awareness, and responsibility of local and global issues that impact their communities” (Aguilar, 2009, Abstract). The GCI consists of six modules: Orientation, Service-Learning, Social Enterprise, International Volunteerism, Cultural Awareness, Sustainable Development, The Role of Non-Profit Organizations and Re-Entry.

In 2010, another SIT student (Anna Welton) doing her practicum as the coordinator for the pilot year of the Princeton Bridge Year program wrote a capstone paper with a very similar focus: “The Global Citizen Revisited: Building Critical Consciousness in Youth Volunteering Abroad.” Based on her experience coordinating the BYP, she writes: “one of the program
component[s] that I have proposed as being crucial to a successful program is structured group reflection in which volunteers think critically about their presence in and impact on the local community in which they are working…” (p.39). The author goes on to suggest that the reflection should be based in social justice pedagogy, emphasizing structural inequalities and attention to historical oppression. She also provides two concrete educational tools to be used as reflective exercises.

So, the argument for reflection as part of ProWorld programs has been made loudly and clearly over the past several years. And the foundation has been laid: the GCI is a good start, an interesting skeleton curriculum. Welton’s argument for a reflective component with a social justice focus and the tools she puts forth are also useful. The curriculum proposed in this paper builds on this foundation built by former SIT students and ties the bow on the package of quality reflection in ProWorld programs. It forces students to dig deep into complex topics, provides more resources and more discussion than does the GCI, and takes Welton’s advice, by staying rooted in social justice pedagogy and perspectives.

Also, with Princeton looking to expand its Bridge Year program to 100 participants in the future (Tilghman, 2008, p. 2) and ProWorld in the process of expanding to six new countries by the end of 2011 (R. Webb, personal communication, September 23, 2011), the ground is fertile and the time is right on all organizational fronts to spread a quality reflective component throughout BYP and PW programs around the globe.

Introduction to the Curriculum for Facilitators

This curriculum is designed to guide student reflection for an international, service-based program. It is based in experiential education principles, cognitive dissonance theory, and social justice pedagogy techniques. It presents social justice perspectives, ultimately forcing students to
ask the hard questions and indulge in self-discovery and social transformation. It does not promote light-hearted, surface ideas. It does encourage deep, jarring analysis. (See the “Theoretical Underpinnings” section for more details of the philosophy underlying the curriculum).

Specifically, the curriculum aims to instill in students the desire and ability to:

- examine historical, structural forces and issues of power and oppression
- embrace cognitive dissonance in analyses of complex topics related to their experience in an international, service-based program and be simultaneously skeptical of and open to new ideas and shifts of consciousness
- analyze their own role in the history of oppression and injustice
- form well-articulated positions on global issues, explore concrete options for finding their future niche in the fight for justice, and plan for their critical intervention in the transformation of the world
- develop an attitude of simultaneous anger and hope that inspires life-long action and reflection

The curriculum is divided into three modules, each of which explores a complex topic that students confront through their international, service-based experience—Culture, Service and Sustainable Development. The modules are then divided into sub-sections which explore the over-riding concept, using different multimedia resources such as documentaries, videos, articles and quotations. The modules do not include detailed lesson plans. Instead, all resources are briefly introduced and then a colored box with suggested discussion questions follows. Again, discussion questions are carefully designed based on the philosophies and theories that fuel the curriculum as a whole. Often, facilitators will want to summarize and/or clarify the content of the given movie or article, before delving into the discussion questions. The curriculum does not do this for the facilitator (with some minor exceptions), although it is a very crucial step. For
example, before discussing an article on the history of development trends since the 1950s, the information in a given article should perhaps be summarized in a visual way (a short PowerPoint presentation, poster or hand-out) for students to check understanding before engaging them in the deeper reflection and discussion. Relevant quotations are offered throughout the curriculum to be used at the facilitator’s discretion, perhaps to introduce content, to stimulate a lagging discussion or to inspire a worn-out group mood.

What this curriculum aims to do—elicit paradigm shifts and awaken consciousness—takes time. It also requires a relationship and trust between the facilitator and students. For this reason, the curriculum is specifically designed for “gap” or “bridge” year students participating in nine-month programs. The modules do not necessarily need to be offered in the order they are presented here. It may very well make sense for the facilitator to jump around from module to module, depending on what students in the program are experiencing, and in what stage of their adaptation and thinking they may be. However, facilitators should keep in mind that the sections of each module follow a (loose) logical order and some sections build on prior ones while others could stand alone.

The curriculum is certainly adaptable to shorter-term programs. Facilitators could choose sections of modules that are most appropriate to the length and context of the given program. However, this selection for shorter-term programs should be done very carefully. For example, the “Motivations to Serve” piece would be appropriate for a student on a 2-week program, whereas a piece like “To Hell with Good Intentions” could be extremely demoralizing to a student on a short-term program with little time to process the weight of the article or make sense of it in the context of a longer, deeper experience.
Ideally, the facilitator should be someone that is intimately involved with the students in their experience. When students trust their facilitator they are more comfortable getting uncomfortable, more willing to ask the hard questions. When the facilitator knows her students well, she’s more comfortable pushing them a bit deeper in their analyses, rattling their complacency. Strangers trying to transform the perspectives of strangers is a naïve, futile endeavor.

Reflection should be deliberate, consistent and unrushed. A regular block of time should be reserved on a weekly basis strictly for reflection. These modules are not meant to be implemented casually during a meal or social activity. Reflection should be its own program component, deserving as much time and planning as service work or cultural activities.

The facilitator should at the very least be familiar with the theoretical underpinnings of this curriculum—experiential education principles, cognitive dissonance theory and social justice pedagogy and perspectives. Even better, she should believe in them. Otherwise, the facilitator will likely be unprepared for students’ reactions to the material and ill-equipped to support them in engaging, transformative discussion. A facilitator without conviction will likely produce students without spark.

Finally, a word on what this curriculum is not:

- It is not meant for inexperienced facilitators. As described above, the modules are designed to cause cognitive dissonance, emotional response and disturbing paradigm shifts. It takes an experienced facilitator to deal with these types of reactions and effectively lead students through them and into deep learning and social action.

- It is not a volunteer support manual. It does not cover such topics as cultural adaptation, intercultural communication, homestay adjustment, language
acquisition and re-entry. It deals instead with the analysis of complex topics rather than volunteer management.

- It is not a guide for reflection on all topics that students confront on an international, service-based program. Not even close. The topics ranked in the needs assessment (attached as an Appendix) but not addressed in the curriculum certainly deserve attention. The “Additional Resources” section at the end of the curriculum offers some ideas for where to turn for help tackling all sorts of issues that emerge for students on these types of programs.

_Dig in. Enjoy. Good luck._
MODULE #1: CULTURE

Introduction to the Module: This module explores some basic theory of culture, introducing several spectra that describe value systems that are widely considered to be the “building blocks” of culture. It also examines US American and host-country cultures, asking participants to begin to unpack and analyze their own value systems, compare them to the host-country’s and begin to explore how their values and identities may be affected by their experience abroad. Finally, it wraps up with two videos on the world wide web of rituals and touches on the importance of the preservation of indigenous cultures.

The Iceberg Model

- Ask participants: What does “culture” mean to you? Tell them to shout out answers as they think of them.
- As they shout out their answers, write them on the board (or on a piece of flip chart paper) either on the top or bottom half of the board/paper, depending on whether they belong “above” or “below” the water in the iceberg model (above = things than can be seen/heard/touched/ and that are tangible; below = invisible and less tangible, things that can’t be observed).
- Examples of things ABOVE the water: facial expressions, dress, food, dance, art, gestures, holiday customs, eating habits, religious rituals, music. This part is generally much smaller than the underwater part.
- Examples of things BELOW the water: religious beliefs, concept of time, concept of personal space, concept of beauty, beliefs about raising children, gender norms, understanding of the natural

“Culture is the shared set of assumptions, values, and beliefs of a group of people by which they organize their common life.”
Culture Matters, p.8
world, rules about social behavior, styles of communication, importance of family, concept of independence.

- When they are done shouting out examples, draw the iceberg model on the board or paper. Explain that the “iceberg” model is a common model used to explain the concept of culture. (Culture Matters, p. 10-11)

- Explain that the invisible stuff below the iceberg fuels the visible stuff above it. What we believe affects how we act. Our values inform our actions. Understanding culture means connecting what’s below with what’s above, and vice versa. Example: religious beliefs dictate religious rituals; concept of beauty informs styles of dress; understanding of the natural world may affect how humans interact with it.

**Below the Iceberg: Spectra of Culture**

- You can introduce this section of the module by presenting this image of a young, beautiful/old, ugly woman:

![Image of a young, beautiful/old, ugly woman]

In looking at this image, the facilitator should be able to see a young pretty woman looking away from the viewer, but slightly over her left shoulder. Her left ear and small nose are exposed and the eyelashes of her left eye visible. You should also be able to see an old, very ugly woman. She is looking towards the viewer and has her head tilted downward to her right, resting on her right shoulder. Her nose is huge. Only her big left eye (the ear of the pretty young woman) is visible. Her mouth is a slit you see just above the shirt collar (this is the neckline of the young woman). Showing this image to kick off this section, follow these steps:

- Ask each participant what he/she sees. Some will inevitably see the young beautiful woman, and some will see the old, ugly woman. One or two people might be able to see them both. Help all participants to see both women.
Then explain: We are all looking at the same picture. But, I see one thing while you see something entirely different. The message is this: you and I may be experiencing the same situation, but we may each reach entirely different conclusions. Just because we see the same thing does not mean we interpret it similarly. In fact, you can almost always bet that two people will interpret something they see or experience very differently.

But, what causes us to interpret things differently? The stuff below our icebergs. So, what is that stuff?

Many people describe what’s below the iceberg using various spectra that explain the range of values that most cultures possess. Some people consider these spectra or value systems to be the building blocks of culture (Culture Matters, p. 29).

Ask participants to be thinking about their experience in the host country as they look at the following spectra. Ask them to think of an example or two of what they’ll be seeing on the spectra, either from their own culture, or the host-country’s. The facilitator should offer examples of each spectra as they are presented.

The Concept of Self (Culture Matters, p. 30-32):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individualist</th>
<th>Collectivist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The individual identifies primarily with self, with the needs of the individual being satisfied before those of the group. Looking after and taking care of oneself, being self-sufficient, guarantees the well being of the group. Independence and self-reliance are greatly stressed and valued. In general, people tend to distance themselves psychologically and emotionally from each other. One may choose to join groups, but group membership is not essential to one’s identity or success.</td>
<td>One’s identity is in large part a function of one’s membership and role in a group, e.g., the family or work team. The survival and success of the group ensures the well-being of the individual, so that by considering the needs and feelings of others, one protects oneself. Harmony and the interdependence of group members are stressed and valued. Group members are relatively close psychologically and emotionally, but distant toward non-group members. Collectivist characteristics are often associated with women and people in rural settings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal vs. Societal Obligations (Culture Matters, p. 67-68):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universalism</th>
<th>Particularism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certain absolutes apply across the board, regardless of circumstances or the particular situation. Wherever possible, you should try to apply the same rules to everyone in like situations. To be fair is to treat everyone alike and not make exceptions for family, friends, or members of your in-group. Where possible, you should set your personal feelings aside and look at the situation.</td>
<td>How you behave in a given situation depends on the circumstances. You treat family, friends, and your in-group the best you can, and you let the rest of the world take care of itself. Their in-groups will protect them. There can’t be absolutes because everything depends on whom you’re dealing with. No one expects life to be fair. Exceptions will always be made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
objectively. While life isn’t necessarily fair, we can make it more fair by treating people the same way. 

The Concept of Time (Culture Matters, 103-105):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monochronic</th>
<th>Polychronic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time is the given and people are the variable. The needs of people are adjusted to suit the demands of time—schedules, deadlines, etc. Time is quantifiable, and a limited amount of it is available. People do one thing at a time and finish it before starting something else, regardless of circumstances.</td>
<td>Time is the servant and tool of people. Time is adjusted to suit the needs of people. More time is always available, and you are never too busy. People often have to do several things simultaneously, as required by circumstances. It’s not necessary to finish one thing before starting another, nor to finish your business with one person before starting in with another.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Locus of Control (Culture Matters, 143-145):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The locus of control is largely internal, within the individual. There are very few givens in life, few circumstances that have to be accepted as they are, that cannot be changed. There are no limits on what I can do or become, so long as I set my mind to it and make the necessary effort. Life is what I do.</td>
<td>The locus of control is largely external to the individual. Some aspects of life are predetermined, built into the nature of things. There are limits beyond which we cannot go and certain givens that cannot be changed and must be accepted. Life is, in large part, what happens to me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here are a few more (slightly less-detailed) descriptions of value systems found below the iceberg (Tirmizi, 2008, p. 28-31). The facilitator should think of examples of personal or country-specific examples of these descriptions to offer participants.

- Specific-Diffuse: how individuals communicate and interact with society
  - Specific: people tend to approach communication directly attention to clarity, words, frankness, facts. People rely on words and their literal interpretation and less on context and implicit understanding. Getting and giving information is the goal of communication.
  - Diffuse: indirect communication is considered acceptable and even preferred; much attention is given to contextual factors. People begin interactions with highly defined notions of how things will unfold, with a sense of working closely together, everyone knowing what everyone else knows and there is little need to be explicit. Saving face and group harmony is the goal of communication.

“Other cultures are not failed attempts at being you. They are unique manifestations of the human spirit.” --Wade Davis
• Power Distance:
  o High Power Distance: people accept differences in power and status as natural. People with power and status emphasize it and separate themselves from those that don’t have it.
  o Low Power Distance: people see power and status differences as artificial and not natural, although perhaps convenient at times. Those in power tend to minimize the difference between them and their subordinates.

• Uncertainty Avoidance:
  o High Uncertainty Avoidance: people feel uneasy about uncertainty and try to avoid it as much as possible by planning for the future. Laws, regulations and policies are very common as a strategy to keep control. Conformity and structure are valued.
  o Low Uncertainty Avoidance: people are not frightened much by the unknown and feel suffocated by too much structure, systems, rules and regulations. People tolerate differences quite well and are comfortable leaving things to fate or chance.

• Assertiveness: the degree to which people in a given culture are aggressive, demanding, confrontational toward each other.

• Performance Orientation: the extent to which a society rewards and encourages individuals for innovation and performance excellence.

• Neutral-Affective: the extent to which a society openly expresses emotions and affection.
  o Neutral: people tend to emphasize self-control by discouraging visible display of emotions and feelings.
  o Affective: emotions are expressed openly and comfortably. Interpersonal exchange is characterized by passion, gestures, physical contact in the form of touching, embracing, etc.

• Future Orientation: the extent to which a society engages in planning, preparing, and investing in the future.

**Discussion Questions:**

- Where do you personally fall on these spectra? Do you see any “personal” exceptions to what is “culturally” acceptable in your home country?
- What are some examples of what’s below your iceberg and how it affects what you do on a daily basis?
- Do you suspect that you’ve experienced any manifestations of these value systems in your time in the host-country so far?
- Have you been frustrated by any cultural behaviors or beliefs? Can you begin to explain the behavior or belief using the iceberg model?
- Do you believe that one end of the spectra is better than the other?
- Do you see a connection between culture and development? Are certain cultural characteristics associated with “developed” or “modern” societies? Why might this be? In the service or development work you do, are you advocating (imposing?) certain cultural values, however subtly?

“People from other cultures, after all, aren’t different by nature, but only different in relation to a particular standard they are being measured against.” Culture Matters, p.37
Before introducing the theme of this section (US American Values), tell students that you’d like to share with them a description of a very interesting and unknown North American tribe. Explain that they’ll read a description of the tribe, and then you’ll lead a discussion on cultural value systems and cultural awareness. The description “Body Ritual Among the Nacirema by Horace Miner” can be found here: [http://www.ohio.edu/people/thompsoc/Body.html](http://www.ohio.edu/people/thompsoc/Body.html)

“Nacirema” is “American” spelled backwards. The point of this article, of course, is to push US Americans to take a look at their own society from an outsider’s perspective. But, don’t explain this yet. Engage them in a discussion using the following questions as a guide:

- What was your general reaction to the description?
- Which of their habits do you find most peculiar and why?
- How do the Nacirema rituals compare to rituals, behaviors, attitudes of your own culture?

---

**Why are you Americans…**

*Why are you Americans…*

- Always in such a hurry?
- So concerned with getting things done?
- Always saying exactly what you’re thinking?
- Always wanting to change things?
- So impatient?
- So sure things are always going to get better?

--Culture Matters p. 134
Now, tell the students to read the word “Nacirema” backwards. Have them look at the description again and find examples of US American culture, behaviors and attitudes. Use the following questions as a guide to further discussion:

- What do you think the point of this activity is?
- What are some things that other cultures might find peculiar about US Americans?
- Are there things that have always seemed normal to you (the dentist, the psychologist, obsession with body image) that this article portrayed as strange?
- If so, how does that make you feel?
- How much have you thought about and critically analyzed your own culture’s value system and your personal values?
- What lessons can we learn from this activity for our time abroad?

Explain to participants: Now, we’ll have a closer look at what typifies US American values. Where do US Americans typically “fall” on the spectra we just examined?

Offer the following list of typical US American Values and Attitudes (Kohls, 1984, p. 2-6 & Culture Matters, p. 44):

- **PERSONAL CONTROL OVER THE ENVIRONMENT**: Self-determination wins out over destiny. Few people believe in the concept of fate. People who do are often believed to be naïve, even lazy, and unwilling to put in the effort to change their circumstances. Parents tell their children they can be whatever they want to be. It is normal and right for humans to control nature and the environment. Nature is not to be feared. Every individual should have control over whatever in his environment may be affecting him. Problems in life are one’s responsibility, not a result of bad luck or circumstance. There is nothing beyond the power of humans—anything and everything can be achieved. People are compelled to do what may seem impossible.

- **CHANGE** is seen as an indisputably good condition. Change is a synonym for development, improvement, progress, growth.

- **TIME AND CONTROL** are very important. People are generally more concerned about getting things done on time and with a schedule than with developing relationships. Time is to be controlled and manipulated. It’s considered rude to be late. Time is so important because in controlling time, people are more likely to reach their goals and be more productive. For example, a typical saying in the US is “Don’t just sit there. Do something.”

- **EQUALITY/EGALITARIANISM**: Equality is an extremely important value. God views all humans alike and therefore, all people have an equal chance to succeed in life. As a result, the janitor

---

**How Non-Americans see Americans:**

**Qualities most associated with US Americans:**

1. Energetic
2. Industrious
3. Inventive
4. Friendly

**Qualities least associated with US Americans:**

1. Lazy
2. Sexy
3. Honest
4. Sophisticated

--Culture Matters, p. 236
deserves just as much respect as the president. High-ranking officials don’t necessarily deserve special treatment—they are just like everyone else.

• INDIVIDUALISM AND PRIVACY are valued. Each person is believed to be unique. People tend to resist being identified with a group. Even if people belong to a group, they like to always be considered at least slightly different from the other members. People tend to join and leave groups frequently and easily because their identity is wrapped up more in themselves than with the group.

Privacy is a result of individualism. It is considered normal and positive to have “alone time.” People need their space to complete tasks on their own and develop/preserve their individual identities. It’s common to hear people say, “If I don’t get at least 30 minutes of alone time each day, I go a bit crazy.”

• SELF-HELP and CONTROL: Emphasis is placed on what an individual has achieved on his/her own. Someone who has “picked himself up by the boot straps and made it in life on his own” is admired. To be a “self-made” woman or man is what many strive for. The number of words in the English language that start with “self” is astounding, and many of them simply don’t exist in most languages: self-esteem, self-control, self-discipline, self-expression, self-sacrifice, self-interest, self-improvement. You are in control of your happiness. If you’re depressed, just do what you need to do to get back on track.

• COMPETITION AND FREE ENTERPRISE: Competition brings out the best in people and is encouraged from a very young age. Similarly, a highly competitive free market economy will bring out the best for society and the economy.

• FUTURE ORIENTATION: The past and the present aren’t nearly as valued as the future. People are constantly thinking about and planning for the future. We spent a great deal of time thinking about what’s to come (this week, this month, this year, in 5 years, 25 years) and how to better our conditions for the future.

• WORK/ACTION ORIENTATION: Action, in whatever form, is better than sitting still. People tend to plan for full days and it’s considered a sin to “waste time,” “lay around,” or “be lazy.” Even vacations are often meticulously planned with a full itinerary. Staying late at work is considered normal and admirable.

• INFORMALITY: US Americans are known as some of the most informal people in the world (even in comparison to Europeans), largely because of their belief in egalitarianism—all people are equal in value and deserve similar treatment and putting on airs is considered presumptuous. Dress is very informal. Some people bathe irregularly. We often greet people (even authority figures) casually. Telling a guest to “help yourself to whatever is in the refrigerator” is normal.

• DIRECTNESS, FRANKNESS: “Getting right to the point” is highly valued, even when the information being communicated may be hard to hear for the receiver. It is believed that saying exactly what one thinks is important and honest. Being clear and concise is valued. Why waste time “walking around the point?” “Saving face” isn’t important because people can take care of themselves. What other people think is not crucial to success, so saying what we think and feel is okay.
• **PRACTICABILITY, EFFICIENCY, OPTIMISM:** US Americans tend to be realistic, practical and efficient. People are quick to make decisions and don’t tend to take their feelings into account very much. It’s considered a “waste of time” to dwell on emotions. Reason and logic are highly valued. Because they believe they are in control of their environment, and they believe in doing things efficiently, they tend to have an optimistic view of the world.

• **MATERIALISM/AQUISITIVENESS:** US Americans value owning and collecting material objects, which are seen as a reward for hard work and personal success. Priority is often given to obtaining and protecting their material possessions, rather than cultivating relationships. Quickly throwing away material things to buy new ones (rather than repairing or maintaining the same objects over time) is very common.

• **SOURCE OF SELF-ESTEEM/SELF-WORTH:** You are what you achieve. You create your own wealth and worth, rather than receiving it through birthright. The first question at a cocktail party is often, “So, what do you do?”

• **ATTITUDE TOWARD AGE:** The value placed on action and accomplishment means that age is not highly valued, since older people are less capable of doing and producing. New is usually better, and older folks are often out of touch with the “new.”

• **VIEW OF HUMAN NATURE:** People are inherently good and should be given the benefit of the doubt. They are innocent until proven guilty. If someone does something bad, we look for an explanation. People should and can be trusted.

• **RISK-TAKING:** Taking risks is no big deal, because you can always start over—there is always enough to go around. “Nothing ventured, nothing gained.” Failure is only temporary. Experimentation and trial and error are great ways to learn and improve.

**Host-Country Values**

• The facilitator should use his/her own experience, or literature from the region to come up with a thorough list and descriptions of host-country values, always being careful to present them neutrally with no hint of preference or judgment.

---

**Have students read the following short story (V.Dibe, personal communication, July 2010):**

An American tourist was at the pier of a small coastal Mexican village when a small boat with just one fisherman docked.

*Inside the small boat were several large yellow-fin tuna. The tourist complimented the Mexican on the quality of his fish and asked how long it took to catch them.*

*The Mexican replied, “Only a little while.”*

*The tourist then asked, “Why didn't you stay out longer and catch more fish?”*

*The Mexican said, “With this I have more than enough to support my family's needs.”*
The tourist then asked, "But what do you do with the rest of your time?"

The Mexican fisherman said, "I sleep late, fish a little, play with my children, take siesta with my wife, Maria, stroll into the village each evening where I sip wine and play guitar with my amigos. I have a full and busy life."

The tourist scoffed, "I can help you. You should spend more time fishing; and with the proceeds, buy a bigger boat. With the proceeds from the bigger boat you could buy several boats. Eventually you would have a fleet of fishing boats. Instead of selling your catch to a middleman you would sell directly to the processor; eventually opening your own cannery. You would control the product, processing and distribution. You could leave this small coastal fishing village and move to Mexico City, then Los Angeles and eventually New York where you could run your ever-expanding enterprise."

The Mexican fisherman asked, "But, how long will this all take?

The tourist replied, "15 to 20 years."

"But what then?" asked the Mexican.

The tourist laughed and said, "That's the best part. When the time is right you would sell your company stock to the public and become very rich, you would make millions."

"Millions?...Then what?"

The American said, "Then you would retire. Move to a small coastal fishing village where you would sleep late, fish a little, play with your kids, take siesta with your wife, stroll to the village in the evenings where you could sip wine and play your guitar with your amigos."

In the large group, use the following questions to generate discussion:

- What is your general reaction to the list of US American values and attitudes? How much had you previously thought about your own value system as an individual? As part of a Western/developed culture?
- What is your general reaction to the “Mexican Villager” story? What do you think the story’s message is in relation to cultural values?
- Do you believe that US/Western values lead to happy, healthy people and countries? To a healthy earth?
- Which of the US American values or attitudes do you feel most attached to? Are you critical of any?
- Which host-country values are most attractive to you? Which are most frustrating to you?
- Do you sense that your time abroad might cause any shifts in your value systems? Or, do you sense that this might be happening already? How so?
The following two TED (www.ted.com) videos can be used to synthesize the ideas presented in the module and to engage students in further discussion on the topics of cultural diversity, indigenous cultures and the connection between the concepts of culture, development and service.


http://www.ted.com/talks/lang/eng/wade_davis_on_endangered_cultures.html:

In these two videos, anthropologist and National Geographic Explorer-in-Residence Wade Davis gives passionate lectures on the “ethnosphere”—the cultural web of life. He tells beautiful stories of the “ways of being” of indigenous cultures across the world. He explains why these cultures are disappearing and why we would all benefit from their survival.

While the central message of the 2 videos is very similar, the “Worldwide Web of Belief and Ritual” gives specific examples from the Andean cultures of Peru and Colombia, which might prove particularly interesting to students living in those or other South American countries.

Discussion Questions to follow the videos:

- What are your general reactions to the video? What feelings did you experience while watching it?
- What have you been taught about indigenous cultures in the past? What words come to mind when you think of “native” or “indigenous” cultures? What other “ways of being” have you been exposed to in your life so far?
- Do you agree that preserving the “ethnosphere” is a necessary and a good thing for the world? That “the world deserves to exist in a diverse way?”
- What about the argument that the world is getting smaller and in order to survive (and develop), cultures must “catch up?”
- What is your reaction to the following quote from the video: “These myriad voices of humanity are not failed attempts at being you, failed attempts at being modern, they’re unique facets of the human imagination, they’re unique answers to a fundamental question—what does it mean to be human and alive? And when asked that question, they respond with 6,000 different voices and collectively those answers become our human repertoire for dealing with the challenges that will confront us in the ensuing millennia.” Do you agree that beyond being “interesting” and “colorful”, indigenous cultures can offer solutions to global challenges? Or is it the “developed” world’s job to address world problems?
- What is your definition of “modern?” Do you believe that a goal of development work should be to modernize societies? What does that mean?
- Do you agree that the (unintended?) result of some development initiatives is to suppress or eradicate indigenous cultures as Wade Davis refers to?
- Can countries/cultures/societies “develop” while preserving their culture? Or does “development” work require some extent of cultural imposition/revolution? As a service/development workers, what is your attitude toward cultural preservation or change?
MODULE #2: SERVICE

Introduction to the Module: This module begins with a “lay-of-the-land,” offering statistics on different types of service among US Americans and Europeans. It then takes students through an exploration of their personal reasons for serving, challenging them to investigate how their motivations affect their daily approaches to service and pushing them to broaden and deepen their reasons to serve. The module then takes a look at the definition and component parts of the concept of service. It also presents two theoretical frameworks that break down the complex topic in different ways. Finally, it urges students to face the complicated power dynamics involved in service work.


The following information should give students a “lay-of-the-land” (in the United States) in terms of who gives, how much and to what causes.

Before presenting each section of statistics, it might be interesting to ask students to guess some of the percentages. When/if there is a striking difference in what they assume and the reality, the facilitator may want to explore why that discrepancy exists.

How much do we give?

- In 2010, Americans contributed about 2% of their disposable personal income to philanthropic causes—that number has remained remarkably consistent over the decades, regardless of the economic climate. Adjusted for inflation, total giving exceeded 280 billion/year every year over the past decade and surpassed 290 billion in six of the last 7 years.
- Individuals, corporations and foundations in the US donated 290.89 billion to charity in 2010.
- Total charitable giving rose 3.8 percent in 2010. Individuals gave 2.7% more than in 2009; corporations gave 10.6% more in 2010 than in 2009.
- Total charitable giving has increased in current dollars in every year since tracking began in 1954 with the exception of: 1987, 2008, 2009.
- Total estimated giving in 2010 is 2% of GDP (Gross Domestic Product or the market value of all goods and services produced within a country’s borders within a specific period of time). Giving slowed relative to the GDP between 2009-2010, but has been above the 2% threshold for 14 years.

Who gives?

- Individuals represented 73% ($211 billion) of the total giving; foundations 14% ($41 billion); bequests 8% ($22 million) and corporations 5% ($15.29 billion)

To whom/what?

- 35% of giving went to religion ($100 billion) which has been the largest category for 56 years; education 14% ($41 billion); human services (those affected by economic crisis, emergency basic
needs) 9% ($26 billion); health 8% ($22 billion); public society benefit (organizations such as the United Way, Jewish Federations) 8% ($24 billion); arts, culture and humanities 5% ($13 billion); international affairs 5% ($15 billion); environment and animals 2% ($6 billion); foundations 11% ($33 billion); individuals: 2%, ($4 billion.)


- 260,327 US students studied abroad for academic credit in 2008-2009, a .08% decline from the previous year (first time in 25 years that there wasn’t an increase). US participation in study abroad programs has more than doubled over the past decade.
- Top four countries remain European (UK, Italy, Spain, France—in that order); China is #5.
- Non-traditional study-abroad destinations are becoming more popular: 14 of top 25 destinations are outside of Europe and 19 of the top 25 are non-English speaking countries.
- 4% fewer US Americans studied in Europe in 2008-2009, 16% more in Africa, 2% more in Asia and 13% more in South America.
- The following non-traditional countries saw double-digit increases in 2008-2009: Argentina (up 15%), South Africa (up 12%), Chile (up 28%), the Netherlands (up 14%), Denmark (up 21%), Peru (up 32%), South Korea (up 29%)
- 54.6% of students in 2008-2009 studied abroad for short-term stints (summer, January term, 8 or fewer weeks during academic year); 41.1% studied abroad for 1-2 quarters or one semester; 4.3% studied abroad for the whole academic year.


- In 2010, 62.8 million Americans served 8.1 billion hours.
- That’s a dip from 26.8% overall national volunteer rate in 2009 to 26.3% in 2010 but the number of hours remained about the same (8.1 billion), which suggests that some volunteers served more hours in 2010.
- The peak years for volunteering are between mid-thirties and early forties.
- 17% mentored; 18.5% tutored; 26.5% raised money for an organization; 23.5% collected, prepared, distributed food; 20.3% provided general labor or transportation.
- 26.1% of college students volunteered in the US in 2010 (27% in 2009.

"Each and every one of us, frail and flawed as we may be, as inadequate as we may feel, has exactly what’s needed to help repair the part of the world that we can see and touch." —Krista Tippett

"Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has." —Margaret Mead
• 29.3% of US American women volunteered in 2010; 23.2% of men (religious institutions are most popular places for both men and women to volunteer).
• 21.2% of Millennials (born 1982 or after) volunteered in 2010.

\textit{How many Europeans volunteer? And in what?} (GHK, 2011)

• 92-94 million adults in the European Union, or 22-23% of Europeans over age 15 are involved in volunteering, with major differentiation among member countries:
  o Very high levels (over 40% of adults) in Austria, the Netherlands, Sweden, the UK.
  o High levels (30-30%) in Denmark, Finland, Germany, Luxembourg.
  o Medium High levels (20-20%) in Estonia, France, Latvia.
  o Relatively Low levels (10-19%) in Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Ireland, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Romania, Slovenia and Spain.
  o Low levels (below 10%) in Bulgaria, Greece, Italy, Lithuania.
• There has been a general upward trend in the levels of volunteering in the EU over the last 10 years.
• European adults between 30-50 years old volunteer the most frequently.
• In over half the member countries, most volunteers are active in the sports and exercise sector; and then social, welfare and health activities; religious organizations; culture; recreation and leisure; education, training and research.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Discussion Questions:} \\
\hline
\textbullet{} Do any of these figures surprise you? \\
\textbullet{} Do you think that 26\% of the population doing service work is satisfactory? \\
\textbullet{} What are your reactions to individuals being responsible for 73\% of the giving? And corporations 5\%? \\
\textbullet{} Why do you think non-traditional study abroad destinations are becoming more popular? Why did you choose a non-traditional destination? \\
\textbullet{} Do you think that the US giving 2\% of the GDP is enough? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Exploring Students’ Motivation to Serve (Adapted from Aguilar, 2009)

Ask students: why do you serve/volunteer? Why did you join a program that has service as its focus? Present the following metaphors for service and ask students which one(s) resonate with them most. After each metaphor are a few questions to help guide the discussion:

• Service as Charity—do you serve mainly to give to the needy? To save people from less than ideal conditions?
• Service as Justice—do you serve in an effort to “level the playing field” and foster more social equality?
• Service as Tradition—do you serve because it is a family value? A religious or spiritual value?
• Service as Responsibility—do you consider service a civic duty? Do you believe that privileged folks have the moral responsibility to give back?
• Service as Intercultural Inquiry/Observation—do you think about service as an investigation into another culture and a different way of seeing and understanding the world? Is service a way for you to get out of the classroom and begin to understand the world?
• Service as Peace-Building—do you believe that peace follows service? Are there ways that service works to diminish the root causes of conflict? Does building intercultural relationships while doing service lay the foundation for a peaceful world?
• Service as a Way of Life: do you look for opportunities to incorporate service into your daily life? Do you rethink aspects of your family/professional/social life in terms of service?

To promote further discussion, ask students:

- Is there a metaphor or concept that is not on the list that motivates you to serve?
  For example, “Service as…”
  - A vehicle to building relationships
  - A way for young folks to discover what they are passionate about and what their role will be in tackling global issues
  - A way to force students to be the minority for once, to be in a “one-down” position for perhaps the first time in their lives
  - A tool to debunk myths about US Americans
  - Exposure (of young folks to the world, and of host-country nationals to new ideas
  - Caring/compassion/empathy
  - A way to learn about international development work
  - A spiritual journey

- Is there anything on this list that resonates with you or peaks your interest that you hadn’t thought of before?
- When you are engaged in service work, what do you think about most—completing project goals? What you are learning? The relationships you’re forming? The beneficiaries’ perception of your work and presence in their communities? The injustice you are battling? Your privilege? The deficits or lack of skills of those you are serving?
- How do your motivations to serve affect the way you approach your work?
  The way you see the people you are serving? Can you see a link between what motivates you to serve and your overall worldview?

Tell students that as they move through their experience abroad, they might want to keep track of how their motivations to serve change. Depending on the length of the program, the facilitator may want to revisit the concept and explore how their motivations have evolved, and why.
What is Service?

Ask students to shout out words that come to mind when they think about the definition of service. Write them on the board as they say them. (Exs: compassion, empathy, hard-work, giving back, vulnerability, relationships, exchange, charity, listening, understanding, caring).

Tell students that you’d like to dissect a few of these words in an effort to understand what service really means, and to identify some of its component parts.

In this TED talk, sociologist Sam Richard takes you through a powerful exercise: putting yourself in the shoes of an Iraqi citizen who witnesses the American invasion of his country. He pushes us all to dare to leave our “tiny worlds” and enter the “tiny worlds of others,” and as a result, achieve understanding of the complex web of humanity.

http://www.ted.com/talks/lang/eng/sam_richards_a_radical_experiment_in_empathy.html

**Discussion Questions:**

- Do you think empathy is a key ingredient of quality service? Why or why not?
- How much time do you spend really trying to understand the lives of host-country nationals? The way they see and understand the world? The way they perceive and understand you, your presence in their country, US Americans in general?
- Have you had any moments in your time abroad so far where you felt you’ve been successful in practicing empathy?
- Do you think you can deeply understand the feelings, struggles, perspective of a poor person?

Tell students that in continuing to explore the definition of service, they’ll watch the following TED video, which explores the concept of compassion. Here, journalist Krista Tippett picks apart the term she suggests is “squishy” and “hollowed out,” taking us through a “linguistic resurrection” of the word “compassion” based on the “basic premise that words matter” and affect the way we interact with our world.

http://www.ted.com/talks/krista_tippett_reconnecting_with_compassion.html

**Discussion Questions:**

- Where does compassion fit into service work for you?
- Krista Tippett talked about the difference between tolerance and compassion, tolerance being “too cerebral to elicit guts, hearts…when the going gets rough.”
- Do you feel like you employ tolerance or compassion more in your service work? Can you give any examples?
• She also says that “curiosity without assumption is the breeding ground for compassion.” What is your reaction to that statement? In your service work, do you feel you are curious without assuming or judging?
• She says that “compassion seeks physicality.” Can you relate to this idea in any of the physical labor you’ve done as part of your service work?
• She also claims that compassion is beauty, and the ability to see what’s beautiful in people, not just what they lack. What do you think is beautiful about the people you serve?

“Compassion is not a sloppy, sentimental feeling for people who are underprivileged or sick...it is an absolutely practical belief that, regardless of a person’s background, ability or ability to pay, he should be provided with the best that society has to offer.” – Neil Kinnock

Unpacking the Concept of Service

Tell students that in this section, you’ll present a few theoretical models which will hopefully give them different ways of structuring their thinking about the big, complex concept of service.

Theoretical Framework #1

Keith Morton (1995): Charity, Project and Social Change (This section is also adapted from S.Leroy, personal communication, March 2011)

The full-text of the article can be found here:
http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/mjcs1/3239521.0002.102/1?view=image

Morton breaks “service” down into three categories or paradigms and defines each:

1) Charity = “The provision of direct service where control of the service (resources, and decisions affecting their distribution) remain with the provider.” (p. 21) No claims are made regarding impact. There is little to no discussion of structural causes of poverty.

2) Project = “Defining problems and their solutions and implementing well-conceived plans for achieving those solutions.” (p.21)

3) Advocacy (transformation/social change) = “Building relationships among or within stakeholder groups, and creating a learning environment that continually peels away the layers of the onion called ‘root causes.’ (p. 22) It assumes that the problems of the poor are a result of systemic injustice. People affected are involved in the change-making process. It is a process of politically empowering the powerless, of joining them in their struggle.

He goes on to say that each form has a “thin” (“disempowering and hollow” (p. 25) and a “thick” version (“sustaining and potentially revolutionary” (p. 25).

He argues that we should work to move deeper into the thicker versions of our service work, regardless of what paradigm we are working in.

Morton describes the criteria for both “thin” and “thick” service work:

“Service is the process of integrating intention with action in the context of a movement toward a just relationship.”
--Morton
Morton goes on to discuss the thin and thick versions of each paradigm. Before you present the following table, ask students what they think might be some examples of thin and thick versions of each paradigm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charity</th>
<th>Thin</th>
<th>Thick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>--“superior class achieving merit by doing things gratuitously for an inferior class” (p. 27)</td>
<td>--offers a coherent worldview, begins with it an individual grounded in a community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>--bears witness to the worth of others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>--represents an ideal way of being in the world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>--may bring unintended, negative consequences</td>
<td>--planning and delivering efficiently (working smarter with resources available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>--can create a dependency on external “expert”</td>
<td>--no solutions are the ultimate; flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>--“expert” versus locals inflames power differential and social divisions</td>
<td>--thoughtful, reasoned approaches leading to measurable action which is an appropriate response to community needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>--Project goals driven by funders rather than community needs</td>
<td>--encourage participation of those served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>--local organization and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thin</th>
<th>Thick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without Integrity</td>
<td>With Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-serving</td>
<td>Building bridges and making connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>Increasing mutual understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnifying or institutionalizing power inequalities, creating unsustainable dependencies</td>
<td>Empowering one another and nullifying social divisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising false expectations</td>
<td>Resulting in long-term and sustainable change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflaming social divisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving people tired and cynical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POSITIVE DISCOMFORT: STRUCTURED STUDENT REFLECTION IN INTERNATIONAL SERVICE-BASED PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy/Social Change</th>
<th>expertise valued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--sells ideas</td>
<td>--deep relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--rhetorical, narrowly selfish</td>
<td>--helps others discover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--organizes people around issues</td>
<td>their interests and dreams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--based on getting rid of some bad things rather than creation, education</td>
<td>--organizes people around values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--dissolves into anger, only “against” without offering alternatives</td>
<td>--brings values, actions and the world into closer alignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Unlike solidarity, which is horizontal and takes place between equals, charity is top-down, humiliating those who receive it and never challenging the implicit power relations. In the best of cases, there will be justice someday, high in heaven. Here on earth, charity doesn’t worry injustice, it just tires to hide it.” —Eduardo Galeano

Discussion Questions:

- What are your general reactions to the 3 paradigms?
- What are the paradigms’ pros and cons as you see them, perhaps based on your practical experience doing service? (Exs: charity offers quick solution to dire situations but power remains with the servant, focus on deficiencies, can create dependency; projects may involve beneficiaries more, but rely on role of “experts,” who may see things differently than locals, can be more focused on proving “results” rather than meeting needs; advocacy can lead to sustainable, large-scale change but can be very slow, risky)
- How would you categorize the type of service work you are doing?
- Are you doing “thin” or “thick” service work? Explain and give concrete examples. How can you go deeper into the thicker versions of your work?
- Morton says each paradigm is based on a particular worldview, on distinct values and beliefs about how to identify and address problems, and hence, it is not a continuum (as many other experts say), and that we are all most comfortable in one paradigm rather than moving through each as we mature in our service work? Do you agree? Do you relate much more strongly to one over the other? Are your skills more appropriate to one paradigm? If so, can you see a link between that paradigm and your worldview?
- Morton argues that, done well, all 3 paradigms can lead to the transformation of both the volunteer and the community. Do you agree? Do you see all 3 paradigms as equal in value and effectiveness?
- Morton writes a lot about the paradigms of service in relation to the servant (the volunteer), and which model he/she is best “wired for.” But, which paradigm is
most effective for the beneficiary? For the host-country? For the problem at hand? Are all models equally effective for all problems?

- Think back on your idea of service before you joined this program. Has it developed? How?

Theoretical Framework #2

*Paul Gorski’s 5 Approaches to Anti-Poverty Work*: Tell students that to build on Morton’s ideas and continue to “unpack” the concept of service, you’ll be looking at a second framework that lays out 5 approaches to anti-poverty work (Gorksi, n.d. & Gorksi personal communication April 2010).

1) **Charitable Giving**: Donation of money or goods (blankets and gifts during holiday season), distance between donor and beneficiary, eases the conscience of the donor but donor doesn’t associate in any deep way with the issue; no attention to systematic structural issues.

2) **Fixing or Saving the Poor**: Underlying assumption is that poverty is the result of what people lack. Focuses on strengthening their work ethics and morals; “equipping” the poor to pull themselves out of poverty. Insinuates moral superiority, suggests supremacy and flaunts privilege; frames the organization/person as the “savior” of the pitiable poor, common in religious-based organizations. Fixing them as opposed to what oppresses them.

3) **Individual Advocacy**: Building personal relationships with individuals that are less privileged than you; involves deep empathy for ways people suffer from injustice on an individual level; serving as an ally or advocate for individuals; begin to acknowledge systemic issues but not quite ready to risk own privilege in pushing for systemic change.

4) **Service and Volunteerism**: *active* involvement in efforts to fight injustice beyond an individual advocacy level; working with oppressed communities, avoiding the “savior syndrome;” includes discussions about how relative wealth of the volunteer is connected to the relative poverty of beneficiary.

5) **Systemic Reform for Social Justice**: fighting for larger social change; organizing and acting on a larger scale to fight the forces that create the cycle of poverty; pushing for policy change; thinking critically and acting against many of the systems we have been socialized to accept without question: consumerism, globalization, corporate capitalism, meritocracy; recognition that real change comes when access and opportunity are distributed equitably on a global level; “less interested in celebrating diversity than in transforming institutions for equity and justice; less interested in lifting individuals out of poverty than in demanding the eradication of poverty.”

“*If you have come here to help me, you are wasting your time. But if you have come because your liberation is bound up with mine, then let us work together.*” – Lila Watson, Australian Aboriginal woman
Discussion Questions:

- What are your general reactions to these stages?
- Which category is most aligned with your understanding of (and experience with) service work? Do you find yourself currently drawn to one category more than others? Has your understanding changed over time?
- In which category (or categories) would you place the service work you’re currently involved in? Why?
- Gorski talks about the “deficit ideology”, describing it as the tendency of people to identify the problem within the disenfranchised community, rather than as that which disenfranchises them. He argues that there is no better way to maintain the status quo and not disturb the power structures that are in place in our society. Do you agree or disagree? Is any part of your service work based on a “deficit ideology?” How much time do you spend thinking about the strengths of the people you serve? What they do well, maybe even better than you?
- Gorski differentiates between intent and impact, arguing that service-learning programs that put people with good intentions to work (such as wealthy kids doing neighborhood clean-ups in ghettos) can actually have a negative impact because they maintain social and political hierarchies. Do you agree? What impact is your service work having (positive and/or negative)? Does the service work you’re involved in preserve unjust power structures? What type of damage might you be doing in your work? How might you tweak your service work to do less damage?
- He also argues that anti-poverty efforts are “stuck in a state of sustenance,” devoting resources to sustaining oppressed people in states of oppression rather than eliminating oppression all together. For example, an organization that provides professional suits and job training for women to get in the work force never addresses the factors that got women out of the work force in the first place—sexism, racism, single parenthood, domestic violence, unjust drug laws…) What do you think? Is your service work sustaining poverty or truly battling it?

“You’re alive. Do something. The directive in life, the moral imperative was so uncomplicated. It could be expressed in single words, not complete sentences. It sounded like this: Look. Listen. Choose. Act.” --Barbara Hall
Power Dynamics in Service

Have students read Ivan Illich’s famous speech “To Hell with Good Intentions” which can be found here: http://www.swaraj.org/illich_hell.htm

Discussion Questions:

- What are your general reactions to the article?
- In a conversation with Ivan Illich, how would you defend your decision to come serve abroad? (exs: longer-term nature of some programs allows for less shallow work and true exchange; some programs do provide good training to neutralize harm; we can’t promote world peace and find solutions to cultural clashes if we’re not interacting with each other and trying to understand each other; shifts in perspective are extremely necessary to change American mentalities and therefore battle injustice; isn’t it human to want to help those that suffer?)
- Had you thought about the notion that service can do damage rather than (or in addition to) good? How might your service work be doing damage? How do you justify that damage is perhaps being done?
- Do you sense that your service work is an (intentional or unintentional) propagation of the US American way of life? Why or why not? How would you respond to someone like Illich who claims that service work is nothing but cultural imperialism?
- Who do you think is benefitting most from your presence in the host country— you or the people you serve? If you think you are benefitting more, how do you justify that?
- Illich says, “There is no way for you to really meet with the underprivileged, since there is no common ground whatsoever for you to meet on.” Do you agree? Do you feel like you’ve truly connected with host-country nationals? Or only the middle class?
- He also says, “If you insist on working with the poor, if this is your vocation, then at least work among the poor who can tell you to go to hell. It is incredibly unfair for you to impose yourselves on a village where you are so linguistically deaf and dumb that you don’t even understand what you are doing, or what people think of you.” How much time do you spend thinking about how host-country folks think of you? Of the culture shock they might experience having met you? Have you thought about working with the US American poor? How do you justify doing service in a foreign country, rather than in your own?
MODULE #3: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Introduction to the Module: This module kicks off with a brief section called “The State of the World,” which presents a series of statistics in answer to the question, “Why develop?” Next, a few different definitions of sustainable development are presented for exploration and discussion. The following section describes in detail the major “actors” involved in the international development landscape and then explores a short article that takes a critical look at the consequences of some of the policies of a few of those major actors. Next, the module delves into the history of international development trends. Finally, in an attempt to summarize much of the content of the module with a real-life example, the last section presents a case study of development efforts in Haiti.

The State of the World: Why “develop?”

Offer the following statistics to open this section (Gorksi, n.d. & Global Issues n.d.). You may also want to add statistics from the region and country the students are working in:

- Approximately 16,000 people die worldwide each day due to hunger-related causes.
- Roughly 50% of the world’s population lives on less than the equivalent of $750 per year.
- Almost half the world—over 3 billion people—live on less than $2.50 a day.
- At least 80% of humanity lives on less than $10 a day.
- 22,000 children die each day due to poverty.
- The wealth of the three richest people in the world is roughly equal to the Gross Domestic Product of the 49 poorest countries combined.
- Nearly a billion people entered the 21st century unable to read a book or sign their names.
- An estimated 40 million people are living with HIV/AIDS, with 3 million deaths in 2004. Every year there are 350–500 million cases of malaria, with 1 million fatalities.
- Some 1.1 billion people in developing countries have inadequate access to water, and 2.6 billion lack basic sanitation.
- Number of children in the world: 2.2 billion. Number of children in poverty: 1 billion.
- The GDP (Gross Domestic Product) of the 41 Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (567 million people) is less than the wealth of the world’s 7 richest people combined.
- In 1960, the 20% of the world’s people in the richest countries had 30 times the income of the poorest 20% — in 1997, 74 times as much.
- For economic growth and almost all of the other indicators, the last 20 years of the current form of globalization, from 1980 – 2000 have shown a very clear decline in progress as compared with the previous two decades, 1960 - 1980.
- For every $1 in aid a developing country receives, over $25 is spent on debt repayment.
- According to the UNDP, in 1998 $780 billion went towards military spending in the world, $8 billion was spent on cosmetics in the US, $17 billion on pet foods in Europe and the US, $105 billion in alcoholic drinks in Europe. In that same year, $6 billion was spent on basic education for all, $9 billion on water and sanitation for all, $12 billion on reproductive health for women, $13 billion on health and nutrition for all.
Discussion Questions to Follow “State of the World: Why Develop?”:

- What is your general reaction to these statistics? What were you feeling as you read them?
- Why do you think these conditions exist?
- Why do you think such poverty exists in the midst of such wealth?
- Were you aware that these conditions exist before you participated in this program? If not, why not?
- Why do you think the statistics show that people value cosmetics and pet food more than universal education and health? Do your personal decisions contribute in any way to these global priorities?

Definitions of Sustainable Development

Begin by asking students: What words come to mind when they think of the concept of “sustainable development?” Could anyone take a stab at a definition?

Introduce the following definitions from various sources:

1) “Development in its broadest sense is any process that promotes the dignity of a people and their capacity to improve their own lives…the Peace Corps uses the term ‘development’ in human, people-to-people terms: helping people develop the capacity to improve their own lives.” (Roles of the Volunteer in Development, p.7)

2) “Sustainability is as community’s control and prudent use of all forms of capital—nature’s capital, human capital, human-created capital, social capital, and cultural capital—to ensure, to the degree possible, that present and future generations can attain a high degree of economic security and achieve democracy while maintaining integrity of the ecological systems upon which all life and all production depends.”

Nature’s capital = the “stock that yields the flow of natural resources.”

Human capital = “the people and the bodies of knowledge that contribute to community and to production.”

Human-created capital = “products and technologies created by humans, including the built environment.”

Social capital = “the civic-ness of life…including such things as participation in the political life of the community, newspaper readership, and membership in associations…the reservoir of mutual trust, civic involvement, and reciprocity…”

Cultural capital = “factors that provide human societies with the means and adaptations to deal with the natural environment and to actively modify it…the life stories and creation myths…the dream of a universe.” (Viederman, 1996, p.46)
3) Sustainable development is...a pattern of social and structural economic transformations (i.e. development) which optimizes the economic and other societal benefits available in the present, without jeopardizing the likely potential for similar benefits in the future.” (Norgaard, 1994, p. 17)

Discussion Questions to follow the definitions of “Sustainable Development”:

- Which definition, or pieces of definitions, resonates with you most? Why?
- How are the definitions similar? Different?
- How does the definition you use for “sustainable development” influence or inform the “development” or service work you do?

“[Globalization’s] whole purpose is to institutionalize inequity. Why else would it be that the United States taxes a garment made by a Bangladeshi manufacturer twenty times more than a garment made in Britain? Why else would it be that countries that grow cocoa beans, like Ivory Coast and Ghana, are taxed out of the market if they try to turn it into chocolate? Why else would it be that countries that grown 90 percent of the world’s cocoa beans produce only 5 percent of the world’s chocolate? Why else would it be that countries that spend over a billion dollars a day on subsidies to farmers demand that poor countries like India withdraw all agricultural subsidies, including subsidized electricity? Why else would it be that after having been plundered by colonizing regimes for more than half a century, former colonies are steeped in debt to those same regimes and repay them some $382 billion a year?” –Arundhati Roy, from Introduction of Pedagogy of Indignation by Paulo Freire
Lay of the Land: Major Actors in the Development Community

Present students with the following visual of the major actors in the development community:

(B.Dwyer, personal communication, March 2006)
Offer students the following descriptions of each major “actor:”

**United Nations (UN):** The United Nations is an international organization founded in 1945 after the culmination of World War II. The UN was founded by 51 countries with the goal of “maintaining international peace and security, developing friendly relations among nations and promoting social progress, better living standards and human rights.” Today, with 198 member countries, the organization has an extremely wide reach across the globe and has its hands in a huge amount of initiatives such as: sustainable development, disaster relief, conflict prevention and resolution, promoting democracy, gender equality, economic and social development, human rights, and international health.

**The United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR):** This office heads up all human rights efforts within the United Nations. Their mission statement is: “to work for the protection of all human rights for all people; to help empower people to realize their rights; and to assist those responsible for upholding such rights in ensuring that they are implemented.” The office pays particular attention to the most acutely vulnerable populations, as well as to the “realization of civil, cultural, economic, political, and social rights, including the right to development” (Mission Statement, n.d.)

“All truly ethical and genuinely human actions are born from two contradictory feelings, and only from those two: love and anger.” (Nita Freire, Introduction to Pedagogy of Indignation)

**Universal Declaration of Human Rights:** In the wake of the destruction of World World II, the international community vowed to never again allow such violence and atrocities. After two years of negotiations, in 1948 the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was created as a road map to guarantee the rights of individuals all over the globe and adopted by 50 member states, with 8 nations abstaining but not dissenting (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, n.d.).

**The United Nations Development Program (UNDP):** The UNDP is the United Nations “global development network, an organization advocating for change and connecting countries to knowledge, experience and resources to help people build a better life.” The UNDP network supports 177 countries in their efforts to reach their own development objectives as well as internationally agreed-upon initiatives such as the Millennium Development Goals. Their focus is mainly on the following 5 categories: Democratic Governance, Poverty Reduction, Crisis Prevention and Recovery, Environment/Energy and HIV/AIDS. The UNDP claims to focus on human rights, capacity development and women’s empowerment in all that they do (About Us, UNDP).

“Recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world.”

--Preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948
**Millennium Development Goals:** In September of 2000 world leaders convened at the United Nations Headquarters in New York to adopt the United Nations Millennium Declaration, stating their country’s commitment to combating global poverty. The conference produced a list of 8 time-bound goals--to be reached by 2015--known as the Millennium Development Goals.

The over-arching MGDs are: Cut Poverty and Hunger by Half, Achieve Universal Primary Education, Gender Equality in Education, Reduction of Child Mortality, Improve Maternal Health, Combat HIV/AIDS, Ensure Environmental Sustainability and Develop a Global Partnership for Development (Background, Millennium Development Goals)

**World Bank:** Along with the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank was formed in 1944, at a conference in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire which was convened by leaders of the United States and England after the end of World War II. The conference was called with the goal of forming multilateral institutions that would be charged with leading post-war reconstruction and ensuring a liberal, capitalist world economy. As a result of this conference, the World Bank was given the task of giving post-war development loans for infrastructure projects and promoting private foreign investment through guarantees or loans and other investments by private investors (Danaher, 77).

Since that original mandate of post-war reconstruction, the Bank’s mission has evolved to focus more on worldwide poverty reduction, “through an inclusive and sustainable globalization.”

Their website says this: “The World Bank is a vital source of financial and technical assistance to developing countries around the world. Our mission is to fight poverty with passion and professionalism for lasting results and to help people help themselves and their environment by providing resources, sharing knowledge, building capacity and forging partnerships in the public and private sectors…we provide low-interest loans, interest-free credits and grants to developing countries for a wide array of purposes that include investments in education, health, public administration, infrastructure, financial and private sector development, agriculture and environmental and natural resource management.”

“One certainty...of today is that if we do indeed wish to overcome the disequilibrium between North and South, between power and fragility, between strong economies and weak economies, we cannot afford to be without ethics, but obviously not the ethics of the market. If we seek to amply and deeply overcome that divide, we require other values, ones that cannot be generated within structures devoted to the forging of unbridled profit or within an individualistic vision for the world, a survival-of-the-fittest sort of mentality.” (Freire, Pedagogy of Indignation, p. 117)
The Bank focuses on the Millennium Development Goals, as well as six strategic themes, which frame their efforts: the Poorest Countries, Post-Conflict and Fragile States, Middle-Income Countries, Global Public Goods, the Arab World, Knowledge and Learning.

The bank is owned by its 187 member countries, or shareholders. A country interested in becoming a member of the Bank must already be a member of the International Monetary Fund. A Board of Governors represents all shareholders and is made up of the minister of finance or minister of development of each member country. The Board of Governors meets annually. The Board of Governors delegate more frequent duties to 25 Executive Directors. The 5 largest stakeholders (United States, France, Germany, Japan and the United Kingdom) appoint an Executive Director as do China, the Russian Federation and Saudi Arabia. The rest of the countries are represented by the remaining Executive Directors. The President of the Bank is selected by the Board of Directors for a 5-year, renewable term.

The World Bank (and the IMF) runs on a weighted system of voting. Their web site says this: “A country applying for membership in the Fund is required to supply data on its economy, which are compared with data from other member countries whose economies are similar in size. A quota is then assigned, equivalent to the country's subscription to the Fund, and this determines its voting power in the Fund. Each new member country of the Bank is allotted 250 votes plus one additional vote for each share it holds in the Bank's capital stock. The quota assigned by the Fund is used to determine the number of shares allotted to each new member country of the Bank.” (The World Bank, n.d.).

International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank: Formed at the same Bretton Woods conference as the World Bank, the IMF was established to oversee the international monetary system by ensuring exchange rate stability and encouraging countries to eliminate restrictions that slow down trade. The founders of the institution believed that such an institution and strategy would prevent a repeat of the economic policies that led to the Great Depression (The International Monetary Fund, n.d.).

Today, the IMF keeps track of the economic well-being of its 187 member countries and provides them with policy advice. It “promotes international monetary cooperation and exchange rate stability, facilitates the balanced growth of international trade, and provides resources to help members in balance of payments difficulties or to assist with poverty reduction” (The International Monetary Fund, n.d.). The IMF’s activities fall into 4 main categories: surveillance (monitoring global, regional and national economic developments); technical assistance in training (in areas such as fiscal policy, regulation, statistics, banking supervision), lending, and research and data.

Like the World Bank, the IMF has an almost-global membership of 187 countries. To become a member, a country must be accepted by the majority of the country members. The IMF is much like the World Bank in its voting system. Its web page explains the following: “Upon joining, each member of the IMF is assigned a quota, based broadly on its relative size in the world economy. The IMF's membership agreed in May 2008 on a rebalancing of its quota system to reflect the changing global economic realities, especially the increased weight of major emerging markets in the global economy...The quota largely

“Abject poverty in the midst of opulence is an expression of the perversity of an economy built according to market ethics, a dog-eat-dog, survival-of-the-fittest, every-man-for-himself mentality.”

--Paulo Freire, Pedagogy of Indignation
determines a member's voting power in IMF decisions. Each IMF member has 250 basic votes plus one additional vote for each SDR 100,000 of quota. Accordingly, the United States has 371,743 votes (16.77 percent of the total), and Palau has 281 votes (0.01 percent of the total). The newly agreed quota and voice reform will result in a significant shift in the representation of dynamic economies, many of which are emerging market countries, through a quota increase for 54 member countries. A tripling of the number of basic votes is also envisaged as a means to give poorer countries a greater say in running the institution.”

Much like the World Bank, the IMF is run by a Board of Governors, representing all 187 member countries. An Executive Board runs the Fund on a daily basis and is made up of 24 members, representing all 187 members. Large economies such as the United States and China have their own seat at the Executive Board table, while other countries are grouped into constituencies (International Monetary Fund, n.d.).

Regional Development Banks: These regional banks are very similar to the World Bank and the IMF in structure and operation. The Inter-American Development Bank, for example, was established in 1959 and is the largest source of development funding for its 48 member countries throughout Latin America and the Caribbean. This regional bank seeks to reduce poverty and inequality and “bring about development in a sustainable, climate-friendly way” (About Us, IADB). The bank offers assistance to central governments, provinces, municipalities, private firms, non-governmental organizations and autonomous public institutions in the form of loans, grants, project design and technical assistance and knowledge for development interventions.

National Government Agencies: This is a broad category that includes institutions such as: the United States Peace Corps, the United States Agency for International Aid (USAID) or equivalents in other countries (such as Canadian International Development Agency or CIDA), Ministries of Education and Health, other national government ministries that are charged with development initiatives (such as the new Ministry of Development and Social inclusion in Peru or the Local Development and Social Investment Fund (FISDL) in El Salvador (B.Dwyer, personal communication, March 2006).

Local Governments: Rather self-explanatory, this category includes local-level, municipal governments or town halls. Often in partnership with national government agencies, NGOs, nonprofits and even regional development banks, local governments are often involved in the implementation of a variety of development activities (B.Dwyer, personal communication, March 2006).

NonProfits, NGOs, Foundations, Social Businesses/Enterprises: In this category are specific “third sector” entities, or organizations and institutions that work in the gap left by the failure of the public and

"Like a boil that can never be cured so long as it is covered up but must be opened with all its ugliness to the natural medicines of air and light, injustice must be exposed, with all the tension its exposure creates, to the light of human conscience and the air of national opinion before it can be cured." MLK, Letter from Birmingham Jail, April, 1963

Local Governments: Rather self-explanatory, this category includes local-level, municipal governments or town halls. Often in partnership with national government agencies, NGOs, nonprofits and even regional development banks, local governments are often involved in the implementation of a variety of development activities (B.Dwyer, personal communication, March 2006).

NonProfits, NGOs, Foundations, Social Businesses/Enterprises: In this category are specific “third sector” entities, or organizations and institutions that work in the gap left by the failure of the public and
private sectors to provide fully for the needy. Nonprofits (or not-for-profit institutions) refer to any type of “third sector” organization working in value-driven activities towards a social benefit—for example, heritage conservation, arts, culture or recreation. NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations) are a sub-set of nonprofits that are exclusively focused on “development” tasks, broadly defined as poverty reduction (Lewis, p. 333).

Foundations are another sub-sector of non-profits that typically donate funds and support to other organizations, or provide their own funding (through private donations) for their own charitable purposes. A social business or social enterprise is “any business venture created for a social purpose–mitigating/reducing a social problem or a market failure–and to generate social value while operating with the financial discipline, innovation and determination of a private sector business” (Virtue Ventures, n.d.). These are hybrid organizations that combine the revenue generating efficiencies of a for-profit entity with the development focus of non-governmental organizations.

The Third World Debt Crisis

Begin this section by asking students: Why are poor people poor? What makes rich countries rich and poor countries poor? How did things get to where they are today with a rich North and a poor South, a “First” and “Third” World, “developed” and “developing countries? The facilitator should simply listen at this point without offering any of his/her perspective, allowing students to throw their ideas around. You might want to list the ideas that emerge from this discussion and keep the list up in a visible spot. Some of students’ ideas may be challenged as they dig into the material of this module, so referring back to their original thoughts may be enlightening.

Have students read the excerpt of the article “Debt: The New Colonialism” by Jean Somers (pp. 78-81) and the short description of “Structural Adjustment Policies” (p. 82), both of which can be found here: http://books.google.com/books?id=gfv2NePkYngC&pg=PA78&lpg=PA78&dq=Debt+the+new+colonialism+jean+somers&source=bl&ots=BsFa167vNi&sig=eVdzMz55wmmnVAreXu90iapWXpns&hl=en&ei=uNuoTrCIJOL10gGSiai3Dg&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=4&ved=0CDsQ6AEwAw#v=onepage&q=Debt%20the%20new%20colonialism%20jean%20somers&f=false.

The Somers piece is a jarring description of the history of the current, dire situation of third world debt to developed nations. It sheds light on the institutions—Northern Governments, the World Bank and the IMF—that are largely responsible for the debt crisis and it details the very human consequences of the decisions made by those institutions.

**Discussion Questions to follow “Debt: The New Colonialism” and “Structural Adjustment Policies”:**

- What are your general reactions to these articles? What were you feeling as you read them?
- Had you ever heard about the debt crisis of third world countries before? If not, why not?
- If entities like the World Bank and IMF claim to exist to help poor countries’ progress, how could the decisions they’ve made in the last 30 years—harshly punishing countries that threatened to limit their repayments, refusing to cancel debt, imposing policies that slash public spending on such things as health and education, keeping countries in situations where
they are spending more of their national budgets on debt repayment than on basic services for their citizens--be explained?
• If asked by a poor peasant in Peru, for example, why he shoulders the burden of his country’s debt to Northern governments, when he never asked to go into debt in the first place, what would you say?
• Do you generally believe that the US and other rich countries act benevolently towards poor countries?
• Who benefits from the debt of poor countries? Do you believe that the IMF and World Bank’s true intention of lending to poor countries is for their (the countries’) ultimate good and with their development in mind?
• What is your reaction to the idea that the debt crisis in a new form of colonialism?

A Glimpse into the History of Development

As a broad introduction to development trends from 1950-2005, have students read Erik Thorbecke’s article “The Evolution of the Development Doctrine,” found here: http://www.rrojasdatabank.info/widerconf/Thorbecke.pdf. In this detailed article, Thorbecke discusses the birth of the development industry after World War II. He describes development policies, strategy and conceptual trends and their effectiveness (or lack thereof) in each decade, from the 1950s to the new millennium. The article is exhaustive in its description of economic trends, which students may find tedious. Advise them to simply focus on the major development trends, policies and strategies in each decade. (An alternative option to having students read the entire article would be for the facilitator to present a summary of each decade’s trend before heading into the discussion).

Discussion Questions to follow Thorbecke’s “The Evolution of the Development Doctrine”:

• Which of the trends discussed in the article—GNP growth through investment in industrialization and agriculture, poverty reduction through increased employment opportunities (including the informal sector), neo-Marxist dependency theory, basic needs, investment in human capital and institutions, vulnerability reduction, impact measurement—resonate most with you?
• Do you associate “development” with modernization or industrialization? Do you believe that “development” consists of bringing “developing” countries into the “modern” world? Do you believe that a balance between the development of the industrial sector and the traditional (agricultural, indigenous knowledge) sectors is important?
• Thorbecke discusses the historical and current debate about the appropriate role of the state and the market in development. On the one hand, development policies have encouraged small government, the “invisible hand” of the market, excessive trade, capital liberalization and financial deregulation. On the other hand, strategies have focused on the strengthening of government institutions, investment in state-run programs for education and health and anti-corruption campaigns within government. What is your reaction to this debate? Which “side” might you be most inclined to support?
• Thorbecke describes “aid fatigue” in the 1990s and a rising fear that poor countries
would become dependent on aid. What is your reaction to this statement? Have you seen any evidence of “aid dependency” in your service work? Should we just leave poor countries alone and let them solve their problems on their own?

- Thorbecke writes about measurement of impact as a recent trend in development. He describes the use of randomized and controlled experiments that ideally produce evidence-based research on effectiveness of programs and policies. What is your reaction to this trend? Are “control groups” in development work ethical?
- At the end of the article, Thorbecke says that there are claims that the development community is out of ideas. He highlights the “amazing reversal” of trends throughout the last 6 decades. What is your reaction to these assertions? Are you hopeful or discouraged when you think about the coming decades of development?

Next, have students read the (short) article “Developing Leaders? Developing Countries?” by Henry Mintzberg, found here: http://www.oxfordleadership.com/journal/vol1_issue2/mintzberg.pdf. A much less objective and more opinionated article than Thorbecke’s, this piece critically describes past development models as outside-in and top-down trends and asks the question: Isn’t it time for “indigenous development, of countries and leaders alike?” He proposes that rather than the outside-in globalism that has failed time and time again to affect change, what is needed in developing countries is indigenous enterprise, a “missing middle” between individual efforts in the informal sector and corporate development imposed from the outside. Incidentally, the diagram on page 4 is a particularly helpful visual that lays out the various approaches to development he discusses.

**Discussion Questions to follow “Developing Leaders? Developing Countries?”**:

- What is your overall reaction to the article? What were you feeling as you were reading it?
- Thorbecke suggested that the development community in the new millennium was “out of ideas.” Mintzberg, on the other hand, proposes a new development model: an “inside-up,” indigenous development with a balance of the economic, social and political that works alongside the other two models he discusses (outside-in and top-down). He says that “Pride, dignity and corresponding confidence do not figure prominently in mainline economic theory; these cannot be measured. But they figure prominently in just about every story of success, whether of countries or leaders. He also argues that copying is a mindless, ineffective form of learning and that people learn from others by doing it themselves. In your service work, how might you work to foster autonomy, pride, dignity and confidence? How might you encourage people to “do it themselves?”
- The author writes: “Has any country ever developed primarily through the outside-in model based on the wholesale importation of beliefs, expertise, and capital? Clear examples are hard to find. So why are developed countries forcing on others a model that never worked for themselves?” As an outsider trying to make a difference in a developing country, what are your thoughts on these questions? How can you, as an outsider, avoid imposition and promote effective development?
In this article, Mintzberg is a harsh critic of globalization. He writes: “The wealthy countries are in effect selling their own manufactured goods while closing their own markets to many of the products developing countries can sell… it is really quite startling how anyone could have tolerated this hypocrisy at all, let alone most of the world for so many years. The issue is not whether economists decry such behavior—of course they have. It is how these economists could have pursued the free trade agenda so doggedly in the presence of such distortions.” How would you defend the developed world’s support of such policies for so many years?

He also describes globalization as “forced development,” ineffective in respecting local traditions and fostering the “autonomy necessary to grown indigenous leaders and enterprises.” He writes: “Globalization focuses on the economic and assumes that the social will follow obediently behind. There is growing evidence, however, that the opposite is now occurring: globalization is weakening our social structures and undermining our democratic institutions. It is throwing our societies out of balance. Will it, therefore, eventually weaken our economies too?” Do you agree with the author in his opinions of globalization? In the past, what has been your general opinion or understanding of globalization? A positive or negative force?

Finally for this section of the module, tell students that they’ll be watching a documentary called “The End of Poverty?” that argues that specific historical events, beginning with colonialism and culminating in economic policies imposed by the North on the South, are the cause of poverty.

If you do not have access to the video for this session, you could use the article “Myths of Underdevelopment” by Michael Parenti which takes a very similar stance on the historical causes of poverty. The article can be found here (p. 64-67):

http://books.google.com/books?id=gfv2NePkYngC&pg=PA78&lpg=PA78&dq=Debt+the+new+colonialism+jean+somers&source=bl&ots=BsFa167vNi&sig=eVdzMz55wnmnVAreXu90apWXpns&hl=en&ei=uNuoTrCIJOL10gGSiai3Dg&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=4&ved=0CDsQ6AEwAw#v=onepage&q=Debt%20the%20new%20colonialism%20jean%20somers&f=false.

Discussion Questions to follow the movie “End of Poverty?” or the article “Myths of Underdevelopment”:

• What was your general reaction to the video/article? What feelings and thoughts were you experiencing as you watched it?
• Do you believe that there is a connection between colonialism in the 15-16th century and poverty today? Do you believe that the South financed the development of the North through colonialism by building their empires with riches stolen from the colonies?
• Do you believe that neoliberal policies from the World Bank and the IMF were a new form of “structural violence,” a sort of neocolonialism intentionally designed to keep poor countries poor and maintain control of the globe’s natural resources?
If not, how would you explain the existence and pervasiveness of these policies around the world?

- This movie clearly focuses on the historical and structural forces that have led to poverty. Are there other forces that you believe lead to poverty? What are they? How did you come to believe in these forces? Do you believe that the poor are at all responsible for their condition?

A Case Study: Haiti and Development

Explain to students that in order to further understand the actors, trends and policies of international development, the way they unfold in a “real-life” setting and the ways in which they affect the direction of a country’s history and the well-being of its citizens, they’ll be looking at a case study called “Haiti and Development.” Using different sources, they’ll be taken through an analysis and discussion of the history of Haiti and the role of foreign governments and development institutions in the development of the country. Explain that you’ll have a look at articles, interviews and video clips and then you’ll discuss and debate. Encourage students to take notes as they digest the material, keeping track of their feelings and thoughts.

1) Begin by showing students this excerpt from the 1992 documentary “Haiti, Killing the Dream.” The excerpt gives a general overview of Haiti’s history, providing context for the material to be introduced later in this section.

2) Next, share with students the following article: “Haiti, Forgive Us” by Amy Goodman, co-host of the daily news program “Democracy Now.” The article can be found here:
   http://www.democracynow.org/blog/2010/2/10/haiti_forgive_us. The piece offers a brief summary of the history of Haiti, going a bit beyond where the documentary excerpt left off, and discussing the role and effects of foreign intervention in Haiti, culminating in the calamity of the January 2010 earthquake.
   http://www.democracynow.org/2010/1/20/journalist_kim_ives_on_how_decades (28:00 – 45:15)

“So the question is not whether we will be extremists, but what kind of extremists we viii be. Will we be extremists for hate or for love? Will we be extremists for the preservation of injustice or for the extension of justice?” --MLK, Letter from a Birmingham Jail, April, 1963

“Most of the Third World is not ‘underdeveloped’ but over-exploited.” –Michael Parenti
The next clip is part of Amy Goodman’s interview with Dr. Paul Farmer, a medical anthropologist, UN Deputy special envoy to Haiti, chair of the Department of Global Health and Social Medicine at Harvard Medical School and co-founder of Partners in Health, a worldwide health organization started in rural Haiti. In this interview, Farmer describes the US role in the 2004 coup that ousted President Aristide and the effect of foreign intervention on Haiti’s public health system and the level of civic engagement of Haitian people. Farmer also talks about former President Clinton’s apology for supporting neoliberal policies in Haiti during his time in office.
http://www.democracynow.org/2011/7/14/dr_paul_farmer_on_bill_clintons (34:30 - 52:00)

The last clip is Amy Goodman’s exclusive interview with Jean-Betrand Aristide in 2004, as he is flown back to the Caribbean after being removed from his home in Haiti a few weeks prior and flown in a US plane to the Central African Republic. Throughout the interview, several members of the delegation supporting Aristide in his return (including members of the US Congress) also speak about Aristide’s ouster and the US’ role in it. http://www.democracynow.org/2004/3/16/stream (starts at 8:30)

Questions to guide discussion of the case study “Haiti and Development”:

• The excerpt of the documentary we watched described the US Marines’ intervention into Haiti in 1915, driven by the US desire to control the passage between Haiti and Cuba to the Panama Canal. Having created a “pretext” for invasion, the US gained control of Haiti through a “murderous, bloody intervention” that “reinstated slavery” and left behind a military force or national guard that has been running Haiti’s dictatorships ever since. What is your reaction to this information? Do you believe that US interventions abroad are generally well-intentioned?

• Were you surprised to read that the brutal dictatorship of the Duvaliers was supported by the US? Why do you think the US government would support such a brutal regime? Do you believe that the US government is generally interested in the success and wellbeing of poor countries? What do you think the ultimate goal of US foreign policy is in poor countries--to support the voice of the people? To protect US interests and economic power? A bit of both? How much do you know about US interventions in poor countries?

• Goodeman writes that Haitian-grown rice was replaced by U.S. government-subsidized rice, leaving the country “dependent on foreign trade and aid, keeping Haiti at a permanent disadvantage.” Kim Ives also describes the US-backed push to privatize public industries such as flour, cement and telephone communications, harming average Haitians and benefitting US-investors. What is your reaction to these statements? Why do you think the US would force Haitians to accept US subsidized rice rather than produce their own? If you were asked to, how would you defend the US’s push to privatize Haitian industries?

• What was your reaction to President Clinton’s apology for supporting neoliberal policies that flooded Haiti with US-subsidized rice and forced Haitian rice farmers out of work? Do you think this was a genuine mistake? Do you think such mistakes are justified in development work as a trial-and-error technique?
How much damage is permissible in development work for the sake of learning what “works?”

- Goodman also writes: “Earthquakes alone do not create disasters of the scale now experienced in Haiti. The wealthy nations have for too long exploited Haiti, denying it the right to develop in a secure, sovereign, sustainable way.” What exactly does she mean? In her opinion, how did foreign involvement contribute to a more serious disaster in the aftermath of the earthquake? Have you ever conceived of “development” as a potentially negative force which exploits rather than aids? That keeps poor countries underdeveloped and rich countries in power?

- Kim Ives and Paul Farmer speak about the US military occupation of Haiti starting in 1915 and then the various US-backed military regimes and engineered elections up until the late 1980s. They both speculate that the US was trying to control Haiti in order to avoid the spread of communism. Do you believe that US intervention in foreign countries is warranted in order to prevent the spread of certain ideologies throughout the world? If foreign intervention by the US in the late 1980s was justified by some as a necessary stance against communism, how might the 2004 (long after the end of the Cold War) removal of Aristide from Haiti be explained?

- President Aristide claims there was a kidnapping by US forces. Donald Rumsfeld and Condoleezza Rice claim they know nothing about it. Who do you believe? Why?

- The US members of the delegation supporting Aristide in his return to the Caribbean described what they perceived as the arrogance of the US government to oust a democratically elected (by 92% of the population) leader. Do you agree? Why do you think the US would meddle with another country’s politics?

- What is an appropriate role of foreign intervention in poor countries? What could the US/IMF/UN/World Bank have done differently in Haiti? What should foreign assistance look like from here on out in Haiti? Should there be a connection between foreign aid and foreign policy?
“I have no thoughts on the ‘discovery’ because conquest was what took place...I celebrate not the invasion but the rebellion against invasion. If I had to speak about the lessons taught us by the tragic colonial experience, I would say that the first and most fundamental one among them should be at the foundation of our decision to refuse exploitation and class invasion, both as invaders and invaded. That most fundamental lesson is the one of nonconformity before injustice, the teaching that we are capable of deciding, of changing the world, of improving it. It is the teaching that the powerful can’t have everything, and that the frail can make their fragility, in their struggle for liberation, into the strength needed to defeat the power of the strong.” –Paulo Freire, Pedagogy of Indignation, p. 55
Additional Resources

In order to respect the page limit of this capstone project, dozens of quality resources had to be left out. Below is a list of those books, documentaries, videos, articles (and more) that I’ve found to be excellent tools for student reflection, but that didn’t make it into the curriculum. Some are complementary to the material presented in the three modules, and some explore entirely new topics. Each resource is briefly described, and tips for optimal use are scattered throughout.

Poverty Reduction

- *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries are Failing and What Can Be Done About It* by Paul Collier: In this book, Collier describes several characteristics shared by the countries that are home to the poorest billion people of the world. He proposes practical solutions to the dire situation of this slice of the global population.
- *End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities of Our Time* by Jeffrey Sachs: Sachs argues that ending poverty is absolutely possible in our lifetime, if only a large-scale, coordinated effort could be organized in the North. This inspiring book leaves you feeling hopeful and determined.
- *The White Man’s Burden: Why the West’s Efforts to Aid the Rest Have Done So Much Ill and So Little Good* by William Easterly: This book, written by a former World Bank employee, is a fierce attack on the West’s failed attempts to develop poor countries. Largely in response to Sach’s *End of Poverty*, Easterly exposes the holes in the large-scale approaches of many aid agencies and argues for home-grown, small-scale solutions instead.
- *Banker to the Poor: Micro-Lending and the Battle Against World Poverty* by Muhammad Yunus. In this inspiring book, Nobel Peace Prize winner Yunus describes the inner workings of the micro-lending institution he founded, the Grameen Bank, and suggests that micro-finance programs have the potential to eradicate poverty. This is one of the most hopeful, motivational books out there and can be great for students that are in need of a dose of optimism.
- *Half the Sky: Turning Oppression into Opportunity for Women Worldwide* by Nicholas Kristoff and Sheryl WuDunn. This book tells several stories of women in situations of poverty and oppression. Ending in a positive, inspiring tone, it argues that women hold the key to lifting families, communities and countries out of poverty.
- *Mountains Beyond Mountains: The Quest of Dr. Paul Farmer, a Man Who Would Cure the World* by Tracy Kidder. This is the story of Dr. Paul Farmer’s seemingly super-human efforts to improve health care in rural Haiti. This is an extremely inspiring book, and could be useful to lift the spirits of students feeling down on development or their ability to make a difference.

• http://www.ted.com/talks/jessica_jackley_poverty_money_and_love.html: In this tear-jerker of a TED talk, co-founder of kiva.org, Jessica Jackley describes the evolution of her view of poor people. She advocates for story-telling as an effective technique to inspire action to tackle poverty.

• http://www.ted.com/talks/esther_duflo_social_experiments_to_fight_poverty.html. Here, MacArthur fellow Esther Duflo cleanly and convincingly argues that measuring development efforts is crucial in helping to determine which efforts help most, and which hurt.

Latin America

• The School of the Americas (SOA) video “Guns and Greed” (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KTncV-hhIIU): SOA is a combat training school for Latin American soldiers, located in Fort Benning, Georgia. In 2001, it was renamed the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (WHINSEC). This 20-minute video describes the school and the atrocities carried out by its graduates. Ultimately, it depicts SOA as a modern-day enforcer of economic and military oppression. More information, including informational flyers and fact sheets can be found at the School of the Americas Watch website—soaw.org.

• Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent by Eduardo Galeano: This Uruguayan writer details the disturbing history of foreign intervention in Latin America. He draws connections between this history and the current situation in most Latin American countries. The poignant introduction could be used with students that haven’t read the entire book. This book is bound to spark intense, important discussion about US foreign policy and the intentions of powerful countries in their interactions with poor ones.

• The Massacre at El Mozote by Mark Danner: This book describes the 1981 massacre of 200-1000 Salvadoran civilians by US-trained Salvadoran government forces during El Salvador’s civil war. Danner describes the disturbing events of the massacre in detail and brings to light the Reagan administration’s role in supporting this large-scale human rights violation.

Globalization

• Globalization and Its Discontents by Joseph E. Stiglitz: In this book, Stiglitz—recipient of the Nobel Prize in Economics—describes the policies of global financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the catastrophic consequences these policies have had on poor countries. He passionately discredits the notion that globalization is in everyone’s best interest and leaves no leaf unturned in his condemnation of the IMF.

Social Justice Perspectives
• **Pedagogy of the Oppressed** by Paulo Freire: This classic by the Brazilian educator outlines the pedagogical process of liberating the oppressed. While this book is mostly for social educators, Chapter 1 is a great piece to share with students. It could spark some complex discussion on the psyche of the oppressor and the oppressed and push students to begin to think about their privileged status in society and their role (however unconscious) in oppressing others.

• **Letter from a Birmingham Jail** by Martin Luther King, Jr. (found through a simple Internet search): King wrote this letter in 1963 when in prison for participating in a non-violent protest against racial segregation. The letter is written to a group of clergymen that claimed that the fight for racial equality should be carried out in the courts, not the streets. With an impressive balance of reason and passion, King calls us all to action, demanding that we focus our discontent with the world into “creative extremism” in “the name of love.”

• **Rethinking Globalization: Teaching for Justice in an Unjust World**, Edited by Bill Bigelow and Bob Peterson: This book is a gold-mine of resources for social justice educators. It is full of excerpts of articles and books, cartoons and lesson plans on a huge range of topics such as the global economy, sweatshops, consumption, the environment and child labor.

**United States Interventions Abroad**

• **Confessions of an Economic Hit Man** by John Perkins: In this book, Perkins describes his role as an “economic hit man” for the United States government. He explains his efforts to blatantly manipulate leaders of poor countries to act in the interest of the US and ensure that US policies were not challenged and its position of power wasn’t threatened. This is perhaps one of the best resources available to open students’ eyes to the unflattering role of the US in poor countries. This book, like no other, chips away at students’ naiveté and forces them to begin to ask the hard questions.

• **Iraq for Sale: The War Profiteers**: This documentary, by Robert Greenwald, exposes the truth about who is fighting the Iraq War (corporations) and what their ultimate interest is (profit). It details the horrific consequences that come about as a result of corporations’ actions in Iraq. This movie is sure to make students angry. It’s great for generating heated discussion about the Iraq war, corporations and capitalism.

• **Eyes of the Heart: Seeking a Path For the Poor in the Era of Globalization** by Jean-Betrand Aristide: In this short, moving book, the former President of Haiti describes the damage his country suffered as a result of neoliberal policies imposed by rich countries such as the United States. He argues for a different approach, one where local knowledge and decisions are respected and power and money take a back seat to love and progress.

• **The Fog of War**: In this documentary film directed by Errol Morris, former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara reveals previously unexposed truths about the United States’ interventions in Tokyo, Cuba and Vietnam.

• Martin Luther King Jr.’s “Beyond Vietnam” speech from April, 1967: http://www.democracynow.org/shows/2011/1/17 (about 25 minutes). Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was best known as a civil rights leader, but he was also a fierce critic of the US’
role in Vietnam. In this moving speech, King explains his criticism and brings to light several disturbing aspects of US foreign policy, many of which are still relevant today.

Climate Change

- *GasLand: Can You Light Your Water on Fire?:* This Academy Award nominee for “Best Feature Documentary” tells the story of one man’s mission to determine whether or not hydraulic fracturing, or “fracking,” is safe. Ultimately, he uncovers a disturbing mess of lies and secrets that ultimately threaten the well-being of our planet.

Consumerism

- *The Corporation:* This documentary film by Mark Achbar, Jennifer Abbott and Joel Bakan takes a critical look at the rise of the modern-day corporation and the pervasive, disturbing impacts it has on our current global economic system and our present-day society.
- *Made in L.A.:* This short film tells the story of three Latina immigrant women working in the garment industry in Los Angeles. It documents their struggle to win basic labor rights from the store Forever 21. This documentary tends to open students’ eyes to the reality of Latinos living in the United States, and can therefore be useful for them to watch it shortly before the end of a program in Latin America and before they head back to the United States. It can spark interesting discussion about students’ role in continuing service work with Latino populations in the US.
- *Story of Stuff video (www.storyofstuff.com):* This short (21 minutes) film details the process of stuff in our society—from extraction, to sale, to use and to disposal. In a simple, fact-filled format, it describes the social and environmental costs of this process and calls attention to disturbing societal patterns. This video tends to ignite rich conversation about how students’ individual decisions and behavior on a daily basis contribute to global problems and how *each student* can/should make individual lifestyle changes that can lead to systematic change.
- *Walmart: the High Cost of Low Price:* This Robert Greenwald film reveals the reality of the lives of the workers and owners of this multinational corporation. This is a great film to get students thinking and talking about how they might change their personal shopping and consumption habits in order to challenge systematic injustices like those committed by Walmart.

Income Inequality

- Of the 1%, by the 1%, for the 1%, by Joseph Stiglitz: http://www.vanityfair.com/society/features/2011/05/top-one-percent-201105#gotopage2. In this Vanity Fair article, economist Joe Stiglitz describes several negative ramifications of an unequal society. He questions the notion that we (US citizens) are the nation we think we are--all living on a level playing field with equal opportunity. He suggests that the well-
being of 99% of society is bound up with the 1% that holds most of the wealth, and that we can’t live well without taking the other into account.

- “The United States of Inequality” by Timothy Noah: http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/the_great_divergence/2010/09/the_united_states_of_inequality.html. In this 10-part series in the on-line magazine slate.com, Noah explores 8 possible explanations of why, since the late 1970s, U.S. incomes have grown more unequal, a trend he describes as “the most significant change in American society in your lifetime….and it’s not a change for the better.”

Sustainable Development

- *Development Betrayed: the End of Progress and a Coevolutionary Revisioning of the Future* by Richard B. Norgaard. This book is a harsh critique of the major tenets of development. It questions basic ideas of modernization, technology, science and progress. Norgaard offers an alternative to our current “modern” mentality that he claims is only leading us to destruction. He proposes a “coevolution between cultural and ecological systems…a patchwork quilt of cultures with real possibilities for harmony.”

- *A Thousand Suns*: http://www.globalonenessproject.org/videos/athousandsuns. This 30-minute video tells the story of the native people of the Gamo Highlands in Africa and contrasts their worldview with that of “modern” societies. The video challenges some common notions of industrialization and development and suggests that pieces of the Gamo mentality may be key for the rest of the world in achieving long-term sustainability. This video is part of the Global Oneness Project (www.globalonenessproject.org) which offers dozens of interesting videos of varying lengths that explore the interconnectedness of our world.

- http://www.ted.com/talks/tim_jackson_s_economic_reality_check.html: In this TED Talk, professor Tim Jackson brings into serious question the logic of current economic policies and challenges us to stop contributing to a deepening crisis and begin planning for a better future.

Culture

- *The Wayfinders: Why Ancient Wisdom Matters in the Modern World* by Wade Davis: In this book, anthropologist Wade Davis describes the ancient cultures of the Anaconda, the Amazon, Andes and Polynesia. He argues that their knowledge and ways of understanding the world are essential to our ability to confront the global challenges of our time. Much of the content of this book can be heard here: http://www.cbc.ca/ideas/episodes/massey-lectures/2009/11/02/massey-lectures-2009-the-wayfinders-why-ancient-wisdom-matters-in-the-modern-world/

Other

- *Food, Inc.*: This Robert Kenner documentary exposes the horrifying reality of the food industry in the United States and how large corporations are running the show, and putting
profit over health, safety and justice. This film isn’t directly related to what students are likely experiencing in international, service-based programs, but it’s still incredibly powerful and important. It can also lead to neat comparisons between the food industry in the United States and the given host country and it can encourage students to think about changing personal food consumption habits when they get back to their home countries.

- **Howard Zinn: You Can’t Be Neutral on a Moving Train:** This film by Deb Ellis and Denis Mueller chronicles the life of US historian and activist Howard Zinn. Although not directly related to the major issues students tend to confront on a service-based program, it can generate interesting discussion about activism in the United States, as opposed to abroad, and the type of work students may get involved in in their home countries.
References


Appendix A: Completed Needs Assessments

Greetings from Urubamba, Peru!

As part of the research for my Master’s Degree in Service, Leadership and Management, I’m putting together a curriculum that guides the reflective component of an international, service-based program. The goal of the curriculum is to aid a program-provider (a Princeton Bridge Year Coordinator, for example) in facilitating sessions that explore several of the complex topics students confront while doing service work abroad. The curriculum will offer dozens of resources (videos, articles, excerpts of books, documentaries) and guidance (such as suggested discussion questions) on how to engage students in effective processing and rich exploration. The ultimate goal of the curriculum will be to deepen the quality of the experience by pushing students to ask hard questions, dare to “un-learn” and “re-learn,” begin to form well-constructed stances on complicated issues, and think critically and act boldly in the face of daunting global issues.

Please fill out the following (short) survey which will inform my research by answering the following over-arching questions: Is there a need for this type of curriculum? If so, what should its content be? What types of topics should students explore as part of a program like Princeton’s Bridge Year?

Thank you so much for your time.

1) What is your relationship to the Princeton Bridge Year Program?

I am the Associate Director.

2) How long have you been affiliated with the program?

Since I was hired in 2008 and started my position in early 2009.

3) Besides the Princeton Bridge Year program, what other experience(s) do you have living and/or working in an international setting? Participating in or supporting service-focused programs? Participating in or supporting student reflection?

I lived in Ecuador (1998 – 2000) where I volunteered at the Center for the Working Boy, a multi-faceted social intervention where I primarily taught classes and supported primary school education. I also lived in Spain (2002 – 2004) where, among other things, I led a high school summer program. I directed ProWorld sites in Mexico (2005 – 2006), Peru (2006 – 2007) and India (2007 – 2008). Participant reflection was a part of all of these experiences, though I was more actively involved in planning and facilitating sessions when working at ProWorld.

4) Do you believe a reflection component—a structured time when volunteers process the experience, connect theory and practice, delve into complex topics that they are confronting as part of their experience—is necessary in a program like Princeton’s Bridge Year? Why or why not?
Yes. Among other things, a structured time helps students learn from their experiences through reflection and conceptualization. It pushes students when they might not otherwise have the skills, motivation or emotional energy to make sense of their experiences. Additionally, a structured time of this nature can allow instructors to check student learning, correct misconceptions and introduce key topics/concepts.

5) Please rank the following topics according to your opinion of their relevance and importance in a curriculum that guides student reflection in an international, service-focused program (1 being your top priority). If you feel that a given topic is not at all relevant or important, feel free to leave it blank.

1. Service  
2. Sustainable Development  
1. Culture  
3. Indigenous Rights  
3. Globalization  
3. Consumerism  
3. Global Warming and Environmental Issues  
3. Sweat Shop and Labor Issues  
2. Civic Responsibility  
2. Wealth and Privilege  
3. Income Inequality  

* I assume we’re talking about the Bridge Year Program here. Otherwise, I think it would be hard for me to rank topics in this way. For me, it would depend on the goals of the particular program. Each of these things can be equally important/relevant (and there could be a host of other equally important/relevant other topics). With Bridge Year Peru in mind, I’ve ranked the topics on the left into three general tiers. I hope this works for you.

What is your relationship to the Princeton Bridge Year Program?

I’m the director

2) How long have you been affiliated with the program?

Since November 2008

3) Besides the Princeton Bridge Year program, what other experience(s) do you have living and/or working in an international setting? Participating in or supporting service-focused programs?
Participating in or supporting student reflection?
I’ve worked in the field of international education for over 20 years
Lived in France as a high-school student (1983-84)
Studied Spanish language in Ecuador (summer 1996)
Worked in Spain (2002-2008)

4) Do you believe a reflection component—a structured time when volunteers process the experience, connect theory and practice, delve into complex topics that they are confronting as part of their experience—is necessary in a program like Princeton’s Bridge Year? Why or why not?

Yes. I believe that reflection is a critical component of experiential learning. Furthermore, I think it is important for programs to facilitate reflection in a deliberate and structured way. Learning is not automatic – particularly with respect to developing intercultural competence – and without some type of facilitated critical reflection, students can all too easily reinforce stereotypes about difference.

5) Please rank the following topics according to your opinion of their relevance and importance in a curriculum that guides student reflection in an international, service-focused program (1 being your top priority). If you feel that a given topic is not at all relevant or important, feel free to leave it blank.

__2__Service

__4__Sustainable Development

__1__Culture

__depends on nature of the service work__Indigenous Rights

__5__Globalization

__8__Consumerism

__depends on nature of the service work__Global Warming and Environmental Issues

__depends on nature of the service work__Sweat Shop and Labor Issues

__3__Civic Responsibility

__6__Wealth and Privilege

__7__Income Inequality
1) What is your relationship to the Princeton Bridge Year Program?

I love the Princeton Bridge Year Program, and will be attending events this year to reflect on last year. Last year I participated in the Program in Peru, which provided a supportive structure to work and think about global issues. The structure helped me organize and process the service, social, and language parts of my year by introducing me to and teaching me about various service projects and providing a forum once a week to process the experiences and discuss developmental theory. As the year went on the program gave me more distance by increasing my independent fieldwork over the year.

2) How long have you been affiliated with the program?

1 year.

3) Besides the Princeton Bridge Year program, what other experience(s) do you have living and/or working in an international setting?

As a child I lived with my family in Madrid for 1 year and in Budapest for 1 year.

Participating in or supporting service-focused programs?

During High School I participated in tutoring peers through National Honor Society and I volunteered as a Docent at a local museum. I served as a guest chef at the Ronald McDonald house and packaged food for Philabundance.

Participating in or supporting student reflection?

No

4) Do you believe a reflection component—a structured time when volunteers process the experience, connect theory and practice, delve into complex topics that they are confronting as part of their experience—is necessary in a program like Princeton’s Bridge Year? Why or why not?

I believe that the reflection component is very important because I had not previously reflected on the process of service, but had viewed all service as good deeds. The Bridge Year Program provided a structure for me to think about how to volunteer effectively, different ways to approach service, context of service, and how to structure my life around civic engagement.

5) Please rank the following topics according to your opinion of their relevance and importance in a curriculum that guides student reflection in an international, service-
focused program (1 being your top priority). If you feel that a given topic is not at all relevant or important, feel free to leave it blank.

3 Service
1 Sustainable Development
2 Culture
7 Indigenous Rights
6 Globalization
11 Consumerism
5 Global Warming and Environmental Issues
9 Sweat Shop and Labor Issues
4 Civic Responsibility
8 Wealth and Privilege
10 Income Inequality

6) Any additional comments?

Friday session made last year mean more to me than any other year. It is always important to do the service, but without reflection and introduction to developmental theory, I might not have realized how important it is to THINK about what will benefit the world. Now I want to study that!

1) What is your relationship to the Princeton Bridge Year Program?

Participant in Bridge Year Peru 2010-2011

2) How long have you been affiliated with the program?

Since 2010

3) Besides the Princeton Bridge Year program, what other experience(s) do you have living and/or working in an international setting? Participating in or supporting service-focused programs? Participating in or supporting student reflection?
I went to Wales for five months in 8th grade with my family, where I studied in a local public school. I had never really participated in structured service programs – I participated in two different semi-weekly volunteer programs, one in a nursing home and one in an elementary school music program.

4) Do you believe a reflection component—a structured time when volunteers process the experience, connect theory and practice, delve into complex topics that they are confronting as part of their experience—is necessary in a program like Princeton’s Bridge Year? Why or why not?

I think a reflection component is really crucial. It did help me a lot while I was there, but I think the most important part has actually been in my re-adjustment to the US. Being so aware of and analytical about my feelings as I went through culture shock, etc has helped me to cope with similar feelings back in Princeton. Similarly, I think the bigger topics of reflection (service, development, etc) helped me put my experience into perspective, so that I can see it my own as a step in my potential life path, and see the work I did as a part of an ongoing process in our partner communities, not as one isolated period of time.

5) Please rank the following topics according to your opinion of their relevance and importance in a curriculum that guides student reflection in an international, service-focused program (1 being your top priority). If you feel that a given topic is not at all relevant or important, feel free to leave it blank.

__2__Service
__3__Sustainable Development
__1__Culture
__8__Indigenous Rights
__4__Globalization
__6__Consumerism
__7__Global Warming and Environmental Issues
__11__Sweat Shop and Labor Issues
__5__Civic Responsibility
__10__Wealth and Privilege
__9__Income Inequality
6) Any additional comments?

I loved the discussions we had when watching movies that related to our experience or Perú in general, especially ones like “Made in LA” (about Latinas in the US, hence linking our two cultures, AND near the end of the year so we could understand the Spanish!)

1) What is your relationship to the Princeton Bridge Year Program?

Not a huge amount of contact – I would say ‘supportive’ when an extra body/pair of hands was needed.

2) How long have you been affiliated with the program?

Just the one year I spent in Urubamba.

3) Besides the Princeton Bridge Year program, what other experience(s) do you have living and/or working in an international setting? Participating in or supporting service-focused programs? Participating in or supporting student reflection?

International school settings – fund raising for a partnering school in Tanzania, organizing workshops for younger students.

4) Do you believe a reflection component—a structured time when volunteers process the experience, connect theory and practice, delve into complex topics that they are confronting as part of their experience—is necessary in a program like Princeton’s Bridge Year? Why or why not?

Absolutely – how else will students internalize and learn from their experiences?

5) Please rank the following topics according to your opinion of their relevance and importance in a curriculum that guides student reflection in an international, service-focused program (1 being your top priority). If you feel that a given topic is not at all relevant or important, feel free to leave it blank.

__1__Service
__3__Sustainable Development
__2__Culture
__5__Indigenous Rights
__4__Globalization
1) What is your relationship to the Princeton Bridge Year Program?

I was the Coordinator of the Bridge Year Program in Peru in 2009/2010.

2) How long have you been affiliated with the program?

Since I began the position June 15th, 2009

3) Besides the Princeton Bridge Year program, what other experience(s) do you have living and/or working in an international setting? Participating in or supporting service-focused programs? Participating in or supporting student reflection?

I’ve lived and worked in several other international settings supporting student programming:

- In Tokyo, Japan I studied and interned for the Fulbright Office where I was helping visiting scholars/Japanese students planning to study in the U.S.

- In Buenos Aires, Argentina I worked for a volunteer organization as a volunteer coordinator for education projects with children in under-resourced areas.

- I worked in the Office of International Education at Kenyon College where I served as the Editor of Off the Hill, which was a journal that captured artistic reflections of students’ time studying abroad.

4) Do you believe a reflection component—a structured time when volunteers process the experience, connect theory and practice, delve into complex topics that they are
confronting as part of their experience--is necessary in a program like Princeton’s Bridge Year? Why or why not?

I absolutely do. I think that any experience that involves an individual stepping out of their comfort zone into a new culture requires a reflective component, both for the individual and the group. This begs for reflection that is personal, identity-based and often transformational for young people who have stepped into a challenging and eye-opening experience at a very impressionable age.

Beyond personal reflection and exploration, I think that connecting theory and practice is key in terms of learning about community development and the local Peruvian context. This is where reflection becomes more academic, more critical thinking is called upon, and students have a chance to process their experiences within their new Peruvian context and adjust their own approaches, expectations and values accordingly.

From a more broad perspective, I think that this reflective component is important for a program like the Princeton Bridge Year because at the heart of the experience is education; let us not kid ourselves that impactful development work is the primary motive—it is of course important, but secondary to Princeton’s hope that this experience will whet the appetites of students to engage in future intellectual and professional undertakings that are meaningful on a global scale.

Therefore this reflective component will sit at the crux of the experience; it will encourage students to think not just about the brick that they lay in the village that day, but where that brick came from, and who delivered it there, and where the materials were purchased, and which mode of production determined the nature of the sale, and all of the cultural and historical pieces that are affecting the very presence of the volunteer in the village that day. By encouraging this kind of thinking we are helping students to employ systemic thinking that will ultimately help shape their convictions about the nature of the work that they want to do in the world; work that we hope will be humanistic, given their exposure to the realities of inequality that they undoubtedly experience during their bridge year.

We see plenty of gap year programs that do not include a reflective component, and I would venture to say that these programs do more harm than good. Without structured reflection and critical thinking, students are at risk of trivializing an experience that is extremely complex. Without being encouraged to reflect and ask deeper questions, I’ve seen many students unknowingly participate in voluntourism that is insulting to local communities, undercuts their own local capacities, and only reconfirms the dominant narrative which says that countries belonging to the Global South need to be helped or saved by their Northern counterparts.
5) Please rank the following topics according to your opinion of their relevance and importance in a curriculum that guides student reflection in an international, service-focused program (1 being your top priority). If you feel that a given topic is not at all relevant or important, feel free to leave it blank.

_6_Service
_8_Sustainable Development
_4_Culture
_1_Indigenous Rights
_3_Globalization
_9_Consumerism
_7_Global Warming and Environmental Issues
_10_Sweat Shop and Labor Issues
_11_Civic Responsibility
_2_Wealth and Privilege
_5_Income Inequality
_3_Other (please specify): The local history and context of colonialism

1) What is your relationship to the Princeton Bridge Year Program?

Student participant 2010-2011

2) How long have you been affiliated with the program?

1 year

3) Besides the Princeton Bridge Year program, what other experience(s) do you have living and/or working in an international setting? Participating in or supporting service-focused programs? Participating in or supporting student reflection?

-2 weeks for 3 summers in Nicaragua

-1 week in Mexico
both mission work, did not stay with a homestay family, student reflection was included but it was related to the Bible

4) Do you believe a reflection component—a structured time when volunteers process the experience, connect theory and practice, delve into complex topics that they are confronting as part of their experience—is necessary in a program like Princeton’s Bridge Year? Why or why not?

I think it is both provides both benefits and drawbacks. While this type of reflection will allow the students to make more sense of what they are experience, it also kind of formalizes the experience and doesn’t necessarily allow them to live out the experience themselves. In a way, I think it imposes a kind of expectation on the students. At the very least though, students should journal their day-to-day lives so they can look back on it when they return to their homes.

5) Please rank the following topics according to your opinion of their relevance and importance in a curriculum that guides student reflection in an international, service-focused program (1 being your top priority). If you feel that a given topic is not at all relevant or important, feel free to leave it blank.

_2__Service  
_3__Sustainable Development  
_1__Culture  
_8__Indigenous Rights  
_5__Globalization  
_6__Consumerism  
_10__Global Warming and Environmental Issues  
_10__Sweat Shop and Labor Issues  
_9__Civic Responsibility  
_7__Wealth and Privilege  
_4__Income Inequality

1) What is your relationship to the Princeton Bridge Year Program?
I helped develop the first year, helped run the first year, was partially involved in the second year, and am the supervisor of the PBY Coordinator.

2) How long have you been affiliated with the program?

2.5 years – since inception

3) Besides the Princeton Bridge Year program, what other experience(s) do you have living and/or working in an international setting? Participating in or supporting service-focused programs? Participating in or supporting student reflection?

I’ve lived and worked abroad for ProWorld for 6+ years in 3 different countries (Peru, Belize, and Mexico). I also spent a year in Spain teaching English. For ProWorld I was a volunteer, Volunteer Coordinator, Project Coordinator, Semester Program Coordinator, Country Director, Regional Director, Programs Director, and Program Specialist. I worked with many students in student reflection in all types of groups.

4) Do you believe a reflection component—a structured time when volunteers process the experience, connect theory and practice, delve into complex topics that they are confronting as part of their experience—is necessary in a program like Princeton’s Bridge Year? Why or why not?

Without a doubt this is necessary. Anyone and everyone will go through an experience and formulate their own thoughts and perceptions. And some bring in more external resources into their thought process, or try to view a point from various angles, but many don’t. And even still, without being guided through the process, it can be more difficult to really get the most out of your experience in an intellectually stimulating way. We all experience the sights and sounds emotionally, spiritually, and intellectually. But we tend to react to our surroundings and experience unless we are intentional with our learning process. Most young traveler’s, like those in Bridge Year, have not fully developed their ability to be conscious of their experience. And while Princeton students may be more adept at giving voice to their intellectual and critical mind, without guidance in a structured setting, they may not develop the global awareness and global citizenship that will come from guided conversation.

5) Please rank the following topics according to your opinion of their relevance and importance in a curriculum that guides student reflection in an international, service-focused program (1 being your top priority). If you feel that a given topic is not at all relevant or important, feel free to leave it blank.

__2__ Service

__3__ Sustainable Development
1) What is your relationship to the Princeton Bridge Year Program?

Participant in Peru Bridge Year for 2010-2011 year.

2) How long have you been affiliated with the program?

Since selection in June 2010.

3) Besides the Princeton Bridge Year program, what other experience(s) do you have living and/or working in an international setting? Participating in or supporting service-focused programs? Participating in or supporting student reflection?

Not much. Worked in local volunteering situations during middle and high school.

4) Do you believe a reflection component—a structured time when volunteers process the experience, connect theory and practice, delve into complex topics that they are confronting as part of their experience—is necessary in a program like Princeton’s Bridge Year? Why or why not?

Yes. When organized and framed appropriately, a reflection component can provide meaningful perspective for volunteers. Service work, especially when done intensely, can often be disorienting and challenges many preconceptions in ways in which answers are difficult to grasp.
A reflection component should help participants to begin to frame their experiences within a larger framework, using service and development related vocabulary and theories to orient themselves within the larger picture of social aid.

For a program like the Princeton Bridge Year, where life-long service is emphasized, the reflection component has added importance because in order to be committed to meaningful service, participants must understand what needs they are serving and how to analyze their work on a larger scale. Additionally, an understanding of what service in other parts of the world – aside from the program location – consists of is necessary in order to open participants thinking to the possibility of other types of social service.

5) Please rank the following topics according to your opinion of their relevance and importance in a curriculum that guides student reflection in an international, service-focused program (1 being your top priority). If you feel that a given topic is not at all relevant or important, feel free to leave it blank.

_1__Service
_2__Sustainable Development
_3__Globalization
_4__Culture
_5__Civic Responsibility
_6__Consumerism
_7__Global Warming and Environmental Issues
_8__Indigenous Rights
_9__Wealth and Privilege
_10__Income Inequality
_11__Sweat Shop and Labor Issues
_12_Other (please specify): A History of Global Development

Any additional comments?

Some parts of the reflection component, especially later in the experience, should be open-ended in order to allow participants to explore areas of personal interest within the world of development.