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Abstract

This thesis is situated in the context of a gap-year education programme operated in Bolivia and Peru by a US-based organisation. Inspired by Paolo Freire’s social-emancipatory educational ethos, the organisation transposes his *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) from literacy programmes for Brazilian peasants to a very different context: into attempts to transform privileged 18 to 21-year-olds from the “developed” world into critical global citizens, ready to challenge social injustices after three months in “developing” countries. This Freirean sentiment is unusual in the gap year industry, as well as in the academic literature on transformative learning which has emphasised personal transformation, overlooking social change and power relations. My thesis addresses this oversight, engaging with the concept of power as an ‘invisible’, symbolic network of social boundaries that defines ‘fields of possibility’ (Hayward, 1998), shaping what happens during the programme.

Much research into transformative educational experiences focuses on the learning outcomes of self-identified transformed learners, based on self-reported data collected retrospectively. By contrast, this thesis is based on a critical ethnographic case study focusing on pedagogic process. Analysing data from participant observation, discussions, interviews, and students’ learning journals, I hone in on the micro-level functions of power, space, and place in shaping not only what is taught and learned during the BB programme, but also how, where and why this happens. Suspended in the tension between Bourdieu’s theory of social and cultural reproduction (1990) and Curry-Stevens’ post-Freirean ‘Pedagogy for the Privileged’ (2007), I principally use Bernstein’s notion of ‘pedagogic device’ (2000) to analyse how programme Instructors counter-intentionally facilitated socially reproductive, rather than transformative, learning.

I argue that the programme reproduces social inequalities by enabling privileged people to accumulate a specific form of ‘cultural capital’ (Bourdieu, 1977) – cross-cultural transformation capital (CCTC). This is gathered by gaining supposedly “authentic” knowledge through “real” experiences with “the Other” in culturally “pure” spaces, accessible only to “travellers” and uncontaminated by “tourists”. I show how this creates patterns of pedagogic segregation whereby specific types of pedagogic space produce specific types of knowledge. However, paradoxically, I also describe sporadic, unpredictable pockets of transformative learning in which students engage critically with their privileged positioning in asymmetric power structures. I thus contend that (socially) transformative pedagogic space is constituted in complex, contradictory ways, but also by pedagogy that must connect personal and social change. I conclude that greater attention to power and space is critical to transformative pedagogic theory and practice which can be framed and conceptualised in spatial terms, as the crossing and reconfiguring of boundaries.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Breaking Boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Cultural Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Cross-Cultural Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTC</td>
<td>Cross-Cultural Transformation Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Development Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Transformation Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Transformative Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLT</td>
<td>Transformative Learning Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPS</td>
<td>Transformative Pedagogic Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>Transformative Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preface

Are You Sitting Comfortably?
A Short Story about a Long Journey

Part 1: A Plaster and a Personal Journey

In the summer of 2008, I worked as an Instructor on a gap year education programme in Bolivia. The programme was operated by Breaking Boundaries (BB), an organisation from the United States (US) selling $13,000 per head ‘learning adventures’ in the ‘developing world’ (BB, 2013a) for adolescents and young adults from the US. In the Educator’s Resource provided to its Programme Instructors, BB states its overarching purpose:

We are looking for a certain kind of education rooted in exchange, dialogue and transformation; the aim of all Breaking Boundaries’ courses is to challenge our students to reflect on their values and gain a broader perspective on the world and their place in it (2013c:12).

This aspiration to trigger transformation through education appealed to me. I had experienced perspective-changing moments during my education – most memorably during my undergraduate degree in Birmingham, Alabama when a lecturer asked why Band-Aids (i.e. plasters for covering skins cuts) only come in one colour: white Caucasian. This prompted me to reflect on issues of inequality and injustice, and my privileged position – as a white, middle-class man

---

1 Breaking Boundaries (BB) is a pseudonym for two reasons: (1) to anonymise the identity of the organisation, protecting it from any potentially negative consequences arising from my research; (2) to stress that the real name of the organisation is not intrinsically important to this study. The organisation serves an instrumental purpose as an example of a transformative education programme.

2 References to the BB website and other BB resources are included in the Bibliography, but all information that could identify the organisation has been altered.
among other advantaged social categories) – in unequal social power structures. How had I never noticed, for 21 years, that a plaster – a seemingly apolitical, neutral, harmless everyday object designed to protect and heal wounds – is so shot-through with prejudice, privilege and power?

Perhaps being white had blinded me to even considering how it might feel for, say, a black person to cover a skin cut with a plaster designed to blend-in with white skin. Suddenly seeing the symbolic, institutionalised, structural racism woven in to the fabric of a “flesh-coloured” piece of sticky material blew my mind. It spoke volumes about the fabric of society. It turned things topsy-turvy, sparking fireworks in my head and questions in my heart. I began to look closely for the normalised, naturalised manifestations of this hitherto “invisible” power in the world around us, in material and symbolic violence that hurts, rather than heals, cutting deep beneath our collective social skin. Rather than sticking a plaster over this societal ‘soul wound’ (Andreotti et al, 2009), I wanted to peel back this superficial layer to see what lay beneath the surface.

Determined to “get to the bottom of” the questions I was asking myself, I couch-surfed, worked and volunteered (doing typical “voluntourism” activities like teaching English and building schools) throughout the Americas during my own gap year(s) from 2005-2007. Not entirely satisfied with the “answers” I found, I cut my travels short and flew home from Lima to Norwich to do an MA in Education and International Development at the University of East Anglia (UEA). Being exposed to literatures on development education, critical pedagogy and transformative learning for the first time, I became fascinated with these approaches to teaching and learning about poverty, inequality, and power in pursuit of a better, fairer world.

Sitting in the UEA library one day, I received an email from Sydney³, a BB Instructor I had bumped into on my travels in Guatemala. Sydney

³ A pseudonym, as are the names of all research participants, for two reasons: (1) to anonymise participants, protecting them from potentially negative consequences
had introduced me to some of the students in her charge and explained what BB does. We had remained in touch and Sydney’s email suggested I apply to be a BB Instructor. I did – and found myself in the three-person Instructor Team leading the Bolivia 2008 summer programme. It proved to be an enriching but challenging experience, raising questions that would lead me to undergo this research. I am acutely aware that my experience as a BB Instructor shaped my motivation, rationale, and approach to this study. Moreover, I feel that a specific instance on a Bolivian bus ride, and the student feedback I received from it, planted a seed that would eventually spur me to write this thesis.

**Part 2: A Bumpy Bus Ride and an Uncomfortable Chat**

Towards the middle of the Bolivia programme, our BB group took a 10-hour bus ride to begin a trek in the Apolobamba mountains. We travelled by public bus but reserved our seats in advance by paying a nominal extra fee. We began our journey, stopping en route to pick up other passengers by the roadside. These included the elderly, young children, and several people carrying sacks of vegetables, weavings, or live chickens to sell at markets. Soon the seats filled up and people stood in the aisle. I got chatting to a man standing next to me with his young son; both seemed unfazed to be travelling for hours without a seat, but I felt uncomfortable about the situation. Even accounting for cultural differences, it felt unfair that I and the rest of our group would sit for the entire journey while others would stand.

I suggested to the man and his son that we take turns sitting in my seat for 20-minute shifts and they agreed. Some of the BB students and Instructors noticed us sharing the seat but none followed suit. It occurred to me that this was a good opportunity for a teachable moment that might lead to productive discussion and learning about power and privilege. I wrote a note and passed it to the students sitting in front of

resulting from my research; (2) to stress that any analysis I make of participants is not ‘personal’, but rather a comment on what can, or could, be observed when observing someone in the research context.
me, asking them to read it and pass it on to the other group members with the same instructions. In the note, I asked: ‘Have you considered sharing your seat with one of the standing passengers?’

All the students and Instructors read the note, but none offered to share their seat. We arrived at our destination late at night and immediately went to bed, exhausted. The following day we began our trek. During the lunch break we sat by the trail and I raised the topic of the note on the bus. It quickly became apparent that many of the students were livid about it, and one began to cry. They felt I was being judgmental and that the note was inappropriate. Part of me felt guilty and, inside, I began to question and doubt my approach. Was I right to provoke the students in this way? I wanted to raise political and ethical questions but was I being overly political and, in fact, unethical by making students feel uncomfortable?

I explained that my intention was not to “get on a moral high horse” (although it is unavoidable that this was part of the message I communicated through my actions) but to raise questions about our positioning in unjust structures of power. Why did we deserve to sit, while others stood? Some students argued that we deserved the seats because we had paid to reserve them. When I responded by inviting everyone to consider how we were able to do that, and to afford to be travelling in Bolivia in the first place, I was met with more resistance. One student – Bianca – angrily explained that she was raised in poverty and that her parents had worked hard to get where they are; this seemed to be ample justification in her view.

Later that day, another student – Penelope – approached me in tears and apologised for her defensive reaction during the discussion. Penelope said it was difficult to confront the implications of the questions I was posing, and that she felt uncomfortable reflecting on her decision to remain in her seat on the bus. Penelope was the only student to (openly) say this however, and numerous others seemed to hold a grudge about the incident for the remainder of the programme. Some of the student feedback I received at the end of the programme criticised
my handling of the situation, saying I was too forceful with my political views. I took this feedback on board, but it raised various questions: was it unethical or unproductive to provoke an angry emotional reaction among students? If so, how might I and other Instructors engage students with questions of power and privilege differently in future? Is it possible to facilitate transformative learning with privileged learners such that they see their privilege and develop a motivation to try to change the social power structures that produce it? If so, what transformative pedagogic strategies and devices might be used for this? These questions eventually led me to write this thesis.
Chapter 1
Introduction, Rationale and Context

1.1. An Outline of Chapter 1

This chapter begins with an overview of the research, and then goes on to: lay out the intellectual puzzle that underpins the thesis; clarify the research questions and the research object (i.e. the unit of analysis); explain the purpose and rationale of the study; describe the research context; outline the research design; discuss my positionality as the researcher, and some associated ethical considerations; and briefly provide an outline of the remaining seven chapters in the thesis.

1.2. An Overview of the Research

This thesis explores how education can function to reproduce and/or transform social inequalities. Through a critical ethnographic case study, I examine what happens during a purportedly transformative gap year education programme operated in Bolivia and Peru by a US-based company.\(^4\) Throughout the thesis I refer to the company using the

\(^4\) Various types of ‘gap year education programme’ exist – including, for instance, some that do not involve overseas travel – but as will become clear in this chapter, I use this terminology, for brevity, to refer to programmes that provide (predominantly) young people from “developed” countries with a structured educational experience abroad – usually in a “developing” country – learning about (international) development-related issues in a purportedly transformative way.
pseudonym ‘Breaking Boundaries’ (BB). I use a pseudonym for two reasons: (1) to anonymise the identity of the organisation, protecting it from any potentially negative consequences arising from my research; (2) to stress that the real name of the organisation is not intrinsically important to this study. The organisation serves an instrumental purpose as an example of a purportedly transformative education programme.\(^5\)

The three-month BB programme I focus on provides a highly-structured learning experience, facilitated by a team of Instructors for twelve 17 to 22-year-old students. In the Instructor Handbook provided to its Programme Instructors, BB elaborates its main aim:

> The goal of every Breaking Boundaries’ course is to cultivate a higher sense of self-awareness and to instil in students a capacity to affect change (2013b:7).

As I will show throughout this thesis, BB’s vision of transformative teaching and learning draws from various influences, but it is particularly influenced by the pedagogy of Paulo Freire. This ‘revolutionary’ (Grabowski, 1972) Brazilian educationist sought, through non-formal literacy programs, to empower ‘illiterate’ Brazilian peasants to analyse, resist and transform the social power structures that ‘oppress’ them (Freire, 1970). BB aims, however, to apply Freire’s ideas in a very different context – by guiding small groups of mostly white and (materially) wealthy gap year students from the US through Bolivia and Peru. BB seeks to transform the worldviews, and ways-of-being in the world, of these privileged young adults through immersive, experiential, cross-cultural education. The objective is not only to expose students to other ways of life but to engage them face-to-face with problems of poverty, inequality and injustice through a Freirean ‘problem-posing’ pedagogy (BB, 2013c:30) in which:

\(^5\) References to BB resources are included in the Bibliography, but all information that could identify the organisation has been altered.
students and teachers use dialogue to teach one another [and] the world is seen not as static, but as ever-evolving and changing.

BB contrasts this with what Freire calls ‘banking education’, in which:

teachers assume students are passive, take all control, determine what will be learned, and “force-feed” information to students. The world is seen as static; students are encouraged to “fit in to” the world as it is (ibid).

Rejecting the banking model, BB explicitly advocates Freire’s approach which not only poses social problems but aims to solve them using “radical” pedagogy as a catalyst. BB appears to see its students as potential agents of change, who – through the BB programme – should, apparently, become:

empowered to criticize the world and also to change it. Problem-posing education allows people to fully develop their humanity because it depends on communication, recognizes the relationship between people and the world, encourages inquiry, and leads to transformation. Breaking Boundaries Instructors should use experience, dialogue, and tools of empowerment (knowledge and information; skill-building) instead of simply providing “content” or “answers”. Students should return self-directed, inspired, and with the belief that they can make a difference (ibid).

The ‘difference’ referred to here marks BB apart from many other gap year education programme providers who also pedal the “make a difference” slogan (e.g. see Gap 360, 2017; Helping Abroad, 2015). BB focuses on transforming its students through learning with and from the people they encounter in South America, rather than purporting to transform those people’s lives through short-term volunteering. BB does not send students to address social inequalities by building schools or working in orphanages (to cite two clichés in international
development), but to engage in ‘deep learning’ (BB, 2013c: 282) about poverty, privilege and cultural difference, and bring that learning home to the US. The Instructor Handbook frames this aim in the language of critical global citizenship, claiming that once ‘students are enveloped by extreme difference’ and enabled ‘to question the cultures from which they’ve come’, the programme will provide ‘a forum in which they can ultimately reinvent themselves’ (2013b:7) and:

will then return to their culture of origin with a much more critical perspective and a greater commitment to contributing to the world as informed global citizens (ibid).

Ultimately, BB aims to inculcate what Freire calls ‘conscientização’ (1970). This ‘critical consciousness’ is a heightened awareness of not only the consequences of social inequality but also, crucially, the root causes and, moreover, strategies for effective resistance and transformation (ibid). For Freire, this involves teaching and learning about social power relations, as I will discuss throughout this thesis.

So, although there are various dimensions to BB’s transformative pedagogic vision, Freirean principals are paramount. As a former BB Instructor, I am sympathetic to the organisation’s pedagogic ethos. Nonetheless, the rationale of BB’s project is, arguably, no less questionable than that of other gap year education providers (or, for that matter, Freire’s highly ambitious agenda). BB’s approach is a dramatic adaptation – a transformation even – of Freirean pedagogy, raising numerous questions that demand scholarly attention. For instance, how are transformative pedagogic strategies designed for use with South American peasants transferred for use with privileged US teenagers on an educational sojourn in South America? Moreover, is it even feasible that privileged learners might learn – in a short space of time – to (want to) work towards transforming the very social power structures that position them advantageously? These questions are part of the central tension, or ‘intellectual puzzle’ (O’Reilly, 2008) that prompts my research.
1.3. The Intellectual Puzzle

Along with some personal scepticism about the plausibility of BB’s transformative aims, I note that prominent sociologists such as Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron have critiqued lofty aspirations of this type. These critics argue that education functions to reproduce, rather than transform, social inequalities by transmitting cultural values and practices that perpetuate social class stratification (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990). Education cannot but maintain social class divides, these sceptics claim, precisely because it is an integral component of power structures which silently and invisibly school people into acquiescence to the unequal, unjust social status quo (ibid).

By contrast, although Freire largely agrees with Bourdieu and Passeron’s nihilistic analysis vis-à-vis formal education systems, he also sees transformative potential – where Bourdieu and Passeron do not – in pedagogy. Like Freire, my use of the term ‘pedagogy’ here, and throughout this thesis, refers to more than the mere ‘method and practice of teaching, especially as an academic subject or theoretical concept’, as defined in the Oxford English Dictionary (2014). As Alexander (2001:540) points out, pedagogy is often misguidedly and narrowly equated with ‘the apparently self-contained act of teaching’. It should, however – as various theorists have argued (e.g. see Bernstein, 1977; Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990; Giroux, 2001) – encompass the discourses that encircle teaching, thus connecting teaching ‘with culture, structure and mechanisms of social control’ (2001:540).

For Freire – and several scholars influenced by his work (e.g. see Curry-Stevens, 2007; Giroux, 2001; McLaren and Kincheloe, 2007) – it is possible to subvert the reproductive function of education through pedagogy, by transforming how teaching and learning happens. By transforming power relations between “the teacher” and “the taught”,
the process of knowledge production can be transformed (1970). Power and knowledge are, then, intimately connected in Freire’s pedagogy, as are the two types of transformation he theorises: (1) a transformation in pedagogic power relations in “the classroom”; (2) a consequent transformation in social power relations in the world (ibid). However, opportunities to implement transformative pedagogy are few and far between in the tightly regulated teaching and learning spaces of the US formal education system (McLaren, 1999). As an alternative to conventional classroom-and-book-bound education, BB provides non-formal pedagogic spaces pitched as transformative ‘learning adventures’ (2013).

In response to proponents of alternative pedagogic spaces, such as the ones provided by BB, Bourdieu and Passeron (1990) have argued, however, that these purportedly progressive approaches are even more socially reproductive than formal education systems, despite their transformative rhetoric (see Burawoy and Von Holdt, 2012). Apparently, it is the illusion created by this rhetoric which merely serves to mask, in the most insidious manner, the ways in which structural inequalities are perpetuated through all forms of teaching and learning. As Burawoy (ibid) says (summarising Bourdieu and Passeron):

> Soft pedagogies that focus on alternative ways of teaching ignore and further mystify the importance of class [becoming] ideologies that do not recognise the role they play in the reproduction of class domination...Freire’s problem-based dialogic pedagogy...is clearly one of those ideologies that hide from themselves their own implication in class domination (108-109).

This assertion raises deeper concerns and questions about BB’s adaptation of Freirean pedagogy. Is the BB programme socially reproductive rather than transformative? Does the programme not only perpetuate, but even deepen, social inequality? These questions probe the intellectual puzzle driving my research.
Certainly, from a Bourdieusian perspective it could be hypothesised that the programme furthers the BB students’ privilege even more than formal schooling. After all, it is a unique, exclusive experience available only to a very select few. Moreover, in the context of the growing gap year industry – which has in recent years become more prevalent in mainstream discourse, at least in certain places in the minority world (e.g. the UK and the USA) through increased popular media coverage such as Channel 4’s comedy drama series ‘Gap Year’ (e.g. see Channel 4, 2017; Jacobs and Hickford, 2017) – the heightened prominence of ‘global citizenship’ in education discourses (Andreotti, 2006; Bamber et al, 2017; McGregor, 2008) places increasing cultural currency on the value of gap year experiences for becoming a “better” global citizen (Lewin, 2009; Lutterman-Aguilar et al, 2002; Wilde, 2016). Being a well-travelled citizen of the world is a status and identity that can confer multiple benefits including access to spaces of prestigious formal education. For instance, as Heath (2007: 91) says:

> the gap year provides students with an important means of gaining distinction over other students in the context of increased competition for entry to elite institutions, and as such deserves further scrutiny by sociologists of education.

In this sense, then, the (potentially) reproductive functions of the BB programme may seem clearer than its transformative potential.

However, a nascent literature on ‘Pedagogy for the Privileged’ (e.g. see Allen and Rossatto, 2009; Case, 2013; Curry-Stevens, 2007; Goodman, 2011; Gorder and Christian, 2007) offers an alternative perspective, sometimes adapting Freirean principles for use with privileged students. Curry-Stevens (2007) points out that history offers numerous examples of privileged people working for radical social change and, as I will discuss in more detail in Chapter 3, her ‘proposed model for the transformation of privileged learners’ (see Appendix 1) proposes the learning stages that privileged students undergo when transforming into ‘allies in the struggle for social justice’ (ibid: 33).
Curry-Stevens’ developed her framework through research in classrooms in Canada, however, and has called for her ideas to be explored in other cultural contexts (ibid). Part of my objective in this study is to apply Curry-Stevens ideas in the “transformative” pedagogic spaces created during the BB programme; I am intrigued by the tension between her optimistic post-Freirean pedagogy and Bourdieu and Passerons’ pessimistic prognosis. My intellectual puzzle is suspended in this tension, causing me to question what a transformative pedagogic space (for privileged leaners) might look like, or in other words what elements and processes it is constituted of. From this puzzle, I formulated the research questions.

1.4. The Research Questions

The following table (see below) shows my main, overarching research question and the secondary research questions that help me to address it. The main question is broken down into three secondary questions (SQ), and each of the empirical-analytical chapters focuses on one of these questions: Chapter 5 addresses SQ(1); Chapter 6 addresses SQ(2); and Chapter 7 addresses SQ(3). I also attend to the cross-cutting secondary research question in each empirical-analytical chapter as the question refers to “power” and “space” which are concepts that cut across the themes and analysis throughout the thesis.

In the thesis conclusion (Chapter 8) I synthesise my analyses from Chapters 5, 6, and 7 into a response to the main research question. I have framed the latter in terms broad enough for me to contribute insights, from my specific research context, to wider theory. In this sense, the question asks me to explore how transformative pedagogic space can be conceptualised (i.e. what, in theoretical terms, constitutes transformative pedagogic space?). But at the same time, I answer the question with regard to my specific research setting, and with direct
relevance to similar contexts. In this sense, the question asks me to analyse the components (including curricula content and pedagogic process) that make up a pedagogic space that has been designed for privileged learners in a gap year education programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Main Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What constitutes a transformative pedagogic space?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Secondary Questions (SQ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SQ(1) What pedagogic devices are used in a transformative pedagogic space, and what are their underpinning rationales, intentions and functions?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Cross-Cutting Secondary Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do power and space function in a transformative pedagogic space?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So, then, the object of my research (i.e. the main unit of analysis) is not the BB programme per se – as I am not conducting a programme evaluation – but rather the ‘transformative pedagogic space’. This is a conceptual construct which the BB programme provides an empirical example of, but which has not been explicitly theorised in the literature on transformative education and pedagogy, although some scholars allude to it (e.g. see Lysaker and Furuness, 2011). As I will discuss in Chapter 3, the concept of space has been somewhat neglected in this literature and addressing this gap is part of my research purpose. Before articulating my purpose further though, it will therefore be helpful to provide my working definition of the research object.
1.5. The Research Object

A ‘pedagogic space’ (Burke, Crozier, and Misiaszek, 2016) is a type of learning space/environment. Warger and Dobbin (2009:3) say of the latter:

The learning space remains the heart of the educational enterprise, but the time has come for educators to widen the scope of inquiry about effectiveness in learning to include a fuller list of factors...learning resources...means of teaching, modes of learning, and connections to societal and global contexts...[this] includes human behavioral and cultural dimensions...and it requires us to examine and sometimes rethink the roles of teachers and students because the ways in which they make use of spaces and bring wider societal influences into play animates the educational enterprise...the learning environment is a composite of human practices and material systems, much as an ecology is the combination of living things and the physical environment.

Whereas a learning environment can describe ‘informal’ (Rogers, 2004) educational spaces in which unplanned learning occurs in everyday life, pedagogic spaces are orchestrated – though they do not necessarily go to plan. My use of the term 'transformative pedagogic space’ refers, then, to a space that is intentionally created with specific transformative teaching and learning objectives in mind. That is, designated educators have designed the pedagogic space to facilitate learning that they regard as transformative.

By exploring the transformative pedagogic spaces created during the BB programme, I tease out tensions, complexities, and contradictions. I analyse the rationales and devices used to produce these spaces, the process and content of what is taught and learned in them – including, importantly, what is not – and how the character of each space contributes to shaping what happens in it. Ultimately, I examine how pedagogic spaces are shaped through lived experiences and the power relations that produce and configure them. To analyse the pedagogic mechanics of these (nominally) transformative teaching and learning
spaces I draw largely on Basil Bernstein’s theory of the ‘pedagogic device’ (2000). For Bernstein:

Pedagogy is a sustained process whereby somebody(s) acquires a new form or develops existing forms of conduct, knowledge, practice and criteria from somebody(s) or something deemed to be an appropriate provider and evaluator – appropriate either from the point of view of the acquirer or by some other body(s) or both (78).

This treats the concept of pedagogy at ‘a higher level of abstraction’ (Solomon, 1999: 267), as:

varying sets of rules and principles [...] devices generating differing sorts of practices, producing different sorts of identities.

My thesis, then, focuses on the interplay of space, pedagogy, and power to address the research questions and thus pursue the main purpose of the research.

1.6. The Purpose of the Research

The overall purpose of my research is twofold. First, my thesis aims to contribute to a body of academic knowledge, primarily in the area of transformative pedagogy, but also in development education (especially in the context of gap year education programmes), which I will introduce shortly. The literature in these fields has grown steadily in recent years, alongside the rise of discourses on global citizenship and the burgeoning gap year industry (e.g. see Bamber et al, 2017; Coghlan and Gooch, 2011; Kiely, 2004; 2005; Mitchell, 2007; O’ Shea, 2013; Porfilio and Hickman, 2011; Warren, 1998). Yet, with some exceptions (e.g. Clark and Young, 2005: Simpson, 2005) there is still a dearth of critical
research – and particularly ethnography – into “transformative” gap year (development) education programmes and the power relations that shape them. Moreover, in a broader sense, although theories of transformative learning have been around for over 40 years, there are few studies in transformative education that ‘empirically engage critical theoretical frameworks to move beyond personal learning’ (Gambrell, 2016:1) and incorporate notions of learning for social transformation to better ‘understand what transformational learning moves students toward acting as agents of social change’ (ibid). I aim to address this shortcoming in my thesis.

Second, my intention is for the research to inform the practice of educators working to engage learners in transformative learning directed towards personal and social change through addressing uneven power relations. More specifically, by using a socio-spatial conceptual-analytical lens in conjunction with more well-established conceptual tools (i.e. provided by Bernstein, Bourdieu, and Freire) and critical ethnographic research methods to focus on the under-researched functions of power in processes of transformative teaching and learning, I hope this research will inform understandings of how space, power, and pedagogy interact to shape transformative education contexts. My research thus straddles the boundaries between the fields of critical pedagogy, critical sociology and critical geography. This is expressed in my attention to calls from critical pedagogues to focus on ‘space’ in educational contexts (McLaren, 1999; Morgan, 2000: Mulcahy, 2006), thus spreading the ‘spatial turn’ (Warf and Arias, 2009) of recent years in critical geography and sociology.

### 1.7. The Research Context

In this section I briefly outline the academic context for my research before discussing the 'on-the-ground' setting for my fieldwork with BB
in Bolivia and Peru. As I have suggested so far in this chapter, I locate my thesis most closely within discourses on transformative pedagogy and development education (and specifically ‘transformative’ development education abroad programmes that take place in the context of a gap year). Before discussing those literatures in more detail in this chapter (and in Chapter 2) I also note that in a broader sense my work overlaps to some degree with the literatures on travel and tourism (e.g. see Crang, 2005; Muzaini, 2006; O’ Reilly, 2005; Paris, 2012; Week, 2012) – including voluntourism (e.g. see Crossley, 2012; Lyons and Wearing, 2008; Raymond, 2008) and service learning (e.g. see Mitchell, 2007; Warren, 1998) – study abroad programmes (e.g. see Lewin, 2009; Lutterman-Aguilar and Gingerich, 2002), and scholarship that is more concerned with the gap year as a wider cultural phenomenon than as a context for specific, structured pedagogic interventions (e.g. see Jones, 2004; O’Shea, 2013; Snee, 2013). Whilst I engage with those fields of work to some degree at appropriate points throughout the thesis, I do not review them in detail because my research context is distinct for reasons that I will now briefly distil.

First, the BB programme provides highly structured pedagogic spaces in which Instructors implement a defined curriculum using various pedagogic devices and play a pivotal part in shaping the daily experiences of a small group of students whilst spending much of the programme in close physical and social proximity. This context is markedly different from most other programmes that provide (young) people with learning experiences abroad but typically with less pedagogic oversight and control (e.g. by organising a placement for a volunteer with an organisation and largely handing responsibility for the volunteer’s learning experience to the organisation and/or the volunteer). This is a crucial distinction for my research, given that ‘transformative pedagogic space’ is the research object.

Second, the BB programme espouses a Freirean pedagogic ethos which distinguishes it from most gap year/study abroad/service-learning/voluntourism programmes, not least because of Freire’s "radical" postcolonial political orientation. Third, following on from its
Freirean pedagogic principles, the BB programme subverts the stated purpose and focus of most gap year/service-learning/voluntourism programmes, which is to do volunteer work to help transform the lives of people who are perceived to be poor and in need of help. Although the BB programme includes a minimal amount of volunteer work, it is approached and framed by BB Instructors with caution and a critical eye. Rather than trying to transform “Others”, the main (stated) aim of the BB programme is for students to be transformed by opening their eyes to other people’s lives. For the above reasons, then, I associate my research more closely with other bodies of academic work, which I will now discuss.

1.7.1. Development Education and Global Citizenship

Having already introduced (earlier in this chapter) how my research is situated in relation to debates over transformative pedagogy, I now indicate how it is also located in discourses on development education (including vis-à-vis gap year education abroad programmes), with attention to the notion of global citizenship – which is central in this context – before elaborating on this discussion in Chapter 2. In academic discourse there is a growing literature on development education and similar forms of ‘adjectival education’ (e.g. see Andreotti and de Souza, 2012; Bourn, 2015; Hicks, 2003; Scheunpflug and Asbrand, 2006) but relatively little literature on gap year education programmes that provide a form of experiential development education.

‘Development education’ describes a family of educational forms that engages learners with international development-related issues and is thus connected to themes of global poverty, inequality, and injustice. Various names have been given to this family, or members of it – for example, global education, global citizenship education, and global learning among others – but like Bourn (2015) I will refer to them under the term ‘development education’. This is not to suggest that those different forms of education are identical in their specific pedagogic aims and approaches; there can be considerable variation between them. I
use the term 'development education' because it is, I suggest, the most appropriate for my research context. This is not only because it is more specifically focused on international development themes (see above) – like much of the BB programme purports to be – than some of the adjectival educations, but because it is the most closely associated with – and indeed, inspired by and rooted in – the ideas of Paulo Freire (Bourn, 2014a, 2014b), incorporating 'elements of postcolonialism and transformative learning' (Bourn, 2014a: 19).

Furthermore, it is the evolution of development education that has provided a context and platform for the increasing usage of the term 'global citizenship', a ubiquitous concept among the adjectival educations and, as I noted earlier, one that BB chooses to use in articulating its programmes’ pedagogic aims. As Bourn notes:

> it is from the development education movement [...] that the term global citizenship became a way of interpreting personal and social responsibility and engagement in global and development issues (2015: 22).

It is worth pointing out at this stage that ‘global citizenship’ is a highly contested term (Baillie-Smith and Laurie, 2011; Dower and Williams, 2002; Jorgenson, 2010). I discuss the reasons for this in Chapter 2, but it is worth pointing out now that different forms of development education invoke different conceptualisations of the ('good') 'global citizen' as the type of person that adjectival educations should seek to nurture.

Andreotti (2006) has helpfully distinguished two opposing approaches to developing global citizens through development education (albeit using the term 'global citizenship education') which she labels 'Soft versus Critical'. Combining elements of global citizenship, postcolonialism and transformative learning, Andreotti compares and contrasts the features of each approach, attending to what the content of teaching and learning looks like in relation to various criteria (see Appendix 6). For example: the 'problem' that international development strives to solve, and which development education teaches about, is
seen to be ‘poverty [and] helplessness’ in the ‘Soft’ approach, but ‘inequality, injustice’ in the ‘Critical’ approach (ibid: 46). The 'nature of the problem' in the former approach is 'lack of “development”, education, resources, skills, culture, technology...' versus, in the latter, 'complex structures, systems, assumptions, power relations and attitudes that create and maintain exploitation...'. Suggestions for 'what individuals can do' about the "problem" differ; an individual can, respectively, either 'support campaigns [...] donate time, expertise, and resources' or 'analyse own position/context and participate in changing structures, assumptions, identities, attitudes and power relations in their contexts' (ibid: 46).

Although Andreotti uses general terms to describe the form (or 'content') of teaching and learning in different types of development education, her distinction provides a useful frame of reference for my thesis by articulating some of the types of learning I witnessed during my fieldwork with the BB programme. Furthermore, Andreotti’s postcolonial framework works in tandem with Curry-Steven's ‘proposed model for the transformation of privileged learners’ (2007) as the former’s descriptions of the content of learning complement the latter’s emphasis on the learning process in relation to specific aspects of that content. Curry-Stevens details the steps learners’ (should) take when they analyse their own (privileged) positions (as Andreotti suggests they do in the critical approach) in social power structures.

My use of these conceptual tools together enables me to identify the need for more scholarship exploring the form and content of learning in transformative learning (Kegan, 2009) and greater engagement in development education discourses with:

debates on processes of learning, how people learn and the relationship between learning, personal experience, behavioural change and individual action (Bourn, 2015: 87).
The characteristics of development education that I have described thus far broadly illustrate its pertinence to my research context. As is already becoming clear, there are parallels here with the relationship of my thesis to discourses in transformative pedagogy. However, it should be noted that Freirean social-emancipatory pedagogy is but one element of the transformative education/learning literature among more prominent approaches (as I will discuss in more detail in Chapter 2). Unlike in development education, however, those prominent approaches are mainly concerned with various psychological dimensions and processes of personal transformation (e.g. see Mezirow, 1997; Taylor and Cranton, 2012) as opposed to being oriented to specific subject matter (i.e. international development) with central themes and issues (e.g. poverty), as development education is.

So, then, similarly to the ‘transformative-reproductive’ tension in which my thesis’s intellectual puzzle sits, there is a fundamental dichotomy between 'soft' and 'critical' approaches (I will substitute the term ‘uncritical’ for ‘soft’ from here on) threaded through the theory and practice of development education. These distinctions provide valuable frames of reference for my study. It is important, however, to be cautious of using binary framings – which risk oversimplifying the complexities of teaching and learning – and to note that examples of transformative pedagogy and/or development education practice are unlikely to be comprehensively and neatly categorisable into either category. Rather than simply being 'uncritical' or 'critical', many instances of development education are likely to be messy hybrids of both approaches (and perhaps feature types of approach I have not identified). Moreover, there are some specific strands of discussion and debate in development education that spin-off the central dichotomy I have discussed. I will leave my discussion of most of these strands until my literature review in Chapter 2, but turn now to one which is especially pertinent to my research context.
1.7.2. Distant Learning and Development Education Abroad

Development education takes place in a variety of formal and non-formal educational contexts, albeit emanating from the “developed” world. Although there are some forms of education in the “developing” world that resemble development education, or use that term, development education most often happens in the developed world – for example, within the global dimension of UK schooling (Think Global, 2017). The considerable geographic and cultural distance between the site and the subject of learning in development education has been the source of discussion and debate. For instance, Martin (2013) has discussed some of the problems inherent in teaching and learning about the ‘distant Other’, which often animates and reproduces problematic representations:

> teaching about distant people and places can unwittingly reinforce essentialist, single stories about the ‘Other’ that create binary spatial distinctions between the places being compared (420).

Martin draws attention here not only to the 'us and them' binary that can inadvertently be reproduced when representing people in uncritical approaches to development education, but to the spatial 'here and there' invoked when representing places ‘near’ and ‘far’.

Some approaches to development education have attempted to bridge the cultural and geographic distance. North-South partnerships, for instance, try to provide platforms for learners in the global North and global South to interact and, in theory, learn from and with one another by ‘closing the mutuality gap’ (Johnson and Wilson, 2006). Sometimes, this interaction is still facilitated from a considerable physical distance, for example using technology (e.g. email, social media, live video links, Skype) or letter writing. But another approach that has in recent years become increasingly popular in some contexts, such as the UK, is short-term visits by people from 'developed' countries to 'developing'
countries to teach and learn about development related issues in situ (Martin and Griffiths, 2012).

These ‘study visits’ – or ‘study abroad’ trips as they are commonly referred to in the US – often involve teachers and students but are also used in teacher education, where several studies report broadly positive ‘outcomes’, with some suggesting that the visits facilitated transformative learning for participants (e.g. see Walters, Charles and Bingham, 2017). However, Martin and Griffiths note that whilst it is often assumed that such visits will automatically facilitate productive learning experiences, these experiences are ‘not always effective’ (ibid: 907). On the contrary, they can also consolidate and reify problematic perspectives on international development issues, producing ‘unintended consequences that only reinforce notions of power and representation’ (ibid: 918).

Martin et al posit several reasons for these unintended consequences but principally argue that these forms of development education produce teaching and learning spaces that lack adequate structure, supervision, and facilitation by ‘differently knowledgeable others’ (ibid). More specifically, although the educators facilitating such cross-cultural experiences (usually teachers from the global North) may have some types of knowledge about the cultural contexts of the places they are visiting, they often lack the reflexive capacities to critically reflect on the ontological and epistemological foundations underpinning their own values, assumptions and worldviews. If so, this makes it very difficult for teachers to model meta-reflection for their students, and therefore hard for both parties to ‘learn to unlearn’ their prejudices and predispositions, which is a necessary first step in the process of transformative learning (ibid).

In response to the problem outlined above, Martin and Griffiths (2014: 956) argue that study visits can potentially be more effective if they happen as part of a more structured educational ‘course’ facilitated by educators with the appropriate knowledge, capacities and skills within a particular transformative pedagogic approach:
We therefore propose that intercultural learning through study visits could be usefully framed by a transformative, relational pedagogy informed by postcolonial perspectives. We believe this represents a significant development to transformative learning theory.

Although there are significant differences between the context of my research and the study visits that Martin et al critique, my thesis is well positioned to contribute to this strand of debate in development education. The type of pedagogy that Martin et al propose for cross-cultural experiences closely resembles what BB aims to provide; and my analysis will explore, in ethnographic detail, what can happen when educators attempt to implement this approach to teaching and learning, albeit in the context of commercial gap year programme provision rather than schooling or teacher education. Gap year education programmes range from accredited courses run by formal educational institutions to non-formal educational experiences provided by commercial organisations. These programmes are planned and structured to varying degrees depending on the education provider. In the case of BB, its programmes are highly structured; I now introduce the organisation in more detail.

1.7.3. Breaking Boundaries

BB operates ‘cross-cultural global citizenship education’ (BB, 2013a) programmes throughout the global South – Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East – for groups of 12 students at most, accompanied by three Instructors who play a crucial role in shaping the programme experience. The organisation offers a range of ‘learning adventures’ (BB, 2013a) for different age groups; its three-month long semester programmes are designed for students aged 17-22, usually as part of a gap year between high school and university but also, less commonly, as a study abroad semester within an undergraduate university course (BB’s programmes are affiliated with a selection of private universities
in the US), meaning that in some cases BB programmes contain a mixture of gap year and study abroad students.

BB mainly markets its services in the US, meaning that almost all students on its programmes are from there. Semester programmes cost over $13,000 per student and judging by my experience as a BB Instructor mainly attract white, financially wealthy middle-class students. I have suggested these students can be considered “privileged” – both in a national and global context – not least because they (or their families) can afford to pay the programme fees.\

BB employs a small team of permanent administrative staff – often ex-Instructors – at its headquarters in the US, some of whom are pedagogic advisers who create and produce BB’s pedagogic materials. The Educator’s Resource – designed to ‘provide some guiding lights to help Instructors frame their course’ (BB, 2013: 8) – provides more details about BB’s pedagogic aims, opening with the following Preface written by experienced Instructor Wendy:

Now that I’m an educator bringing students to parts of the world where genocides fuelled by arms production in the West are more frequent than anyone would like to admit... I wonder, how can I choose in such a way as not to add to the poverty; how can my choices, in both thought and action, contribute to our global community in such a way that supports justice, well-being, and compassion? “How can I guide my students to choose in such a fashion?” The compilation of this Educator’s Resource attempts to ask just that (ibid: 1).

This apparent desire to look critically-reflexively at (so-called) “Western” culture is repeated in BB’s definition of a successful BB programme:

We succeed when our students develop a curiosity in finding truths and inspiration beyond conventional, Western paradigms,

---

6 Nonetheless, I acknowledge, as BB does, that ‘privilege’ is a complicated notion (BB, 2013b) and should not be understood simplistically, or used comprehensively to encapsulate the entirety of an individual’s character or lived experience. Labelling the students in this way requires further explanation and I provide this in my discussion of Curry-Stevens’ ‘Pedagogy for the Privileged’ (2007) in Chapter 3.
when our students consider alternative models of thought and ways of framing goals, values and a sense of place and an understanding of one’s relationship to others (ibid: 13).

To achieve these aims, the 414-page Educators Resource provides BB’s Instructors with extensive pedagogic materials and recommendations. For instance, BB offers guidance on ‘What makes a great experiential Lesson?’ by referring to Freire and recommending and explaining his problem-posing pedagogy. In accordance with their Freire-inspired pedagogy, BB also encourages Instructors to ‘lead from behind’ and empower students to lead themselves through a gradual ‘handing over’ of power and responsibilities (ibid). This intended transfer of power from Instructors to students is built into BB’s programme structure.

1.7.3. The Structure of a Breaking Boundaries Programme

BB programmes feature several overarching and overlapping pedagogic structures which organise and order the programme experience across time and space. These are too numerous to discuss in detail, so I only highlight key programme structures and provide more details about them in the Appendices.

The processes of teaching and learning that BB aims to facilitate take place within three programme phases (see Appendix 2): (1) The Skill Development phase, in which Instructors take a directive role in teaching skills for students to learn; (2) The Enacting phase, in which students practise their newly learned skills and assume more responsibilities, and more power of sorts; (3) The Empowerment phase, in which students are meant to take more control over the programme and Instructors taking more of a back seat to “lead from behind”. These three phases represent, in theory at least, a transfer of power and responsibility from Instructors to students over the course of the three months. This is gradual but is also punctuated with marked transitions between phases. These transitions are explicitly acknowledged, usually through some form of ceremony facilitated by Instructors, and often based on an
interpretation of ceremonial practices observed in the “local” in-country cultural context.

The phases are bookended by two much shorter, but important, sections of the programme: Orientation and Transference. Orientation takes place over the first five days of a BB programme and is designed to gently introduce and orient students to their new, unfamiliar cultural environments. Transference happens during the final three days of the programme, following the Empowerment phase, and sees Instructors taking the lead back from students and guiding them through preparation for the potentially challenging transition back home to the US. I discuss these sections further in my analysis in Chapter 5.

In conjunction with the programme structures outlined so far is the Three Zone Framework, which outlines three states of being that students might experience at different times during a programme:

1. The Comfort Zone
2. The Learning Zone
3. The Panic Zone

Students are encouraged to spend as much time as possible in The Learning Zone and to avoid The Comfort Zone and Panic Zone as much as possible. The rationale underlying this is that transformative learning is most likely to take place when students are being pushed and challenged outside The Comfort Zone but not so far that they are in a state of panic. I analyse this framework in Chapter 5, as one of various ‘pedagogic devices’ (Bernstein, 1996) that BB Instructors used in the Bolivia and Peru programme.

Lastly, all BB programmes also feature the same set of programme components (see Appendix 3) – each one being a type of learning activity which students engage in on all of BB’s programmes. Each programme places different emphases on certain activities, however. For instance, the Bolivia and Peru programme emphasises staying in local people’s homes, studying international development issues, and trekking, but very little volunteer work.
In addition to the programme structures that BB provides, the organisation also encourages Instructors to leave their mark on each programme and shape it as they want to. This leaves Instructors significant freedom to design and facilitate the pedagogic spaces that programme participants will inhabit during the programme. The Bolivia and Peru programme I studied for my research is no exception and I will now discuss some of its specific features. Given that the design of the programme – including the itinerary – is closely linked to the country-contexts it takes place in, I begin with a brief background to the socio-political and cultural landscapes of Bolivia and Peru.

### 1.7.4. The Bolivia and Peru Programme Contexts

Two thirds of BB’s three-month Bolivia and Peru programme were spent in Bolivia. In its promotional material, BB explains that this programme focuses on social movements, political activism, indigenous identity, land rights, environmental sustainability, urbanisation and rural poverty, linking its itinerary closely with what it describes as a region that is currently undergoing ‘political change and social transformation’ (BB, 2013a). This is, perhaps, especially relevant to Bolivia – ‘one of the poorest countries in Latin America’ (UNICEF, 2014) despite being rich in mineral and energy resources like lithium and natural gas. Other valuable natural resources, most notably silver, were extracted in vast quantities by the Spanish during colonisation of the region from the 1500s to the 1800s. This process included the enslavement and death of hundreds of thousands of indigenous people and African slaves forced to work in the ‘Cerro Rico’ (Rich Mountain) silver mine in Potosi (Galeano, 1997; Strosnider et al, 2014). Now known as the ‘Mountain that Eats Men’ (Nash, 1993) with reference to the miners ‘swallowed’ in its depths, a tour of the mine has become a popular feature of Bolivia’s fledgling tourist trail. It also features in the BB programme itinerary and is central to my analysis in Chapter 7.

Today, Bolivia’s wealth is invariably owned by the country’s elite, largely Spanish-descendants who reside in the eastern lowlands and have for a
long time dominated political and economic life. Like many other countries in South America, Bolivia has experienced decades of military dictatorship, following its independence from Spanish colonial rule in 1825. Whilst this has been punctuated with revolutions and periods of (relative) democratic rule, the Bolivian population – particularly its majority indigenous population, composed of several ethnic groups but predominantly the Aymara and Quechua – have suffered years of discrimination, marginalisation and systematic violence and oppression.

Bolivia’s periods of military dictatorship have often been supported by the US Government (Galeano, 1997; Klein, 2011), most infamously in 1967 when the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) assisted the capture and killing of Che Guevara by the Bolivian Army. More recently – from the 1980s to the early 2000s – democratically elected Presidents (e.g. Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada and former dictator Hugo Banzer) have been supported by the US in implementing a raft of neoliberal reforms, restructuring the Bolivian economy through privatisation of state-owned enterprises. This has been met by considerable resistance from Bolivian indigenous groups, most famously in the Cochabamba Water War of 2000.

Perhaps even more notable has been the resistance to the US “War on Drugs”, which has sought to eradicate the production of coca leaves in Bolivia. The coca leaf is a sacred symbol of iconic cultural and political importance in the country – not to mention forming the livelihoods of thousands of indigenous coca farmers – and is used for several purposes from the medicinal to the spiritual. Its use as one ingredient among many in the production of cocaine is reserved almost exclusively for cocaine consumption outside Bolivia (e.g. in the US), or to benefit Bolivian elites (Leons and Sanabria, 1997). The War on Drugs is thus seen by many indigenous Bolivians as a war on their cultures and identities, further stoking flames of antagonism towards the US.

This antipathy was harnessed by current Bolivian President, and ex-coca farmer, Evo Morales who rose to power in 2006 as head of the MAS - Movimiento al Socialismo (Socialist Movement) Party – and is Bolivia’s
first indigenous (Aymara) President. Whilst increasingly dividing opinion in progressive political circles, Morales has overseen a raft of social reforms including the writing of a new constitution, converting the Republic of Bolivia into the Plurinational State of Bolivia. This has not only recognised the rights of a plurality of social groups – including indigenous women and children – but also, for the first time in world history, enshrined the rights of Pachamama (Mother Earth) into Law, as a living being with an equal right to life as humans – the Law of Mother Earth (Vidal, 2011).

If Bolivia provides a country-context that is radically different from the BB students’ homeland, the places that the BB programme visits in Peru offer slightly less contrast. Peru is, of course, no less culturally rich and diverse than Bolivia, and there are clear similarities to be made in terms of the countries historical development, not least regarding colonialism, independence, and conflicts with neighbouring states. More recently too, one can find a narrative of neoliberal ideology being met with resistance, the most common and controversial example being the activities of the Shining Path (Sendero Luminoso), a communist militant group in Peru classified by the Peruvian Government as a terrorist organisation. Yet, Peru’s story is less “revolutionary” than Bolivia’s, at least in recent years. Current President Pedro Pablo Kuczynski is the latest leader of a series of centre-right Governments committed to neoliberal policy and actively participating in negotiations toward a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) (Schipani, 2016). Peru’s relationship with the US is convivial, whereas Bolivia’s is confrontational.

So, whilst many parts of Peru are in many ways “a world apart” from the world(s) inhabited by BB students, there are also more cultural commonalities to be found. Compared to Bolivia, Peru’s tourist infrastructure is vastly more developed and has therefore learned to cater to the cultural tastes and creature comforts of foreign (mostly Western) tourists. If globalisation can indeed be described as ‘McDonaldization’ (Ritzer, 1993), where it is easy to find a McDonalds in a reasonably sized town in Peru, the company closed its only restaurant in Bolivia in 2002. Whereas travelling by bus in Peru is a luxurious, seat-
reclining pleasure for the moneyed tourist, in Bolivia it is more likely to be an uncomfortable hair-raising experience. So, whilst Peru’s attraction as a tourist destination is enhanced considerably by globally renowned sites such as Machu Picchu, Bolivia’s relative lack of tourism is also due in part to its reputation as an edgier, more adventurous (or even dangerous) place to visit. As will become clear in this thesis, I suggest that this is part of the reason why most of the BB programme itinerary (see Appendix 2) takes place in Bolivia. Certainly, the Programme Instructors seemed keen to spend more time in Bolivia.

1.7.5. The Instructors

BB Instructors are employed on a fixed term, contract-by-contract basis and are paid on a pay scale ranging from approximately $4,000 to $6,000 per programme – determined by various criteria, including their previous experience with BB, and formal educational qualifications. Extensive travel experience is a prerequisite to work as a BB Instructor. However, given the nature of the work, which involves Instructors spending up to nine months away from home per year, staff turnover is relatively high. From my own experience, and from speaking to some of the few longer-term Instructors, it is quite unusual to work together in the same Instructor Team – or ‘I-Team’ – more than once or twice.

In the case of the Bolivia and Peru programme, two of the three Instructors – Frida and Owen – had worked together on the previous semester, whereas Randall was a new member of the I-Team. Frida – the Program Director – is originally from the United States but has lived in Bolivia for over 3 years and is planning to settle there with her Bolivian partner. Of the I-Team, Frida is by far the most experienced BB Instructor and has the highest level of Spanish (fluent), having also travelled and lived extensively around Latin America. In her late twenties, Frida has a BA in Anthropology and Latin American Studies from New York University and an MA in Poverty and Development from the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex. She has a left-wing political orientation and takes a keen interest in current
issues (social, cultural, political etc.) – not least in Bolivia – particularly regarding the environmental and cultural patrimony of indigenous populations in the Americas.

Owen is from Wales and is leading his second BB programme. The Instructor has a BSc in Environmental Management and Policy from the London School of Economics and an MSc in Climate Change and Development from the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex. Before joining BB, Owen worked as a climate change policy adviser for government agencies and think tanks in the UK, and then moved to Bolivia to work for an NGO. In his early thirties, he also works as a Geography Teacher in the UK and like Frida, has travelled extensively in South America and beyond. Like Frida, Owen is also politically engaged – including in a Bolivian/Latin American context – particularly with issues relating to climate change and environmental protection, and he has a decidedly left-wing stance.

Like Owen, Randall is also working on his second programme, though his first was in China. Randall is from the US and has travelled in South America but is less familiar with the Bolivian and Peruvian contexts than Frida and Owen, with less accomplished Spanish language skills. In his mid-twenties, Randall is the youngest Instructor but has a B.A. in Anthropology from Columbia University and experience teaching as a middle school English teacher in New Mexico. Like Frida and Owen, Randall has a love of the ‘great outdoors’ – particularly rock climbing – and an interest in current affairs, although his political leanings, whilst progressive, appear to be closer to the middle ground than his colleagues.

Each BB programme team of three Instructors usually contains at least one native to the country, or region, in which that programme is located. In this case, it did not; but, unusually, Frida, Owen, and Randall were joined by Frida’s partner Sergio. Whilst Sergio resembled a fourth member of the I-Team in many ways, he was not technically an Instructor in the same sense and was thus not accorded the same status, responsibilities or pay. In his late twenties, Sergio is a native of
Cochabamba, Bolivia and is a documentary filmmaker by training and trade. Sergio speaks very little English and has the least experience as an educator. He is very knowledgeable about Bolivia, and a political activist with radical leanings, describing himself as an “anarchist”. Like Frida, Sergio is a staunch indigenous rights activist and a fierce critic of US foreign policy in Bolivia and Latin America more widely. Whilst this may have positioned him in a potentially antagonistic relationship to the BB students, like his colleagues Sergio is warm, accommodating and understanding in his demeanour.

1.7.6. The Students

All students applying for BB programmes must go through a ‘screening’ process to be deemed suitable to participate. This process involves phone interviews with BB staff, submitting essays, providing character references from adult professionals, and passing psychological tests. From this, Instructors are provided with an Excel spreadsheet breaking down each students’ characteristics from their contact details, birthdate and dietary requirements to their medical and emotional issues, interests, and smoking and drinking habits. Most BB students are upper/middle-class, White-Caucasian young adults (aged 17 - 22), many of whom are from extremely financially wealthy families and can be considered privileged in various ways. BB students have included the sons and daughters of Hollywood film stars and US presidents.

Students’ reasons for attending a BB programme generally vary. Many are on a gap-year between graduating from high school and attending university and want a “worldly” experience (many are academic high achievers and some have already been accepted to attend elite US universities such as Princeton and Harvard). Some mainly want a CV enhancer while having fun at the same time. Some want to escape problems (e.g. drinking, drugs, family) at home and make a fresh start. Others have been sent by their parents for the same reason. There are some students who come on the programme with an interest in, and some knowledge of, the cultural, historical and political landscape of
Bolivia and Peru. Others still are mainly interested in outdoor pursuits (i.e. trekking and camping) in the natural landscape. The Bolivia and Peru programme was no different and students’ motivations, interests and characteristics varied. Nonetheless, after doing pre-programme individual interviews with all students (via Skype, whilst they were still in the US) several similarities emerged. Most students spoke about wanting to:

1. Be ‘out of their comfort zone’ and challenge themselves;
2. Be in a ‘remote’ place;
3. Interact with ‘the locals’;

Whilst it was useful to interview students before they arrived in Bolivia – in order to get a sense of their characters and motivations for signing up to the BB programme – participant observation was far more important to my research design, which I will now briefly outline.

### 1.8. An Outline of the Research Design

To see a World in a Grain of Sand  
And a Heaven in a Wild Flower,  
Hold Infinity in the palm of your hand  
And Eternity in an hour.

— William Blake

My research design – a critical ethnographic case study – employs an approach to research which borrows from poetic devices insofar as it aspires to poetry’s capacity, alluded to above by Blake, to reveal something about “the big picture” by looking closely at something as
small as a grain of sand. The aim of my research is similar, albeit more modest in scope. I conduct a detailed study of transformative pedagogic space – using participant observation as the principle method – to generate insight into its complexity (Stake, 1995) through an ethnographic process that is a combination of the scientific and the artistic (Woods, 1996).

This does not mean that I will claim a ‘grain of sand’ (to extend my analogy with Blake’s poem) to be statistically representative of, or generalisable to, ‘a World’. More specifically, it does not mean that I will claim any pedagogic space created during the programme to be statistically representative of, or generalisable to, the entire BB programme. Instead, I treat the transformative pedagogic spaces I examine as examples of what complexities can be seen in such spaces and make inferences about the relationship between these “grains of truth”, so to speak, and the broader landscape of transformative pedagogic theory and practice. I select these examples for various reasons – which I discuss further and justify in Chapter 4 – but mostly, then, because they best elucidate the empirical grounding of the key conceptual and theoretical contributions I make through my analysis.

Rather than statistical generalisation, then, the strengths of ethnographic case study research, as Cohen et al (2011) note, lies in each case being a unique example of ‘real’ people in ‘real’ situations that tries to capture ‘what it was like’ using ‘thick description’ (Geertz, 1973) of multiple “variables” or factors. As a participant observer, I was afforded a unique, though not unproblematic, opportunity to experience and analyse examples of lived experience that took place during the BB programme from a different perspective. This approach to the research requires that I overlay my own interpretation of participants’ experiences, including both those experiences that they articulated to me in interviews and discussions, and those that they haven’t (but which I have observed during participant observation). I discuss the methodological and epistemological implications of my research design in more depth in Chapter 4, but now turn to the implications of my positioning as a researcher.
1.8.1 Researcher Positionality and Ethical Considerations

I begin this section by discussing how I came to do this research, picking up from where I left off at the end of the short story told in the Preface to the thesis, describing how I gained access to the research setting and my relationship to others in it. After this I discuss aspects of my demographic profile (e.g. as a white, middle-class man), drawing on Curry-Stevens’ ‘Pedagogy for the Privileged’ (2007) to reflect on how the privileged aspects of my being are implicated in the research.

1.8.2. Accessing the Research Setting

After working as a BB Instructor in 2008, I left Bolivia with several questions swimming in my mind, as outlined at the end of the Preface. Four years later, having embarked on a Ph.D., those questions led me to contact BB Head Office in 2012, requesting permission from the Director – Jeff Yarborough – to conduct my Ph.D. fieldwork on the Bolivia and Peru programme. I had maintained a healthy relationship with BB staff since 2008 and attempted to strengthen my chances of gaining access by offering to document the programme experience through photographs and film, and to share these freely with the Instructors and students. I also offered to write a short research report specifically for BB, after the programme, which would focus on practical pedagogic suggestions and less on the academic theory that would feature in my thesis.

Understandably, BB Staff had some reservations about my proposal: for instance, I did not at that point know any of the Instructors (or students) on the programme and there was always a risk that my presence would influence the programme detrimentally. What if an Instructor or student did not like me for example? Nevertheless, after writing the BB staff a detailed proposal of what I intended to do during the fieldwork, pointing out that BB would potentially benefit from being the subject of externally
conducted research, Jeff granted permission and I was put in touch with the Program Director, Frida.

Frida agreed that it would be a good idea for me to participate in two one-semester programmes, which I did. I participated in the first as a scoping trip, building up relationships with the Instructors and other programme associates (e.g. homestay families and guest speakers) and familiarising myself more with the programme curriculum, pedagogy, and itinerary. I joined one of the students in staying with a homestay family during the BB group's one-month period in Cochabamba and returned to that family in the second semester having built up trust with them. This enabled me to observe a BB student in the homestay setting, including using video-recording with everyone's consent. Although I also developed healthy relationships with the Instructors, it is still necessary for me to unpack some of the implications of my positioning as a researcher.

1.8.3. Ethical, Political, and Epistemological Issues around Researcher Positioning, Power and Privilege

Reflecting on the Bolivian bus incident in the 2008 BB programme, and the students’ reaction to it, challenged me to question my motivations. Did I stand up and offer to share my seat to merely try and take the moral high ground? It also raised other ethical questions: what right did I have to challenge students in ways that brought some of them to tears? What position was I in to question the actions, or non-actions, of others? Was I using my power and status as an Instructor to bully students by trying to assert my perceived moral superiority? Curry-Stevens (2007) raises a pertinent point here, prompting me to examine my own positionality as a researcher, educator, and human being:

Educators involved in ‘Pedagogy for the Privileged’ need to understand the ethical critiques that exist about their work. The most scathing possibility is that educators engaged in this practice build a self-concept that they are “better than” others,
with this issue being most clearly observed among White, antiracism educators (54/55).

Curry-Stevens points here to a sense of arrogance that can pervade the work of some White radical educators who can tend to see themselves as somehow impervious to the White privilege they identify and critique, by virtue of naming such privilege. This is a trap I tried not to fall into as I attempted to maintain a necessary critical distance between myself and the BB Instructors, students and programme associates without “Othering” my travelling companions and being condescending or belittling.

Various commentators have warned against a tendency to, consciously or unconsciously, exoticise, essentialise, romanticise, and demonise the perceived ‘Other’ (e.g. see Said, 1979; Smith, 1999). Perceiving and representing other people like this is highly problematic for various reasons, including that it constructs distance and difference between the perceived and perceiver, creating a dichotomy of ‘them and us’ (Simpson, 2004: 688) which paves the way for attempts to dehumanise the Other and legitimise violence(s) exerted onto ‘them’. These forms of violence include epistemic violence, in which academic research (and by extension academic researchers), among others, are implicated.

As a middle-class, white, male, British, heterosexual, cisgender, and physically “slim”, healthy (and “abled”) Ph.D. researcher (among other social categories I fit into) I see myself as positioned in a privileged place – or rather, a continually shifting set of places – within unequal, unjust social power structures that produce and reproduce myriad forms of privilege and oppression. I am privileged in multiple ways and, as Curry-Stevens would argue, in at least some ways that position me as ‘implicated in the oppression of others’ (2007: 49). This can be understood in simple, tangible terms; for instance, by flying to Bolivia and Peru for my Ph.D. fieldwork, I contributed to accelerating processes of climatic change that increasingly, disproportionally, and often devastatingly, impact on populations that, literally and figuratively, cannot afford such choices. My function in the reproduction of social
inequality can also be understood in more abstract, but arguably more insidious terms; as a Ph.D. student at a higher education (HE) institution in the UK, I play a (small) part in reproducing a hierarchical, hegemonic, and globally far-reaching structure of systematic, formalised, academic knowledge production (see Ellsworth, 1989; Smith, 1999; Zuber-Skerrit, 1996).

Though I am aware of these pitfalls, I am by no means immune to them, and endeavour to remain critically reflexive as I construct representations of people and places through my interpretations. If I have failed, it reflects my own shortcomings and the difficult challenge of writing critically and analytically about the research participants when developing close relationships with them over an extended, intense and socially intimate period. Moreover, it is important to note here that any critiques I make of Instructors, students or other programme participants are critiques I also apply to myself – both my past self and my present self. It remains to be seen whether they are applicable to our future selves.

1.9. An Outline of the Thesis Structure

Having provided an overview of the thesis in this chapter, I move on to reviewing the literature on transformative pedagogy in Chapter 2. I sketch-out the rising trajectory of notions of ‘transformation’ in education discourses from the Age of Enlightenment to the present, through discussing literatures on development education and the gap year, critical pedagogy, and transformative learning theory. My main conclusion is that while these literatures have each made valuable contributions to transformative pedagogic theory and practice, there has been a lack of cross-fertilisation between them and, simultaneously, an absence of attention to power and space in transformative teaching and learning.
I respond to this absence in Chapter 3, by developing a conceptual framework around power and space. Employing a ‘defaced’ (Hayward, 1998) approach to power as social boundaries that define ‘fields of possibility’ (ibid), I draw on Massey’s notion of ‘power geometries’ (1994) to conceptualise space as an active agent in the reproduction or transformation of social power relations. To ground these ideas in my research context, I find Bourdieu’s concept of ‘cultural capital’ (1986) especially valuable, as is Bernstein’s theory of the ‘pedagogic device’ (1996) – and the conceptual toolbox it contains - which is the principle means through which I analyse micro-level pedagogic processes in the BB programme. Finally, Curry-Stevens’ post-Freirean ‘Pedagogy for the Privileged’ (2007) completes my framework by adding a layer of contextual specificity. These conceptual tools enable me to examine the importance of power and space in transformative pedagogy, leading me to question the predominance, in the literature, of ‘time’ as the foremost conceptual category for understanding transformative teaching and learning.

Chapter 4 focuses on my research methodology: critical ethnographic case study. I discuss and justify my use of critical ethnography and the participant observation method – as well as supplementary methods (e.g. discussions, document-gathering, interviews) – before unpacking some epistemological implications of my approach. Lastly, I address the case study component of my research design, concentrating on what kinds of claims I can make, before briefly outlining my empirical-analytical chapters and providing a rationale for their contribution to the research.

In Chapter 5, I concentrate on the research question: what pedagogic devices are used in a transformative pedagogic space and what are their rationales, intentions, and functions? (I also address the cross-cutting secondary research question – How do power and space function in a transformative pedagogic space? – as I do in Chapters 6 and 7). My main line of argument in the chapter is that the pedagogic devices I analyse function as ‘mental maps’ (Kitchin, 1994; White, 2012) which guide, organise and order BB group members’ programme experiences.
Moreover, the devices help to construct and maintain a crucial ‘cultural distinction’ (Bourdieu, 1979, 1990) within the BB group – who define themselves as ‘travellers’ not ‘tourists’ – aiding the accumulation of a specific type of cultural capital: cross-cultural transformation capital (CCTC). I conclude that the devices can be seen as “secret treasure maps” that reproduce BB students’ privileged positions in globalised ‘power geometries’ (Massey, 1994) and through a ‘regulative pedagogic discourse’ (Bernstein, 1996). While there are isolated examples of transformative learning facilitated through the pedagogic devices, these are mostly of a personal nature and unconnected to social change. This contradicts BB’s Freirean aims.

Chapter 6 addresses the question: what constitutes the process and content of teaching and learning in a transformative pedagogic space? I focus on the BB group’s week-long stay in Nación Apu, a group of “remote” indigenous communities in the Peruvian Andes. Instructors intended to shock students into experiencing transformative learning by taking them as far away as possible from the comfort zone of cultural familiarity. I argue that this strategy appears to facilitate some transformative perspective change, alongside the reproduction of some problematic discourses (e.g. students’ perceptions of the Apu people as “poor but happy”), but also masks a ‘hidden curriculum’ (Giroux and Purpel, 1983) of “pure” CCTC accumulation in which the BB group members extract knowledge and experience from pedagogic spaces that they perceived to be culturally pure, uncontaminated by Western influence. These parallel pedagogic functions happen through ‘explicit and tacit’ pedagogic relations (Bernstein, 1996) and illuminate the sometimes-paradoxical process and content of teaching and learning in a transformative pedagogic space.

In Chapter 7, I focus on the question: how does the character of a transformative pedagogic space shape what happens in it? I analyse what happens when some BB group members go on organised tour of Cerro Rico (Rich Mountain), a working mine in Potosí, Bolivia and have a reflective discussion about it in their hostel room afterwards. The Instructors’ main aim is for students to learn about Bolivia’s mining
history and issues around child labour, environmental protection and international development – but this does not happen. Instead, the gendered character of the male-dominated pedagogic space unexpectedly reproduces patriarchal discourses that shape socially reproductive and transformative knowledge production processes in relation to issues of misogyny, homophobia, and sexual identity. Building on my analysis of pure CCTC accumulation in the previous chapter, I develop the notion of pedagogic segregation to describe how different types of knowledge were produced in different types of space and shaped by the character of those spaces.

I conclude the thesis, in Chapter 8, by synthesising my responses to the research questions in the previous three chapters to address the overarching question: What constitutes transformative pedagogic space? I find that transformative pedagogic space is constituted by and through complex and sometimes contradictory processes of power that can shape teaching and learning in transformative and socially reproductive ways. These processes can be intentional and/or unintentional (and unconscious) but I suggest that unintentional reproductive learning during the BB programme was enabled by a pedagogy of political neutrality, which largely failed to achieve BB’s Freirean aim of connecting the personal and socio-political dimensions of transformative learning. Through analysing this process, my main original contribution to knowledge is the elaboration of the concept of CCTC, a specific type of ‘cultural capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) peculiar to cross-cultural education contexts in the 21st Century knowledge economy.
Chapter 2

The Time and Place for Transformation: Reviewing the Rise of the 'Transformative' in Education Discourses

2.1. Introduction

Having located my research, in theoretical terms, between Curry-Stevens’ post-Freirean transformative pedagogy and Bourdieu’s theory of pedagogy as social reproduction, in this chapter I place the increasing prevalence of the concept of ‘transformation’ in education discourses into historical and geographical context through a critical review of the literature on transformative pedagogy. This is not a systematic review – which is beyond the scope of this thesis – but one I conducted by following “reference trails” of key texts in each body of literature, starting with core texts in that field.

I point to convergences between discourses on transformation and the literatures on development education and the gap year introduced in the previous chapter, while locating my thesis in relation to them. I do not intend to write a comprehensive history of the representation of ‘transformation’ in education discourses across time and place. Instead, I seek to trace the trajectory of transformation in education literature in a way that is specifically relevant to my research, and thus limited in scope. This compels me to focus on education discourses that are
prevalent in North America and Western Europe, and specifically Freirean approaches to transformative pedagogy.

I start by discussing the notion of ‘transformation’ in education discourses. I briefly sketch out an historical trajectory of ‘transformation’ as a concept that is often used in relation to various forms of education (i.e. formal, non-formal, and informal education). Transformation has come to be associated by numerous scholars with dominant frameworks for theorising adult education, for example, in transformative learning theory (see Mezirow et al, 1978; Kitchenham, 2008). While tracing the trajectory of ‘transformation’ in education theory and practice, I review the changes it has itself undergone.

I locate the beginnings of this phenomenon in the transformation narratives of the Enlightenment. Having traced some of the pervasive epistemological and ontological themes of this period of scientific and intellectual revolution – focusing on the Cartesian ‘mind and body’ dualism it birthed – I briefly discuss how notions of transformation have, more recently, been used in neoliberal discourses of self-improvement and self-help through education. I then describe how neoliberalism has also played a part in the de-politicisation of (some forms of) transformation in development education, including its influence in the rise of the concept of global citizenship. By way of contrast, I then concentrate on a very different approach to the notion of transformation in education discourses, through reviewing the literature on critical pedagogy. Highlighting Paolo Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed (1970) as a seminal text which catalysed the emergence of critical pedagogy, I discuss this body of theory and practice (Freire, 1970) and its politically progressive anti-neoliberal notions of transformative teaching and learning.

Following this, I focus on the Transformative Learning Theory (Mezirow et al, 1978) that emerged alongside the development of critical pedagogy, and was also inspired and informed, in part, by Freire’s work in its early stages. I outline how the ‘first-wave’ (Gunnlaugson, 2005) of transformative learning theories that emerged from the US in the 1970s
has evolved following critiques that it was ‘Western-centric’ because its theories were ‘rationalist’, ‘individualist’ and ‘psychologised’ (Taylor and Cranton, 2012). A ‘second-wave’ (Gunnlaugsson, 2005) of theories has addressed these limitations to an extent, for instance paying greater attention to the function of socio-cultural context and place in transformative learning. Nonetheless, I argue that the literature on TLT remains limited by a lack of attention to power and a preoccupation with time – at the expense of space – as the principle conceptual-analytical category for understanding transformative learning.

2.2. The Trajectory of ‘Transformation’ in Education

Attempting to try and pinpoint when and where discourses of transformation began to be associated with formal education, let alone non-formal and informal education, would be difficult and problematic. Rather than attempt this, I seek to sketch-out a rough trajectory of specific notions of transformation in formal/non-formal education discourses as it pertains specifically and directly to my research; this leads me to the Age of Enlightenment as a ‘starting point’.

2.2.1. A Lightbulb Moment

Some notion of transformation (if not the term itself) in education discourses was born, or at least gained traction, during the European Renaissance, and more specifically the Age of Enlightenment. During this period, an idea gathered momentum – that education, as a vehicle for the transmission of (so-called “Western”) scientific knowledge, could transform humankind – or more accurately, some members of mankind, namely upper/middle-class, white European men – by lifting human intellect from the dark ages of ignorance into the “light” of scientific knowledge (Lewin, 2005; Taylor and Cranton, 2012).
This learning and transformation was located firmly in the notion of rational thought and encapsulated in René Descartes’ declaration ‘I think therefore I am’. This equation of cognitive thinking with ontological being served to privilege a way of knowing and sited that way of knowing in the head as opposed to, say, the body (and the physical and emotional dimensions associated with it). It gave rise to what is known as Cartesian dualism between the mind and the body:

Since the rise of enlightenment philosophy, particularly Cartesian dualism, the extra-cognitive elements of learning, such as feeling, imagination, intuition, and dreams, have been anathema to Western epistemology, in which mind and body are separated and seen as utterly distinct (Kucukaydin and Cranton, 2012: 44).

This dualistic dismemberment of mind and body, was necessary, as Kucukaydin et al (ibid) explain, to maintain the construction of Western science – founded on positivism – as the basis of a superior knowledge production system for understanding the natural and social world. More specifically, Cartesian dualism helped:

- to minimize the human factors of perception and subjectivity in an attempt to discover natural and social laws. For example, logical positivism did not recognize any emotional or affective propositions as meaningful because they cannot be reduced to factual propositions and defined with numerical data (ibid: 44).

Various scholars have highlighted the Age of Enlightenment as the birthplace of the guiding principles of contemporary Western liberal education (e.g. see Clifford-Vaughan, 1963; Lewin, 2005) but critics have highlighted some of the problematic assumptions that lie at its heart. For instance, Bowers (1993: 25-26) identifies ‘root metaphors’:

that reinforce the problem of anthropocentric thinking. These include the notion of change as inherently progressive, faith in the power of rational thought, and an understanding of individuals as “potentially free, volunteristic entities” who will
take responsibility for creating themselves when freed from societal forms of oppression (in Bell and Russell, 2000: 192-193).

As Bell and Russell (ibid) note, these notions are culturally specific and stem from a certain period in Western history when the modern industrial world view was beginning to take shape, at the conception of industrial capitalism (Kocka, 2016). The emphasis placed on individual freedom, responsibility and self-creation signal the antecedents of liberal political and economic thought which evolve, eventually, into the neoliberal ideological paradigm that begins to dominate not only European, but global political, economic and cultural activity from the 1980s to the present day.

2.2.2. Neoliberal Notions of Transformative Education

Since the late 20th Century, the term ‘transformation’ has become increasingly invoked in relation to formal education. Focus is placed on the transformative potential of formal education to enhance the lives of individuals (e.g. see Morgan, 2015). Aligned with a neoliberal approach to education as a means of accumulating human capital, formal education came to be regarded as the means to an end and framed in economic terms. For example, universities now advertise courses that ‘transform your career’ (The Open University, 2017; University of Brighton, 2016) and employability has come to define the overarching purpose of the modern university, at least in many Western contexts (e.g. the USA and UK) in which rising tuition fees are marketising Higher Education (Brown and Carasso, 2013; Molesworth, 2010).

Outside the sphere of formal education, in the realms of non-formal and informal education, the notion of individual betterment and transformation has manifested in the growth of discourses on self-improvement and self-help. These growth industries offer educational courses and books – based on ideas ranging from ‘the ancient teachings of Buddha...to The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People’ – that promise to ‘transform your life’ (Butler-Bowdon, 2003; Gyatso, 2007). The heady
blend of ideas constituting these discourses include the “Western” import and translation of “Eastern” philosophies and spiritual practices, such as yoga, meditation, mindfulness, and a fixation with living in the present moment, all seen as a means to transform one’s levels of personal happiness (see Gyatso, 2007). It also includes inputs from “Western” psychology – for instance, in the form of psychotherapy and person-centred counselling – and physical treatments (e.g. massage, spa treatments) that promise to transform one’s wellbeing. This neoliberal notion of transformation in education discourses has played a part in the evolution of other forms of education too; most pertinently for my research, neoliberalism has played a part in shaping development education and gap year education programmes.

2.2.3. Neoliberalism and the De-politicisation of ‘Transformation’ in Development Education

Although all types of development education ostensibly strive to educate towards a fairer, more equal, and ultimately ‘better’ world, and many envisage this task to involve transforming learners into agents of social change in one form or another (ibid), there can be considerable, and sometimes contradictory, differences between approaches. These indicate the contested – and competing – values, ideologies, theories and pedagogic practices driving development education. Bourn (2015: 24) describes how, in some cases, the core feature of development education has become weakened:

Behind the growth of development education there has been a distinctive pedagogical approach that needs to be recognised for what it is, a pedagogy for global social justice. Whilst elements of its practice have had an impact on educational policies and practices, its underlying radicalism has perhaps at a number of times and in a number of countries become too diluted. It is the connection to critical pedagogy, transformative learning and postcolonial theories that opens the possibilities for a new radical development education, based on a distinctive approach towards learning.
The ‘dilution’ of development education’s ‘underlying radicalism’ has, then, incorporated a move away from the use of critical pedagogy – Freire’s transformative educational legacy. I discuss critical pedagogy in relation to transformative education further later in this chapter, but in short, I understand it to mean approaches to teaching and learning that seek to transform learners’ understandings of – and attitudes and actions towards – poverty and inequality. This involves learners excavating the historical-colonial, socio-economic and political-structural causes of contemporary social injustices, and exploring ways of redressing and transforming them, within an explicitly political (and moral-ethical) frame of reference.

By contrast, the weakening of development education’s radical political roots has, in numerous contexts, led to markedly different approaches to teaching and learning about international development that tend to, for instance, emphasise aid, charity and ethical consumerism as the means to combat poverty and other global social injustices (see Andreotti, 2006a; Barker, 2004; Huckle, 2004; Jefferess, 2008; Vare and Scott, 2008). Such approaches have been accused of (unintentionally) reproducing patriarchal discourses and paternalistic approaches to international development, often inadvertently stereotyping people in the developing world as helpless victims in need of aid (Andreotti, 2006b; Jefferess, 2008). This threatens to merely reformulate and reproduce colonial-era power relations, perpetuating the pernicious ‘white Western saviour’ narrative (Martin and Griffiths, 2012).

Moreover, neo-colonial approaches to development education that foreground philanthropic relationships with international development issues tend to operate mainly within moral-ethical frameworks, steering clear of critical engagement with global political and economic systems. If these ‘uncritical’ (Vare et al, 2008) approaches ever tread into political terrain, critics argue that they reinforce and reproduce neoliberal hegemony in its political and economic guises (Martin et al, 2012) by subscribing to a vision of positive social change that adheres, respectively, to the value of individual agency and ‘freedom’ from socio-
structural ‘constraints’ and, correspondingly (in economic terms), the underpinning rationales of globalised free market capitalism (e.g. see Barker, 2004:90; Cameron and Fairbrass, 2004; Martin et al, 2012). Indeed, in some contexts – for example, development education provision in state schools by non-governmental Development Education Centres (DEC) in the UK – it has been argued that the ‘transformative’ – and even ‘revolutionary’ – development agenda once evident in the development education ‘movement’ (ibid) has largely given way to a neoliberal vision that:

does not call for critical engagement, rather it is an education for the acceptance of globalisation (Barker, 2004: 92).

In this vision, rather than ‘an education to challenge globalisation’ (Cameron et al, 2004: 734), development education becomes a mechanism for preparing learners for employment in the global marketplace. If so, this would appear to add weight to Bourdieu and Passeron’s (1990) assertion (outlined in Chapter 1) that ostensibly progressive pedagogies (such as those associated with development education) merely mask a more insidious inculcation of leaners into the social status quo.

Critics such as Cameron et al (2004) have argued that the dilution, or de-radicalisation, of the development education movement – at least in the case of DECs in the UK – was facilitated through the creation of the Department for International Development (DFID) by the newly elected New Labour government in 1997. Many DECs received significant project funding from DFID, who, it is argued, endorse the neoliberal ideologies of International Financial Institutions (IFI) like the World Bank by promoting a globalised market economy as the key to development. By contrast, DECs had tended to argue ‘that these institutions and the globalisation of markets [are] ‘bad’ for the poor and should be reformed or even abolished’ (ibid: 734). Moreover, it has been highlighted that DFID applied conditions to DEC funding by declining to provide financial support for any initiatives that involve:
direct lobbying of the UK government or of international organisations of which the UK is a member, or which involve lobbying for or against activities of particular companies, individuals or institutions (DFID in Cameron et al, 2004: 734).

The processes I have discussed so far can be seen, in my view, more as de-politicisation than dilution, with uncritical approaches amounting, in some cases, to ‘depoliticised’ development education. Indeed, opposing approaches to teaching development education (i.e. explicitly political/critical versus depoliticised/uncritical) mirror differences in approaches to ‘doing development’ within the international development industry, where the predominance of neoliberal policy and practice has led to the label ‘the Anti-Politics Machine’ (Ferguson, 1990) being applied to the industry by critics in some quarters. Moreover, the popularisation of the concept of ‘global citizenship’ within development education can be understood as an important part of the process of re-framing this adjectival education as apolitical.

2.2.4. The ‘Global’ Transformation of Citizenship

Developing global citizens is commonly seen as one of the main purposes of development education. As examined in Chapter 1, BB couches its transformative aims in this terminology, and Andreotti (2006) distinguished two opposing ways that development education can approach the task of developing global citizens. Global citizenship, then, is a contested concept, and a global citizen can be conceptualized in various ways (Dower et al, 2003). One conception suggests that ‘we are citizens of individual countries and it is through those countries that we can best effect global issues’ (Kerr, 1999:281/2). However, critics challenge the globalising of the concept of citizenship by arguing that ‘the exercise of citizenship requires the capacity to participate in the public discussion of the polity’ (Appiah, 2005:101). Yet, as Dower points out (in Jefferess, 2008:28):
because the institutional structures associated with citizenship do not exist at a global level, “citizenship” [...] functions metaphorically [within the term ‘global citizenship’].

This argument notes that conceptualizations of citizenship (at least within nominally ‘democratic’ societies) are typically predicated on membership of a political community which, by definition, contains the institutional structures required to facilitate some degree of participation by the citizenry in legally binding, political decision-making processes. The use of the word ‘citizenship’ in a global context arguably transforms this definitional premise as it implies that everyone is a global citizen merely by virtue of their membership of a global ‘community’ of human beings. Although this might at first glance seem to be an egalitarian, progressive and inclusive notion of citizenship it renders the concept redundant as it becomes inseparable from ‘membership’. Moreover, it functions to depoliticise the concept of citizenship by stripping it of any association with political agency within democratic decision-making mechanisms. As Roman (2004:231) asks:

Is "global citizenship" an oxymoronic slogan; a well-meaning but naive equation of transnational mobility or "belonging" with formal legal substantive citizenship and human rights...?

Furthermore, this apparently ‘naïve’ conceptualization fails to recognise that citizenship has always been exercised exclusively (Dower, 2002; Heater, 2004) and involved various inequalities and forms of gender, race, and class subordination (among others). These inequalities have various implications, but regarding the rhetoric of global citizenship and ‘interdependence’ in development education, they elucidate Andreotti’s (2006: 104) assertion that ‘the North has a global reach while the South only exists locally’, suggesting that ‘not everyone is a global citizen’ (Jefferess, 2008:27) and also raising questions about how ‘global’ citizens in the ‘North’ can actively work for social change in the global South and North in productive and politically attuned ways.
In response, Jefferess sees the concept of global citizenship as unhelpful because it ‘normalizes the conditions of the privilege that allow some to be in the position to help or “make a difference”’ (ibid: 28) to the lives of people in ‘developing’ countries. This reproduces the colonial rhetoric of moral responsibility for the perceived ‘Other’, as opposed to creating a better world with others, cultivating a patronising and divisive ‘us and them’ mentality projected from the self-identified ‘helpers’ in the global North onto the supposed ‘helped’ in the global South. Moreover, it can be argued that by depoliticising the meaning of citizenship, the globalisation of ‘citizenship’ implicitly frames the notion of active global citizenship in apolitical, individualist terms. I suggest that this has contributed to some forms of development education teaching learners the value of, for instance, ethical consumerism as a ‘solution’ to poverty and inequality at the expense of collective political action.

However, it is important here to exercise caution with the use of binary categories – as I pointed out in the previous chapter’s discussion of Andreotti’s 'soft versus critical' distinction – which risk polarising and glossing over the complexities involved in untangling concepts of global citizenship, transformation and neoliberalism in the context of development education. In their work on international volunteering in ‘developing’ world contexts (which is distinct from, though related to, my research context) Baillie-Smith and Laurie discuss 'the neoliberalisation of international development and citizenship', but propose 'an antidote to the idea of neoliberal global citizenship as a new form of unfettered global mobility or a simple extension of global consumption' (2011:556). The authors argue that 'neoliberalism is producing a complex reimagining of international volunteering' which 'encompasses processes of commodification' (i.e. as I outlined above) but that they:

wish to move the debate forward by focusing on how contemporary international volunteering is producing and being produced through new dynamics and relationships between the state, the corporate sector and civil society (546)
Baillie Smith et al’s important contribution here is, then, to broaden the focus of research in this area – which typically focuses on individuals' experiences – to the:

shifting organisational configurations that structure individual experiences [...] the processes through which international volunteering is produced, particularly as this connects with broader debates around neoliberalism and neoliberal governance (ibid).

Whilst this broader focus is beyond the scope of my research, Laurie and Baillie Smith’s most recent work is more pertinent as it aims to 'unsettle' established 'geographies of volunteering' that produce ubiquitous binaries such as the global North/South (2017). Whilst acknowledging that these 'geographies of mobility' produce processes of 'inclusion and exclusion' (as I mentioned earlier in my discussion of citizenship) that are 'facilitated through international volunteering' and underpinned by 'hierarchical spatial imaginaries' (2011: 556), Baillie Smith et al:

seek to critique relational conceptualisations of space and explore the ways in which the “hidden geometries” of volunteering and development produce unexpected spaces of coming together for different actors, which both confound and complicate spatial binaries and expose their over-determination (2017:96).

As will become clearer in chapter 3, and throughout the rest of my thesis, this presents questions and challenges for my research as I employ relational conceptualisations of space and power and use them to micro-analyse the production of transformative pedagogic spaces during the BB programme. Whilst I also use a similar concept of hidden 'power geometries' (Massey, 1994) in my analyses, and also reveal unexpected instances of complicated and contradictory pedagogic space, my main lines of argument tend to be premised on the geographies that Baillie Smith et al unsettle.
So, in spite of the conceptual challenges presented by Baillie Smith and Laurie, and their desire to move the focus of enquiry from the individual to the institutional, for the time being I remain focused on how neoliberal ideology has influenced notions of global citizenship and transformation at the level of educational programmes and their participants. This can be found in gap year and study abroad programmes, many of which engage in a development education of sorts and increasingly employ the concepts of global citizenship and ‘transformation’ to promote their enterprise.

2.2.5. Global Citizenship and Transformation in Gap Year and Study Abroad Programmes

Gap year and study abroad programmes have increasingly used the narrative of transformation (often in conjunction with global citizenship) to sell international learning experiences. Programme providers often claim transformative aims in relation to participants (e.g. see Carpe Diem Education, 2014; Leap Now, 2015) though these vary. Some providers focus solely on advertising a transformative experience to potential students, and frame this in the language of self-improvement and leadership, such as Global Learning Semesters (2012) which provides:

transformative semester and summer study abroad programs that aim to prepare North American students to be leaders in an increasingly interconnected world (no page).

By contrast, other providers like ‘Me to We’ – a Canadian ‘innovative social enterprise’ (2012) – states on its webpage that its programmes are ‘driven by the goal of creating systemic change – for the participants and within the communities where they travel.’

Me to We does not articulate its notion of ‘systemic change’ but apparently uses an ‘ingenious business model’ based on ‘ethical consumerism’ created ‘to help transform consumers into socially
conscious world changers, one transaction at a time’ (ibid). Me to We’s online merchandise shop supposedly aids this transformation as it is claimed that:

purchasing a Me to We Artisans product adds a stylish accessory to your wardrobe, while empowering a woman to lift her family out of poverty in Africa (ibid).

Aside from the paternalistic rhetoric on clear display here, the shift from stating transformative aims to making transformative claims in Me to We’s pitch is apparent. Other gap year providers also go beyond goal-setting to confidently claim that students on its programmes will have ‘life-changing’ experiences (IES Abroad, 2017) and ‘make a [positive] difference’ (ibid) to the ‘local’ people that they engage with through volunteer work, or ‘service learning’ (see Gap 360, 2017; Global Citizen Year, 2017; Helping Abroad, 2015).

So, some approaches to transformation in development education abroad programmes are oriented around self-improvement while others sell the idea of “making a difference” to poor people in “other” countries. Either way, both these narratives are intimately tied to a neoliberal discourse that locates the causes of poverty and inequality in the behaviour of individual people, rather than acknowledging structures and systems of power and oppression. Even when the notion of systemic change is invoked, Me to We’s vision for achieving it amounts to buying “ethically” sourced products.

In addition to the political and economic neoliberalism evident, then, in the promotional discourse of some gap year programmes, some academic research into study abroad programmes identifies cultural manifestations of neoliberalism (and liberalism). For example, Chaput, O’Sullivan and Arnold (2010) examine the experiences of Canadian students who participated in a supposedly transformative short-term study abroad programme in Cuba and argue that the transformative potential of the trip was curtailed by students’ reluctance to debate
differences of opinion and perspective in relation to the experiences they were having in favour of upholding liberal values of tolerance and acceptance of individual differences. The authors note that although many of the students appeared to be uncomfortable with aspects of Cuban society, which they viewed through a 'neoliberal lens' – such as the lack of 'open competition and meritocratic reward' – and perceived 'contradictions' in elements of Cuban culture, they 'reverted back to a more traditional brand of liberalism as they attempted to make sense of the supposed contradictions' (29) by avoiding debate and deliberation. Drawing from Foucault by seeing neoliberalism as 'every bit as much a cultural phenomena as it is a political economic practice’ (29), the authors, through their research, subsequently:

come to believe, first, that a liberal culture of tolerance maintains the dominance of a neoliberal political economic worldview by falling back on such notions as individualism, privacy, and non-interference, and, second, that this coupling mutes the deliberative activities necessary for transformative education (27).

By focusing on how neoliberalism functions as a culturally reproductive mechanism that mediates the transformative potential of transformative education, Chaput et al's study speaks to a strand of development education theory and practice that is highly relevant to my thesis. As I will discuss in detail in chapter 3, Bourdieu's theory of cultural reproduction – which is central to my conceptual framework – explains how forms of asymmetric symbolic power (or symbolic violence) function through 'habitus', or sets of socially produced, durable predispositions that shape our ways of thinking and being in the world (1984). Albeit referencing Foucault rather than Bourdieu, Chaput et al describe something very similar in their critique of cultural neoliberalism:

neoliberalism operates to give organic coherence to life patterns. Neoliberalism governs our everyday activities through an embodied habituation or way of thinking and acting that stems from discrete, but interconnected practices bound within the
Furthermore, the habituated ways of being referred to here are closely connected to fundamental concepts in transformative learning theory. As I will discuss in more detail shortly, transformative learning theory is predicated on the transformation of cognitive structures – which are intimately linked with socio-cultural structures – that form ‘habits of mind’ that ‘frame an individual’s tacit “points of view” and influence their thinking, beliefs, and actions’ (Mezirow, 2000:17).

By employing these theories of cultural reproduction and transformative learning in a critical ethnographic study that focuses on the function of power in the production of transformative pedagogic spaces during the BB programme, I am able to contribute to this area of theory and practice in development education. Although literatures in similar areas have also invoked notions of transformation, few have focused on power and space in the same way, and fewer still have done so through ethnography (Chaput et al’s study is something of an exception here, but it, nevertheless, does not employ participant observation to explicit effect, like I do, which is a valuable method for interpreting participants changing ways of being, as I will discuss further in chapter 4). For example, the academic literature on gap year and service learning programmes abroad has also invoked the notion of transformation and transformative learning (e.g. see Bamber, 2016; Coghlan and Gooch, 2011; Kiely, 2004; 2005; Mitchell, 2007; Porfilio and Hickman, 2011; Warren, 1998) but varies between studies which advocate the transformative benefits of gap year experiences (see O’ Shea, 2013) to more critical accounts (e.g. see King, 2007; Lyons et al, 2012; Simpson, 2004, 2005; Snee, 2013, 2014), some of which apply critiques to neoliberal ideology in the gap year enterprise (see Wilde, 2013).

While this literature is growing steadily, it still lacks a well-established base. As Jones (2004:7) has noted in his Review of Gap Year Provision ‘there is a severe lack of literature to ‘review’ on the subject of gap years and there has not been any substantial academic or policy research in
the past’. Moreover, the empirical research that exists has mostly been limited to approaches that focus on the learning “outcomes” of self-proclaimed transformed learners after a transformative experience or are reliant on analysing learners’ experiences “from a distance” – for example Snee’s (2014) study of gap-year students’ online blogs.

There are, then, few ethnographic studies that employ participant observation to explore processes of transformative teaching and learning in this context. While the literature on travel and tourism provides abundant examples of backpacker/traveller ethnography (e.g. see Brown, 2009; Muzaini, 2006; Noy, 2004; Sørensen, 2003; O’Reilly, 2005) the literature on structured gap year and study abroad programmes has not followed suit. The former and latter differ in the sense that backpacker ethnographies are not situated in the same context of structured pedagogic spaces and thus would not need to account for pedagogic power relations in the same way. Either way, the result has been a lack of (critical) ethnography that attends to the function of power in transformative pedagogic spaces within the context of gap year education programmes such as BB’s. I now turn to a literature on transformative pedagogy that has, by contrast, focused on power: critical pedagogy.

2.2.6. Critical Pedagogy

Critical pedagogy is an approach to teaching and learning that attempts to unearth and uproot historical, structural causes of inequality and injustice. As mentioned earlier, pedagogy is more than a mere teaching technique; and, although critical pedagogy is certainly intended to be translated into practical teaching strategies, it is not regarded as a template to be applied uniformly irrespective of context. Indeed, it is anathema to that notion for many critical pedagogues and theorists (Darder et al, 2009) and is better understood as a theoretical and political orientation to teaching and learning.

Nonetheless, despite its malleability, critical pedagogy is defined by a set of core tenets. It seeks to equip learners with the means to identify
and resist neoliberal ideology and work towards transforming asymmetric social power relations. Critical pedagogy can, then, be seen as:

capable of appropriating from a variety of radical theories — feminism, postmodernism, critical theory, poststructuralism, neo-Marxism...and those progressive elements that might be useful in both challenging neoliberalism on many fronts while resurrecting a militant democratic socialism that provides the basis for imagining a life beyond the “dream world” of capitalism (Giroux, 2004: 32).

In doing so, critical pedagogy seeks to illuminate the explicitly political character and function of education and schooling, which is typically concealed by a neo-conservative rhetoric that attempts to define educational spaces as neutral, apolitical spaces that should be free of ideological partiality. Indeed, for critical pedagogues, this masking of the intrinsic political character of pedagogy is an integral part of the teaching and learning of capitalist logics and social structures, not least because it obstructs educators and learners from questioning and challenging those logics and structures and the role of education in reproducing them (Freire, 1970; Giroux, 2004; Illich, 1971).

By focusing on pedagogy as a highly political site of power-knowledge production, and by seeking to enable the unlearning and relearning of this process, critical pedagogy can be described more specifically as 'a counter-hegemonic strategy’ (McLaren and Fischmann in Lapayese, 2003: 495). Within this broad remit, critical pedagogy contains various strands of foci on specific sites of oppression. For instance, regarding race, critical pedagogy:

attempts to help teachers unlearn racist practices as well as develop forms of revolutionary agency capable of contesting dominant arrangements within white supremacist capitalist patriarchy (ibid).
As illustrated, a continual critique of the traditional teacher as a reproducer of inequality is central to this analysis and the role of the teacher as an exclusive owner of knowledge is challenged. A direct link can be made here with Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970). Indeed, the radical Brazilian educator is widely regarded as the founding father of critical pedagogy. Although Freire’s ideas have since been translated and adapted in various ways for use in different contexts, the participatory-democratic ethos of his pedagogic vision is at the heart of critical pedagogy, which is above all a form of democratic pedagogy:

Democratic pedagogies are singularly dedicated to creating critical citizens who can analyze the social contradictions that constitute everyday life within capitalist democracy and to transforming relations of exploitation and oppression (Giroux 1988 in McLaren et al., 2000: 168).

Critical pedagogies have, of course, been criticized on various grounds. For example, the field is dominated by male theorists which impedes its ability to be an effective thorn-in-the-side of patriarchal power-knowledge structures (see Ellsworth, 1989; Luke et al., 1992). Other critics argue that critical pedagogy has failed to translate theory into the “nuts and bolts” of pedagogical practice in a way that is easily usable by educators (e.g. see Andreotti, 2006a). For these and other reasons, which I will shortly discuss, the link between the literature on critical pedagogy and the literature on transformative teaching and learning has been surprisingly underdeveloped. They have largely overlooked one another. I begin to address this in the next Chapter, by reinfusing and re-politicising notions of transformative pedagogy with attention to power. For now, though, I discuss the rise of transformative learning theory which took place alongside the emergence of critical pedagogy.

### 2.2.7. The First Wave of Transformative Learning Theory

Transformative learning is proposed – though not without challenge (see Newman, 2012) – to be a qualitatively distinct form of learning
(Mezirow, 1994). Whilst ‘learning’ usually connotes change of some kind, Rogers (2002:86) notes that some forms of learning are understood as confirmation and reinforcement of ‘existing patterns of knowledge and behaviour’ in which ‘change’ refers to the consolidation and intensification of these patterns. By contrast transformative learning involves unlearning socialised ‘habits of mind and action’ (Mezirow, 1997).

While there are various conceptualisations of transformative learning, it is widely agreed to involve a ‘dramatic and fundamental change in the way we see ourselves and the world in which we live’ (Merriam, Caffarella, and Baumgartner, 2007:133). More fundamentally, it involves a:

```
  deep, structural shift in basic premises of thought, feelings and actions. It is a shift in consciousness that dramatically alters our way of being in the world (O'Sullivan, 2003:327).
```

Transformative learning theory (TLT) provides a framework to understand how this shift happens. TLT originated in the work of Jack Mezirow and Victoria Marsick during a 1978 study of women in the US returning to college and can be located in relation to a history of “alternative” educational theory and practice in the US. Mezirowian TLT has been hugely influential in shaping discourses about transformation and education and is the main current that steers ‘first wave’ theories of transformative learning (Gunnlaugson, 2005). In his early work, Mezirow described TLT as:

```
  the emancipatory process of becoming critically aware of how and why the structure of psycho-cultural assumptions has come to constrain the way we see ourselves and our relationships, reconstituting this structure to permit a more inclusive and discriminating integration of experience and acting upon these new understandings (1981: 6).
```
I note the language of emancipation here, drawing attention to the Freirean influence in the formative stages of Mezirowian TLT development (Dirkx, 1998). However, this initial interest in ‘social-emancipatory’ forms of transformative learning dissipated in Mezirow’s work which became increasingly oriented to theorising cognitive processes within the psychological dimension of transformation.

During the evolution of Mezirow’s TLT, the notion of ‘perspective transformation’ has remained central and refers to the process through which an individual revises her frame(s) of reference by critically reflecting on personal experiences (Mezirow, 1996). Frames of reference are structures of ‘assumptions, predispositions and orientations that act as a filter for interpreting the meaning of experience’ and are constructed through the ways that people interpret experiences (Mezirow, 2000:17). These structures form ‘habits of mind’ that ‘frame an individual’s tacit “points of view” and influence their thinking, beliefs, and actions’ (ibid). A perspective transformation involves:

1. elaborating existing frames of reference;
2. learning new frames of reference;
3. transforming points of view;
4. transforming habits of mind (ibid).

Mezirow developed a 10-phase model (1978) which outlines the process in more detail – and revised it in 1994 (see Appendix 4) – also emphasising that the phases of perspective transformation might happen gradually or suddenly and need not necessarily proceed in order, nor include every phase. Nonetheless, some phases such as, for instance, ’Phase 1) The Disorienting Dilemma’ are widely acknowledged as essential to transformative learning (Taylor, 2007). The Disorienting Dilemma refers to an experience that turns one’s ‘compass’ (e.g. ethical, political, emotional etc.) – or frame of reference – upside down and causes an individual to question deeply-held assumptions that they may have previously been unaware of. Various experiences can apparently
catalyse this process, including the exposure to unfamiliar cultural contexts, because:

frames of reference often represent cultural paradigms (collectively held frames of reference) – learning that is unintentionally assimilated from the culture one is familiar with (Mezirow, 2000:17).

This, then, provides a vocabulary and conceptual apparatus for helping me make sense of the teaching and learning process in the transformative pedagogic spaces created during the BB programme. For instance, BB appears to explicitly attempt to catalyse a disorienting dilemma by instructing Instructors, in the Educator’s Resource, to:

Grab your students’ attention. Blow their minds with beauty or cultural difference. Balance cultural immersion with lots of group time. Intentionally separate your group from the hustle and bustle to effectively transfer tools, information, and lay the infrastructure for empowerment (BB, 2013c: 34).

BB elaborates on this advice by recommending that programmes:

start with a strong wake-up call for the participants, usually a dramatic and exceptionally different experience that illustrates the power of cross-cultural learning, such as a first day's trip to the Killing Fields in Cambodia, or a first night stay in a shelter for pilgrims in Calcutta, India (BB, 2013c:12).

It is unclear from this how students might process this type of potentially disorienting experience but drawing on Mezirow’s framework helped me to gain insights into this process throughout my research.

Mezirow’s work has, however, been critiqued on various grounds. For some critics, his approach to transformative learning is overly ‘rationalistic’, ‘individualised’ and ‘psychologised’ (Taylor et al, 2012) characteristics that expose the Western hemispheric bias in first-wave
theories of transformative learning (ibid) – for example, the strong emphasis on the individual as the unit of analysis and a lack of attention for the sociocultural contexts that shape learning (Ntseane, 2011).

Furthermore, Mezirow overlooks the issue of power which is in need of investigation in TLT (Taylor et al, 2012). For example, Belenkey and Stanton (2000) contend that Mezirow does not fully consider the power differentials which impact upon opportunities for learning, and that educators need to understand that different groups require different approaches to learning.

2.2.8. The Predominance of ‘Time’ in TLT

Other critics of first wave transformative learning theory have pointed to concerns with its treatment of the concept of ‘time’. For example, Dirkx (2000) questions the common notion that transformative learning involves extraordinary events or “aha!” moments that punctuate the progression of time in the transformation process. Transformative learning can happen gradually in everyday experiences (in Kucakaydin et al, 2012).

Yet perhaps more problematically, first wave TLT focuses predominantly on the process of learning and change that learners undergo over time. This is, undoubtedly, very important, but it also foregrounds time as a conceptual category through which to understand the theory and practice of transformative pedagogy. Moreover, an implicit conception of time as linear is almost exclusively employed in the literature. As Taylor et al (2012: 202) point out in their discussion on ‘Rethinking the Process of Transformation’:

The typical perception of a transformative learning process is linear and mechanistic, in the search for cause and effect. Yet living systems are fluid and responsive, continually oscillating between habitual and novel patterns.
The assumption of linear time is linked, in my view, to the common contention that transformative learning is ‘irreversible’, based on Mezirow’s claim:

that it is irreversible once completed; that is, once our understanding is clarified and we have committed ourselves fully to taking the action it suggests, we do not regress to levels of less understanding (1991: 152).

This temporal premise raises various questions, for example: does one’s ‘level of understanding’ remain constant across time and space? What is the relationship between understanding and taking action? The underlying premise is rarely if ever critically and thoroughly interrogated beyond minor admissions that the transformative learning process may not necessarily happen in the chronological order suggested by models such as Mezirow’s ‘10-Stage Model of Transformative Learning’ (1978). The category of time has permeated both academic discourses and practitioner discourses. For example, witness how BB’s Educational Resource frames its description of the transformative moments that punctuate its programmes:

There are moments in all of our lives when time has stood still, when we have been so absorbed in the present moment that we can remember every detail of an event. Typically, this is when the unexpected has happened. A [Breaking Boundaries] student’s first week in-country may seem like a lifetime because time itself will feel to have moved slowly: so many new and different experiences will happen and the student will HAVE to be present to negotiate these moments. The more moments we have that are remarkable and wildly “foreign”, the more students will forget their past, eschew thoughts of the future, and focus on the here and now (BB, 2006: 86/87).

I suggest that by being oriented principally around time, TLT is limited by not, for instance, addressing the other fundamental dimension of human existence – space. I will address the shortcoming in the next chapter and the rest of the thesis.
2.2.9. The Second Wave of ‘Integral’ Theories

In this section I discuss some ‘second wave’ (Gunnlaugson, 2005) theories of transformative learning that critique, but also build-upon and adapt the first wave by incorporating and integrating the importance of experiential, physical, somatic (bodily) learning and knowing into a more holistic form of transformative pedagogy. This is an approach that also integrates the importance of socio-cultural context, or place, into transformative teaching and learning (Gunnlaugson, 2005; Taylor et al, 2012).

A somatic, embodied orientation to teaching and learning attends to the interaction between learners and their environment and places emphasis on the primary importance of the body as a medium of learning and knowing (Sellers-Young, 1998). It thus sees teaching and learning as experiential and existential, involving ‘senses, perception, and mind/body action’ (Matthews, 1998). This holistic “whole body” approach to teaching and learning challenges cognitive-centred orientations – based on Cartesian mind-body dualism - and the widespread distrust and denigration of bodily knowing (Simons, 1998) within “Western” epistemological and educational systems.

The shift in recent years from first-wave to second-wave theories of transformative learning has also involved recognition of the importance of socio-cultural context to transformative pedagogy. For instance, an Afro-centric perspective of transformative learning has emerged (Taylor and Cranton, 2012; Ntseane and Chilisa (2012) explore an Indigenous Knowledge approach to learning from an ‘African context’, finding that transformative learning often happens through ‘cultural institutions, proverbs, spirituality, participatory approaches and experiential learning’ (82).

This shift has, then, included the notion of ‘place’. Place is a difficult concept to pin down, but for my research I align myself with Massey’s interpretation of place, as being constituted through social relationships:
What gives a place its specificity is not some long internalized history but the fact that it is constructed out of a particular constellation of social relations, meeting and weaving together at a particular locus. If one moves in from the satellite towards the globe, holding all those networks of social relations and movements and communications in one's head, then each 'place' can be seen as a particular, unique, point of their intersection. It is, indeed, a meeting place (Massey, 2012).

If places can be understood as intersections in this way, then integral transformative learning theories might be seen as places for the meeting of wide range of influences on TLT. In this vein, O'Sullivan (2003:327) defines transformative learning as a shift:

of consciousness that dramatically and irreversibly alters our way of being in the world. Such a shift involves our understanding of ourselves and our self-locations; our relationships with other humans and with the natural world; our understanding of relations of power in interlocking structures of class, race and gender; our body awareness's; our visions of alternative approaches to living; and our sense of possibilities for social justice and peace and personal joy.

Yet, despite the attempts of integral theories of transformative learning to tie various elements of transformation together into a holistic and comprehensive theory, I suggest that there continues to be a lack of attention to power and space.

2.3. Conclusion

This chapter discussed the trajectory of the concept of transformation in (Western) education discourses. I located its starting point in the Age of Enlightenment and traced its evolution to the present day where it is often invoked in discourses on gap year education programmes, such as
BB’s. I then highlighted how neoliberal notions of transformation are used in discourses of self-improvement and self-help through education, before focusing on how neoliberal ideology has contributed to a process of de-politicisation in development education, aided by the concept of global citizenship.

After discussing critical pedagogy, identifying it as an anti-neoliberal approach to teaching and learning, I reviewed the literature on transformative learning theory. I discussed the first wave of head heavy conceptualisations popularised by Mezirow’s TLT, through to second wave, integral theories which challenge this purportedly Western centrism. The underlying rationale for BB’s pedagogic intention is that pedagogies which are heavily oriented to cognitive ‘head-domain’ modes of teaching and learning – for example, most classroom-based pedagogy – are Western pedagogies predicated on Cartesian dualism by which a dismemberment of the mind from the body takes place, and the former is privileged as the approved, proper medium for learning and knowing.

Furthermore, I critiqued TLT for focusing almost exclusively on the process of learning and change that learners undergo over time and, moreover, a conception of time as linear and irreversible. I argued that this has happened at the expense of attention to space and locate my study within the second wave of transformative learning theories that acknowledge the importance of place/sociocultural context. Indeed, as the next chapter will outline, this is central to my conceptual framework.

Moreover, as the next chapter will also discuss, conceptualisations of power have been notably absent from the literature on transformative education. Despite numerous commentators suggesting that an ‘emancipatory’ concern with social change, and its relation to personal transformation, is built into the foundations of transformative learning theory (O’Sullivan, 2002), attention to power has been surprisingly absent and there have been calls to address this omission (see Taylor and Cranton, 2012).
Chapter 3

Space for Time and Place, but No Place for Power and Space: A Critical Review of the Literature on Transformative Pedagogy

3.1. Introduction

In this chapter I respond to calls for more attention to be given to power and space in transformative pedagogy (Boddington and Boys, 2011; McLaren, 1999; Morgan, 2000; Taylor et al, 2012). Despite the much-vaunted “power of education” to transform people’s lives, research into transformative pedagogy has neglected to pay adequate attention to what is ‘one of the most important concepts in the social sciences’: power (Church and Coles, 2011: xi). Despite its fundamental importance, the ‘essentially contested’ (Lukes, 2005) notion of power ‘is also one of the most routinely under-theorised and ambiguously conceptualised’ (Church and Coles, 2011: xi). Drawing mainly on Bernstein, Bourdieu, and Curry-Stevens I address this lack of attention, focusing on the micro level functioning of power in the micro-pedagogic practices enacted during the BB programme.

In addition to the power-gap in the literature, the recent ‘spatial turn’ in the social sciences – which has reinvented a critical sociology of space and revitalised the field of critical geography (see Warf and Arias, 2009) – requires greater attention in transformative pedagogic theory and practice (McLaren, 1999; Morgan, 2000; Taylor et al, 2012). After all, like power, space is a fundamental organising principal of social
experience (Harvey, 1989), and thus the experience of teaching and learning. Moreover, as numerous theorists of power and space have argued, the two phenomena are intimately linked and mutually constitutive (see Harvey, 1989; Lefebvre, 1992; Massey, 1994; Soja, 1989), not least in educational contexts (e.g. see Bernstein, 2009; Bourdieu, 1989; McLaren, 1999; Morgan, 2000).

Furthermore, although power and space have received some attention in related literatures on travel and tourism (e.g. see Paris, 2012; Raymond, 2008; Scheyvens, 2002) they have been largely overlooked in research into the gap year industry. This includes research into structured gap year programmes, such as the ones offered by BB, which overlap into the field of development education. In this chapter, I begin to address these conspicuous gaps in the literature and suggest that power and space should not only fall within the expanding boundaries of transformative pedagogic theory and practice, but should be placed at its core. Indeed, these concepts are central to my study.

I start the chapter by referring briefly to a well-established framework that identifies three ‘faces’ (or dimensions) of power (see Gaventa, 2006, Lukes, 2005; Pettit, 2010). This typology provides a useful starting point but I point out some of its limitations before a discussing a ‘defaced’ (Gaventa, 2006; Hayward, 1998; Pettit, 2010) conceptualisation of power, showing how it also adds value to my framework by theorising power as a social force that is not necessarily traceable to an identifiable, singular source. This understanding enables me to consider the pedagogic spaces created during the BB programme as active agents in the reproduction or transformation of social power relations.

This highlights the importance of ‘space’ to my framework. Following several theorists (e.g. Harvey, 1989; Lefebvre, 1992; Massey, 1994; Soja, 1989) I reject conceptualisations of space as a:
Lefebvre’s point has much in common with Freire’s rejection of ‘banking’ pedagogy (discussed in Chapter 1), which treats students’ minds as empty spaces waiting to be filled with knowledge deposits (Freire, 1970). Massey elaborates on the notion of space as a ‘living organism’ (Lefebvre, 1992: 94):

> Space is not a flat surface across which we walk... you’re taking a train across the landscape – you’re not traveling across a dead flat surface that is space: you’re cutting across myriad stories going on. So instead of space being this flat surface it’s like a pincushion of a million stories... I want to see space as a cut through the myriad stories in which we are all living at any one moment. Space and time become intimately connected (1994: 254).

Conceptualisations of space as alive in this way re-humanise and re-politicise the concept, acknowledging its intimate relationship to power. Massey’s notion of ‘power geometry’ (1991) helps me to harness this notion in my research context by analysing how the BB programme facilitates a process of pedagogic segregation; different types of knowledge are produced in different types of pedagogic spaces, facilitating the uneven accumulation of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986) by BB group members.

I then discuss cultural capital (CC) – a component of Bourdieu’s theory of social reproduction – showing how it is vital for analysing how the BB programme functions reproductively by enabling already privileged students to extend their cultural advantage. But the concept of CC lacks the capacity to explain the processes through which it is accumulated, and, moreover, how forms of ‘symbolic power’ (Bourdieu, 1989) are reproduced and/or transformed during the BB programme. I therefore move on to discuss how Bourdieu’s concept of ‘habitus’ (1977), is helpful
for this purpose by providing an explanation of how students’ ways of being in the world are unconsciously produced.

Habitus, however, does not, alone, provide adequate means for thoroughly analysing the micro-level functions of power in pedagogic spaces. For this, I draw on Basil Bernstein’s conceptual repertoire, focusing mainly on his later work and the poststructuralist turn it took through the theory of ‘pedagogic device’ and his use of the concept of ‘boundary’, which I use to operationalise Hayward’s defaced definition of power as ‘social boundaries that, together, define fields of action for all actors’ (1998: 12). While Bernstein’s conceptual tools help to ground such broad notions of power in the nuts and bolts of pedagogic interaction during the BB programme, Curry-Stevens’ post-Freirean ‘Pedagogy for the Privileged’ (2007) adds a layer of contextual specificity to my study. Nevertheless, while Curry-Stevens’ framework vitally re-focuses attention to power in transformative pedagogy, it fails to acknowledge the importance of space (and place). By combining it with the other elements in my conceptual framework, I address this shortcoming.

3.2. The Proverbial Power of Education

The fabled ‘power of education’ to transform people’s lives is invoked in a range of contexts (e.g. see Butler-Bowdon, 2003; Rodgers, 2009). The very term ‘transformative’ connotes a grandiose sense of power, not least when prefixed to terms like ‘education’ and ‘pedagogy’; the power to empower, the power to catalyse some form of fundamental change through teaching and learning. Transformative learning has been described as ‘a beautiful metaphor’ (Howie and Bagnall, 2013) which has arguably attracted researchers towards it, helping the field of transformative learning become a central pillar in the theory and practice of adult education (Taylor et al, 2012).
Moreover, the power of education to transform is often imbued with positive connotation (e.g. see Butler-Bowdon, 2003; Rodgers, 2009). This is true, for instance, of my research context: BB advocates and advertises a (positive) ‘transformative’ pedagogy of experience, dialogue, and reflection for its students. Yet ‘power’ – like ‘transformation’ – is conceptualised in various ways (Pettit, 2010) and the ‘power to’ (e.g. to realise potential) is but one type of power. Other types include, for instance, ‘power over’ which refers to the ability of a person or group to affect the thoughts and actions of another (Gaventa, 2006; Gramsci, 1971; Lukes, 2005) – an ability that is exercised through various means, including pedagogy (Alexander, 2001; Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990; Freire, 2000).

Rogers (2005) points out, moreover, that all groups privilege certain kinds of knowledge and behaviour, thus producing and perpetuating particular power relations. When viewed in this way, the importance of focusing on power to answer my main research question is clear: various forms of power are omnipresent in social relationships and thus inevitably play a significant part in shaping transformative (or not) possibilities and processes in pedagogic spaces. However, power remains relatively unexplored in the transformative education literature (Taylor and Cranton, 2012). Indeed, according to Gore (1995) this is true of scholarship on learning environments more broadly, particularly when it comes to the micro level analysis of pedagogic spaces:

With the exception of Bernstein (1975, 1990), Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), and a handful of others who have drawn on their work, educational researchers have paid little attention to the micro level functioning of power in pedagogy (167).

The slippery concept of power has, then, somehow wriggled-out from under the microscope, despite being foundational to Freire’s seminal work and an important influence on Mezirow’s early ambitions for a ‘critical’, ‘emancipatory’ (1981:6) theory of transformative learning informed by Freirean ‘conscientização’ (Kitchenham, 2008). I start
addressing this by discussing the definition of power I employ in the research.

3.3. Defining Power

Power can be conceptualised in various ways, but for this study the categorisation of power into three faces, or dimensions (Gaventa, 2006; Lukes, 2005; Pettit, 2010), is a useful starting point. In brief, the first-face view conceptualises power as something held and exercised by an individual, or group, over another, and results in an observable, successful attempt to make another individual/group ‘do something he [sic] would not otherwise do’ (Lukes, 2005:16). The second-face view expands this scope to include ‘non-decision-making’ – the ways in which power functions to prevent certain issues, and thus some people’s interests and grievances, from even reaching the decision-making table (ibid). But critics have pointed out that the first-face and second-face perspectives, while valuable, are simplistic, and therefore inadequate for the construction of a comprehensive understanding of the range of power’s functions.

In response, various theorists have argued that power can also function through a third face to shape people’s frames of reference in such a way as to prevent potential grievances with the status quo from ever emerging. In some cases, people subsequently accept (with varying degrees of awareness), and perhaps even embrace, their place in the unequal order of things (Bourdieu et al, 1990; Gramsci, 1971; Lukes, 2005). Like proponents of this approach, I am concerned too with understanding if (and if so, how) power functions to secure the consent of social agents to the unequal and unjust structural and social power relations they operate within and/or if and how agents may or may not resist this phenomenon (see Scott, 1992). Moreover, like Bourdieu, Bernstein, Curry-Stevens, and Hayward I am particularly concerned with
how this process is facilitated through education, and more specifically how it is mediated through pedagogy and space.

Yet, whereas numerous theorists (e.g. Bourdieu, Freire, Lukes) focus on how the consent of the so-called ‘dominated’ (Lukes, 2005) is secured and/or might be resisted by ‘oppressed’ (Freire, 1970) groups, my research subverts this focus. I am concerned with how transformative education may or may not empower privileged learners to become more critically conscious of, and challenge, structures of inequality and injustice and their own unconscious complicity in reproducing them. Moreover, I investigate the possibility that BB students and Instructors might, rather than challenge structures of inequality, unintentionally reinforce them through their participation in the programme. I therefore focus on whether and how the consent of the so-called ‘dominator’ (Lukes, 2005), or ‘oppressor’ (Freire, 1970; Curry-Stevens, 2007) may be inadvertently consolidated through the very ‘transformative’ pedagogic spaces that purport to help learners unlearn and transform their ways of being in the world, rather than reproduce them.

In this sense, the three-faced framework for analysing power still has limitations for the purposes of my research. Furthermore, as Pettit says, these limitations become more fundamental upon closer inspection; for example, the third face perspective:

tends to focus on the deliberate efforts of powerful actors to manipulate beliefs via ideology, education, religion, the media, etc. and is therefore an intentional ‘power over’ (Pettit, 2016: 95.).

This focus in inadequate for considering how the beliefs of BB students (and Instructors) are, perhaps, manipulated through unintentional pedagogic processes. Clarissa Hayward (1998) also points out that even when theorists of the third face of power – principally Lukes (2005) – discuss how it can function unintentionally, the conceptualisations they use nevertheless insist on locating the source of power as residing in identifiable, and relatively powerful or powerless, people or groups.
Hayward exposes the limitations of this approach in her defaced conceptualisation of power.

### 3.3.1. From Three-Faced to Defaced

Clarissa Hayward rejects the three-faced approach to power analysis, arguing that:

> Power’s mechanisms are best conceived, not as instruments powerful agents use to prevent the powerless from acting freely, but rather as social boundaries that, together, define fields of action for all actors. Power defines fields of possibility. It facilitates and constrains social action (Hayward 1998: 12).

For my socio-spatial analysis of how power functions in relation to the transformative pedagogic spaces created during the BB programme, I suggest that a defaced approach adds a layer of sophistication to my framework. The defaced approach has thus far been overlooked in applied research into not only transformative pedagogy, but also educational settings and social science research more broadly (McGee, 2016), perhaps precisely because it is difficult to operationalise in applied research (ibid). There are some notable exceptions to this, such as Hayward’s comparative ethnography (1998) of power and pedagogy in two high school classrooms in the US. Later in this chapter I discuss how I operationalise a defaced approach within my conceptual framework.

Hayward challenges the firmness of the line that has been drawn between agency and structure in sociological analysis as misleading, arguing instead that that all actions and structures are in some way shaped by socialized norms, identities and knowledge. Questioning ideas emphasised in the three-faced approach, but carrying forward the concept of boundaries evident in Bernstein’s (and Bourdieu’s) work, Hayward argues that power’s:
mechanisms consist in laws, rules, norms, customs, social identities, and standards that constrain and enable inter- and intra-subjective action... freedom enables actors to participate effectively in shaping the boundaries that define for them the field of what is possible (1998: 12).

This represents a marked difference in the treatment of freedom in relation to power within the defaced approach. As Digeser (1992) explains:

Unlike the other conceptions [the three-faced approach], power is not defined in opposition to freedom. Liberation, if understood as an act that escapes power, assumes that we could jump outside our social skin to some unsituated arena where power had no play (981).

Instead, in the defaced conceptualisation, power is seen in a more Foucauldian manner as ‘co-extensive with the social body; there are no spaces of primal liberty between the meshes of its network’ (Foucault 1980, 142). In the defaced approach, the agency to challenge power involves acting to shift the boundaries of what is considered possible. In educational contexts – such as the pedagogic spaces created during the BB programme – these boundaries are maintained, as I discussed earlier, by the instructional and regulative discourses embedded in pedagogic discourse (Bernstein, 1996; 2000).

This notion of agency as the contestation and redefinition of boundaries challenges the idea that power is necessarily exercised deliberately or otherwise in an exchange between two or more people, or groups. The latter view, emphasised in the three-faced approach, is limited as it for instance cannot accommodate the possibility that:

the field of what is socially possible can be shaped at a distance by events and historical trends that are not explicitly intended to affect a given group (Hayward, 1998: 18).
Accommodating this possibility is more difficult to operationalise in applied research because it is hard for the researcher to put a finger on how and why power appears to be operating in a space. Moreover, this denies the opportunity to ‘point a finger at’ who is to blame (Hayward, 1998: 14) for the (unjust) functioning of ‘power over’. Instead, the defaced approach requires different questions to be asked from that of the three-faced approach, as Digeser (1992) explains:

Under the first face of power the central question is, ‘Who, if anyone, is exercising power?’ Under the second face, ‘What issues have been mobilized off the agenda and by whom?’ Under the radical conception, ‘Whose objective interests are being harmed?’ Under the fourth face of power the critical issue is, ‘What kind of subject is being produced’? (980)

The defaced approach is important for my conceptual framework because it does not preclude the possibility that power can function in ways described by the three-faced approach. Rather, it emphasises and elaborates the notion that power is a social force whose source cannot necessarily be located within, or possessed by, people who are, in the three-faced framework, cast as relatively powerful or powerless. This is not to suggest that a defaced approach denies that the agency of individuals and groups is not differently (and unequally and unjustly) enabled and constrained but, as Butler (1997a) puts it, that some forms of power ‘circulate without voice or signature’ (6).

Crucially, this understanding enables me to understand how pedagogic spaces constructed during the programme can be seen as the products and producers of forms of power (relation) that are not all necessarily attributable and/or traceable to identifiable people. Rather, power courses through the veins of ‘spaces’ that, as Massey suggests, are best understood as being in some sense ‘alive’ (2013). For instance, although BB Instructors exercise agency in creating and regulating transformative pedagogic spaces during the programme, those spaces can also take on
a life of their own, shaping unintended and unpredictable learning processes and (short term) outcomes. In this view, space becomes a social agent, of sorts, that is greater than the sum of its parts. The power of space therefore becomes clearer.

3.3.2. The Power of Space

Space is not only saturated with power, but constituted by it and of it (Lefebvre, 1992). This might be said of many, if not all, facets of our lived experience but space can also be said to be a concept of singular, stand-alone importance. After all, space is a fundamental organising principal of social experience (Harvey, 1989), universal in its presence if not in the way it is experienced, interpreted, and conceptualised. Everything, people included, exists in space (and of course, time), and in spatial relationships to other things. This has been overlooked in educational fields, including TLT and critical pedagogy, despite its resurgence as part of the spatial turn in the social sciences more broadly (Boddington et al., 2011).

Given the constant presence of space, it is a phenomenon that is perhaps particularly susceptible to inconspicuousness by virtue of its conspicuousness. In other words, it is so fundamental to our everyday lives that, over time, it becomes taken for granted and even, in some sense, invisible. As Warf (2011) puts it:

Space and time usually appear ‘natural’ to people living within a given society, i.e. as located ‘outside’ of society and, therefore, beyond human control. Indeed, time and space seem so ‘natural’ that they typically do not need explanation: they simply ‘are,’ or more bluntly, viewed as given, not made (143).

The naturalisation and normalisation of space and time depoliticises these fundamental categories, or dimensions, of human experience by hiding their power-riddled character. This process of concealing power – therefore making it less-visible, or even invisible – risks conjuring the
illusion that space and time are ideologically neutral, thus “laying the foundations” for these fundamental ontological dimensions to silently (re)produce, and be (re)produced by, power of all kinds. Indeed, some scholars have argued that changing forms of globalised contemporary capitalism, or globalisation, can be characterised using the conceptual categories of space and time, as a form of space-time compression.

3.3.3. The Power Geometry of Space-Time Compression

Space-time compression, in brief, refers to the ways in which contemporary capitalism compresses space and time through the acceleration of economic activity – particularly in the contemporary global knowledge economy – across vast geographic areas, hence providing the driving force behind globalisation. David Harvey (1989) argues that the production, circulation, and exchange of capital occurs increasingly rapidly, and in a manner that ‘shrinks space’, particularly through technological advances. For example, computer software used by Wall Street traders creates millions of dollars in milliseconds by using algorithms to convert national currencies in rapid response to fluctuations in global exchange rates. The association of globalization with the ‘global village’ – and thus the compression of space and time regarding, for instance, communication and travel – is well-established.

Building on the concept of time-space compression, Massey (1994) focuses on how it affects diverse groups differently depending on the directional ‘flows and interconnections’ of compressed forms of capital production and accumulation. Massey concentrates on the social dimension of spatial and temporal contraction, arguing that the relative mobility and power of individuals and groups can oppress others. She calls this:

the power geometry of time-space compression. For different social groups, and different individuals, are placed in very distinct ways in relation to these flows and interconnections. This point concerns not merely the issue of who moves and who doesn’t, although that is an important element of it; it is also about power
in relation to the flows and the movement. Different social groups have distinct relationships to this anyway differentiated mobility: some people are more in charge of it than others; some initiate flows and movement, others don’t; some are more on the receiving-end of it than others; some are effectively imprisoned by it (Massey, 1994: 149).

For Massey, then, one’s level of mobility (and control over that mobility) is both a product and (re)producer of power. The implication is not simply that power and mobility are unevenly distributed. Rather, this relational understanding of power argues that:

the mobility and control of some groups can actively weaken other people. Differential mobility can weaken the leverage of the already weak. The time-space compression of some groups can undermine the power of others (ibid).

Building on this point, other commentators have noted the emergence of a ‘new global elite’ (Bauman, 2007) of internationally mobile ‘movers, shakers and backpackers’ who have been termed ‘flashpackers’ (ibid). As Paris (2012) describes them, this is a sub-group of (mentally, corporeally, and virtually) hypermobile travellers who, through mobile technologies, are linked into multiple networks that enable them to exploit a ‘nomadic institutional structure’ (O’ Regan, 2008: 111), traversing the compression of space and time to reap its rewards. I suggest that BB Instructors and students (and I) are members of this global elite.

The power geometry of space-time compression is, then, an economic and social phenomenon. Johnson (2012) highlights the connection here with Bourdieu’s concept of ‘cultural capital’ (1986):

Such a system [space-time compression] of creating value is both social and economic, as what is valuable is profoundly cultural. How to move beyond such an abstract approach to the actual study of value systems...is assisted by the work of Pierre Bourdieu and his formulation of cultural capital...to describe the possession of knowledge, accomplishments, formal and informal
This is especially salient in the globalised knowledge economy and, as I will now argue, is useful for explaining what happens during the knowledge production processes that take place in different pedagogic spaces constructed during the BB programme. Like Johnson, I will link the notion of space-time compression to Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital, adapting and elaborating both for application in my study of transformative pedagogic space.

It is important to note here that although I will now – within the linear narrative of this thesis – discuss these concepts before I apply them in my empirical analyses (in Chapters 5, 6 and 7), they emerged as centrally important during my fieldwork. This inductive approach to the research is consistent with my ethnographic methodology, as is my conceptual elaboration of the notion of ‘cultural capital’ (CC) – that I will shortly present – which evolved from observations and preliminary analysis during fieldwork.

3.3.4. Cultural Capital and Symbolic Power

Bourdieu’s notion of symbolic power expands and adapts the Marxist premise that the social relations engendered through capitalist economic production and distribution create social class stratification. Whilst recognising the significance of economic capital to power relations, Bourdieu argues that the symbolic display of other forms of capital, such as CC, is also crucially important for the reproduction of social inequality (1986). Bourdieu posits that people compete to accumulate and display various forms of capital in the particular social spaces or ‘fields’ they occupy within an unequal social order. It is, therefore, a relational approach to power and space: the value and status of the capital possessed in any social space is determined by the possessor’s position in relation to others in that space.
For Bourdieu, education systems are particularly pernicious mechanisms for the unequal distribution of capital; for instance, privileged students attending private schools/universities can gain high (symbolic) cultural currency through both obtaining valued formal educational qualifications and informally learning a ‘feel for the game’ (Bourdieu, 1990:66) as it is played – and where the rules are made – in high cultural circles. This symbolic currency is described by Bourdieu as cultural capital, which accrues in different amounts to different social actors in different socio-cultural spaces and functions to empower or disempower a social agent’s ability to get ahead in life (ibid).

The process of accumulating cultural capital is, then, a process of social class distinction that is intimately related to the accumulation of other forms of capital (economic, social etc.) which both (1) enables BB students and Instructors (and I) to gain access to a programme like this; and (2) are also able to be accumulated, in significant quantity and quality, during the programme. It is a process of distinction based on the accumulation of a specific type of cultural capital that I refer to as CCC.

### 3.3.4. From Cultural Capital to Cross-Cultural Capital (CCC)

As I will now explain, I use the term CCC differently from how it has been employed in other contexts (see Ang et al, 2008; Becker, 1975; Earley, 2003; Eisenberg, 2013; Jackson, 2013). Eisenberg’s (2013) ‘Review of Recent Empirical Studies’ in ‘University-Based Approaches for Developing Students’ Cultural Competences’ indicates that the concept of CCC has often been used in relation to the notion of ‘intercultural competence’ in higher education contexts – for example, ‘Cross Cultural Management courses’ in business schools (2). As will shortly become clear, this is very different from the Bourdieusian sense in which I develop a conceptualisation of CCC based on what I observed during the BB programme.
The concept of CCC that I will elaborate has stronger affinities with the notion of ‘cosmopolitan capital’ (see Weenink, 2008), a form of ‘social and cultural capital’ (1089) obtained, for example, by ‘children who attend an internationalized form of education’ and develop ‘a global perspective on their course of life’ (ibid). However, according to Weenink cosmopolitan capital is not related to social class position and ‘should be viewed as an expression of agency, which is acted out when people are forced to deal with processes of globalization’ (ibid). As I will now explain, my conceptualisation of CCC differs in that it is related to social class position, but is also articulated in socio-spatial, geographic terms by being dependant on global mobility.

I conceptualise CCC as a type of cultural capital gathered by going beyond a cultural boundary. For the boundary-crosser to gain CCC, the perception that she has encountered a space of cultural otherness may be held both by people in the boundary-crosser’s familiar cultural spaces and/or by people in the unfamiliar spaces she is entering. Accumulating CCC can thus be done by simply going abroad, or even going to a place in one’s own country which is regarded as being culturally distinct. However, the value of the CCC accumulated by a boundary-crosser is determined by the perceived quality and quantity of time spent in an Other cultural space. Crucially, my use of the term CCC is distinct from other uses by being dependant on physical, geographical boundary crossing.

In my research context, it is, then, important to investigate how participation in the BB programme – which is impossible for the vast majority of people – might enable students and Instructors to accrue cultural capital that enables them to extend their privilege. The distribution and symbolic display of cultural capital is, according to Bourdieu, a form of symbolic power, or more specifically symbolic violence ‘which is exercised upon a social agent with his or her complicity’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2002: 167) and thus functions to normalise and naturalise the unequal social order. To help explain the invisible process through which privilege and power is reproduced as social habits and norms, Bourdieu uses the concept of ‘habitus’.
3.3.5. Habitus

Habitus describes the vehicle through which social-class stratification, and thus unjust social inequalities, are reproduced largely unconsciously. More specifically, habitus refers to:

the way society becomes deposited in persons in the form of lasting dispositions, or trained capacities and structured propensities to think, feel and act in determinant ways, which then guide them (Wacquant, 2005: 316 in Navarro, 2006: 16).

Put differently, habitus can be described as a system of lasting, acquired schemes of perception, thought and action (Grenfell, 2012). An individual develops these dispositions from absorbing the social structures that shape his/her environment. In short, habitus is what shapes our individual and culturally collective ways-of-being in the world.

A way-of-being is learned in various contexts but, as mentioned earlier, Bourdieu highlights education as a particularly powerful channel through which social stratification is reproduced. Given that BB’s transformative education programme, heavily influenced by the Freirean goal of critical consciousness, aims to transform students’ ways of being, Bourdieu’s concepts (especially CC) form an important part of my conceptual framework as they enable me to analyse and articulate the ways in which aspects of students’ habitus (individual and collective) are reproduced rather than transformed during the programme. As York (2014) says:

An analysis of transformative education approaches can usefully be complemented by examining Bourdieu’s theory of domination...and in particular, his use of ‘cultural production’...as a conceptual framework for understanding how social inequality manifests and becomes constant in social life [through] the relationship between self, material society and experience in the formulation and circulation of discourse...embodied in languages, texts, knowledge, policies and human practices (59).
Moreover, as some commentators have suggested (e.g. see Laros, Fuhr and Taylor, 2017; Haugaard, 2008), although habitus is rarely mentioned explicitly in the literature on transformative education, it bears similarities to the ‘frames of reference’ that form ‘habits of mind’ – both concepts central to (Mezirow’s) transformative learning theory and by extension most other theories of transformative teaching and learning, as discussed in the previous chapter.

But in contrast to the ‘head-heavy’ cognitive bent of Mezirow’s theory, Bourdieu’s concepts provide a way to address the other side of Cartesian dualism by placing greater emphasis on the ways in which social structure, and thus structural power, is physically inscribed onto, and transmitted through and between, bodies. Following my discussion, in the previous chapter, of the need to expand integral theories of transformative learning to include both conscious and unconscious verbal and non-verbal communication and change whilst also attending to issues of power, habitus is useful for my analysis. By using this concept, the ‘invisible’ face of power became visible as it manifested not only through what people verbalise (and don’t verbalise) but also physically in people’s bodily functions (posture, movements, expressions etc.). As Reay (1995) says:

Habitus is a way of looking at data which renders the ‘taken-for-granted’ problematic... Are structural effects visible within small scale interactions? What is the meaning of non-verbal behaviour as well as individuals' use of language? (in Reay and Vincent, 2016: 97)

Bourdieu uses the term ‘bodily hexis’, or ‘the way we walk, talk, sit and blow our nose’ (Bourdieu 1984: 466), to refer to these observable, learned, physical comportments which are (re)produced and transmitted by the habitus. Moreover, he emphasises that the habitus is incredibly durable, composed of ‘structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures’ and therefore only susceptible to change in
extraordinary circumstances, such as in situations of crisis (ibid). After all, as Haugaard (2008) notes, habitus is both an epistemological and ontological phenomenon, meaning that ‘a transformation in habitus alters the being-in-the-world of a social agent’ (194). Considering this ontological durability, Bourdieu is adamant that:

habitus is beyond the grasp of consciousness, and hence cannot be touched by voluntary, deliberate transformation, cannot even be made explicit (1977: 94).

This view clearly conflicts with the fundamental premise of transformative education, and more specifically one of the main aims of BB’s development education abroad programme in Bolivia and Peru.

3.4. Transforming the Habitus through Transformative Education

Partly because of Bourdieu’s dismissal of transformative pedagogy, his critics see habitus as structurally deterministic (e.g. see King, 2000). However, others find more theoretical space for agency, and even transformation (see Sweetman; 2003; Mills, 2008). For instance, Sweetman (2003) argues that transformation of habitus is, in general, becoming increasingly commonplace due to the various geographical, economic, social, and cultural shifts which people make or undergo during their lifetimes. He suggests that habitus should be regarded as an adaptive construct, rather than a determinate one, and that it is no more fixed than the social terrain in which it finds itself (Hillier and Rooksby, 2005: 13).

Mezirow and others have also pointed to the potential for changes in social terrain to catalyse transformation of one’s frame of reference and habits of mind and action. For example, immersion in a drastically
different cultural setting can trigger a disorienting dilemma, according to Mezirow (2000). As discussed in previous chapters this is, of course, one of the rationales underpinning BB’s place-based transformative pedagogy and is a notion implicitly aligned with the socio-cultural sensitivity integral to integral transformative learning theory.

But if Sweetman’s argument, and the cross-cultural dimension to BB’s pedagogy, point to the importance of sociocultural context in shaping habitus, particularly in a rapidly changing, “globalising” world, it does not explicitly challenge Bourdieu’s point that habitus cannot be transformed by intentional intervention. By contrast, the awakening of critical consciousness sought through BB’s pedagogy does precisely that. The logic underpinning this pedagogic approach is that for transformation to occur, the unconscious must be brought into the realm of consciousness. As Oosterom and Scott-Villiers (2016:3) put it:

> Once beyond day-to-day consciousness, norms and values also move out of the reach of everyday criticism. It is only once they enter what Giddens called ‘discursive consciousness’ that they can be discussed, examined and challenged, and the boundaries they set and the values they engender can be ruptured or redrawn.

Yet, neither Bourdieu’s nor Freire’s opposing standpoints on the possibility of transforming a person’s way of being through education will suffice within my conceptual framework as the lone means for understanding power and change in the BB programme. For all of Freire’s seminal work on pedagogy, and its emphasis on approaches to teaching critical literacy that are grounded in learners lived experiences, critics have pointed to a fundamental irony in his work. Key texts such as *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) are often criticised as highfalutin, inaccessible, and highly abstracted, lacking examples of everyday practice in which to ground Freire’s often convoluted theoretical musings. With some exceptions (e.g. see Stromquist, 1997) there is also surprisingly little research literature that critically discusses Freirean
pedagogy in practice. Thus, Freirean pedagogic theory lacks a set of sophisticated concepts to apply to the analysis of pedagogic practice.

Similarly, whilst symbolic power and associated concepts are important for my framework, they fall short of providing a set of finely tuned conceptual instruments for examining and articulating the forensic details of cultural transmission alluded to by Bourdieu, at the micro-level of pedagogic interaction, in the pedagogic spaces produced during the BB programme. As Diaz (1983) says:

> While Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) are preoccupied with the structures of culture and their legitimization, this is conducted at a very general level. In their analyses there is very little systematic and specific analysis of the principles whereby a specific discourse is constituted nor of the principles of its transmission (in Atkinson, 2015: 178).

This is a shortcoming that Bernstein addresses. For Bernstein too, discourse is a conduit for the exercise of power but he elaborates by honing in on the function of pedagogy, the focus of his theory: 'Pedagogic modalities are crucial realisations of symbolic control, and thus of the process of cultural production and reproduction' (Bernstein and Solomon, 1999: 269).

I focus on Bernstein’s later work which took a poststructuralist turn in its concern with the structuring of the pedagogic discourse (Bernstein, 1990, 1996, 1999, 2001; Bernstein and Solomon, 1999). Here, he was mainly:

interested in developing the necessary theoretical instruments to uncover the social logic of pedagogy and the internal structure of the pedagogic device. Through this analysis Bernstein aimed to build a sociological theory of the relationship between modes of educational transmission and their regulatory bases, that is, a complex system of power relations and social control that overdetermined pedagogy. Each pedagogy could and should be studied by looking at the social forces that induced, maintained and legitimated it. Furthermore, the study of dominant pedagogies was, for Bernstein, a crucial aspect to understand how communication systems would structure individual and
social consciousness and identity (Bonal and Rambla, 2003: 172).

I turn, then, to the pedagogic device which helps to refine the concepts I have discussed in my framework so far, when applying them to the micro-analysis of power, space and pedagogy in my research context.

3.4.1. Fine-Tuning the Framework with Bernstein’s Pedagogic Device

Bernstein (1990:172) describes the pedagogic device like so:

Between power and knowledge, and knowledge and forms of consciousness, is always the pedagogic device (PD). We shall define the pedagogic device as the distributive, recontextualising and evaluative rules for specializing forms of consciousness.

These rules are the ‘condition for the production, reproduction and transformation of culture’ (ibid) and as Singh (2002) notes, they provide:

researchers with explicit criteria/rules to describe the macro and micro structuring of knowledge, and in particular the generative relations of power and control constituting knowledge (Singh, 2002: 571).

What is also important to note in the context of my critical ethnographic research is that Bernstein was interested in not only the description of knowledge production and transmission, but also with the consequences for different groups (Sadovnik and Coughlan, 2010). This is especially useful for my research as it pertains to the production of particular knowledges for and by would-be global citizens (BB students and Instructors) during BB’s development education abroad programme. As Singh (2002: 580) argues, we are living in a ‘global knowledge society’
characterised by ‘the global growth and interconnectivity of knowledge-intensive industries’ and ‘growing social inequalities between the knowledge rich and the knowledge poor.’

At the heart of Bernstein’s work, then, is a concern with how power, knowledge and control is mediated through pedagogic interaction. More specifically, he asks:

How does power and control translate into principles of communication, and how do these principles of communication differentially regulate forms of consciousness with respect to their reproduction and the possibility of change? (Bernstein, 1996: 4)

To help understand and analyse these forms of pedagogic interaction, Bernstein uses the notion of pedagogic discourse (1990, 1996). As Singh (1997) puts it, this concept refers to ‘an ensemble of rules or procedures for the production and circulation of knowledge within pedagogic interactions’ (6) and is not a discourse per se, but a ‘principle of recontextualization’ (ibid) which, as Bernstein (1996) explains:

embeds two discourses: a discourse of skills of various kinds (instructional discourse) and their relations to each other, and a discourse of social order (regulative discourse) (46).

So, ‘the regulative discourse constitutes the social division of labour for knowledge production, transmission and acquisition’ (Singh, 1997: 6) and ultimately regulates:

the limits and possibilities for what is thinkable and unthinkable in relation to school knowledge, student and teacher identities, and classroom order (ibid:7).

To explain in more detail how pedagogic discourse works, Bernstein (1999) has distinguished three forms of pedagogic relation: explicit,
implicit and tacit. The first two refer to deliberate attempts to ‘initiate, modify, develop or change knowledge, conduct or practice’ (267) by someone or something (the transmitter) which can evaluate this process, regardless of whether the ‘acquirer’ of the knowledge deems it legitimate. The explicit or implicit nature of the process refers to the visibility of the transmitter’s intentions. In explicit pedagogy, the intention is visible but in implicit pedagogy it is invisible to the acquirer (ibid). This differs from the tacit pedagogy in which neither the transmitter nor the acquirer are aware of what is happening. In this case, the meanings are ‘non-linguistic, condensed and context dependent...’ (ibid).

These pedagogic relations – and by extension power relations – are realised in the principle of classification, or:

the strength of the insulation between categories of agents, discourses and institutional contexts [...] in other words, power relations create boundaries, legitimize boundaries, reproduce boundaries, between different categories of groups, gender, class, race, different categories of discourse, different categories of agents. Thus power always operates to produce dislocations, to produce punctuations in social space (Bernstein, 1996:9).

As Tyler (2004) asserts, Bernstein is beginning to develop the argument ‘that the underlying principle of social reproduction is one of the delocation and relocation of knowledge’ (in Davies et al, 2004: 15) in an era of expansive neoliberal globalisation. As we will see later, this notion resonates closely with the knowledge production processes embedded in the accumulation of cultural capital by BB students and Instructors during the programme. Moreover, what is becoming clear now is that the notion of boundaries is centrally important to Bernstein’s theorisation of power, pedagogy and the tension between social reproduction and transformation. It is also therefore central to the treatment of power and space within my conceptual framework.
3.4.2. The Power of Boundaries and the Boundaries of Power

As Bernstein (2000) has pointed out, pedagogic relations are defined by boundaries. There is always a boundary, although:

it may vary in its explicitness, its visibility, its potential and in the manner of its transmission and acquisition. It may vary in terms of whose interest is promoted or privileged by the boundary... Is the boundary a prison of the past (whatever the nature of that past) or is it a tension point which condenses the past yet opens the possibility of futures. Finally, social class relations through distributive regulations distribute, unequally, discursive, material and social resources, which in turn creates categories of the included and excluded, makes crucial boundaries permeable to some and impermeable to others (206-207).

Boundary is important to Bourdieu’s work too, albeit less explicitly articulated. Many of the concepts central to Bourdieu’s theory ultimately refer to what ‘falls within the limits of the thinkable and the sayable...the universe of possible discourse’ (Bourdieu, 1977: 167). At any given point in time and space, what it is conceivable to think, say, and do is contained within boundaries, albeit ones that change over time and space. Bernstein’s notion of ‘boundary’ can also be seen, I suggest, as an application of Hayward’s defaced approach to conceptualising power as ‘boundaries that define the field of what is possible’ (1998: 12). I now discuss applying these concepts for use in my study of what is possible in pedagogic spaces created for the transformation of privileged learners. To help me do this, Curry-Stevens’ ‘Pedagogy for the Privileged’ (2007) provides the final, vital, piece of my conceptual framework.
3.5. Pedagogy for the Privileged

Curry-Stevens’ ‘Pedagogy for the Privileged’ is fundamentally concerned with social injustice and aims to help catalyse social transformation by transforming privileged learners into ‘allies in the struggle for social justice’ (Curry-Stevens, 2007: 33). This can be understood, in short, to involve ‘a transformation from individualist and anti-collectivist ideologies to those that are further to the left on the political spectrum’ (ibid: 40).

These approaches are located within a ‘social emancipatory’ strain of transformative pedagogy that, as Curry-Stevens (ibid) and others (e.g. Kitchenham, 2008; Taylor and Cranton, 2012) have noted, has close connections with popular education models based on Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed (1970). However, whilst popular education focuses on transforming (so-called) ‘oppressed’ learners, Curry-Stevens forwards a ‘Pedagogy for the Privileged’ that turns this approach on its head.

3.5.1. A Distinct Post-Freirean Pedagogy

Curry-Stevens argues that pedagogy for the privileged is a unique form of transformative pedagogy, similar to, but distinct from, Freire’s pedagogy of ‘conscientização’ (Freire, 2005, 1970). Freirean pedagogy was originally designed to catalyse the conscientisation of ‘oppressed’ Brazilian peasants. Curry-Stevens’ approach, however, transforms it by inverting the focus to privileged learners who, I concur, also have the potential, and arguably the responsibility, to become change agents. This places the onus for social justice on the shoulders of the privileged, not only the oppressed, arguing to not let the privileged ‘off the hook’ (Razack, 1998; in Curry-Stevens, 37).

It could be argued that this inversion undermines the revolutionary agency, albeit dormant, located amongst the oppressed in Freirean pedagogy. However, I counter that such a conception also implies by extension – and in-line with a residual approach to inequality (see Hickey...
and Du Toit, 2007) – that the locus of causality for inequality resides, to a significant degree, with the oppressed. I argue that it is preferable to locate shared (potential) agency for change among the oppressed and the privileged and so recognise the relational (Mosse, 2010) character of the structures and systems of power relations that produce inequality.

But if this is part of the pedagogic rationale for BB’s brand of experiential cross-cultural global citizenship education, what are privileged students taught? What, and how, do they learn? Or rather – using BB’s preferred phraseology that suggests whatever students learn is something ‘caught not taught’ (2008:18) – what do students who are “let off the hook” end-up “catching”?

Though BB does not reference Curry-Stevens at any point in its literature – as opposed to Freire, who is cited numerous times – Curry-Stevens’ inversion of Freirean pedagogic principles appears to be an implicit, underlying pedagogic rationale of BB’s programme design. In addition to inverting Freire’s political-pedagogic rationale, Curry-Stevens flips the Freirean pedagogic model upside-down, attempting to harness the change potential of privileged learners by creating a distinct pedagogy tailored to their specific needs. Freirean pedagogy dictates that learners begin the process of conscientisation by exploring their own personal experiences of oppression, and social positions, before expanding this focus to analyse the social structures that position them. Curry-Stevens recommends reversing this – contradicting several commentators (e.g. see Leonardo, 2004; Thompson, 1999) – because, according to the educators in her study, privileged learners often can’t see their privilege, or resist acknowledging it, particularly at an early stage of the TE process.

Curry-Stevens argues – and so points to the function of hegemonic, invisible, symbolic power (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992; Lukes, 2005) as discussed earlier – that ‘part of this difficulty stems from the nature of privilege itself; marginal identities and experiences are easy to name because they have been so thoroughly “othered” but dominance stays cloaked in the guise of “normal” and “natural” and, consequently, is
difficult to identify’ (Curry-Stevens, 2007: 46). Even when identified, it is hard for privileged learners to acknowledge because their ‘self-concept is invested in relations of domination and, therefore, may be threatened at its core by suggestions of relinquishing this power’ (41). To return to my Bolivian bus ride story in the Preface, I contend that this sense of threat might explain why some BB students reacted as they did when I suggested they relinquish their seat, and when we discussed this afterwards.

A workable pedagogy for the privileged must therefore account for the likelihood of learners resisting the process of acknowledging and challenging their own privilege. After all, it asks much of privileged learners as they are challenged to voluntarily ‘bring their relative power to bear’ (Rothenberg and Scully, 2002 in Curry-Stevens, 2007: 35) by acting against the very structures and systems that privilege them, thus ‘advocating against their apparent self-interest’ (ibid). To do this, it is pedagogically important that, for example: ‘educators do not take learners to a “tipping point” in their feelings of guilt as this will paralyse action’ (ibid: 42). A Pedagogy for the Privileged should therefore be designed around learners’ ‘ideological, psychological, emotional, spiritual, behavioural, and cognitive characteristics’ (ibid: 55).

The rationale behind Curry-Stevens’ inversion of Freirean pedagogy is, then, that it is more effective to engage privileged learners with concepts of structural, hegemonic power in an abstracted, intellectual, impersonal manner before considering their personal privileged position and function in structures and systems of oppression. The author’s insistence about the need for a distinct pedagogy reminds us of the importance of developing context-specific, and thus perhaps more sensitive and sophisticated, pedagogic strategies for transformative education – and indeed teaching and learning more generally – rather than crudely applying a one-size-fits-all approach. This also reminds us of the need to develop theoretical and conceptual frameworks better equipped to account for the complexity and subtleties of TE and transformative learning in different contexts. As regards pedagogy for the privileged,
this means paying attention to the problem of defining ‘the privileged’, and by extension ‘the oppressed’.

3.5.2. Defining ‘the Privileged’ and ‘the Oppressed’

Defining the privileged has proven a difficult task for scholars (Curry-Stevens, 2007). Past attempts to describe people and their lives with such imprecise, reductive, value-laden terms are problematic. For example, Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) has been critiqued for its binary categorization of social actors as oppressors or oppressed (Schugurensky, 2011). It is argued that this simplistic conceptualisation cannot adequately account for the complexity of social experience and thus leads to impoverished understandings of it (ibid). Such critiques can be located within a post-structural perspective that has challenged binary frameworks for understanding social phenomena and deconstructed the positivist essentialisations and meta-narratives that have been an historical feature of the social sciences as well as the natural sciences (Agger, 1991).

Debates continue over how to define the privileged, with the core conundrum being as follows: If one accepts the premise, posited by various scholars (e.g. Ross et al, 2009; Sen, 2007), that all social actors (individuals and groups) have multiple identities (e.g. class, race, gender, sexual orientation etc.), it follows that all are likely to experience both privilege and oppression in various ways and to varying degrees, depending on context. How then can social actors be defined as privileged or oppressed? That is, what could possibly be the criteria for determining, or weighting, the relative significance of each form of privilege and oppression to attribute a categorical definition to a social actor?

But also, as Curry-Stevens warns (2007: 37), how can frameworks for understanding privilege avoid provoking a ‘race to innocence’ (Fellows and Razack, 1998), in which privileged learners prefer to ignore their privilege and focus on the ways in which they are oppressed, or a ‘rush to complexity’ (Crosby, 1997,) which pluralises privilege (and
oppression) to an extent that attention is diverted from the ‘core axes’ (38). By ‘core axes’, Curry-Stevens is referring to social categories such as class, race, and gender that have long been core sociological concerns as they are socially ascribed identities that we are ‘born into and unlikely to change’ (Curry-Stevens, 2003: 5), suggesting they are particularly durable and pervasive.

Curry-Stevens proposes a ‘universal construction’ of privilege in which we all are regarded as ‘composites of both oppressed and privileged identities’ (2007: 53), thus conceptualising ‘all groups as containing privilege’ (ibid: 37). This offers a solution to the conundrum outlined above by approaching it differently. Rather than attempt to construct, somehow, an unavoidably problematic hierarchy of privileged and oppressed identities, Curry-Stevens’ suggests that we are all relatively privileged and oppressed, in relation to each other, by the power structures and systems that frame and position our lives. Further, we are all arguably complicit in re-producing this hegemony, consciously and/or unconsciously, in various ways and to varying degrees.

Crucial to the underpinning rationale for Curry-Stevens’ framework is the assertion that this ‘hegemony dehumanizes all of us’ (hooks, 2003; Freire, 1970 in Curry-Stevens, 2007: 43); and crucial to understanding her ‘Pedagogy for the Privileged’ is understanding that it is not exclusively designed for a select group of privileged learners, but to engage with those privileged aspects of all learners’ identities. This is a significant contribution as it universalises the political-pedagogic imperative for, and applicability of, a transformative pedagogy for the privileged, yet also provides the basis for a theoretical and conceptual framework capable of being developed and applied in context-specific ways, and thus accommodating the complexity of this task. I now discuss how I apply the framework in my research context.
3.5.3 Applying Curry-Stevens’ Framework to the Research Context

Applying Curry-Stevens’ framework to understand what, and how, students are learning in the BB programme’s pedagogic spaces requires a further breaking-down of binaries. Although most students share similarities along core axes of class, race, and gender, they cannot be conceptualised as a homogeneous group. Students are from diverse US cultural backgrounds. Throughout my analysis I also endeavour to remain critically reflexive of my background and belief system, questioning what my understanding of wealth and poverty in Bolivia and Peru, and indeed the Andean belief systems and cultural practices of communities such as the Apu, brings to my research in these settings. Moreover, stretching Curry-Stevens’ framework across these cross-cultural pedagogic spaces also demands that I pay attention to how Instructors scaffold such learning experiences and how they construct notions of privilege and oppression in relation to them.

Given that in my experience many BB students have indeed – as Curry-Stevens predicts – often objected to and resisted any implication that they are privileged and prefer to recall the ways in which they perceive themselves to be oppressed (2007), Curry-Stevens’ approach is valuable to understand the transformative learning process with BB students. As discussed earlier, it is difficult for learners to see their privilege because, through the function of invisible, symbolic power (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992; Lukes, 2005), privilege and dominance are naturalised. Curry-Stevens’ approach insists that a transformative pedagogy for the privileged de-naturalises, and thus nullifies, invisible power by catalysing critical consciousness in learners, empowering them to locate themselves as privileged and implicated in the oppression of others before committing to take action for social justice. In this way, and with the help of her ‘proposed model for the transformation of privileged learners’ (2007) as a guide, Curry-Stevens’ framework helps me to see invisible power by locating its presence in the absence of the de-naturalisation process. Nevertheless, it has some limitations.
3.5.4 Some Limitations of a ‘Pedagogy for the Privileged’

Curry-Stevens re-politicises transformative pedagogy by re-inserting an attention to power and oppression – surprisingly absent from much of discourse despite its Freirean-influenced origins (see Mezirow and Marsick, 1978). However, her limited Mezirowian focus on cognition and rationality through discursive reasoning as a way of learning transformation is itself arguably shaped by hegemonic, enlightenment-fuelled epistemological values. Given Curry-Steven’s recognition of different forms of domination, it is perhaps surprising that her approach does not recognise varied forms of TL but maintains the narrow boundaries drawn by Mezirow’s focus on one form of transformation through one way of learning and knowing; namely, transforming an individual’s cognitive frame of reference through critical reflection and “rational” discursive reasoning via verbal dialogue.

Yet, as I discussed in the previous chapter, there are multiple ways of learning and knowing. For example, a somatic, embodied orientation places emphasis on the primary importance of the body as a medium of learning and knowing (Sellers-Young, 1998). Curry-Steven’s approach to catalysing conscientisation is inadequate to account for TL that might take place through other ways of knowing. Furthermore, although Curry-Stevens explicitly discusses power, I argue that omitting other ways of knowing in her approach, in favour of cognitive-rational knowing, is itself the result of – as well as an exercise of – power. As Ellsworth (1989) says, there is:

overwhelming evidence of the extent to which the myths of the ideal rational person and the universality of propositions have been oppressive to those who are not European, White, male, middle-class, Christian, able-bodied, thin, and heterosexual (in Zuber-Skerritt, 1996: 129).
Rationality has, for example, in many cultural contexts been gendered as male and constructed as superior to emotion, which is gendered as female. In educational contexts, Boler (1999) points out that:

> emotions are invisible because neither emotions nor women’s and students’ daily experiences have been foregrounded. Further, in Western cultures the absence rather than the presence of emotion signifies masculinity, the virtuous, and the good. Since the ideal moral citizen or student is understood to be both rational and masculine, emotions generally fall through the cracks of history (in Barrett, 2007: 215).

I propose re-orienting and expanding Curry-Stevens’ post-Freirean framework by integrating it with the concepts already discussed in this chapter. For example, if habitus is a ‘product of our upbringing, and more particularly of our class, it is class-culture embodied; an adaptation to objective circumstances that makes a “virtue of necessity” through encouraging our tastes, wants and desires to be broadly matched to what we will be realistically able to achieve’ (Bourdieu 1984: 175 in Sweetman, 2009). Should “critical consciousness” not incorporate a “bodily consciousness” – in addition to a cognitive-linguistic understanding – that facilitates consciousness of the unconscious habitus as part of an attempt to transform the boundaries of what ‘we will realistically be able to achieve’?

Although Curry-Stevens’ work vitally reasserts attention to power in transformative pedagogy, it fails to adequately account for the importance of space, place, and extra-rational ways of knowing and learning. This must be addressed when applying her framework in my research context, not least because the BB Instructors and students are regularly on the move. As they travel through different spaces and places in Bolivia and Peru, the students learn in what might be described as a portable classroom, or rather a series of interconnected and differently-boundaried mobile classrooms. This differs markedly from the immobile classroom context in which Curry-Stevens developed her
pedagogy, and I therefore bring the concepts of space and place to bear in my adaptation of her approach, and her treatment of power.

3.6. Conclusion

In this chapter I have addressed the lack of attention to power and space in transformative pedagogic theory and practice. Following my point in the previous chapter – that this field has been preoccupied with the importance of ‘time’ as a conceptual category through which to understand the process of transformative learning – I suggest that power and space should be inserted at its core. I have argued that these concepts are vital for my conceptual framework, not least because a spatialised framework helps to enable the analysis of invisible, symbolic power. While space is perhaps particularly amenable to the veiling of invisible power, it is at the same time particularly amenable as a medium for the unveiling of power, due to its visibility.

I discussed space as a thoroughly political and power-ridden concept, drawing on the notion of power geometry (Massey, 1994) to understand the uneven distribution of the benefits and pitfalls of globalisation in the new knowledge economy. An elite class of hypermobile ‘flashpackers’ – or global travellers – such as BB students and Instructors (and I) has emerged who exploit power geometries in ways that reproduce their privilege.

By studying the purportedly transformative pedagogic spaces created during a BB programme populated by ‘privileged’ students and Instructors – who operate within particular boundaries of possibility merely by virtue of being able, as globally mobile “global citizens”, to “go Breaking Boundaries” by participating in a BB programme – I can apply and explore the assertion that a defaced approach to the study of power relations shows how powerful people’s actions are just as socially conditioned as those of the powerless (Gaventa, 2011; Hayward, 1998).
Curry-Stevens’ ‘Pedagogy for the Privileged’ (2007) provides me with a valuable framework for operationalising this notion.

I showed how the defaced approach defines power as a set of social boundaries that enable and constrain possibilities, a conceptualisation that enables me to conduct a socio-spatial analysis of how pedagogic spaces constructed during the programme can be understood as the products and producers of forms of power (relation), and pedagogic relation. The concept of ‘boundary’ has, then, emerged in this chapter as vital to my conceptualisation of power in transformative pedagogic space. Bernstein’s attention to ‘boundary’ highlighted the importance of space to my framework in more detail.

Employing the notion of power as the ability to define and negotiate the boundaries of what is possible in any given context, I suggest that transformation can best be understood as a process of boundary creation, crossing and re-constitution. This in turn suggests that transformative pedagogic space might be understood as teaching and learning arenas that facilitate this process within their own boundaries of what is possible. This helps me to begin answering my main research question: what constitutes transformative pedagogic space?
Chapter 4
Methodology

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter I discuss my research methodology: critical ethnographic case study. I begin by describing and justifying my use of ethnography and the participant observation method central to it, before discussing the differences between conventional and critical ethnography and three major reasons I methodologically locate my work in the latter approach: first, my thesis is focused on social power relations; second, I combine research participants’ perspectives with my own critical interpretations; and third, I explicitly declare my personal political-pedagogic motivations and predispositions (see Carspecken, 1996; Foley, 2002).

I then elaborate on my participant observation methods while reflecting on the implications of my positionality, describing what my specific methods entailed in practice and how my methodology shaped my critical interpretations. This leads me to outline the critical constructivist epistemological (and ontological) underpinnings of my methodology before going on to account for the other data collection methods used (e.g. interviews, discussions) and to describe and justify how I went about analysing the data in response to my research questions. My methodology raises various ethical questions which I then address, building on my brief discussion of ethics and researcher positionality in Chapter 1. I address several issues including anonymity, my regular use of video-recording and audio-recording methods during fieldwork, and
the implications of my/our presence in the Bolivian and Peruvian communities we visited.

Next, I discuss the case study component of my research design. In Chapters 1 and 2, I discussed important aspects of the case study context (e.g. the gap year industry, and the Bolivian and Peruvian country contexts); in this chapter, I focus on discussing the relationship between the case and the context in a methodological sense. I concentrate on what kinds of inferences I can make, and what kinds I cannot, through critical ethnographic case study. Lastly, the chapter ends with an introductory outline of each empirical-analytical chapter, describing them and justifying their specific contribution to the research.

4.2. Painting a Picture of People and Places: Ethnography by Participant Observation

Ethnography takes various forms but is, fundamentally, a style of research in which the researcher produces data through direct participation in the everyday spaces of people’s lives. As Brewer (2000) describes it:

Ethnography is the study of people in naturally occurring settings or “fields” by methods of data collection which capture their social meanings and ordinary activities, involving the researcher participating directly in the setting, if not also the activities (6).

Participant observation is therefore a central component of ethnography (Cohen et al, 2000) and was my primary method of data collection. Participant observation was vital for interpreting what happened during the programme rather than relying solely on other participants’ interpretations. As Bleek (1987: 315) has noted, the latter can be a problem in ethnography – depending on the aim of the research –
because many ethnographers ‘write about what people say they do, and not what they see them doing’. Whilst I paid close attention to the former, I combined this with my focus on the latter and was a participant observer throughout the BB programme from beginning to end, including the instructors’ preparation phase beforehand and their reflective/evaluation phase afterwards.

As discussed in Chapter 1, my use of participant observation fills a gap in the research literature on gap year development education programmes, which mostly employs post-programme data collection methods to focus on learning outcomes, rather than analysing pedagogic process during the programme. Using participant observation also took full advantage of my position as an ex-BB Instructor which allowed me into a research setting that would otherwise be very difficult to access.

Typically, ethnographers conduct participant observation for extended periods of time in the research setting. In some cases, this might mean years living with a community (O’Reilly, 2008) but for my research this was neither necessary nor possible because the community being investigated was temporary. The BB Instructors, students, programme associates and I were a group of strangers brought together to form a teaching and learning community that lasted only three months, at least in terms of our physical proximity and close social contact. Although definitions of ‘community’ extend beyond ‘closeness’ – and in some sense the BB group still constitutes a community (we have a Facebook group and remain in sporadic contact online) – because my research focuses on the transformative pedagogic spaces created during the programme I am only concerned with the community which formed over those three months. My ethnography therefore captures the lifespan of the BB group in the research setting.

The nature of my participant observation places a different spin on Brewer’s description (above). In relation to their normal lives in the US, the BB students did not take part in everyday ‘ordinary activities’ during the BB programme. By contrast, the experience was a radical departure from the ordinary, which is precisely why it attracted me as a case of
transformative pedagogic space. However, the activities I analyse are still commonplace in the context of a BB programme, and so the research setting is therefore comparable, at least in this sense, to sites in which more orthodox ethnographies of ‘naturally occurring settings’ (Brewer, 2000; 6) are usually conducted. Nevertheless, my critical approach to the ethnography deviates considerably from conventional approaches in ways that I will now discuss.

### 4.2.1. From the Conventional to the Critical

Conventional approaches to participant observation, and ethnography more broadly, originated in early 20th Century anthropology. They were typically conducted by white “Western” researchers (e.g. see Malinowski, 1922; Evans-Pritchard, 1951) – as they still are, by and large – and focused on the comparative study of the “Other” – people who lived in other places from that of the researcher and who were perceived to be culturally, as well as geographically, distant. These early ethnographies were produced within an historical-political period that coincided with the “twilight” of the British Empire and have been critiqued for, at best, their Eurocentric assumptions and, at worst, the violence they inflicted upon their research ‘subjects’ (Smith, 1999). As Smith says:

From the vantage point of the colonized, a position from which I write, and choose to privilege, the term ‘research’ is inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism. The word itself, “research”, is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world’s vocabulary... The ways in which scientific research is implicated in the worst excesses of colonialism remains a powerful remembered history for many of the world’s colonized peoples... Just knowing that someone measured our “faculties” by filling the skulls of our ancestors with millet seeds and compared the amount of millet seed to the capacity for mental thought offends our sense of who and what we are. It galls us that Western researchers and intellectuals can assume to know all that it is possible to know of us, on the basis of their brief encounters with some of us. It appals us that the West can desire, extract and claim ownership of our ways of knowing, our imagery, the things we create and produce and then simultaneously reject the people who created and developed
those ideas and seek to deny them further opportunities to be creators of their own culture and own nations (ibid:1).

Although my research focuses on the privileged rather than ‘the colonized’, the epistemic violence and cultural appropriation Smith speaks of raises relevant questions. My ethnography includes interactions between indigenous peoples and BB group members (myself included), who may be seen in Bolivia and Peru as representatives of the West. My research also includes analysis, in Chapter 7, of a pedagogic space situated in a self-proclaimed ‘independent indigenous nation’ in the Peruvian Andes. Populated by Incan descendants who escaped the reach of Spanish colonialists, Nación Apu\(^7\) remains relatively insulated from Western influences, aside from occasional visits by BB groups. This presents a major ethical question for the BB group and my research methodology: what are the implications of our presence in the Apu communities’ space, and my presence as a researcher? Similar ethical and methodological questions must also be asked, more broadly, of my presence as a participant observer throughout the BB programme; such as, what are the implications of my ethnographic approach for the knowledge(s) produced during the BB programme? I will discuss these and other ethical questions later in this chapter.

The example of a “scientific research method” referred to by Smith may have been left in the early 20\(^{th}\) Century, but remnants of the positivist epistemological paradigm that promulgated it linger on. The notion that knowledge can be produced through objectively measuring phenomena persists, though mainly in the natural sciences as it has been largely debunked in the social sciences (Bryman, 2008; Fuchs, 1996). Whereas the impartiality of the observer was once considered a pre-requisite for ethnography, it is now widely regarded as an impossibility (Carspecken, 1996; Foley, 2002). As Kemmis (1980) said, the researcher:

\(^7\) A pseudonym used to protect the identity of the Apu community, and BB who are reportedly the only Westerners permitted to visit Nación Apu, thus making them traceable online.
is not an automaton shorn of human interests and programmed to execute a design devoid of socio-political consequences... research is not merely the application of sophisticated techniques and procedures which yield up true statements as if we did not have to decide which techniques to use in which situations and how they must be modified to suit the particular conditions of any study...his/her descriptions must be justified both in terms of the truth status of his/her findings and in terms of social accountability (119-20).

It is now accepted that ethnography is not only filtered through the subjective lens of the participant observer, but that the participation of the observer in the research setting inevitably changes that setting (Atkinson et al, 2007; Walford and Carspecken, 2001). It is an intervention that has social and political implications as well as methodological and epistemological consequences. Indeed, much ethnography has turned its back on aspirations of apolitical objectivity and embraced its subjective and highly political nature. This ‘critical turn’ (Foley, 2002) is embodied in the critical ethnographic approach – defined by Thomas (1993) as ‘conventional ethnography with a political purpose’ – that frames my participant observation, the characteristics of which I will now discuss as they are foundational methodological principles in my thesis.

4.2.2. The Critical Characteristics

I employed a critical ethnographic approach to my participant observation (and the other methods I used) for the following reasons. First, because my research is not only motivated by an intellectual desire to understand what constitutes transformative pedagogic space, but to contribute to the development of transformative pedagogic theory and practice in service of a more just world (Anderson, 1989). As discussed in Chapter 1, I occupy a privileged position in unequal, unjust social power structures, and I am therefore implicated in the oppression of others. I openly declare my commitment to challenging and changing
those power structures through my work as a researcher and practitioner of transformative pedagogy.

Second, beyond my broadly political commitment to social change, I am explicit about my specific political-pedagogic orientations to the research: I am influenced by a post-Freirean critical transformative pedagogy shaped by a critical constructivist epistemology. In short, I am motivated by developing critical pedagogic theory and practice with the aim of constructing “least imperfect” forms of participatory democratic socialism; that is, forms that are more contextually adaptive, deliberative, and direct-democratic than most other forms of socialism have historically proven to be.

Third, my critical ethnographic approach focuses on power relations. This is not only necessary for the two reasons I have already outlined, but principally to respond to my research questions. Given that power – and specifically invisible, symbolic power – is an integral feature of my conceptual framework, it is imperative that my research methodology and methods enable me to study it.

Participant observation enables me to do this in a way that other methods do not. If, as discussed in Chapter 3, invisible power functions unconsciously on and through people (Bourdieu et al, 1990; Hayward, 1998), the only way to observe and analyse this form of power is surely by being conscious of it and using appropriate conceptual tools (such as those I outlined in Chapter 3) and methodological instruments. For instance, Bourdieu emphasises how invisible, symbolic power functions through the body, shaping how people walk, talk, and ‘blow their noses’ (Bourdieu et al, 1992). By employing participant observation, I could see this physical manifestation of invisible power at work in verbal and non-verbal communication, shaping BB group members’ ways-of-being in a transformative pedagogic space in ways they often seemed unaware of. This is a form of ethnography, then, which not only documents the perspectives of research participants but:
calls into question the apparent understandings of the actors in the case and offers from the outsider’s standpoint explanations that emphasise causal or structural patterns of which participants in the case are unaware (1985: 49).

To point to the possibility that research participants may have limited awareness of what “is” happening, so to speak, in a pedagogic space is not to be condescending. It is merely to point out that none of us can be entirely conscious of the complex processes at play during our lived experiences. Indeed, as Barret (2007:211) points out, various “under the radar” forms of power can sometimes be inadvertently exercised by educators, and indeed researchers. To bring these into view, critical ethnography is needed to:

open up the possibility of attending to how everyday actions, speech and physical spaces work through micropractices of power to constrain both...educators and researchers within the very discourses they are often working to change (ibid).

This further underlines the importance of researcher reflexivity when conducting participant observation, not least regarding my positionality in the pedagogic spaces I observed. I now discuss this further while describing in more detail the implications of how I went about my participant observation for the critical interpretations I make.

4.2.3. The Implications of Researcher Positionality: My Participant Observation in Practice

In practice, my approach to observation involved participating directly in all settings in which the whole BB group was together, and selectively participating in some whole-group activities, and some small-group activities that took place during “free-time” in the programme schedule (e.g. a small group of BB students going shopping at the market). This meant spending approximately 80% of my time with the group, or some of its members (when they were not together as a whole group) daily,
using the rest of my time to type-up field notes, transcribe interviews and conduct preliminary analysis.

When possible, I filmed and/or audio-recorded activities while observing them (all participants had provided written consent to be recorded, though my methods nevertheless raise ethical questions which I will address later in this chapter). To film activities in which the BB group was stationary in one setting, I attached my video camera to a nearby object such as a tree or fence, using a ‘gorilla tripod’ (a small tripod with bendable legs that can be adjusted to wrap around and grip branches etc.), and left it alone to record the entire activity. I attached a wide-angle lens to the video camera to ensure that a large area, and all research participants, were included in the shot even when I placed the camera close enough to the group to record audio clearly.

To record activities while the BB group was on the move (e.g. discussions while travelling on the bus or doing a 'scavenger hunt' in the Cochabamba town market), I carried the video-camera. But rather than holding the camera up to my eye level when recording, I held it more discreetly by my side at waist level, choosing to use a device with a flip-out adjustable viewfinder screen which enabled me to glance down and see what I was recording, making sure not to record anyone outside the BB group. Carrying the camera in this way allowed me to gather more footage in a less intrusive way than if I had held the camera up around students' and Instructors' eye levels. Although students and Instructors were all aware they were being recorded – as I frequently reminded them when double-checking their consent before I began recording activities – it quickly seemed that they became accustomed to the camera, and comfortable with it, many remarking that they often forgot I was recording (again, this raises ethical issues which I will shortly discuss).

I chose to participate more actively in "informal" social activities (i.e. activities that were not scheduled as part of the programmes’ curriculum, and/or that did not have specifically defined learning objectives as did some of the pedagogic devices and strategies
facilitated by the Instructors) such as mealtimes, in the sense that I contributed more to discussions, participating more conspicuously in the group’s social dynamic. My reason for participating more actively in informal situations – aside from my wanting to have some social interaction with the people I spent three months with during the fieldwork – was to integrate myself into the group's social dynamic and earn the trust of group members. I felt that this would enable me to gather richer data from the research participants and gain deeper insight into their experiences. I think this was largely successful, as it seemed that the students and Instructors would more readily "open up" and speak more freely about their thoughts feelings and experiences in these "unscheduled", impromptu spaces.

By contrast, I participated less actively in activities within structured teaching and learning spaces, facilitated by Instructors, in which specific pedagogic aims were being pursued. I attempted to make myself less conspicuous during these activities, spending more time at the physical and social periphery of the space and synchronously making notes (i.e. in real time) more regularly than I did when interacting more actively with students in more informal, ad-hoc situations. My reason for this was to try and avoid excessively interfering in the Instructors' teaching, both as a matter of professional courtesy but also to try and avoid undue influence in shaping curricular content and pedagogic process. I felt that participating more actively in these structured teaching and learning spaces (e.g. by contributing my own points of view to discussions) would have risked “distorting” the teaching and learning process, and thus my research of it, in problematic ways. To be clear, I am not suggesting that my presence as a participant observer did not alter the pedagogic spaces I observed; it inevitably did. I am suggesting that I sought to avoid influencing specific aspects of the teaching and learning environment.

My concern about distorting the pedagogic spaces might seem to run counter to my 'critical' approach to the ethnography, but I argue that it does not because of the particular focus of my research. Given that I was interested in studying the functions of invisible power in the pedagogic process, participating too actively in particular types of
pedagogic space would have meant my introducing this concept explicitly into the programme as it would have been impossible for me to share my viewpoints during group discussions about poverty, inequality and injustice without using this concept. This would have contributed to “making the invisible, visible”, enacting stages of Curry-Stevens’ ‘proposed model for the transformation of privileged learners’ (2007) and (potentially) influencing the course of Instructors’ and students' teaching and learning. Although I had explained the main purpose, focus and methodology of my research to the students and Instructors before the start of the programme (by email and Skype conversations), and in more detail on our first day together in Bolivia, I had consciously avoided speaking about invisible power, because doing so would have precluded the possibility of making critical interpretations about the (potential) absence of attention to power by Instructors and students throughout the programme.

My methodological decisions and my positionality inevitably have implications for the critical interpretations I made through my participant observation. It is possible, for instance, that at least some of the students and Instructors were indeed familiar with the concept of invisible power, despite not discussing explicitly at any point during the programme, but had gained an implicit understanding of the research I was doing and were performing particular 'ways of being' in my presence that they thought would provide me with "fodder" for critical analysis and a coherent critical narrative for my thesis. The fact that I had built up trust and healthy relationships with all of BB group members perhaps increased the likelihood that they would try to please me by aiding my research in this way. However, although I think that research participants were inevitably 'performing' slightly differently, in some sense, for my participant observations than they would if I had not been there, there is nothing in the data to suggest that participants were familiar with the concept of invisible power as no one mentioned it (at least to my knowledge) during the three-month programme.

Additionally, although I have made claims about the capacity of participant observation to enable me to see how BB Instructors and
students' ways of being are changing, or not, when used in conjunction with concepts such as symbolic power and habitus, it is important for me to acknowledge some of the potential pitfalls of this method. For example, elements of my claim are predicated to some extent on the notion that 'situations where there is a lack of fit between habitus and field can bring habitus to the fore' (Sweetman, 2009: 9) in the sense that research participants' ways of being, or habitus, were more visible to me in the contexts of the BB programme (than they would have been if the research was conducted in, say, the US or UK) by virtue of being placed in stark relief in a different cultural context to which it was produced.

However, for the same reasons, aspects of participants' habitus may also have become more visible to themselves (regardless of whether they used the concept/term habitus to recognise it); indeed, this is one of the aims of the programme and necessary for transformative learning to take place. In these instances, changes that I observed in participants’ ways of being may or may not be attributable to the unconscious functioning of symbolic power, and it is therefore difficult for me to make such claims with confidence. Instead, I endeavour to make interpretations and empirically-based inferences and recognise that the process of forming these is ongoing and iterative.

Another aspect of my critical ethnographic approach that requires critical reflexivity is the notion of the 'ethnographic present'. This requires me to turn my attention from how power and space (and time) function in the production of pedagogic spaces during the BB programme, and the people that inhabit them, to how those concepts function in my representations of those spaces, processes and people. As Charlotte Aull Davis (1999) says:

The ethnographer moves on. [But] temporally, spatially and developmentally, the people he or she studied are presented as if suspended in an unchanging and virtually timeless state, as if the ethnographer’s description provides all that it is important, or possible, to know about their past and future (in Madison, 2005:10).
Whilst it is impossible to avoid perpetuating the 'ethnographic present' to some degree, I hope by acknowledging it to minimise its influence in my work. Moreover, it helped compel me to try and maintain dialogue with as many research participants as possible both during and following the fieldwork period, and to continue to involve them in the research process (for example, I have engaged in discussions with BB Instructors about the research following the fieldwork period and provided them with verbal and written feedback, ideas and suggestions). This is an important aspect of critical ethnography, as Madison says:

*critical* ethnography is always a meeting of multiple sides in an encounter with and among the Other(s), one in which there is negotiation and dialogue toward substantial and viable meanings that make a difference in the Other’s world (2005: 9).

This ethos is central to the critical constructivist orientation that informs my research methodology, which I will now discuss.

### 4.2.4. Constructing my Critical Interpretations

Critical constructivism is an epistemological stance that compels me to describe, and offer tentative, partial explanations for, the pedagogic processes through which knowledges are *constructed* by people in pedagogic spaces during the BB programme (myself included). Moreover, it exhorts me to examine the ways that symbolic power functions in these pedagogic spaces (Kincheloe, 2005), highlighting the symbolic character of pedagogic spaces and how they are experienced by the BB Instructors, students and other programme associates that inhabit them.

I adopt the perspective that individuals shape, and are shaped by, the spaces (social, physical, mental, etc.) they inhabit, and that knowledge is constructed through this mutually generative relationship. This suggests a relationship and pedagogic process that is more complex than perhaps hitherto understood (Kincheloe, 2008). Kincheloe suggests that by:
defining research methodology as a theory and interpretation of how knowledge production works, we begin to gain new frameworks from which we can better devise and frame the questions we ask of the world. With ontological complexity in mind and the critical complex need for multiple vantage points on the different domains of study... all issues are multidimensional and need to be viewed from diverse perspectives (ibid:242).

A critical constructivist orientation is, then, underpinned by the epistemological premise that there is no single, certain, objective truth which is accessible through the lens of human subjectivity. Instead, there are multiple, partial, constructed truths and knowledges. Moreover, the ontological underpinning of critical constructivism is that “reality”, or the “nature of being”, is not necessarily singular, but perhaps plural; in short, perhaps we live in a ‘pluriverse’ (Cardenal, 2009) rather than a universe.

The methodological implications of my epistemological and ontological orientations are that I needed to gather and analyse various perspectives on the pedagogic spaces I examined. As I have discussed, participant observation was the main means of generating data for analysis, but I also supplemented this with other methods.

4.3. More Methods of Data Collection

In this section I discuss the data methods I used in addition to participant observation: discussions, document gathering, and interviews. I discuss them in order of their usefulness for generating data during fieldwork.
4.3.1. Discussions

I used informal discussions with BB Instructors, students and programme associates during the BB programme, some of which they initiated and others which I initiated at appropriate times and in suitable spaces (e.g. during free time between activities, for example while walking back with students from the programme house in Cochabamba to their homestay family accommodation). This data collection method allowed me to probe deeper into the meanings of what I observed and help triangulate the data, supplementing my own observations and interpretations with those of others. Discussions were particularly useful as they allowed me to ask research participants about specific events soon after they occurred. These casual chats also felt less staged than arranged interviews and I felt that participants opened-up more than during interviews. Moreover, the discussion format was more dialogic and participants could steer the direction of the conversation, revealing things that were important to them and which I had not anticipated. Much of the data generated through these discussions could, therefore, not have been generated through semi-structured interviews as I would not have considered asking the “right” questions.

I audio-recorded all discussions using a digital recorder which I always carried in preparation for impromptu opportunities for data collection. I carried the recorder in my shirt (or jacket) breast pocket so it was easily accessible, close to mouth level (to ensure audible recordings, even in settings with considerable background noise), and less intrusive in conversations than holding it to participants' mouths or placing it on a table between the participant and I. As with my video recordings, it felt to me like this technique was effective, not least in the sense that students and Instructors quickly got used to me making audio recordings in this way and never expressed reservations or appeared to be unnerved by it. Nevertheless, though I always verbally confirmed consent from participants' before recording, my approach does raise ethical considerations which I will reflect on shortly.
Some discussions were especially useful. For example, those that I had with programme Instructors in the days following the end of the programme (and after I conducted the end-of-programme interviews with Instructors) led to more in-depth discussions about themes of transformation, pedagogy, and power relations. Until this point I had only shared the focus of my research with Instructors in broad terms, for fear of excessively influencing their approach to the programme. However, as the focal period of my research had now ended, I could reveal more about my study and my preliminary thoughts. I felt this made the research process slightly less extractive and one-directional, and provoked Instructors to discuss and debate different ideas around my research concepts and themes – for example the function of invisible power – thus revealing more about their own pedagogic philosophies.

4.3.2. Document Gathering

Gathering various documents, including BB promotional and pedagogic materials and students’ journals, to supplement participant observation was also a useful research method. Most of the data I used was gathered from students’ journals and revealed more detail of the content and process of students’ learning experiences (and how students chose to present these) as they unfolded during the programme. They showed what programme experiences were deemed significant enough by students to write about and how students interpreted these experiences. Conversely, and importantly, these data also showed what wasn’t deemed important enough to write about or even what perhaps was absent from the students’ programme experience (and perhaps, therefore, consciousness). I also collected and analysed the following types of documents:

(1) BB promotional materials, mostly in the form of written and visual texts from BB’s website. These showed the types of transformative pedagogic aims that BB presented to potential customers through its “public face”, and the types of ‘pedagogic discourse’ (Bernstein, 1996)
the organisation reproduces. It is important to note here that to maintain BB’s anonymity, I did not conduct a detailed analysis of its promotional materials as this would require using the exact written and visual texts BB produces, therefore making the organisation traceable through an internet search. In any case, analyses of gap year programme’s promotional materials have been done elsewhere (e.g. see Calkin, 2014) – as discussed in Chapter 2 – and adding to these is not my aim. My brief analysis of BB’s brochure and website is therefore only intended to provide “a taste” of the public face of BB’s pedagogic discourse.

(2) BB’s pedagogic materials, mostly in the form of written text in the organisation’s 414-page Educator’s Resource and 88-page Instructor Handbook. These showed the types of transformative pedagogic aims that BB presented to its Instructors – through its private face – and the detailed pedagogic guidance it provides for achieving these aims. In contrast to the promotional documents, these pedagogic materials reveal pedagogic rationales and influences that are omitted from BB’s website and brochures and show a different side to its ‘pedagogic discourse’ (Bernstein, 1996). Analysing verbatim text from these materials is ethically feasible because they are unpublished and only available to BB staff.

(3) BB ‘Instructor Quest’ documents, which are composed of questions from BB administrative staff (Programme Directors/Co-ordinators) and completed by each programme Instructor before the start of the programme, mid-programme, and at the end of the programme. The questions encourage Instructors to reflect on their pedagogic approach to the programme and generated data that revealed more about Instructors and their individual goals for the programme.

(4) Introductory messages from programme Instructors (including pre-programme learning assignments given to students) and students on BB’s internet forum. These demonstrate what was being prioritised in the programme Instructors’ pedagogic approach and what was not (for instance by virtue of the choices of pre-programme learning assignments that Instructors made).
4.3.3. Interviews

The use of semi-structured individual interviews with BB Instructors, students and various programme associates (e.g. homestay host families, visiting speakers) during the programme was also a useful data collection method. As with the discussions, interviews allowed me to probe deeper into the meanings of different experiences, although the data were often less useful than those generated through discussions. This is due to the broader scope of the interviews and their proximity to the pedagogic spaces I selected for analysis (i.e. interviews, unlike discussion, were not focused specifically on those selected pedagogic spaces and often occurred a considerable time – sometimes weeks – after them).

Semi-structured individual interviews were conducted with all Instructors (including Sergio, the fourth member of the Instructor Team) and students at the pre-programme, middle, end, and post-programme stages. Interviews were also conducted once during the programme with each of 15 programme associates (e.g. homestay host families, educators, NGO staff etc.) and once with students’ mothers and/or fathers (by Skype) shortly after students returned home. These interviews generated data that are important for answering the research question for four main reasons.

(1) Student interviews contributed to forming a baseline, mid-line, and end-line (albeit only in relation to the three-month duration of the programme itself) regarding students’ perspectives on themes central to the programme curriculum: for example, I asked students for their definitions of “poverty” and their understandings and feelings in relation to this word. This enabled me to observe changes and continuities in students’ perspectives throughout the programme (at least in relation to how they manifested during interviews).

(2) The data also provide some of the students’ thoughts as to why and how changes, or continuities, in their perspectives occurred.
(3) The data also provide information (excepting the pre-programme interview) about how participants interpreted certain activities and events that took place during the programme, some being of particular interest to me (prompted by specific questions that I asked about these events).

(4) Interviews with Instructors provided data in the form of their observations about students’ learning experiences during the programme, including ways in which students had changed (or not) and inferences as to how and why this happened.

4.4. Ethical Considerations

My thesis raises the following ethical considerations which I have reflected on throughout the research process:

First, the process of gaining consent from research participants to do the research raises questions that require attention. Whilst all research participants provided consent, the contexts in which they did this inevitably differed. For instance, I informed BB students and Instructors about my research by email and Skype conversations in advance of their arrival in Bolivia, thus giving them time to consider my proposal and whether they wished to provide their consent or not. Although it was impossible to avoid a situation in which the Instructors and students may have felt some degree of social obligation to provide their consent (despite my clearly explaining that there was no obligation) to avoid "causing problems", these research participants had clear opportunities to do this. Those opportunities were perhaps less plausible for some other research participants; for instance, there was no way for me to contact homestay host families in Nación Apu prior to our arrival in their communities, therefore the family that Scott, Patrick and I stayed with had little time to consider my request to do participant observation in their home during our stay. Moreover, although I clearly explained that there was no obligation for our host family to give consent, it is unavoidable that they may have felt a degree of social and economic obligation by thinking they should consent for fear of displeasing
Wilfredo and/or I and possibly risking the loss of financial compensation from hosting BB students again in future.

Furthermore, although I provided all participants with an outline of the purpose and general focus of my study before requesting their consent to participate, it was of course impossible to give a detailed description of what the final version of my thesis would look like at that early stage of the research process. Whilst I pointed this out to research participants, and, when possible, reminded them periodically throughout the programme that their consent is retractable, it is inevitable that my thesis might be markedly different from how research participants may have imagined it when providing their consent. It is also unavoidable that some research participants might disagree with my analysis, and even be dissatisfied with how they are portrayed, albeit anonymously, in the thesis. I considered sharing drafts of my thesis with research participants to elicit their views and engage in discussion (and possibly, negotiation) about my depictions of them and the programme experience. However, I decided that this would risk beginning a potentially intractable process that could compromise the integrity of the research as a product of my subjective, critical ethnographic interpretations.

Second, it is important to anonymise the identity of the organisation ('Breaking Boundaries' is a pseudonym as I pointed out in Chapter 1) to protect it, and programme participants and associates, from any potentially negative consequences arising from my research (e.g. damage to BB’s reputation), particularly considering that my thesis makes several critical points about the educational experiences provided by the organisation. I have gone to lengths to ensure anonymity, for example by checking that any quotes I use from BB documents cannot be used to identify the organization through an Internet search (many of BB's promotional documents are available online). To do this, I performed Internet searches with all the quotes included in my thesis and in cases where a search revealed BB’s identity, I altered the composition of the quote by reducing its length and/or combining verbatim words or phrases with paraphrasing.
However, the measures described above only provide complete anonymity in the sense that people outside the BB organisation would be unable to identify it from my thesis, and thus unable to identify BB staff, students and associates. It is, nevertheless, impossible to ensure the same level of anonymity between staff, students and associates given that they know each other and are therefore more likely to be able to ascertain who I am writing about in my thesis despite my using pseudonyms to refer to all research participants. This is something I explained to research participants before requesting their consent to participate in the research.

The likelihood of research participants being able to identify one another by reading my thesis varies widely from one instance to another in my analysis, depending on various factors such as, for example, each participants' position within the programme. For instance, as Frida is the Programme Director, it is impossible to anonymise her from identification by other research participants. It is easier, in most cases, to anonymise the BB students depending on what information I chose to include and exclude when writing about them, and what sources of data I analysed. As most of the data I analysed in the thesis was generated through participant observation of pedagogic spaces in which all students were present, attempting to maintain/guarantee anonymity between students in this context is neither necessary nor possible as all students can link my descriptions of those situations to their memories of them.

However, there are other situations in which the ethical considerations around anonymity are more complex. For example, in Chapter 7 I analysed a situation in which just four BB students and one Instructor are having a small group discussion during which one student – Jay – discloses personal, sensitive information. Given the context, it was unclear to me if Jay would be happy or not for other members of the BB group who were not present to be privy to this information. Although there is nothing in what Jay discloses that would conclusively reveal his identity, other group members might plausibly be able to hazard an accurate guess by, for instance, recognising familiarities in his speech
patterns (albeit in written form). As a precaution, I therefore contacted Jay while writing up my thesis to check if he still consented to my using this piece of data, which he did. I also double-checked with all BB students and Instructors at the end of the programme that they still maintained their consent for me to use any of the data that were collected during the programme.

Third, the ethical issues discussed so far are complicated further by my use of video recording, audio recording and photography during the fieldwork. For example, to ensure anonymity, and adhere to data protection regulations, it was necessary for me to carefully and securely manage the large quantities of recorded data I gathered. In practice this meant password protecting access to encrypted digital files stored on my laptop and backed up on various external drives (several drives were needed due to the large file size of video recordings). To minimise the possibility of losing or damaging external drives while travelling during the programme (and to reduce my baggage), when an external drive was filled to capacity with data, I securely stored it (e.g. in a locked cabinet in a friend’s house) and returned to collect it after the program had finished. I have also committed to destroying the data once I have finished using it for research purposes.

Fourth, in the spirit of critical ethnography it is incumbent upon the researcher to "give something back" to the research participants to try and make the research less extractive and more reciprocal. I did this in several ways:

- I provided BB Instructors with a face-to-face summary of my preliminary analysis of the data, immediately following the end of the programme. In addition to this academic summary, I also gave the Instructors my verbal and written feedback from a practitioner's perspective, offering practical pedagogic suggestions for how they might develop their work in the future. The Instructors told me they found this very valuable and it also gave us an opportunity to discuss the programme in more depth,
in relation to my critical interpretations as a researcher and an educator, which we all found insightful;

- After conducting further data analysis in the months following the programme, I compiled a short, written research report for BB which distilled the main conclusions of the research and made practical suggestions and recommendations for how the organisation could develop its transformative pedagogy. I sent this to the programme Instructors who incorporated it into a workshop that they facilitated for other BB staff (instructors, administration and management) during BB’s annual week-long Instructor training camp in the US;

- I gave research participants free access to high-quality photographs I took throughout the programme, and thus memories of the experience, by giving them access to my shared online storage drive. BB staff and students expressed their gratitude for this. However, although I attempted to provide programme associates (e.g. homestay host families) with access to the drive too, this was done somewhat belatedly, without adequate planning, and it is unlikely that the gesture was of much benefit to anyone other than BB staff and students. This clearly raises ethical questions about how the research and its outputs differently impact on research participants.

4.5. Critical Ethnographic Case Study: Some Methodological and Epistemological Foundations and Implications

I now discuss the case study element of my critical ethnographic research design. This involves discussing the characteristics of
ethnographic case study and how they relate to my critical constructivist epistemological approach to the research. It also involves explaining how I conceptualise the relationship between my study and the wider phenomenon it is a case of (i.e. transformative pedagogic space). It is important to discuss these wider phenomena; as Stake (1995) notes, by applying a magnifying glass to the forensic study of human cultures, much ethnographic case study research risks de-contextualising the case being studied by magnifying it to such an extent that it becomes abstracted out of any clear relationship with its historical, sociocultural, and political context. This process atomizes and depoliticises the case study, and by extension the research. Indeed, from a methodological standpoint Yin (2013: 13) points out that even attempting to conceptually separate a case study from its context is difficult because a case study is an ‘empirical enquiry to investigate a contemporary phenomenon in real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident’.

In the case of my research the boundaries are blurred even further. I am presenting the phenomena being investigated as pedagogic spaces that are constituted by physical, social and cultural contextualities. Thus, the spaces that are my units of analysis are not clearly distinguishable from context; in a sense, they are context.

However, this is not to say that these pedagogic spaces cannot be conceptualised as discrete and bounded spaces. They are assemblages of specific elements of various contexts that coalesce together, albeit loosely, at points in time and space. In doing so, they form discernible characteristics that distinguish them from other spaces and contexts around them. So, I suggest that whilst they are closely inter-connected to other pedagogic spaces located “outside” the boundaries/borders I have drawn, and that those boundaries/borders are porous, each pedagogic space can nevertheless be understood as bounded in some ways and to some extent. The spaces are ‘bounded systems’, as are case studies (Stake, 1995: 2).
So, having already discussed (in Chapters 1 and 2) the political, economic, socio-cultural conditions my case studies are embedded in, I focus here on discussing the case context in a methodological sense. This involves discussing what I can claim or infer from the study in relation to broader contexts. For example, in what ways, and to what extent, I can generalise “findings” or insights and map them onto wider contexts such as development education and gap year programmes. This is an important step in a process of ascertaining what contributions I think my research can make, not only to academic knowledge, but to informing the work of practitioners working in other transformative education contexts. Although I do not seek to make statistically generalisable claims, as with much case study research the examples I analyse are ones that I present as illustrative of a more general principle (Cohen et al, 2011). This methodology is qualitatively distinct from approaches that employ representative sampling, to the extent that it almost speaks a different research language. As MacDonald and Walker (1977) say:

> We might say that case-study is that form of research where n = 1, only that would be misleading, because the case study method lies outside the discourse of quantitative experimentalism that has dominated Anglo-American educational research (in Bassey, 1999).

Moreover, case studies do in some sense seek to look outwards and be relevant and illustrative of some phenomenon that exists beyond the boundaries of the case (Cohen and Court, 2003). This distinguishes them from non-case study ethnography which is more ‘inward looking’ (ibid) in that it contains the implications of its analysis within the boundaries of the culture it investigates. Nonetheless, a case study is not a representative, generalizable example of a wider phenomenon. As Bassey (1999) argues, in his attempt to reconstruct what is meant by an educational case study, it is important to:
recognize the potential value of what I shall now call a fuzzy generalization. This is the kind of statement which makes no absolute claim to knowledge, but hedges its claim with uncertainties. It arises when the empirical finding of a piece of research, such as

In this case it has been found that ...

is turned into a qualified general statement like this:

In some cases it may be found that ...

Previously I had treated the concept of generalization (of the empirical kind, that is) as a statement that had to be absolutely true. This is the sense in which physical scientists use the term. It is the basis of their concept of scientific method, as described by, say, Karl Popper (1963), in which a hypothesis stands as a generalization (or law) only if it withstands all attempts at refutation. I argued that there were very few generalizations (in this absolute sense) about education – and even fewer, if any, that were useful to experienced teachers. While still holding to this view in terms of scientific generalizations (i.e. the absolute kind), I now recognize that there are two other kinds of generalization which can apply in social science research: the statistical generalization and the fuzzy generalization. The statistical generalization arises from samples of populations and typically claims that there is an x per cent or y per cent chance that what was found in the sample will also be found throughout the population: it is a quantitative measure. The fuzzy generalization arises from studies of singularities and typically claims that it is possible, or likely, or unlikely that what was found in the singularity will be found in similar situations elsewhere: it is a qualitative measure (Bassey, 1999: 12).

This sentiment captures my methodological approach; as discussed earlier, I examine the complexities of transformative pedagogic spaces to reveal what it is possible to observe.

There are, of course, different types of case study, and using Yin’s (2009) typology of case study design, I suggest my approach is “exploratory”. Exploratory case studies are rooted in grounded theory in that they ‘discover theory by directly observing a social phenomenon in its “raw” form’ (ibid). Aspects of my study are “revelatory” as they are, according to Yin (2003: 42), ‘opportunities to observe and analyse a
phenomenon previously inaccessible to investigation’. This can be said of, for example, the homestay visit in Nación Apu (featured in Chapter 6). I now briefly introduce each of my empirical-analytical chapters and justify their selection for my thesis.

4.6. Introducing the Empirical-Analytical Chapters

As should now be clear, the “object” of my research is transformative pedagogic space (TPS). The units of analysis in Chapters 5, 6, and 7 can be understood as examples of sub-spaces (and the pedagogic devices used in those spaces) that are contained within the larger TPS that is the BB Bolivia and Peru programme. It is important to stress here that I have constructed (i.e. conceptualised, generated, categorised, analysed, selected, and presented) these examples as the most useful to use for addressing my research question, rather than discovering them as pre-determined units of analysis. My rationale for using these examples over other possibilities, and presenting them how I do, differs from one chapter to the next, although the following reasons apply to all of them:

First, the units of analysis are spread over three phases of time which span the group’s stay in Bolivia and Peru. These three phases, and their accompanying pedagogic imperatives, are consistent features of BB programmes. They contain mandatory curricular content and happen in relatively standardised ways at similar times and places, and in certain types of space. For example, the Orientation and Transference phases always happen at, respectively, the beginning and end of a programme in isolated, tranquil surroundings.

This pattern of curricular content and pedagogic timing and sequencing is intended to inculcate BB’s overarching pedagogic frameworks in students (and Instructors) in a relatively prescribed, systematic, and controlled manner. It therefore provides suitable material for my
analysis of what constitutes a transformative pedagogic space in this context. As I will reveal, various informal regulative mechanisms are in place to assess this process – part of a triumvirate of common ‘message systems’ that, according to Bernstein, work to make education ‘an agency of socialization and allocation’ (1975: 199) – curriculum, pedagogy, and evaluation:

Curriculum defines what counts as valid knowledge, pedagogy defines what counts as a valid transmission of knowledge, and evaluation defines what counts as a valid realization of this knowledge (Bernstein, 1971: 85).

The pedagogic devices used during these programme phases are, however, not mandatory but recommended by BB. Within BB’s overarching programme framework – that orders the content, spacing and timing of the learning experience – Instructors have considerable freedom to decide what to teach, and how. BB’s pedagogic framework is mediated through Instructors’ individual and collective pedagogic frames of reference. In turn, this process is also mediated by students who construct meanings through the pedagogic devices.

Second, I wanted to select a range of pedagogic spaces and devices as units of analysis, to increase the probability of drawing out as wide as possible a range of different questions, tensions, contradictions, and insights for discussion and analysis. The logic underlying this is that a diversity of spaces and pedagogic devices is more likely to produce a diversity of interesting points for analysis and discussion.

Third, I have better quality data for these units of analysis than others I could have selected. That is, I have a greater quantity, quality and diversity of data generated through a range of methods which enrich my analysis.

Lastly, my rationale for sequencing the chapters, and the content within them, in chronological order is that the students, Instructors, and other people that I discuss in my analysis acted in ways that were informed
by events that had taken place previously. It is important to inform the reader of these background contexts to the events I analyse in order to understand them better. That said, although my reconstruction of my participant observation is chronological, I also insert pieces of data from interviews and students’ journals that I deem to be directly relevant to the event I am discussing. These pieces of data were not necessarily generated at the same point in real-time in which I insert them in my reconstruction, but I have chosen to insert them at these points as they shed light on the situations at hand. These data are supplementary to the data generated through my main ethnographic method of participant observation.

Having outlined my rationale for constructing my units of analysis, I now briefly introduce each empirical-analytical chapter.

4.6.1. (Chapter 5) Treasure Maps for Travellers: Digging Beneath the Pedagogic Devices

In this chapter I focus on ‘pedagogic devices’ (Bernstein, 1996) – a concept I discussed in Chapter 3 – that were used by Instructors, for different ostensible purposes, during three periods of time which span the group’s stay in Bolivia and Peru (i.e. the beginning, middle, and end). I concentrate on the research question: What pedagogic devices are used in a transformative pedagogic space and what are their rationales, intentions, and functions?

The chapter is organised into three sections (5a, 5b, and 5c). I analyse several interconnected pedagogic devices (presenting them in chronological order as I have just explained) but anchor my analysis in each section around one of three particularly important mechanisms that distil and illuminate my main arguments.
4.6.1.a. (Section 5a) The Container, The Comfort Zone, and the Cultural Distinction

This section is anchored around the Three Zone Framework. This was a pedagogic device for mapping students’ states of being throughout the programme in relation to three zones: the comfort zone, the learning zone and the panic zone. Students were encouraged by Instructors to avoid states of comfort and panic and inhabit the learning zone as much as possible. This zonal frame of reference was introduced through an activity during Orientation, which took place over the first five days and aimed to help students acclimatise to an unfamiliar environment. The timing of this pedagogic device in the context of the programme forms part of my rationale for selecting it; I wanted to analyse devices that were used during different stages of the programme. These stages are defined in temporal terms as the beginning, middle, and end, but in pedagogic terms – by BB – as the ‘Skill Development’, ‘Enacting’, and ‘Empowerment’ stages (as explained in Chapter 1).

The Three Zone Framework is also a fundamentally important mechanism that frames a core element of BB’s pedagogic approach to the students’ learning experience and is returned to regularly and consistently throughout the programme. Moreover, it is a pedagogic device that is articulated in an explicitly spatialised, zonal form, creating a mental map for students and Instructors that highlights the importance of my focus on the interaction between space, pedagogy and power. To understand the rationales, intentions, and functions of the device I “bookend” my analysis between, respectively, discussions of BB’s promotional and pedagogic materials, analysis of “The Container” – a pedagogic device used to build BB group identity as a precursor to the Three Zone Framework – and an activity in which students’ state their collective and individual programme goals. This is, therefore, the longest section in Chapter 5 and sets-out key concepts and themes that also apply to the other two examples of pedagogic devices – for instance, that the programme is constructed as an experience for ‘travellers’ and not ‘tourists’ (BB, 2013c).
4.6.1.b. (Section 5b) Safe Space or Suspension Space?

This section focuses on The Spectrum Activity. This was a pedagogic device for positioning students’ points-of-views in response to controversial statements about poverty, inequality and injustice, as part of a 20-minute preparatory exercise for an Instructor-led workshop about International Development. This pedagogic device was used during the middle month of the programme – the ‘Enacting’ stage in which students practice the skills they have learned – when the BB group was relatively stationary, and students were accommodated in ‘homestays’ with Bolivian families. The Spectrum Activity takes place in BB’s private programme-house garden near Cochabamba, Bolivia and requires students to respond to provocative statements about international development by individually, simultaneously, and physically placing themselves along a spectrum between two points, one representing ‘strongly agree’, and the other ‘strongly disagree’. I selected this pedagogic device for analysis because it illustrates, in an explicitly spatialised form, some of the core themes that emerged from the data; for example, the Instructors’ commitment to political neutrality.

4.6.1.c. (Section 5c) Everyone Loves a Story with a Happy Ending

This section is oriented around The Storytelling Activity. This pedagogic device was designed for helping each student package the story of their three-month programme experience into three bite-sized versions (30 second, 3-minute, and 30-minute). Each version is tailored for telling to different audiences in different times and spaces upon returning home to the US; for instance, the 30-second story might be told to a vaguely interested acquaintance who the student passes in the corridor. This activity took place during the final two days’ ‘Transference’ period of the programme, designed to prepare students for the reverse culture shock, or ‘re-entry shock’ (BB, 2013c: 130) that can occur when transferring one’s ‘transformed’ being back home and re-entering everyday life. I chose this pedagogic device for analysis not only because it took place
in the closing stages of the programme (thus completing my selection of a range of devices that spanned the entire program). Rather, because the device employs space and time as criteria that structure and organise an activity which provides a framework for students to rehearse the representation, and indeed performance, of their experiences – including the people and places they encountered – to others back home in the US.

4.6.2. (Chapter 6) Nación Apu: Exploring a Transformative Pedagogic Space

The purpose of this chapter is to focus on responding to the research question: What is the process, and content, of teaching and learning in a transformative pedagogic space? A pedagogic space was created by Instructors in the form of a week-long trip to Nación Apu, a self-declared independent indigenous nation in the Peruvian province of Paucartambo, located approximately 100 miles from Cusco. The BB group treks from community to community in Nación Apu, staying in each community for between one and three days. Students divide into pairs and stay with Apu families in their homes, eating, sleeping, working, and talking with their hosts to try and get a glimpse of life in the communities. I chose to focus, in Chapter 7, on Nación Apu for the following five reasons.

First, the Nación Apu visit was presented by Instructors to students as one of the most important and potentially transformative experiences of the programme. It encapsulates many features of what BB and its Instructors consider to be a transformative pedagogic space and incorporates many of the main pedagogic devices that were used to try and facilitate transformation during the programme.

Second, as Instructors had anticipated, many students did come to describe their visit to Nación Apu in transformative terms as the most profound and impactful experience of the programme, some even describing it as ‘life-changing’. Whilst I deliberately avoid limiting my selection of pedagogic spaces for analysis to those that appeared to be most transformative (in order to discuss a range of different spaces,
including those that seemed to be more mundane and less impactful) I wanted to include one pedagogic space that was closest to meeting this “transformative” criteria, hence my choice of Nación Apu.

Third, the data generated in Nación Apu reveal important themes and concepts that feature throughout the rest of the programme and are threaded through the central argument of my thesis – for instance, the distinction between tourists and travellers that is emphasised so strongly by Instructors and subscribed to by students.

Fourth, the Nación Apu visit lasts for approximately one week and is one of the longest experiences of its type in the programme. Given that I wanted to select a range of experiences, this offsets the following two analytical chapters which, by contrast, focus on pedagogic spaces that last for significantly less time.

Fifth, it takes place in a rural, indigenous, Peruvian setting that contains within it various types of pedagogic sub-space. Some of these sub-spaces are more consciously and carefully facilitated and shaped by Instructors (who are not present in all the spaces and therefore have less control in some of them) than others. Moreover, Nación Apu is located at a considerable geographical and social “distance” from the other types of spaces that the BB group inhabits in the other two analytical chapters. Chapter 5 features spaces that are suburban, physically comfortable, sealed off from non-BB group members, and highly regulated by Instructors. By contrast, in Chapter 7 the pedagogic space is urban, extremely uncomfortable (physically, emotionally, psychologically), moderately regulated by Instructors, unusually gendered (male dominated due to a rare BB group split), and open to participation from a variety of non-BB group members who interact with the students and Instructors.
4.6.3. (Chapter 7) The Mountain that Eats Women: How Pedagogic Spaces Shape Pedagogic Processes

The purpose of this chapter is to respond to the research question: how does the character of a transformative pedagogic space shape what happens in it? Another 'transformative' pedagogic space was formed when some of the BB students visited Cerro Rico, a working silver and tin mine in Bolivia, a visit that unfolded in unplanned and unanticipated ways. Before the visit to the mine, Randall (a BB Instructor) planned to pedagogically “scaffold” the activity by facilitating preparatory activities with students (e.g. a film about the mine focusing on the exploitation of child workers) and follow this up with reflective activities after the visit (e.g. a group discussion about the experience). However, these activities did not go to plan, for various reasons, and the pedagogic space instead produced the exercising of explicitly misogynistic gender power relations, though also the critical exploration of these relations by some BB group members. I describe and analyse what happened in this case and the ways in which it was transformative (or not) and/or unintentionally reproductive in relation to engendered power relations.

The visit to the mine took place in the ‘Empowerment’ phase of the BB programme (in week 10), immediately preceding Transference. In the lead-up to the visit the 12 BB students were handed more decision-making power by Instructors, as is normal during the Empowerment phase of the programme. The students collectively decided the itinerary for the final three weeks of the programme through a series of group discussions (that included Instructors) interspersed with their own research about different places they could visit, and different things they could do, in the final phase of the programme.

In the weeks prior to the mine tour, and increasingly in the days leading up to it, Instructors and students occasionally talked about the mine tour. Early in the programme, for instance, Frida mentioned to the students the possibility of doing the Cerro Rico mine tour at some later point during the programme. At times during these discussions, some of the ethical implications of entering the mine as tourists were raised
by BB Instructors, and some students, as indeed they are in the group’s shared Lonely Planet guide book. Frida drew attention to the critique that the tour is akin to ‘poverty tourism’ and ‘feels a bit like a human-zoo’. Having been into the mine before, Frida declared her ambivalence about personally entering the mine again. I felt sympathetic to this and, having visited the mine myself once in the past, could relate to Frida’s reservations. Although the apparent support for the tours from many miners certainly complicated the ethical dilemmas posed, I also felt ambivalent. I nevertheless tried to justify, to myself, the necessity of my second visit, if only for my research.

4.7. Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed how my research methodology has prepared me to present my analysis in the remaining chapters. I have shown how critical ethnographic case study is well-suited to addressing my research questions by focusing on the function of power and space in the constitution of transformative pedagogic space during the BB programme. This is an ‘exploratory’ and ‘revelatory’ (Stake, 2005) approach that has rarely been employed in contexts such as the BB programme. It enables the analysis that now follows to go beyond the type of research that dominates the literature, based as it often is on retrospective analysis of learning “outcomes” using self-reported data from self-described “transformed” learners. By combining research participants’ perspectives with my own critical interpretations – formed mainly through participant observation but supplemented with analysis of data generated through discussions, interviews and document gathering – I am able to analyze and make empirically informed inferences about how invisible, symbolic power operates unconsciously, through space, shaping processes of teaching and learning in transformative pedagogic spaces during the programme.
Chapter 5
Treasure Maps for Travellers

5.1. Introduction

In this chapter I concentrate on the research question: What pedagogic devices are used in a transformative pedagogic space and what are their rationales, intentions, and functions? The chapter is organised into three sections (5a, 5b, and 5c), each containing pedagogic devices that I briefly described in the previous chapter. I make some analytical points that are specific to the pedagogic devices in each section, but also compare points between sections and draw-out cross-cutting themes.

The main line of argument threaded through the chapter is that each device functions as a form of map – a ‘mental map’ (Kitchin, 1994; White, 2012) which provide frames of reference that not only guide students and Instructors, but organise and order their programme experiences. Using Bernstein’s concepts of ‘classification and framing’ (1971) and ‘instructional and regulative pedagogic discourse’ (1996; 2009) I hone-in on how the devices maintain various types of boundaries which are tightly contained by Instructors to regulate what is taught and learned.

What emerges is that students are taught to construct themselves as ‘travellers’ and not ‘tourists’ (BB, 2013c), highlighting the pedagogic device as a means of identity construction, and the mental maps as maps for travellers. The maps are intended to guide students through
the various types of transformative terrain (e.g. geographical, cultural, emotional, and intellectual) they are preparing to traverse, by signposting paths of profound learning and change. These are presented as the paths of the traveller, not the tourist, and the distinction is made clear to students.

However, crucially I also argue that these transformative intentions do not necessarily facilitate transformative “outcomes”. Referring to Bourdieu’s ‘forms of capital’ (1986) I suggest that the mental maps are “secret treasure maps” of sorts. They enable students (and Instructors and I) to locate sources of particularly valuable cultural capital (ibid) and facilitate the efficient accumulation and management of that capital. Thus, the pedagogic devices are, I contend, produced within power geometries (Massey, 1994) which unevenly distribute the benefits of global mobility, rendering them socially reproductive, rather than transformative because they reproduce BB students’ privilege.

Yet, I also point to instances where students appear to experience certain types of profound learning and change. However, while these are sometimes congruent with BB’s socially transformative Freirean aims, for the most part the transformative learning is personal. Students appear preoccupied with personal exploration, identity formation and individual wellbeing and there is little sign of motivation and commitment to working for social change. I will argue that this represents a depoliticised marketisation of Freirean pedagogic principles which not only contradicts BB’s aims but is also incongruent with the political-pedagogic orientations and commitments of the programme Instructors.
Section 5a

The Container, The Comfort Zone and The Cultural Distinction: Setting the Boundaries of “the Traveller” Space

5a.1. Introduction

In this section, I begin by briefly analysing some promotional\(^8\) and pedagogic materials that indicate core features of BB’s ‘pedagogic discourse’ (Bernstein, 1996). This sets the scene for my analysis throughout this chapter and the remaining chapters. Following these scene-and-theme-setting opening passages, I discuss how BB Instructors created the ‘container’ (BB, 2013c: 18). This is a pedagogic device (Bernstein, 1996) in the form of a metaphoric construct containing a comfort zone for the BB group, but also demarcating boundaries that helped group members to learn a new identity as ‘travelers’ (BB, 2013c).

The Container is a precursor to the Three Zone Framework, an important pedagogic device in which the notion of ‘The Comfort Zone’ – a metaphoric space, or state of being – is a central element. After analysing the three-zonal pedagogic device, I explain more of its rationales, intentions and functions by dissecting ‘Mission Statements’ and ‘Magic Statements’ written by students about their individual and

\(^8\) As explained in the previous chapter, in order to protect BB’s anonymity I cannot analyse its promotional materials in-depth using verbatim text because it would be traceable online.
group goals for the programme. Like the other pedagogic devices analysed in this section, these pre-emptive statements helped to set the scene for the attempted transformation of the students, but also to sell the scene for an important ‘cultural distinction’ (Bourdieu, 1979) to be made as students are constructed as travellers rather than tourists.

5a.2. Selling the Scene: Promoting Travelling Not Tourism

BB’s promotional brochure and website (2013) offers rugged, challenging travel experiences for the bold and intrepid. There are no plush hotel rooms or luxury buses, and few famous landmarks. The predominant imagery is cloud forests and snow-capped peaks, rough rivers and makeshift canoes – young white westerners exploring beyond the edges of the “tourist” map. It is hardly surprising that an organisation selling ‘learning adventures’ (BB, 2013a) for young adults markets its products differently than, for instance, a travel agent offering package holidays for middle-aged tourists. It is imperative for BB to distinguish itself from competitors by constructing a brand identity. Prospective students and their sponsors want to know why they should pay over $13,000 for a place on a BB programme.

The message sent by BBs promotional material is that its programmes are – to use the distinction BB makes – for travellers not tourists. The difference between travelling and tourism is articulated in the BB Educator’s Resource given to all Instructors:

Why do we travel abroad? Reflecting on the distinction between a Tourist and a Traveler sheds light... the tourist travels through places in removed observation; the traveler exchanges and participates with those other places and peoples. For the tourist, culture is a commodity; for the traveller, culture is a gift. The line is fine. Falling on the traveler side requires intention, curiosity, and openness to confront and wrestle with difference and diversity...of singular importance to this process is the student’s subjective experience. We have found that placing them in cross-
cultural settings provides profound and value-forming experiences (BB, 2013c:12).

Yet, it remains to be seen what kind of exchange takes place during the programme. In what ways does the cross-cultural setting help to “value-form” for students?

5a.2.1. Cultural Values and Venerable Colleges

As suggested in the extract above, BB promotes the value of discovering the unknown world that lies both ‘out there in the world’ and inside one’s internal world (ibid). BB’s Instructor Handbook features the following quote (2013b: 7) – heading a section entitled ‘GOING OUT AS A MEANS OF GOING IN: BREAKING BOUNDARIES’ PEDAGOGY IN ACTION’ – which encapsulates this core value in BB’s pedagogic ethos:

I went out for a walk and concluded to stay out ‘til sundown, for going out, I found, was really going in (John Muir).

However, BB’s unique selling point is not based solely on the desire of ‘intrepid adventurers’ to experience ‘profound learning’ (ibid) about the self and the Other. This becomes clear in a BB ‘position paper’ (2012) espousing the benefits of a gap year. The paper – based on ‘research’ (ibid:1) that goes unidentified – starts by citing the two main reasons that students give for taking a gap year: a desire for self-discovery, and burnout from the competitive pressures of high school. However, crucially it then goes on to offer more reasons why ‘you should take the leap’ (ibid:1) with BB:

98% of colleges and universities accept deferrals for planned Gap Years. In fact, Harvard, Princeton, University of North Carolina (to name a few) encourage it...
Research shows that students who take a Gap Year graduate with higher GPAs [Grade Point Averages] than their peers and are more satisfied with their careers. This advantage held when controlling for socioeconomic background or academic performance in high school.

This is a very different set of reasons for purchasing a place on a BB programme than is presented in the main part of the prospectus. BB’s promise here is that students will gain a significant competitive advantage over those who have not participated in a BB programme. This is an advantage that Bourdieu describes as a form of capital (1986). There is, then, a very different kind of value being offered. Specifically, it might be understood as a form of ‘educational capital’ (Bourdieu, 1984) but this does not capture the distinctive character of the capital on offer here. I will begin to argue in this chapter that it is better described as a form of cultural capital (ibid) associated with the value of travel, but not tourism. To do this, it is necessary to extend my analysis beyond BB’s promotional strategies. I therefore now begin to discuss what happened when twelve students arrived on BB’s Bolivia and Peru Programme.

5a.3. Setting the Scene for Transformation: Building Communal Culture, Comfort and Belonging with ‘The Container’

The student orientation phase of the Bolivia and Peru Programme officially began when the students met each other for the first time at Miami airport and flew to Bolivia to join the Instructors and I. However, orientation unofficially began for some students (who had enrolled at an early stage) nine months earlier when BB Staff – based at BB’s
headquarters in the US – first opened an online group forum on BB’s website (2013e). BB’s first message in the virtual group space was⁹:

Welcome to your Breaking Boundaries forum! The official start of your program is a long way off but this signals the beginning; beginning to build the community that will support you in your adventure. Together you will learn to think, speak, and act in a completely new and inspiring way, changing your life forever.

We’re excited to share it with you!

Sincerely,

Breaking Boundaries Administrative Staff

The message is, I suggest, intended to excite and inspire students by promising transformation, but also to reassure them that throughout the experience that lies ahead, they will be safe within a supportive community. Following this message, the forum lay dormant until the next summer when Instructors and students began introducing themselves. BB Staff encouraged students to begin forming a group identity but also requested that they did not interact on social networking sites before the programme, so to avoid social cliques forming. Staff also requested that students did not post photos of themselves on the BB forum so that they could meet each other in person ‘without prejudice’ but with a willingness to be exposed to the ‘new, different, wild and other’ (ibid).

These virtual interactions function as part of BB’s visible, official instructional discourse (Bernstein, 1996); they begin building a sense of communal identity and belonging among strangers that would spend three challenging months together. Put another way, these interactions began the construction of a virtual container demarcating the boundaries of the BB group, creating a safe, secure vessel in which to travel through the programme. This space is not virtual merely by virtue

⁹ Paraphrased and shortened to maintain anonymity.
of being online, but as an imagined, psychological and metaphysical structure. It is also a concept that was explicitly taught to Instructors by Lyle (BB’s Latin America Programs Coordinator) during Instructor training. Lyle describes ‘The Container’ as having various layers, ‘like the skin of an onion’, each containing various social, cultural, and personal spaces, and encourages the healthy maintenance of the various layers and spaces. Constructing the container was clearly a conscious strategy on behalf of BB and its Instructors.

I also suggest however, that as part of BB’s less-visible unofficial regulative discourse (Bernstein, 1996) the layers of the container are also boundaries. Initially demarcated in the programme’s pre-stages, these boundaries signal the start of attempts by BB and its Instructors to regulate the pedagogic process. The requests made by Instructors for students to refrain from certain activities are, in effect, rules – albeit relatively ‘weakly classified and framed’ (Bernstein, 1971) as Instructors’ ability to enforce them is limited. Whereas BB’s control over social networking sites is weak, its online forum is easier to regulate; it is more ‘strongly classified and framed’ (ibid).

Strong or weak, both are attempts to maintain some control, over a considerable spatial and temporal distance, over what and how students learn from each other when interacting before the official start of the programme. BB staff are beginning to regulate the process of knowledge production. As discussed in Chapter 3, this involves ‘distributive rules’ (Bernstein, 2009) which define and distribute access to different knowledges thus mediating its classification and framing. Later in student orientation, as will become clear, this regulative discourse and the distributive rules within it produces the Three Zone Framework, an even more strongly classified and framed pedagogic device whose boundaries prove pervasive and durable.

5a.3.1. Border Control and Boundary Consolidation

Clean clothed, “backpacked”, and with hair freshly cut, the students landed in La Paz and passed through customs to a shower of confetti,
whooping, and welcoming hugs from Instructors and I as we greeted them for the first time. After exiting one form of border control, the students entered another: Instructors gathered us into a circle in the airport car park to run over health and safety guidelines and facilitate get-to-know-you team-building activities. This articulated – in a conspicuously symbolic manner (i.e. an inward-facing circle) – the boundaries of the BB group. It signalled the start of our physical existence as a collective entity and consolidated the inside and outside of our social unit. The container was now a physical reality, not just a virtual reality.

The BB group had now begun a five day orientation programme designed to be a period of acclimatisation and acculturation in two main ways: 1) for BB group members to begin constructing, and simultaneously adapting to, the internal culture of the group – a process that was framed by the Instructors facilitating various pedagogic activities, mostly designed for group members to learn more about each other and the programme; 2) for students to be exposed for the first time, in a measured manner controlled to a large degree by Instructors, to some elements of the climates and cultures of Bolivia and Peru.

The socio-spatial rationales built into the construction of the group container were accompanied by boundaried temporal guidelines. For instance, BB’s Instructor Manual stresses the paramount importance of the ‘first 72 hours of any program’ in which ‘the initial tone for the course is set, including the formation of a group culture’ (BB, 2013f:21):

A well planned and executed 72-hour plan can open healthy communication lines, promote positive behaviours, and ensure consistency across courses. Instructors need to have a detailed plan for their students’ arrival, with an agenda that fills just about every minute of the first 72 hours. If given too much unstructured time, students will immediately go to the behaviour patterns that they are most familiar with. A tight agenda will make you look professional, instil confidence among your group, and assuage students’ ‘What am I doing here?’ insecurities (ibid).
Part of the pedagogic rationale here is to establish Instructors’ authority as guardians of a behaviour-transforming experience, albeit couched in terms of students’ wellbeing. The 72-hour plan included a careful choice of location. Whilst the BB students would soon enter spaces outside their comfort zones, Instructors ensured that student orientation took place in a comfortable “safe space”.

5a.3.2. Safe Spaces in Sacred Places

Starting in the Valle de las Almas (Valley of the Souls) on the outskirts of La Paz and culminating in the Valle Sagrado (Sacred Valley) in Peru, the programme orientation provided students with their first taste of what the itinerary – on the BB website and in the brochure – describes as:

a region full of superlatives, existing at extremes. The ancient Land of the Incas contains a fascinating blend of vibrant cultures and dramatic landscapes placed in a modern context of political change and social transformation (BB, 2015).

The students’ first cross-cultural forays were, however, very limited. During student orientation we stayed at secluded eco-resorts designed principally for foreign tourists. Other tourists were in short supply while we were there and there was also little time or space for BB group members to make contact with anyone outside the BB group aside from brief interactions with the resort staff, such as with waiters/waitresses at dinner. This was no accident; the intention was to allow time and space for the BB group to construct a clearly-boundaried container and the group dynamic within it, before exposing the students to myriad new cultural experiences.

Nonetheless, some Instructors expressed reservations about the resort being too ‘touristy’. For example, Frida noted that tourist groups sometimes come to participate in ‘inauthentic’ pseudo-Shamanic Ayahuasca ceremonies without the stewardship of a genuine spiritual
guide (or “Shaman” – which Frida pointed out was, in any case, a term of ‘Western invention’). The Program Director had seen tourists sitting in a circle, in the resort’s activities room, vomiting into buckets after swallowing the psychotropic plant. I note here that the Instructors had begun to intensify their reproduction of the travelling vs tourism distinction. The students seemed keen to buy into this readily, perhaps not surprising as they had bought into an experience sold as travelling not tourism.

In the eco-resort there was, then, little opportunity for BB students to enact the scenes portrayed on BB’s website, to enact a vision of travelling not tourism. There was no playing drums with “the (colourfully dressed) Other” or weaving blankets, and lives, together with “the locals”. However, by way of a gradual, safe transition for students, Instructors recreated certain indigenous Andean cultural practices. Ceremonies were particularly popular and would be used by Instructors (usually Frida and Sergio who were most familiar with them) throughout the programme to punctuate important moments, such as transitions between phases. Following a candlelit ceremony to mark the beginning of the programme on the first night of student orientation, the BB group sat around a campfire to discuss the programme itinerary, which was still open to some student input and adjustment.

5a.3.3. Around the Campfire, Clarifying Coded Messages

Although the students appeared to subscribe to the notion that travelling was superior to tourism, they were less au-fait than Instructors in the categorisation of activities available to them in Bolivia and Peru as being for either “tourists” or “travellers”. They were also more prone, paradoxically but understandably, to want to see some famous (tourist) sights in South America on their first visit to the continent. For instance, around the campfire all the students agreed with Ethan that Machu Picchu was a “must see” having heard so much about it and knowing that friends and family at home would ask if they had been there. The Instructors immediately expressed reservations about this proposal,
based on it being too touristy, but acknowledged that several BB programmes had visited the sacred site as it is a regular request from students. The proposal was left on hold for the time being but it was becoming clear that Instructors not only encouraged travelling, but actively discouraged tourism.

More than mere personal preference, Instructors’ privileging of travelling over tourism begins sending a powerful message to students. It is a form of coded message that functions to legitimise the experience and knowledge produced through travelling over that produced through tourism. In Bernstein’s language of pedagogic ‘codes’ (1981) this represents a form of ‘cultural relay’ (ibid) which transmits selected cultural values to students, reproducing a traveller culture within the BB group container. Two of Bernstein’s three ‘rules’ of the pedagogic device (discussed in Chapter 3) are evident here; (1) the distributive rules which are, in this instance, defining and distributing access to different knowledges (i.e. traveller knowledge rather than tourist knowledge) and; (2) recontextualisation rules, which are determining ‘what knowledge and skill is to be selected from the field in which it was produced and translated to pedagogic knowledge and practice’ (Wheelahan, 2005:4). At this early stage of the programme, evaluation rules are not yet producing intended outcomes; the BB students requested to visit a tourist site, therefore not demonstrating that they implicitly know how to produce the ‘right outcome’ in the informal assessment process – that ‘they can produce the required “text” called for by the implementation of the pedagogic code’ (ibid).

Aside from the absence of cross-cultural opportunities in the resort, the student orientation was also, as one student commented, ‘unexpectedly comfortable’ in the sense that the eco-resorts were relatively luxurious in comparison to the types of accommodation that we would stay in for most of the programme. I have argued so far that Instructors were deliberately creating a comfort zone within the group container – a space for shelter in anticipation of storm clouds ahead. Although being inside the BB group container means signing-up to be a traveller not a tourist, even the hardiest traveller needs a sound, supportive springboard. The
Instructors had designed an easing-in to the programme, a “safe space” in which to settle-in and allow students (and Instructors) to find their bearings before venturing into more uncomfortable, transformative terrain.

5a.4. Venturing Outside the Comfort Zone: The Three Zone Framework

Although the program orientation was conducted in comfortable surroundings, if any students were unaware that the rest of the programme would regularly challenge them to be uncomfortable in many ways (physical and otherwise), they were quickly made aware of their error. On the second day of orientation at the Waynamari eco-lodge outside La Paz, Randall facilitated what he described as a ‘zone activity’. The Instructor introduced students to a conceptual framework comprised of three zones, or states-of-being, each of which they are likely to ‘be in’ at some stage of the programme: (1) The Comfort Zone – a state in which one feels comfortable (e.g. physically, emotionally, intellectually) but unchallenged; (2) The Learning Zone – located outside, but not too far outside, the comfort zone, where optimal learning takes place as one is exposed to new, unfamiliar phenomena which is challenging, but not excessively so; and (3) The Panic Zone – an extremely challenging space where one has been pushed too far from the other two zones and is in a state of distress.

The concepts central to the Three Zone Framework were not new to all the students. For instance, Harrison – an avid outdoorsman – says that he is familiar with a similar set of ideas having learned them through his experiences “in the wilderness”. Though the other students seem less accustomed, many are familiar with the notion of a comfort zone and appear to accept the notion that spending too much time in it is undesirable, or at least frowned upon within the BB programme. In her
first journal entry on the first day of the programme, for example, before the group has even arrived in Bolivia and students have only recently met each other at the airport in Miami, Madeleine describes the comfort zone as a space to try and avoid when possible:

“They’re [the student group] all very cool people. I think the ratio is good even though it's overwhelmingly male – but that’s good, one more way I will be out of my comfort zone.

Regardless of the students’ prior familiarity with the concept of the comfort zone, the main point here is that Randall’s use of the Three Zone Framework is a pedagogic device that maps out a framework of reference points to guide students’ learning experiences. It is a frame of reference which students (and Instructors and I) can use to understand and mentally ‘map where they are at’ regarding their states-of-being at different times, and in different places and spaces, throughout the programme. This framing is, then, an explicitly spatial one; it is characterised by three zones, or spaces, which students occupy and move between (in their mental conceptions) while making sense of their learning experiences.

5a.4.1. A Mountain Metaphor

Whilst Frida, Sergio and I stand to the side looking on, the rest of the group stands in a circle in the middle of the room – an octagonal structure with a shiny wooden floor and large windows providing spectacular 360-degree peripheral vision of the surrounding mountains. As was often the case, particularly at this early stage of the programme, the male and female students voluntarily group together by gender – perhaps in their gendered comfort zones. Randall then presents the three zones to students ‘as a way to envision three different modes that you can be in’, suggesting that this will be a useful conceptual tool for them to use. He helps students to understand and remember this tool by using a teaching resource that is, at once, visual, spatio-kineasthetic,
and metaphoric (i.e. it helps students to see and feel – physically, spatially, and through metaphor – what they are being asked to learn) in the form of a rock-climbing rope which he fashions into a representation of a mountain. Randall – an avid rock climber and mountaineer – gets the rope out of his bag and explains to students:

—Like most things I like to use a mountain as a metaphor... so the way I think of it is that the comfort zone is basically the foot of the mountain... you’re not even on the mountain... you’re just hanging out...chilling... you’re not being pushed... you’re very happy and very comfortable...and you’re not really learning anything... you’re not really growing personally.

Randall then begins laying the rope on the floor, in the middle of the circle, in the shape of a mountain with a gradual slope on one side and a sheer drop on the other. Sergio and Frida help, and as they finish arranging the rope the students gravitate towards the base of the mountain. Frida and Sergio then return to their positions on the sidelines and Randall continues speaking:

—But then as you start to go up the mountain...this is when you’re really in your learning zone... you’re going through hardships...maybe a rainstorm rolls through... you have to figure out how to deal with that... all these things are coming your way because you’re journeying... that’s like the ideal zone that...during this experience [i.e. the programme]...we want you guys to be in...and just in life in general... you’re getting new lessons and you’re just growing personally... and it might be a little uncomfortable ‘cos you’re not in your comfort zone anymore... you’re definitely feeling...things are a little unknown...maybe things are even a little bit scary.

5a.4.2. Hanging-out on Panic Cliff

Randall then introduces ‘The Panic Zone’, pointing to the sheer drop on one side of the rope mountain:
—Here on the other side we have ‘Panic Cliff’…the panic zone…where you’re just like hanging off the side of the cliff…couple of fingers…cliff-hanger style…just barely holding on…and it’s terrifying… it’s not fun and you’re not learning anything because in that situation your mind just shuts down… and it happens to everyone… it’s a very natural human reaction… you’re doing everything you can to protect yourself… that is not a great place to be… it’s a really scary place to be.

Having explained the three zones to the students using the mountain metaphor, Randall then recaps the framework to summarise and consolidate what he has taught:

—The comfort zone… sometimes it’s necessary… you just want to relax a little bit… maybe just reading a Harry Potter novel or something like that [students laugh]… but a lot of the time and especially during this trip…we want to try and be here in this learning zone…and what we don’t wanna be in…ever…is this panic zone… it’s not a very productive place to be and sometimes it’s a dangerous place.

Telling students that ‘to conceive of this a little more…and think about what this means for concrete situations’, Randall then reads out various ‘scenarios… situations’ that the students will find themselves in during their lives, and more specifically during the programme. The students are asked to respond by placing themselves along the mountainside to indicate how they would feel, individually, in these ‘real-life’ situations. Randall begins posing scenarios, beginning with ones relating to the students’ lives outside the programme, such as ‘meeting your freshman year college roommate for the first time’. Students choose a place on the mountainside and Randall asks a selection of them to explain their positions and feelings.

Randall then begins introducing situations that students will encounter during the programme, starting with ‘using a latrine/squat toilet…basically a hole in the ground’. After discussing this with students, Randall poses the next scenario; ‘living with an indigenous family…that doesn’t speak a word of English or Spanish…for four days’. All the students position themselves along the gradual slope of the
mountainside except for Ava and Noah who stand on Panic Cliff. After some of the students speak about their positions, Frida interjects and asks Randall if she can say something.

5a.4.3. “Real” Mountains in Really “Remote” Places

The Programme Director then proceeds to lead on from Randall’s scenario by introducing the first major event on the programme itinerary – a week-long visit to Nación Apu, a group of indigenous Quechua communities living in the Peruvian Andes, during which BB group members will divide up and live (stay) with community members:

—You’re gonna find yourself in this situation in about a week... [students chuckle nervously] when we get to Peru we’re going to jump right into it... we’re going to probably one of the most remote places that any Breaking Boundaries course in the world goes to.

‘Sick!’ (i.e. very good) says Scott, visibly awed. Another student whistles loudly while, like the others, listening intently and transfixed by Frida as she continues to describe Nación Apu, emphasising the remoteness, ruggedness, and intensity of the experience. Both Instructors and students seem impressed by the geographic (and psychological) ground they must travel to reach Nación Apu and the unknown cultural “Otherness” they anticipate encountering there. I pick up on this attraction to distance and difference in the next chapter which focuses entirely on the BB group’s visit to Nación Apu. For now, though, the Instructors appear to have succeeded in generating excitement, anticipation, and a healthy dose of fear in the students – all within the supportive scaffold of the Three Zone Framework. Having done this, they ask students to think about their specific aims for the programme and articulate these in the form of a group Mission Statement.
5a.5. Finding Ourselves: The Mission Statement and the Magic Statement

Having requested that students collaboratively write a Mission Statement and present it to them, the Instructors stressed that it was important the students did this alone (without Instructors or I present). This would help them to begin working out group dynamics within the student container. Nevertheless, I was assured by all that it was fine to leave my video camera recording the activity unattended. With all the students sitting on the floor in a circle, Ethan - wearing a beanie hat perched and angled on the top of his head - kicks off the conversation in the temporarily student-only space:

—I think we all came here...because you think it would be a cool experience to go to Bolivia and Peru but...I'm gonna go ahead and guess that everyone did come here for...a bigger reason... to think about something in their life that...they just sorta wanna...conquer and give time to understanding a little bit.

Gemma says “Amen” before Nathaniel responds:

—Well...a lot of us are talking about finding ourselves and...discovering who we are... I’m really on this trip to...sort of adventure in who I can be... [general murmur of agreement amongst the group] and I think that the reason I went somewhere so far from home is so that I can like...be a traveller experiencing so many different colours of life and so many different...ways of being and so many different types of culture and as I travel through this programme... I’m really hoping that I can sort of like pick those up [gesticulates] and sort of like stuff them in my basket of ways of life.

Ethan offers his agreement with Nathaniel:

—Yeah... you’re also able to observe your own organic reactions and things because everything’s so new...at home I feel like
there's a lot of grey area in the way I actually react to things and the way I feel like I should react to things... and here it's so different... it's like just...the way I am... I feel like it's...

Ethan pauses and Gemma interjects:

—It's like genuinal... genuinality?

Ethan agrees enthusiastically:

—Yeah....yeah...absolutely...yeah...it's just like who you are as a...

Then Scott interrupts, followed by a murmur of agreement among the students:

—You really don't wear masks here...you don't.

After the students have shared their personal visions for the programme, the student group articulates its collective vision in writing and invites the Instructors back into the room to present this mission statement to them:

We hope to create a positive, functional, sincere, appreciative, enviroment [sic] that, as an [sic] unified group, maximises each persons’ [sic] potential to seize the opportunities provided in Bolivia and Peru, venture outside his or her comfort zones and successfully achieve personal goals.

The Instructors told the students they were very happy with the mission statement and that it set a positive tone for the programme. From a critical perspective though, and with BB’s transformative pedagogic ethos in mind, several points can be made about the statement and the conversation through which it was produced. The “colourful” allure of distance and difference that motivates the students to travel - as mentioned in my analysis of the Three Zone Framework - fizzes from Nathaniel’s comments, as does the close connection he makes between the two. The ideology, terminology and rhetoric of travelling rather than
tourism is also very evident. However, Nathaniel’s description of collecting types of culture and ways of being is more evocative of a tourist hurriedly stuffing souvenirs in an airport gift shop basket than it is of a traveller who ‘exchanges and participates with other places and peoples’, as per BB’s description. The exchange conceived in Nathaniel’s account appears to be a one-way transaction.

Moreover, the quantity (and diversity) of cultural exchanges in Nathaniel’s account appears to be more important to him than the quality of those experiences. If not analogous to “picking up” an assortment of tourist trinkets from every sightseeing attraction on the itinerary, the image conjured here is of the quintessential camera-laden, trigger-happy sightseer snapping as many shots as possible before boarding the bus for the next destination. Nathaniel’s rationale for travelling so far from home – that he will be able to travel further in his self-exploration – also appears to be shared by other students. Many already appear to be recognising what they perceive as the rewards of this journey; the revealing of their “genuine” selves from behind the masks they wear in everyday social performance. The students appear to be searching for “authenticity”, a search that is common in the context of gap year travel and tourism according to Snee (2014) and others (e.g. see Crang, 2005; Kontogeorgopoulos, 2003).

5a.5.1. Mission (I’m)possible

What emerges from the Mission Statement conversation, then, is the sense that many of the students see the programme as a vehicle for experimentation with their identities, with who they are and who they can be, as Nathaniel put it. One of BB’s ‘core values’ and pedagogic aims – self exploration in the pursuit of a higher sense of self-awareness – thus appears to be at the heart of why the students are in South America. This is reflected markedly in the Mission Statement which shows the way in which the group, and its main goal, is portrayed by the students as a vehicle for the maximal achievement of personal goals. These are to be achieved by ‘seizing’ opportunities, almost as if, as
Nathaniel alluded to earlier, ‘stuffing’ them in one’s shopping basket in a supermarket of cross-cultural experiences.

My interpretation of the Mission Statement is supported by pre-programme Skype interviews with each student, and interviews and discussions in the early days of the programme. These suggest that almost all the students were motivated to join the programme for predominantly personal reasons. None made links between these reasons and “bigger than personal” socio-political aims – which are integral to BB’s pedagogic ethos – except for Eleanor. Eleanor was keen to portray herself as politically engaged, voluntarily telling me she was a Democrat and had recently travelled overnight by bus to attend a climate change demonstration in Washington DC.

The students’ preoccupation with “the personal” is perhaps not surprising and does not, at this early stage, reflect significantly on the programme’s transformative and/or reproductive functions. Moreover, to suggest that the group mission statement conceives the group as a vehicle for the achievement of individual goals is not to say that none of the students are at all interested in broader societal issues, as Ethan shows at one point in his recollection of a visit to a Brazilian favela (‘slum’).

5a.5.2. Favelas and Freire

During programme orientation Ethan speaks of how a visit to a favela during a trip to Brazil exposed him to ‘ways of life and levels of poverty’ that he had never seen before. The appreciation and humility he gained for his own way of life as a result was, he explained, part of his motivation for enrolling on the BB programme. Ethan’s sense of gratitude for his lifestyle does not, however, seem to have translated – thus far – into a conviction to try and do anything to address the poverty he witnessed in Brazil. This is the kind of conviction that BB wants its students to return home with after experiencing three months of Freirean-influenced transformative education, as this e-mail (2014)
from staff at BB headquarters to all BB Instructors across the world explicitly states:

Dearest Members of the BB community,

We have a tremendous amount of respect for Brazilian educator and philosopher Paulo Freire. Many of you are familiar with his work and for those to whom this name is new we cannot speak highly enough of this man’s contribution to progressive education. Perhaps the most famous line from his seminal work *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* states that ‘Education either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity 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.’ Transformation through education, through direct contact with what is there and what can be created. Anyone who has ever seen the look in a student’s eye when their experience overrides their conditioning understands the power of Freire’s words.

Whilst BB’s admiration for Freire is clear, it is less clear how Instructors will translate and implement his principles through the pedagogic devices they use. The Three Zone Framework did not appear to engage students with issues of social transformation but instead focused on monitoring of personal states-of-being. The group Mission Statement activity produced a process and final statement that was oriented to students’ individual aims. Furthermore, after this activity Instructors asked students to write an individual, personal mission statement which they called a ‘Magic Statement’.

5a.5.3. From Mission Statements to Magic Statements

After the students had produced a group mission statement, Instructors asked them to find a quiet space away from everyone and write an individual ‘magic statement’ in their journals. This required students to project themselves forward three months in time to the end of the programme and explain why it had been a magical, transformative
experience. Instructors told the students that the magic statement must start by completing the following sentence:

‘The Breaking Boundaries Andes and Amazon Fall 2013 programme was a life-changing experience for me because...’

Evidently, from the beginning of the programme the prospect of students’ transforming was framed by Instructors not only as a programme aim but an expectation, and even a certainty. The students duly responded; for instance, Andrew writing:

The Breaking Boundaries Andes and Amazon Fall 2013 programme was a life-changing experience for me because...for three months I was able to take in new and exciting data, influences, and cultures, without the suffocating hold of social pressure/inhibition, fear of wasting time or being weird. I was able to use my surroundings and my mature and personable group to let go of neurological pathways that I didn't need to use...ever. I never pretended. I developed a sense of self that I didn't seem to have the time to develop... perhaps it was that at that age, I had not quite crossed the line dividing the stages of my life where I didn't and did see the value of every moment, of time's blistering pace. And that second day outside of La Paz when I sat and wrote, I had no fathoming of the course of the river that would soon sweep me, sweep me away to another state of being.

In his magic statement, Andrew is pre-empting transformation by projecting desired future events, writing an uncertain future with the certainty of the past tense. It is hardly surprising that Andrew uses this language of expectation and certainty given that the activity required him to do so by explicitly framing the tone of students’ responses using a lead-in sentence that demanded they explain why the programme ‘was a life changing experience’ [emphasis mine].
5a.5.4. Magic Statements or Magical Thinking?

I argue that the language used to structure students’ Magic Statements is symptomatic of an institutional culture within BB which blurs the boundary between transformative aims and transformative outcomes. Pre-programme interviews with Instructors confirmed my impression (formed during my fieldwork scoping trip, and previous experience working for BB) that there is a tendency within the organisation to think that its programmes are transformative by virtue of trying to be transformative. Lyle (the BB Latin America Programmes Coordinator) confessed this to me in a discussion during a taxi ride in La Paz before the start of the programme, saying that BB has never had a sound method for attempting to evaluate the transformative “impact” of its programmes. Evaluation methods are limited to mid-programme and end-of-programme evaluation forms completed by the students.

Whilst these methods have value, they are inadequate as a means of conducting the kind of thorough and rigorous evaluation required to make the claims that BB makes regarding the transformative impact of its programmes. Perhaps more importantly, on what empirical basis can BB attempt to develop and improve its transformative pedagogy? Moreover, beyond methodological shortcomings, no-one connected to the BB programme, whom I spoke to, had a clearly defined understanding of what transformative learning means in the context of the BB programme, or more generally. As is often the case in the academic literature too (Illeris, 2014; Newman, 2012), ‘transformation’ had become a buzzword in BB’s institutional context, a catch-all term that means whatever BB staff and students want it to mean. Whilst there is a seductive laissez-faire freedom to this approach, which may suit BB’s commercial imperatives and its students’ self-styled personal learning adventures, there is also a danger of depoliticising the Freirean ethos that BB espouses.
5a.6. The Marketisation of Transformation

During interviews, when I asked Instructors to define what transformative learning meant (to them personally) in the context of the BB programme, few seemed to have considered this question before. Many struggled to formulate an answer. Their answers tended to be nebulous, noncommittal, and abstract. This is also reflected in BB literature which refrains from ever pinning-down a definition of transformative learning or a description of what it might look like in practice. There was little sign of much serious thinking about what transformation looks like in the context of a BB programme. It would seem necessary for BB and its staff to make a concerted effort to define in more detail what it is they are striving to achieve if they are to have a better chance of achieving it, or at least have a better understanding of how to gauge their success. However, the absence of clear definitions opens doors of opportunity.

5a.6.1. Capitalising on Travelling

As I mentioned at the start of this section, part of BB’s selling point is that students will accumulate a form of cultural capital through participating in the BB programme. At this early stage of my analysis, I tentatively suggest that it doesn’t matter whether anyone involved with the BB programme has a clear idea of what kinds of transformation they are aiming for. Regardless of what type of transformation has taken place – or more importantly, what type of transformation is perceived by others to have taken place – there is, in a broad sense, a cultural currency placed on the notion of profound personal change, or transformation. This can be seen, then, as a strain of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986) that I will term ‘transformation capital’ (TC).

I argue, therefore, that it is preferable for everyone involved with BB that the meaning of transformation is not clearly defined in relation to its programmes. This ensures that the transformation capital on offer
during the programme is available to all prospective customers. By being a BB student, one buys the opportunity to gather transformation capital; by defining and declaring a personal experience of transformation on one’s own terms, that capital is easily gathered. Everyone is a winner; except everyone who does not go on a BB programme.

5a.7. Summary of Section 5a: Secret Treasure Maps for the Traveller, Not the Tourist

In this section I have discussed several pedagogic activities and devices, but anchored them around a particularly important device in the context of the BB programme; the Three Zone Framework. I have shown how this frame of reference functions as a simple, memorable and innately spatial “mental map”. With it, students, and other BB group members, can locate their personal states-of-being at any given moment during the programme and monitor movement between states/zones.

Drawing on Bernstein, I have argued that the map produced through this pedagogic device serves not only to transmit BB’s explicit instructional pedagogic discourse, but also its implicit regulative pedagogic discourse. The latter provides a secret treasure map of sorts; having made it clear to students that travelling is strongly preferred over tourism - thus legitimising particular forms of experience and knowledge production over others - there was no mixing of metaphors in the Instructors’ use of the mountain metaphor within the Three Zone Framework activity. One of the main aims of the programme is to ensure that students do not spend too much time in the comfort zone. To be too comfortable is to be a tourist. To be a tourist is, as I will elaborate over the ensuing chapters, to inhibit the ability to accumulate a form of cultural capital only available to the traveller - to inhibit upward mobility along the social spectrum.
Section 5b

Safe Space or Suspension Space? Structure, “Neutrality” and Student Agency in The Spectrum Activity

5b.1. Introduction

In this section I analyse a 20-minute activity facilitated by Frida, the Program Director, for the students as the preparatory ‘warm-up’ section of a 2-hour workshop designed to introduce students to International Development. My analysis of the ‘Spectrum Activity’ (as described by Frida) reveals similarities and differences in relation to the Three Zone Framework; it also functions as a form of explicitly spatialised mental map, but in this case it is designed to challenge students to declare and map-out their ethical and political positions in relation to contentious, controversial issues. Whereas the tri-zonal framework sought to prepare students to exit their comfort zones, the Spectrum Activity causes discomfort in the present moment by stimulating probing examinations of students’ beliefs. In this sense, the pedagogic device has the potential to engage students with elements of Curry-Stevens’ post-Freirean ‘Pedagogy for the Privileged’ (2007), by prompting them to reflect on the implications of their positioning in uneven, oppressive global power structures.

Although the spectrum also contains a comfort zone, or safe space, this is not part of Frida’s initial design for the activity; rather, it emerges as a pedagogic by-product. Like the structure of the spectrum itself, I argue that this “neutral” space reveals how ‘invisible’ symbolic power functions to unintentionally reproduce certain ways of thinking and being, many
of which rub uncomfortably against BBs transformative pedagogic ethos. This clash between BBs instructional and regulative discourses is, I suggest, an example of mixed (Bernsteinian) message systems, or what Bernstein has described as ‘oppositional discourses’ that can create contradictory and paradoxical practices within a pedagogic space. These contradictions do not necessarily forestall the potential for transformative learning, however, as I will argue. Given the importance of the socio-spatial structure of the Spectrum Activity, in the early part of the analysis I dedicate significant attention to analysing what its “shape” shows us – before students have even begun the activity – about its underlying rationales and intentions. I then focus on the functions of the pedagogic device, once students enter the spectrum space.

The Spectrum Activity took place on a sunny summer afternoon in November – approximately two months into the three-month programme – in the spacious, verdant, high-walled garden of BB’s programme house. Situated in a middle class, semi-rural area on the outskirts of a small town to the west of the Bolivian city of Cochabamba, this is basecamp for the BB group during a one-month sedentary phase of the programme. While Instructors stay in the programme house for this time, students stay individually with local families in ‘homestays’ (BB, 2013a). The BB group meet at the programme house most days for group activities such as Spanish classes, or talks and workshops about Bolivian history, culture, politics, and history with various guest speakers (e.g. lecturers, activists, NGO workers). Though the students have more free time in this middle phase than at other points in the programme, their time is still considerably structured.

5b.2. Structuring the Spectrum

If given too much unstructured time, students will immediately go to the behaviour patterns that are most familiar (BB, 2013f:21).
Almost six weeks after the highly structured ‘First 72 hours’ of student orientation, the students are relaxing in the garden during some free time before the start of Frida’s workshop, many having just returned from Cochabamba city centre. Ava is perched up a tree, in her favourite spot, offering casual commentary on the game of volley football happening below her. Frida enters the garden from the programme house to start the scheduled workshop, declaring that ‘we’re gonna start outside...’ and asking the students to ‘bring it in’ by gathering into a circle.

Frida tells the students she will read aloud a series of ‘provocative’ prompts (controversial statements) that ‘...are just some prompts to get us thinking about some of the themes that we’re going to be talking about today... the workshop this afternoon is on International Development’. These prompts include statements like:

‘Third World countries should try to be more developed like us.’

The Program Director then instructs students that they should express their responses to the prompts by moving to ‘kind of place yourselves on a line...on a spectrum’. Frida demarcates the space to be used for the spectrum, drawing an imaginary line that runs between a nearby tree and the ‘casita’ [small outhouse].

The physical position each student takes-up along the line will represent their ‘position’ in relation to the provocative statement (i.e. their ethical, political, intellectual, emotional position).

5b.2.1. Embodying BB’s Transformative Pedagogy

The structuring of the Spectrum Activity embodies BB’s transformative pedagogic ethos in important ways. In a Freirean spirit, it requires
students to adopt a position in relation to socio-political issues which are shot-through with references to hierarchical power relations. Freire (1985: 122) famously stated that ‘washing one’s hands of the conflict between the powerful and the powerless means to side with the powerful, not to be neutral.’ In the Spectrum Activity, there is nowhere to hide; no opting-out, no washing one’s hands of the dilemma posed by difficult questions. Students are required to display their positions publicly (within the group container). The pedagogic device requires students to, literally, stand up and be counted.

Moreover, the Spectrum Activity can also be interpreted as an example – an embodiment even – of the holistic, “integral” form of “mind-body-environment” transformative pedagogy (discussed in Chapter 3) that BB aims to use. Rather than reading, writing, or talking in a classroom, the Spectrum Activity gets students moving about in the BB garden. The underlying rationale for this strategy is, as discussed in Chapter 3, that pedagogies heavily oriented to cognitive “book-bound” modes of teaching and learning - for example, most classroom-based pedagogy - are “Western” pedagogies predicated on Cartesian dualism: ‘I think, therefore I am’. This epistemological and ontological dismemberment of the mind from the body privileges the former as the “proper” medium for learning and knowing. By contrast, the Spectrum Activity is intended to engage students in intellectual, physical, and affective ways – through the ‘head, hands and heart’ (BB, 2013c: 203). It is a pedagogic device that re-writes Descartes: I think and feel, therefore I am.

**5b.2.2. Students Speaking their Minds with their Bodies**

So, by requiring students to physically position themselves on the spectrum – individually and simultaneously – the Spectrum Activity invites bodies as well as minds into the pedagogic space. The students use a spatial vocabulary to speak their minds, silently, with their bodies. In this sense, the pedagogic rationale behind the Spectrum Activity acknowledges, to some extent, the importance of the extra-cognitive, somatic dimension of teaching and learning, and thus of other ways of
knowing and communicating. The Spectrum Activity thus seems, at first glance, to be pedagogically congruous with BB’s aim (BB, 2013c: 13) that:

students develop...beyond conventional, Western paradigms... consider alternative models of thought and ways of framing goals, values and a sense of place and an understanding of one’s relationship to others.

This highlights, moreover, BBs acknowledgement of the social and contextual dimensions of learning, as discussed in Chapter 3. The Spectrum Activity is, of course, a social space.

5b.2.3. The Social Spectrum

In addition to the environmental and somatic dimensions of the Spectrum Activity, entering the spectrum space also requires a student to enter a social spectrum constituted by other students. In doing so, students were not only asked to position themselves to reveal their own points-of-view in relation to the controversial statements, but also in relation to other students and their points-of-views. The sociality of this positioning is inextricably interrelated with a social hierarchy – or spectrum – which participants are positioned in within the BB group. In other words, there is – inevitably and unavoidably – a hierarchy of popularity, leadership, and perceived intelligence (among other criteria) that has emerged within the student group container. As I will demonstrate shortly, this social spectrum, and thus the Spectrum Activity, is constituted through relations of power which do not necessarily function in transformative ways, despite the Instructors’ intentions.
So far in this chapter, I have discussed the ways in which the structure of the Spectrum Activity is broadly congruent with BB’s holistic, integral, transformative pedagogic ethos. There are, however, also several ways in which it is not. I will argue that elements of the socio-spatial dynamics of the pedagogic device mean that it functions, unintentionally, in a socially reproductive manner. I will show, nevertheless, that this contradiction does not necessarily preclude the Spectrum Activity from helping to facilitate transformative learning for at least one student.

5b.3.1. Learning Binary “Code”

By requiring that students respond to statements about complex international development issues within the limited confines of a dualistic, uni-linear spectrum, the activity taught students to relate to complexity with inadequate simplicity. As Scott would later comment, in relation to the prompts:

—They’re not that black and white… there’s just a lot more factors that go to each one of those questions situationally.

In this sense, rather than being a pedagogic space that encouraged students to transform by going beyond Western ways of thinking and being (BB, 2013c), the Spectrum Activity reproduces what various scholars have described as Western epistemological and ontological schematic structures rooted in dualism (e.g. see Park, 2012). As Scarborough (2011: 70) says:

In the West binary oppositions pervade speaking writing and thinking and intellectual endeavours of all kinds are faithfully
wedded to conceptual and ontological dualisms, sometimes even when dualism as an explicit doctrine is rejected.

The spatial configuration of the spectrum constructed a simplistic structure that required students to answer difficult questions that beg for complex, nuanced answers within a limited, dualistic frame of reference. The Spectrum Activity models for students a way of thinking, and being, which is boundaried by binary poles. In this sense, the structure of the Spectrum Activity is a visible manifestation of, and a conduit for, ‘invisible’ symbolic power as it shapes the boundaries of what is possible (Hayward, 1998) – what is possible for students to conceive of and be. Whilst elements of this pedagogic device embody transformative features of Freirean pedagogy, this aspect of the Spectrum Activity reproduces the tendency towards binary framings in Freire’s work (i.e. ‘the oppressed’ vs ‘the oppressors’).

5b.3.2. Stepping Outside the Spectrum

As Frida was giving students the introductory instructions for the activity, Owen (another Instructor) arrived, following a work-related telephone conversation, and sat in a hammock on the periphery of the activity space, watching without joining in. This was not unusual; Frida was leading the activity and it was common practice throughout the programme for Instructors to divide and rotate the responsibility for facilitating pedagogic activities, taking turns to individually lead them. It is notable though that this approach meant that Instructors rarely took part in pedagogic activities in the way that students did, sharing their thoughts and contesting their personal points-of-view with other students and Instructors.

It was also notable that Frida had separated herself from the spectrum-space by standing three to four metres away from the students and as she had explained to the students, was clearly planning to read out the provocative prompts but not respond to them herself by choosing a position on the spectrum. This distancing of the facilitating Instructor
from the centre of the pedagogic space, in this case the spectrum-space, was also common practice throughout the programme. But what might students, and indeed Instructors, be teaching and learning from being “put in their place” in this way?

Frida’s separation from the spectrum was consistent with her personal pedagogic aims for the programme, telling me in our pre-programme interview that she wanted to ‘step outside of my connection to Bolivia and avoid imposing my view on students’.

Frida explained that in previous BB programmes, some students had criticised her in their programme feedback for being a politically ‘biased’ radical (leftist) who was, at times, overbearing when sharing her personal points-of-view with them (often being overtly critical of US foreign policy, and US culture, and supportive of Bolivian indigenous groups and political agendas that were seen as “radical” by many students). In response to this critical feedback, Frida told me she wanted ‘to be neutral during the programme’.

The Program Director explained her pedagogic aims in more detail in the Instructor Quest document (2013) she completed before the programme:

More than anything I hope that we can allow place to be the teacher and classroom. One of my goals for the semester is to immerse students in radical and diverse surroundings, and bring in a multitude of voices to comment on thematic issues... to continue to balance the course material as much as possible: the program touches on themes that are often quite biased politically, which is in large part related to the nature of where we are based (and my own inclinations!).

So far, the Program Director had achieved her aims in the sense that she wasn’t sharing her political views with students. Andrew had noticed this, expressing his relief to me in a mid-programme interview: ‘I haven’t noticed Instructors trying to indoctrinate us yet.’

Like Frida, Andrew is aware of those privileged aspects of the Instructor position in Instructor-student power relations and seems averse to
Instructors sharing overtly political points-of-view with students for fear they will influence students’ learning. That this was a concern for Frida and Andrew, among others, is perhaps unsurprising when considering the pervasive rhetoric of pedagogic a-politicism in mainstream educational discourses in the U.S. (Giroux, 2001b).

5b.3.3. Neutralising the Problem?

If Frida and Andrew’s concerns are congruent with dominant educational discourses, they are antithetical to BB’s stated adherence to Freirean pedagogic principles which are founded on the belief that education is always political, never neutral, and to claim neutrality is to side with the powerful (Freire, 1970). Freire categorically states that: ‘the educator has the duty of not being neutral’ (in Horton and Freire, 1991: 180).

When translating his explicitly politicised notion of education into pedagogic practice, Freire speaks of the need to reduce, rather than reproduce, the power-knowledge gap between educators and students. BB interprets and incorporates this principle into its stated pedagogic aim to empower students as ‘leaders’ and its approach to the pedagogic power relations between students and Instructors. Instructors should progressively hand over the reins to students during the programme and begin to ‘lead from behind’ (BB, 2013c:19) until, as Frida puts it, by the end of the programme Instructors are “just along for the ride” rather than, so to speak, “driving the bus”.

However, this is but one way to interpret power relations between Instructors and students. In practice, during the Bolivia and Peru programme it has so far manifested in empowering some students to take control, to some extent, of a limited range of decision-making practices. These have focused on practical, logistical issues, such as organising travel arrangements. Rather than “driving the bus”, students have merely decided which bus they would catch, and who would be responsible for buying the tickets. The pedagogic power shift has not, thus far, significantly disrupted other important aspects of Instructor-student power relations such as, for instance, their hierarchical positions.
in the shared social process of knowledge construction during the Spectrum Activity.

**5b.3.4. The Pedagogic Pedestal and the Knowledge Production Gap**

The spatial separation created between Instructors and students in the structuring of the Spectrum Activity has important implications. By being outside the spectrum-space in the positions of facilitator and observer, Frida and Owen were clearly not planning to participate with students in the social process of learning and knowledge production. They are not going to share their own responses to the provocative statements. I argue that this separation risks re-producing the pedagogic pedestal upon which educators are placed as the holders of knowledge, correspondingly positioning students as receivers of knowledge. Crucially, students in the spectrum space are thus denied the opportunity to learn how to negotiate unequal social power relations (between students and Instructors). They do not learn to produce knowledge by sharing, creating, and contesting their knowledge(s) with Instructors’ knowledge(s) in the same pedagogic space.

**5b.3.5. Filling the Gap**

As Frida marked out the spectrum, she indicated to students that the tree and the casita at the extremes of the spectrum represent, respectively, ‘totally agree’ and ‘totally disagree’ but also said that:

—You may find yourself somewhere in the middle...um...not necessarily at the extreme of one end or the other.

Ava and Noah seek to clarify the instructions and point, in close succession, to a white metal arc between the tree and the casita, Ava beginning to ask a question which is interrupted by Noah:

—so we’ll call the arc the middle?
Ava says ‘yeah’, suggesting that that is what her question was too. Frida asks Noah to repeat his question but Ava does instead, altering it:

—the arc is neutral?

Frida hesitates, utters a drawn-out ‘Uuuum’, and looks at the arc while deciding how to respond. Madeleine breaks the silence by answering ‘yes’ and Jay puts on a playfully grave voice to declare it ‘the arc of truth’. Nathaniel verbally declares his agreement with allocating the arc as a neutral space and Frida then agrees.

Naming this new third option in the spectrum (i.e. neither agreeing or disagreeing) as ‘neutral’ is significantly different to naming it ‘the middle’, despite Ava substituting the first for the second as if they were interchangeable. Frida has been led by her desire to be politically neutral to allow a supposedly neutral space to enter into the spectrum. As a result, the Program Director is playing a part in reproducing the notion – antithetical to the Freirean pedagogy which underpins BB’s mission – that neutrality is a possibility, a legitimate position for students to adopt.

5b.4. Suspending Judgement: Students Re-Shaping the Spectrum

Frida ushers the students into the spectrum space and reads aloud the first prompt: ‘I am proud to be from the most developed country in the world’. The students – all from the USA – position themselves, ranging from Ava who agrees quite strongly to Ethan who strongly disagrees. Frida continues: ‘I believe that North Americans should try to use less natural resources like water, coal, and oil’ and all the students move
towards ‘strongly agree’, Jay (a student) going to the furthest point.
Frida then reads out:

‘I personally feel badly about the amount of resources I use.’

All the students moved towards ‘strongly disagree’, Jay covering the furthest distance to adopt a so-called ‘neutral’ position. Later, in the post-activity discussion, Jay explained why he chose, in his words, ‘the neutral space’:

—Sometimes it was...like...one word, like the way it was worded that...like...really changed it for me...the one about feeling personally bad... it’s kind of where I grew up and the life I’ve always lived and so I don’t bring myself down for it.

I suggest that Jay perceived and used the third (‘neutral’) space as a “safe-space” where he could “wash his hands”, consciously or unconsciously, of the difficult questions and personal implications the statement raised for him. Curry-Stevens anticipates this response in her ‘Pedagogy for the Privileged’ (2007):

One’s self-concept is invested in relations of domination...where dominance stays cloaked in the guise of “normal” and “natural” and, consequently, is difficult to identify. Further, even if dominance is identified, it can be difficult for ‘the privileged’ to deal with because one’s self-concept “may be threatened at its core by suggestions of relinquishing this power’ (41).

I argue that creating a “neutral” space in the spectrum functioned, at least in Jay’s case, to construct a naturalised conception of neutrality as a harmless, inconsequential way of being within oppressive structural power relations. It was a safe-space for Jay to hide from publicly contemplating the notion that he is ‘implicated in the oppression of others’ (ibid: 49).
Rejecting the whole notion of neutrality, I follow Freire in asserting that ‘washing one's hands of the conflict between the powerful and the powerless means to side with the powerful, not to be neutral’ (1985). In my view, the supposedly neutral space in the spectrum functions as a reproducer of invisible power, or as Curry-Stevens put it ‘cloaked’ dominance (2007:46). The illusion of neutrality is reproduced through the unchallenged (by Instructors or students) creation of the neutral space in the spectrum, and Jay’s positioning in it. Far from being impartial, harmless, and inconsequential, the illusion of neutrality serves ‘the powerful’, ‘privileged’ aspects of everyone’s ways of being (Curry-Stevens, 2007) to the detriment of the ‘oppressed’ aspects of everyone’s ways of being, thus ‘dehumanizing all of us’ (hooks, 2003; Freire, 1970 in Curry-Stevens, 2007: 43). Among other things, this highlights the importance of space in the reproduction of power relations. As Edward Soja says (1989:25):

> We must be insistently aware of how space can be made to hide consequences from us, how relationships of power and discipline are inscribed into the apparently innocent spatiality of social life, how human geographies are filled with power and ideology.

However, having analysed the reproductive functions of the neutral space, and by extension the Spectrum Activity, I now discuss how it was also subverted into a (potentially) transformative space for the suspension of another students’ beliefs.

### 5b.4.1. Transforming the Neutral Space into a Suspension Space

During the Spectrum Activity, Ethan occupies the ‘neutral’ space in response to the statement:

‘I am proud to be from the most developed country in the world’ [the US].
In the post-activity discussion he explains how he felt about the statement and why he ‘took a place in the middle’:

—I have a pride in our history like... I have a pride in like...like yeah...patriotism... like I feel proud to be from the United States of America... I just don’t feel pride to use as many resources as we do...and rob other people.

Ethan felt ‘the middle’ of the spectrum was the best place to express his mixed feelings. In a discussion with me, he later explained that:

—I just wasn’t sure where to go... I needed more time to think... a couple of times I agreed with things and disagreed with others [about the statement] at the same time.

I argue that the third space offered a possibility beyond the agree/disagree binary where Ethan could suspend his feelings, thoughts, and response. According to Gunnlaugson (2007), this pedagogic process of ‘suspension’, in which learners process the cognitive and affective dissonance between incompatible propositions (in this case, whether they agree or disagree with the statement), is crucial for transformative learning. It is a dialectical process in which the creative tension between opposing propositions can birth a new amalgamated third possibility that is more than the sum of its parts. Thus, I suggest that Ethan, unlike Jay, seemingly used the middle space (he called it ‘the middle’ rather than ‘neutral’) as a suspension-space rather than a safe-space, a distinction that was absent in Ava’s use of the terms ‘middle’ and ‘neutral’ as interchangeable. This is a crucial distinction which not only illuminates the contradictory ways in which the same space was used by different students, but also the subtleties that mediate the extent to which a pedagogic space is reproductive and/or transformative.
5b.5. Summary of Section 5b: The Spectrum Activity as a Transformative Suspension Space and a Reproductive Safe Space

I suggest that the Spectrum Activity took on a potentially transformative quality for Ethan as he worked through mixed feelings about his positioning as a U.S. citizen within exploitative global power structures, apparently considering the notion that he is ‘implicated in the oppression of others’ (Curry-Stevens, 2007: 49) through his use of resources. This means, to sum-up, that although the spatial configuration of the Spectrum Activity functioned in some ways – for Jay – to reproduce and further naturalise the problematic notion of “neutrality” (in this case regarding questions of unequal global resource use), it also simultaneously functioned – for Ethan – to create a potentially transformative space.

Whilst the Spectrum Activity is not a mandatory feature of BB programmes, my analysis of it has wider significance, both for BB and for understandings of transformative pedagogic spaces. Firstly, it starkly highlights the pervasiveness of a (fictional) narrative of “neutrality” in pedagogic spaces, even those formed through Freirean influence. Moreover, my analysis has shown that although contradictions and paradoxes can be created through the clash of ‘oppositional discourses’ in pedagogic spaces, these contradictions do not necessarily foreclose the transformative potential of such spaces.

Although a reading of the Spectrum Activity as largely socially reproductive is persuasive, there is always space for student agency to resist and subvert this reproductive function. The extent to which this agency is exercised intentionally and/or consciously is a question, however, that requires further investigation. Can the unconscious functioning of ‘invisible’ symbolic power be resisted and transformed unconsciously? Exploring this difficult question in the detail it deserves is beyond the scope of this thesis. However, I engage with elements of the puzzle it poses in Chapter 7 when I analyse how the character of a
transformative space – more specifically, the gender power dynamics at play in it – inadvertently shaped reproductive learning, but also appeared to catalyse a degree of unconscious resistance.
Section 5c

Everyone Loves a Story with a Happy Ending:
Practising the Performance of Personal Change in
The Storytelling Activity

5c.1. Introduction

In this section I focus on the Storytelling Activity, a pedagogic device used for helping each student prepare to tell the story of their programme experience. The activity took place during the final ‘Transference’ phase of the programme and asks students to formulate three different-length versions of their story for recounting to different audiences in the US. The Storytelling Activity is framed by Instructors, as part of BBs instructional pedagogic discourse (Bernstein, 1996), as a way for students to prepare for the ‘re-entry shock’ (BB, 2013c: 130) that can be experienced on re-entry to the US. The rationale is, ostensibly, that having a pre-prepared narrative will make the difficult task of representing the people and places the students encountered during the programme less daunting.

I will argue, though, that this pedagogic device can also be understood as a rehearsal for revelation, a practice-run for the performance of profound personal change upon returning home. In this sense, the Storytelling Activity performs an evaluative function as a form of ‘assessment message system’ (Bernstein, 1975) which checks whether students are ready to perform the transformative programme outcomes their sponsors have paid for. I suggest that these transformations are of a personal nature, and that there is little to no evidence of transformative learning that links personal change to social change. In
this sense, the programme’s Freirean transformative aims have not – at least at this stage – been achieved. Furthermore, I argue that Freire’s pedagogic principles have been largely depoliticised and diluted – as I argued earlier in this chapter – into a pedagogy of personal improvement rather than social transformation. This is embodied in the Instructors focus on helping students to find pathways to personal happiness, something I discuss before analysing the Storytelling Activity as it provides context and material for students’ stories.

I begin the analysis by setting the scene with a brief description of the Transference phase in order to contextualise the pedagogic devices. Like student orientation, Transference happens in a secluded resort (Illimani Lodge), this time in the Yungas region of Bolivia. Yet unlike student orientation, rather than orienting students to the programme and the unfamiliar country contexts it takes place within, Transference is designed to orient students to their upcoming transfer back into their familiar, though now perhaps slightly less familiar, home cultures in the US. Transference can be understood as a kind of bridge between worlds.

5c.2. The Beginning of the End of the Beginning: A Bridge Between Worlds

Transference, as BB’s Instructor Handbook puts it, ‘tone sets’ for students entering a different kind of space. If the first 72 hours’ tone sets for their time in-country, Transference tone sets for how their experience abroad will affect the rest of their lives:

For many students, the programme end is really the beginning of an extensive journey of personal transformation (BB, 2013c: 118).
So, the Transference phase happens in the later stages of a ‘transformative’ pedagogic space (i.e. the programme) and in the early stages of a potentially transformative pedagogic space that is the space students enter when they re-enter their home cultures in the US. Students may experience transformative learning after returning to the US, as they continue to process their BB programme experience. The role of Instructors during Transference is also made clear in the Educator’s Resource:

As an Instructor, it is essential to be available to students during this stage. Students may be experiencing intense feelings of anxiety and/or excitement as they look forward to their journey home and as they ponder their new roles in that environment. If that Breaking Boundaries experience is not processed and contextualised within the larger scope of their life, the student may experience emotional stress that manifests in the form of alienation, depression, and isolation. This last week in country is a great time to slow down, find a beautiful spot and allow students the time and space to really reflect upon their experiences (BB, 2013c: 118).

The Instructors used various pedagogic devices to prepare students for their journey home. As emphasised in the above text, many of these activities focused on students’ emotional states. For example, on the penultimate day of Transference, shortly before the Storytelling Activity, Owen facilitated a short session with the students on happiness.

5c.3. Pathways to Personal Happiness: The Positive Psychology of Transformation

With the BB group gathered in the meeting room of the Illimani Lodge, Owen introduces the session:
—This workshop is about happiness... more specifically it’s about positive psychology... over the next few months and years you guys will be making a lot of decisions that will affect your future lives... it’s a good time to be thinking about a framework for making good decisions that you’re not going to regret.

Having framed the session, and students’ future decisions, in terms of personal happiness, Owen then asks the students to spend a few minutes writing alone in their journals about ‘the happiest person you know’ and ‘why you think that person is so happy’. After writing for a short time, the Instructor invites the students to share their thoughts with the group. Owen picks up on a comment made by Scott, who says of his friend:

—I think one of the key things is that I never see him talk about the future too much... he always stays in the present moment.

As the next chapter will elaborate, the promotion of “living in the present moment” – a popular “Eastern” philosophical cultural import, as seen in the meteoric rise of “meditation” and “mindfulness” practices in the West over recent years – was a regular feature of the BB programme.

5c.3.1. Living in the Moment, and other Social Pressures

Owen expands on Scott’s point:

—The first insight from positive psychology is that we can make ourselves happier than we are... we have a huge amount of control... but social pressures and cultural pressures...often shape our decisions... from a very early age our education system drums into us what's most important in life is the attainment of goals...grades...results...success... we're sort of programmed to think...‘I'll struggle now...I'll work hard now and I won't enjoy this time...this present moment right now... I'll sacrifice the now for a future goal’.
Owen continues speaking about social and cultural pressures, alluding to them almost as forms of invisible power – though not using this language – and linking them to wealth accumulation:

— we almost don’t even question it... what matters is the results at the end of the year...the pay cheque...the promotion... so what's important is not the journey itself...it’s the destination... and linked to this is a huge emphasis placed on financial wealth and income...and status... so how much you earn and your job title are often measurements of people.

Having pointed to some of the social value systems and power structures that underpin contemporary capitalist society, Owen presents a riposte:

— But this positive psychology research turns that on its head and shows that income is a very poor measure of happiness... and yes it’s better to be rich than it is to be poor... but once your basic needs are fulfilled the amount of money you have has little or no impact on your happiness.

What is becoming apparent is that in addition to engaging students with positive psychology, Owen is touching on issues of social inequality. In the knowledge that Owen’s politics are decidedly left-wing, I suggest that his comments are indirect critiques of US capitalist society. Rather than engage students directly with these critiques, or choose to frame his comments in terms of social injustice, the Instructor has chosen to broach the topic in relation to personal happiness. Like Frida (e.g. in the Spectrum Activity), it seems that Owen is trying to maintain “neutrality”, perhaps to avoid negative feedback from students – which Frida (and I – see Preface) received – that his teaching is overly political.

5c.3.2. From Covert Anti-Capitalism to Buddhism and the “Authentic” Self

To underline his points, Owen reads a Buddhist quote:
—‘Happiness is not about making it to the summit of the mountain, nor is it about climbing aimlessly around the mountain, happiness is the experience of climbing towards the peak.’

Owen notes that ‘Buddhist teachings often have analogies with mountaineering’ which reminds Randall of the mountain metaphor he used during the Three Zone Framework activity at the start of the programme:

—Owen, one thing that reminds me of...that model we talked about...the comfort zone...the learning zone... it should neither be too comfortable nor too hard... there's a sort of sweet spot.

Owen then speaks about understanding one’s strengths and virtues. He points to a typology of 25 virtues of character (e.g. bravery, humility) in the literature on positive psychology:

—We all have these qualities within us and between three and five of them are your signature strengths... using those strengths makes you feel authentically you...'this is the real me’... a key part of positive psychology is knowing yourself... so it's totally in line with Breaking Boundaries curriculum...self-exploration and so on... if you don't use your own strengths you are likely to suffer a lack of personal gratification and a sense of...pretending to be something you're not.

Owen recommends students visit a website – www.authentic-happiness.com – where they can do a ‘strengths and virtues character test’. As mentioned earlier in my discussion of the Magic Statement pedagogic device, the search for “authenticity” emerges as a theme during the programme; I begin unpacking this phenomenon in the remaining chapters. For now, though, I discuss a final point that Owen
makes, which reveals a twist in the tale he has told the students thus far.

**5c.3.3. A Teleological Twist in The Tale?**

To close the happiness workshop, Owen makes a final point:

—perhaps the most important things is that...the research says the happiest people...use their strengths for something bigger than themselves... so it questions the whole idea of altruism...rather than having to decide between something which is good for me and something which is good for others...there's actually not a trade-off... it makes sense from an individualistic point of view...from a selfish point of view...to be idealistic...to try and find a bigger meaning beyond just looking at your individual life.

This is the twist in the tale of Owen’s message, the happy ending in the narrative of personal happiness that Owen has presented to the students. The moral of the story is revealed here, as is a large part of Owen’s motivation for telling it. In a roundabout way, the Instructor has encouraged students to think beyond the self, to do something for others. But rather than appealing to ethics, politics, or morality he uses the “selfish” pursuit of personal happiness as the motivation for “selflessness”. Although the idealism Owen refers to remains as opaque as it is in BB’s transformative rhetoric, by connecting the personal with the social he is, in some ways, adhering to BB’s overarching aims.

Owen is, nonetheless, walking a tightrope balanced between the contradictory functions of the BB programme as a transformative and reproductive pedagogic space. To achieve BB’s aim of connecting personal and social transformation, students must be shielded from this contradiction: they must return home thinking they can “make a difference” to the world while also “making progress” within its existing structures. Owen is careful to assure students that:
—The research doesn't say that rich people are unhappy... if they are happy it’s not because they are rich... so it's perfectly possible for someone who is rich to be very, very happy.

As opposed to a relational perspective on poverty and power (see Mosse, 2010) the rationale being tacitly invoked here is that material wealth and poverty are unrelated. I argue that Owen’s implicit attempts to engage students with issues of social inequality are reproducing the fanciful fallacy that “everyone can be a millionaire” – the narrative of “The American Dream”.

Owen ends the session by asking students to start reflecting on what gives them meaning and purpose. He adds:

—When you're thinking about this... also think about the ways in which some of these things may have changed as a result of the course...because if we've done it properly...maybe you'll know more about yourself than you did before... maybe you've come across some sort of new meaning or sense of purpose... your values may have changed.

This gentle reminder that students not only might have but should have changed profoundly during the programme will be returned to the following day, as they prepare their transformative tales in the Storytelling Activity.

5c.4. The Storytelling Activity: Different Stories for Different Times and Spaces

Though the Transference phase is intended to help students prepare for “re-entry” (i.e. Transference) to the US, many of the pedagogic devices used are designed to, first, help students reflect on the programme. The
Storytelling Activity does just that: Instructors ask students to review their programme experience, drawing on various resources (e.g. their personal journals) to help them prepare their stories.

5c.4.1. The Time Machine: Looking Backwards to Look Forwards

Randall starts the Storytelling Activity by leading a guided meditation in which he talks as the group meditates:

—Welcome to the last session of Transference... going over the trip talking about all the things that have happened and then starting to look more inward and think about ways you might have changed...ways your values might have changed...and we're going to start looking forward and what's to come next and how you're going to approach that... I'd like to start with a guided meditation... if everyone could close their eyes... this will be sort of a time travelling meditation. So, go back in your Time Machine... to way, way back.

Randall talks through the major parts of the programme, for instance the visit to Nación Apu. As he talks, the Instructor asks students to focus on their emotions, on what they were feeling and thinking at the time, and how this might shape their plans for the future. Although I could not see inside students’ heads as they recollected these memories, their journals provide detailed accounts of their thoughts at different stages of the programme. For example, Jay’s entries during the Nación Apu visit in the second week of the programme show that he was already thinking forwards to how he was going to change his life when he returned home:

There are things about myself that I want to change when I get home. My habits in particular. I’m on a fucking BB trip...with a group of incredible people that I would never have otherwise met. Never again will I hesitate to step out of my comfort zone. Instead of sitting back and worrying about the little bits of discomfort that I might experience, I’m going to say ‘Fuck it. I’m
going to own this and come out on the other side with something great.’

Jay then goes on to compile a ‘To Do’ list for when he gets home:

**When I Get Home**

(Food) – cook my meals... Get cookin. Get good at it.

(Music) – Pick up the drums. That set [drum set] is so much more than I deserve, so use it. Set out that keyboard and get exploring.

(The piano) – Give myself at least a solid month of playing each day, even for a little, just to fall in love with it. Put the goddamn work in. Work is the only way I’ll see great things. Work is what makes ease and restoration worth it.

Jay’s list continues:

- Watch Land before Time
- Order a diner cheeseburger deluxe
- Play GTA v Halo [a videogame, GTA stands for Grand Theft Auto]
- Listen to Christmas music
- Grab Dunkin Donuts coffee
- Make hot chocolate
- Watch Harry Potter/Lord of the Rings marathon...

Jay’s list of skills, hobbies, and pastimes is oriented around personal fulfilment and self-improvement and does not contain any references to social change. On one hand this is not surprising as it was written early in the programme. On the other hand, it was written in Nación Apu which, as I will elaborate in the next chapter, was a pedagogic space that Instructors intended and anticipated to be one of the most transformative of the programme because it would engage students so directly with issues of poverty, inequality, and injustice.
This absence of attention to these issues was consistent in Jay’s journal entries throughout the programme, and was also a pattern that emerged from analysis of the other students’ journal entries too, with some exceptions (i.e. Eleanor). The lack of demonstrable commitment to social change is not surprising perhaps, given the Instructors’ commitment to political neutrality during the programme. It reflects the Instructors’ approach, which allowed students to define transformation in personal terms, without reference to BBs Freirean aims.

Jay’s to-do list continues, mostly listing movies that he wants to see when he returns home, and then finishes as follows:

- Keep doing push-ups and planks
- Get Andean weavings framed
- Hit up some parties
- PUSH-UPS

Here, Jay counterbalances his intention to eat comfort food (i.e. donuts etc.) and watch movies with a conviction to do more physical exercise, and specifically to condition his upper body. He combines this with plans to socialise and to frame the cultural artefacts he has accumulated in Bolivia and Peru, presumably intending to display them, and thereby display his worldly travelling experience. Each of these aims works towards elevating Jay’s social standing in his home cultural context but do not work towards social change.

Jay’s list reminds me of the convictions made during Transference by the previous group of Bolivia and Peru programme students (which I accompanied for my fieldwork scoping trip, as mentioned in Chapter 1). When prompted by Instructors to make an action plan for when they returned home, all the students vowed to embark on self-improvement strategies. Most commonly, these were exercise plans to lose weight or as one student put it ‘go to the gym more to get buff’ [i.e. physically bigger with better muscle tone]. During that programme, bodyweight/body image was a regular point of discussion among
students, who often addressed it with tongue-in-cheek joviality and sarcasm. However, this seemed to be accompanied by a less-playful underbelly of body anxiety and social pressure to conform to “acceptable” body shapes; the students created the informal group name ‘Fatch’ – a combination of the words ‘fat’ and ‘bitch’ – to refer to themselves. Although Jay’s journal entries do not suggest similar levels of body anxiety, they do reveal some of the ways in which his life goals are influenced by social pressures.

5c.4.2. Social Pressures and Social Reproduction

Jay’s list of aims for his re-entry into US culture(s) are, I argue, reproductive rather than transformative. They pander to a process of cultural reproduction in which Jay is internalising societal pressures to achieve personal success, or certain ‘great things’, through hard work. The causal connection Jay makes between work and ‘great things’ is the “meritocratic myth” – prevalent in numerous Western, advanced capitalist settings, not least in the USA – that hard work and success go hand in hand. The implication is that a lack of success – often conventionally defined in these contexts as poverty of one form or another (with “poverty” typically characterised by ‘a lack of [something]’ in prevalent ‘deficit discourses’) - is due to a lack of hard work.

Jay’s list is unremarkable because the social pressures to achieve certain goals are considerable, as discussed earlier by Owen in his workshop on happiness. One’s success is measured against attaining these goals. It is unclear precisely what notions of success Jay is referring to, but one of them appears to be becoming a better pianist – playing the piano being a quintessentially middle-class symbol of social status. Other students spoke too of social pressures. Like Jay, Andrew has a love for playing music but told the group, during the happiness workshop, that:

—I struggle with the fact that in my future career I don’t really see the love that I have fitting into a paying job.
Similarly, Ava has a love for music and is a concert-level pianist. The student also excels at science and told me during a discussion in Cochabamba that she felt pressure from her father to pursue a scientific career but that she wanted to study music, or even make her own jewellery and open a jewellery shop. For her Independent Study Project in Cochabamba, Ava chose to apprentice with a local Bolivian Jewellery maker and told me:

—During the month in Cochabamba being able to work with jewellery reaffirmed...that I love creating beauty...I love creating something that's pretty to someone... It's just such a calming thing for me to do... I can express my creativity.

As Ava now prepares to return home, she appears to be wrestling during Transference with how to pursue her creative aspirations in the face of external social pressures. Ava has become noticeably more outgoing, sociable and relaxed over the course of our three months in Bolivia and Peru. She told the group that she feels happier than she has ever felt in her life. In a discussion with me during Transference, Ava tells me unequivocally that the programme has transformed her. She says she is a happier, more confident person who has found her “creative calling” in life.

Although Ava’s ‘life-changing’ experience does not constitute a transformation by Curry Steven’s post-Freirean framework, it does in the student’s personal frame of reference. On one hand, perhaps it can then be said that, in Ava’s case, BB’s aim to catalyse personal and social change has been partially, or even halfway achieved. On the other hand, this is a tenuous claim as there is no discernible link between Ava’s self-proclaimed transformation and the type of social change that BB and Curry-Stevens’ allude to. Wanting to open a jewellery shop is a far cry from responding to the ‘chorus of marginalized voices pressing for social change’ (Curry-Stevens, 2007: 33) by becoming ‘an ally in struggles for [social] justice’ (ibid: 34) and returning to the US motivated to criticise the world and change it (BB, 2013c).
Nearing the end of the guided meditation, Randall asks the students to begin contemplating their return home and the emotions and challenges they face. Ava quietly begins to cry. The Instructor asks the students to continue the meditation in silence, and afterwards asks:

—What were some things that came up?

Ava replies:

—Stress from college applications.

Applying for college/university was a regular conversation topic among the students throughout the programme. The anxieties they felt about this appeared to intensify as they neared their return home to “real life”. Like Ava, other students also felt parental pressure to pursue certain academic paths. For instance, Andrew told me earlier in the programme – during a trek in Nación Apu – that he was interested in studying Anthropology at a small liberal arts college but that he felt pressure from his parents to study Medicine or Law at a large, prestigious university.

A couple of students – Ethan and Scott – were not feeling the same pressure about university applications. These students had already started University and were enrolled on the BB programme as a semester abroad component of their degree course. Nonetheless, they were not immune to social pressures during the programme. For example, when writing in his journal during the Nación Apu trip, Ethan writes positively of the Apu community – ‘I am learning some very valuable things, just from watching these people live. I have watched the way they interact with the land and I’m inspired by it’ – but also speaks of the pressure he feels when staying with Apu hosts in their homes:
As educational as these homestays are, they are also a bit confusing. I feel like I should be learning some great lesson which puts pressure on me.

This highlights an important point. Among the social pressures placed on students during the BB programme is the pressure to experience profound learning and change; the expectation of transformation. The hope – on the part of different stakeholders (e.g. BB staff, students and their family and friends) – that students will have a positive life-changing experience during the programme cannot help but create, I will argue, an unspoken pressure for students to experience “a revelation”. Regardless of whether students experience transformative learning (however defined), this places pressure on them to perform the profound change hoped for by stakeholders – not least the sponsors that have funded the students (e.g. parents). I argue that this pressure shapes the Storytelling Activity – a pedagogic device that functions to help students rehearse for revelation.

5c.4.3. Rehearsing for Revelation (and Representation)

Randall asks the students to consider how they can represent their experiences to people in the US. By returning home the students are not only entering a space that might be transformative for them, but also for people who will learn something, through students’ representations, about people and places in the “developing world”.

Going home can be challenging for students, though, and after Ava has shared her anxieties about college, Randall speaks about:

—“reverse culture shock”...or re-entry shock... you get back...it's really exciting seeing your family and friends... you have all these stories to share... all these exotic gifts to give them and it's great... and then time passes... you might start to miss the place that you were... how nice things were back in Bolivia...the juices...or the people...or the relaxed attitude towards time... it might also feel hard to connect with people [in the US]... hard to communicate... you'll be going back home to familiar situations with...a whole new story... I
wanted to talk about the challenge of sharing that experience.

Randall asks the students if ‘anyone has had a travel experience before when they’ve come back home and it's been hard?’ Ethan speaks about his experience of coming back from a study abroad program in Greece:

—when you go home...your friends will be talking about their first semester of college which is obviously just so different from what we've just experienced... they'll be talking about the parties they went to...and all these things are going to sound pretty pointless to you...after something like this [the BB programme] I can almost guarantee you it's going to sound pretty dumb to you guys.

Frida asks the students for some more ‘signs or symptoms of reverse culture shock’ and Gemma builds on Ethan’s comment:

—When my friends are having really superficial conversations... [does impression] ‘oh my god at this one Halloween party this girl was wearing’...will make me just wanna be back in my Bolivia zone.

Harrison adds to this peer critique:

—When other people complain to you about something [trivial]... it's like...’really you can complain about that?’ But here [in Bolivia] the stuff that we complain about can be so different from what other people complain about... like how bad an iPhone is...or slow internet connection.

In these comments, the students are, intentionally or not, invoking the ‘cultural distinction’ (Bourdieu, 1979, 1990) that has been cultivated within the group by highlighting the exclusivity of the extraordinary experience they have undergone, and how it distinguishes them from
their peers. The Program Director then inadvertently reinforces this distinction while emphasising the importance of empathising with peers:

—These are all really good points…but I think it's important to emphasise we've spent a lot of time talking about really big issues and putting things into perspective and evaluating our lives…and our culture…in ways that our peers haven't…sometimes the people we most want to share stories with are the people that are going to be least able to listen and understand…like our best friends…and that could come from a place of not having a point of reference…or it could also come from a place of envy…I guarantee you that none of your friends that went to college last semester had as cool an experience as you've had…no matter what…the experiences they have had…you're all going to have the opportunity to enjoy but...might feel quite superficial.

Whilst Frida’s comments are undoubtedly motivated by a concern with the wellbeing of the students during their re-entry to the US, they also function – intentionally or not – to remind students that they have had a “special” experience, and that they are thus special and distinct from their peers. In this narrative, the students have transformed and will now find it difficult to relate to others, who have not transformed, when returning to their familiar cultural spaces. Put differently, the students have accumulated what I introduced earlier in this chapter as ‘transformation capital’, a specific kind of ‘cultural capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) that sets them apart.

In fact, I argue that the students (and the Instructors and I) have gathered an even more specific, and valuable, form of cultural capital that can only be gained through a cross-cultural experience. I call this ‘cross-cultural capital’ (CCC) which, as I explained in Chapter 3, is accumulated by going beyond a cultural boundary to cross into, and/or from, what is perceived as an-Other cultural space. I will shortly elaborate on this argument at the end of this section but now return to the Storytelling Activity, which culminates with the Three-Story Strategy – a more sophisticated mechanism for helping students rehearse for revelation.
5c.4.4. The Three-Story Strategy

Randall begins introducing “the strategy I wanted to share... I share my experience when I go back home...through specific stories” but then remembers that he wanted to warn the students about representing their programme experience through generalisations:

—that also reminds me of something that I wanted to send you home with as well...just remembering the specificity of this experience... that you were in certain parts of Bolivia and certain parts of Peru for just a few days...just a few weeks...and in sharing with people back home...being aware of not generalising...not 'oh yeah Bolivia's like this...Peru's like that'... you know it's easy for travellers to start talking in those sweeping generalisations...and I think it's a little less interesting for people to listen to and it's also probably a little unfair to the places that you've been and the experiences that you had... so yeah that's really important.

Although Randall highlights the importance of this point, it is nevertheless given little attention in the context of the Storytelling Activity, and indeed in the Transference phase and programme more broadly. It is treated as an addendum to the focus of the pedagogic device, which is to present students with a framework for structuring their story. Randall moves on:

—That brings me to the next point I want to talk about...thinking about not only how to share your story but...who to share your story with... not everyone you run into is going to have the time or the interest to hear all about your adventures down in Peru and Bolivia... so right now I want to introduce this strategy for those different types of stories and those different people... and that's the idea of a 30-second story...a 3-minute story...and a 30-minute story...and how there's not really the same story for everyone in every situation... there will be some people who you'll just share your 30-second story with...you know a quick summary...'I spent the last three months in Peru and Bolivia'... it won't really do it justice... but sometimes you run into a family friend or you’re at party...it’s just a simple short little thing...and then your 3-minute story is something a little more detailed...maybe one of those anecdotes...the
ice creams in Cochabamba or the chocolate-covered frozen bananas...something like that...and who might it be that you share that story with? In what situations? And then the 30-minute story...those times when you're with someone who really does want to hear about it...and you really can get deep back into this experience and almost relive it through telling it...which is such a treat...that’s one of my favourite things actually...it's almost like a selfish thing...I get to relive the trip.

To end the Storytelling Activity, Randall then asks the students to take a few minutes and:

—Think about your 30-second story...3-minute story and 30-minute story...think about who might be the audience for each of those different types of stories and think about what some of the details might be for each of those different situations...we'll do this silently and this is something that I’d like you to start thinking about now but something that will definitely grow and evolve over the next few days...on the plane and for a long time after you get back.

It appears that the Three-Story Strategy that Randall recommends to the students is ostensibly designed to alleviate reverse culture shock. The strategy is presented as a way for students to simplify the complexity of their three-month experience (while somehow not making sweeping generalisations) by packaging it into three timebound stories tailored for the time-constrained needs of different audiences. This, then, is the distillation of the explicit intention and rationale of the Storytelling Activity within the programme’s instructional pedagogic discourse (Bernstein, 1996).

However, I will now argue that this pedagogic device is serving a very different parallel function within the programme’s regulative pedagogic discourse (ibid). In doing so, I elaborate the concept of CCC mentioned earlier.
5c.5. A Strategy for CCC Maximisation

The Storytelling Activity is a pedagogic device that provides a structure for the performance of profound change. Moreover, the Three-Story Strategy is a part of the device that prepares students to recite their transformative tales to different audiences, at different times, and in different spaces. The underlying function is for students to distinguish themselves from peers who have not transformed through participating in a BB programme. By tailoring their performances for enactment in the different social circles, or fields (Bourdieu, 1986) they move within, this process of cultural distinction (ibid) enables students to maximise the value of the CCC they have accumulated during the programme.

What emerges from my analysis in this chapter, moreover, is that there are different types of CCC with different values. These are accumulated in different ways for different uses in different types of social space. For instance, someone travelling abroad on a package holiday will accumulate a certain type and quantity of CCC. However, the cultural currency of the holidaymaker’s CCC is unlikely to be worth more than the “rate of interest” it generates within her social circles. It is highly unlikely, for example, to help secure entry into a prestigious University. This, then, is (Tourist) CCC.

By contrast, the specific strain of CCC accumulated by BB students will strengthen their applications to the most elite universities in the US, as discussed in Section A. This is not only made explicit in BB’s promotional material, but also in the application guidelines for universities such as Princeton and Harvard which extol the benefits of certain kinds of structured cross-cultural gap-year educational activities (e.g. see Harvard, 2017). This is indicative of the increasing cultural value of development education abroad programmes which, as discussed in Chapter 1, have grown in profile alongside the gap year industry and discourses on the importance of education for global citizenship (see Andreotti and de Souza, 2012; Lewin, 2009; Peters et al, 2007; UNICEF, 2016).
Importantly, the specific form of CCC I am defining here cannot be obtained by people who are perceived as tourists. It is only available to those perceived as travellers – a (Traveller) CCC tied to the notion that one’s cultural credentials as a global citizen are enhanced by spending time *abroad* in a particular way. Moreover, as I will show in the next chapter the more “foreign” the destination is perceived to be, the more (Traveller) CCC is acquired. This is arguably one reason why all of BB’s programmes are in “developing” countries. It is telling that BB does not offer cross-cultural education programs in the USA.

The accumulation of (Traveller) CCC is thus dependent on global mobility. This highlights how the pedagogic devices I have analysed in this chapter, and the transformative pedagogic spaces they are used in, are embedded in ‘power geometries’ (Massey, 1994). As I explained in Chapter 3, this concept is primarily concerned with: (1) the capacity to be globally mobile (i.e. geographically, culturally, socially etc.); and (2) how power functions ‘in relation to the flows and the movement’ of that mobility (ibid: 149). Power geometries differently enable and constrain the geographical and social mobility of different people – broadening the boundaries of possibility (Hayward, 2000) for BB students but simultaneously narrowing them for many others. After all, the CCC accumulated through the BB programme is reserved for certain social groups, with few exceptions. As discussed in Chapter 1, BB students are predominantly white, wealthy, middle-class, “able-bodied”, young, healthy, formally-educated, US citizens.

Ultimately, then, the distinction made between travellers and tourists during the programme is what Bourdieu would describe as a ‘cultural distinction’, and is connected to social class distinction. The categories of “traveller” and “tourist” are qualitatively different from the categories of “travelling” and “tourism”. They are ontological descriptors that classify a category, or class, of person. Although this class is not a social class in a conventional sociological sense, there are connections to be made between social classes and traveller/tourist classes. The distinction is different to that made between social classes but is also closely related in the sense that BB group members reinforce their own
class privilege, perhaps unwittingly, through celebrating their own form of moving through space and time. This is ostensibly because tourism is perceived as less “profound” – less engaged, informed, daring, culturally sensitive, and ethical. But the BB group’s way of travelling is only feasible for a wealthy minority. Most people in the US, let alone the rest of the world, do not have the means to go on an expensive educational sojourn to South America.

5c.6. Summary of Section 5c: Transformative Travellers’ Tales in the Theatre of the Privileged

In this section, I have developed my argument that there is an expectation that BB students will experience transformative learning during a BB programme. Among the other social pressures that students feel, they are therefore under pressure to perform a narrative of personal transformation to satisfy the expectations of various programme stakeholders, not least themselves and their sponsors. In this sense, the Storytelling Activity performs an evaluative function as a form of ‘assessment message system’ (Bernstein, 1975) which checks whether students are ready to perform the transformative programme outcomes their sponsors have paid for.

The final stage of BB’s pedagogic cycle, which immediately precedes Transference, is titled ‘the performing stage’. But my application, in this analysis, of the terms ‘performing’ and ‘stage’ are different from BB’s. Whilst BB is referring to a stage of students learning and development in which they are expected to perform “well” by enacting the profound learning they have undergone, I am referring to the incentive for students to enact a performance of profound learning and transformation when returning home to the US. As any actor would do before going on stage, this performance requires rehearsal. When preparing the three different versions of this story for audiences at
home, the students have an opportunity to rehearse their lines. Given the students preoccupation with personal change over social transformation, this is not the ‘rehearsal for revolution’ Augusto Boal calls for in his *Theater of the Oppressed* (2000) but rather, a rehearsal for revelation in a theatre of the privileged.

5c.7. Chapter 5 Conclusion

In this chapter I addressed the question: What pedagogic devices are used, and what are their underpinning rationales, intentions, and functions? Running through the chapter is a main thread of argument. Each of the pedagogic devices I analysed functions to construct a form of mental map. While these maps are ostensibly intended – within BB’s instructional discourse (Bernstein, 1996) – to guide students safely across transformative terrain, I argued that they also function – within BB’s regulative discourse (ibid) as “secret treasure maps” that enable BB group members to locate specific, highly valuable forms of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986) and facilitate the efficient accumulation and management of that capital.

I articulated two specific forms of cultural capital that the pedagogic devices help to accumulate; transformation capital (TC) and cross-cultural capital (CCC) – the latter being divided into (Tourist) CCC and (Traveller) CCC. TC is tied to the cultural currency placed on the value of profound personal change and CCC can only be gained by crossing a cultural boundary. In the context of the BB programme the types of transformative experience sought after are dependent on international cross-cultural travel. Therefore, whilst CCC and TC are distinct, they are so mutually interdependent that from here on I will describe them together as cross-cultural transformation capital (CCTC) I discuss this form of capital in more depth in the following chapters.
As I explained, the function of the pedagogic devices is therefore largely socially reproductive, rather than transformative. Social inequalities and inequities are reproduced within ‘power geometries’ (Massey, 1994) that define fields of possibility (Hayward, 1998) by unevenly distributing global mobility. The BB group members extend their already considerable privilege by using the pedagogic devices to manipulate the space and time available to them during the programme to maximise the value of the CCTC gained. The construction of BB students and Instructors as travellers not tourists is not, therefore, an innocuous process but a process of ‘cultural distinction’ (Bourdieu, 1979; 1990) which functions to reproduce unequal social power relations.

Nevertheless, I also argued that there were some instances in which the socially reproductive function of the pedagogic devices was contradicted. For example, during the Spectrum Activity Ethan appeared to subvert the “neutral” safe space and turn it into a transformative suspension space in which he confronted uncomfortable questions about his privileged position in unequal global power structures. These examples were few and far between, however, and while some students showed signs of having transformed these were expressed as personal changes with little evidence of the commitment to social transformation espoused by Freire and BB. This amounts to a depoliticised translation of Freirean pedagogy that strips it of its core socio-political principles, breaking the bridge between the personal and the political. I explore this theme, among others, further in the remaining chapters, demonstrating in more detail how this de-politicisation was enabled by the Instructors commitment to neutrality.
Chapter 6

Nación Apu

6.1. Introduction

In this chapter I address the question: what constitutes the process and content of teaching and learning in a transformative pedagogic space? I focus on the BB group’s week in Nación Apu, a group of indigenous communities in the Peruvian Andes, which immediately followed programme orientation. My main line of argument is that while some transformative teaching and learning happens in Nación Apu, the reinforcement and reproduction of some problematic, simplistic discourses also takes place, mostly in relation to perceived differences of the “distant Other”.

Drawing on Bernstein’s notions of explicit, implicit, and tacit pedagogic relations (1999), I suggest that this teaching and learning is produced through an explicit pedagogy of distance and difference that intends to shock and awe students into a disorienting dilemma – a precursor to transformative learning – by placing them as far away as possible from the comfort zone of cultural familiarity. Although this strategy appears to facilitate some transformative perspective change alongside the reproduction of problematic discourses, I argue that it also masks a tacit pedagogy of “pure” CCTC accumulation. I suggest that this is a form of hidden curriculum (Giroux and Purpel, 1983) based on the pursuit of particularly valuable forms of rare “uncontaminated” CCTC, only to be found in “remote” places.
Analysing these parallel-functioning pedagogies reveals spatial patterns of various forms – not only of boundary maintenance, but also segregation. I suggest that this is a spatialised manifestation of Bernstein’s notion of ‘classification and framing’ (1971), in this case producing strong boundaries (ibid) between the different forms of pedagogy being employed in different spaces, and the different categories of knowledge being produced through them. This reveals much about the unique character of the CCTC being accumulated in this transformative pedagogic space, including what gives it its considerable cultural value.

The chapter starts with the Instructors’ introduction and framing of Nación Apu to the students during the Three-Zone Framework, picking up from where I left off during my discussion of this in the previous chapter. I then document and analyse the journey to, and through, Nación Apu as the BB group stays with Apu families in their homes, participates in a sheep sacrifice, and begins to unpack the concept of ‘cultural relativism’ (Malinowski, 1922). As the week-long journey unfolds, I identify and analyse several themes in relation to my main line of argument. These include: the reproduction of “poor but happy” and “simple primitives” discourses about the Apu people; Instructors’ commitment to political neutrality; and tensions between students’ attachments to US pop culture as a coping mechanism in a challenging pedagogic space, and Instructors’ exhortations to “be in the present” time and space.

Whilst much of my analysis critiques reproductive pedagogic processes, it also reveals transformative moments – intentionally triggered by Instructors – in which some students described “revolutionised” perspective changes. These parallel functions illuminate the sometimes-paradoxical process and content of teaching and learning in a transformative pedagogic space.
6.2. From Program Orientation to Profound Disorientation: introducing Nación Apu

Following the student orientation phase, the BB group prepares to travel to the (self-proclaimed) independent nation of Apu in the cordillera (mountain range) Vilcanota. The programme itinerary says that students:

will venture deep into a traditional and highly remote region of Peru where Quechua communities trace their lineage directly back to the Inca...living in small stone huts and following the traditional migratory patterns of the local people from glaciated passes into the lush cloud forest below (BB, 2013d:12).

This type of description, intended to entice and awe, was repeated by Instructors when they first described Nación Apu to students. Instructors implied that this “remote” place would be the first major transformative pedagogic space of the programme.

6.2.1. Being Remotely Interested

During the Three Zone Framework activity, Frida spoke about Nación Apu for the first time:

—When we get to Peru we’re going to jump right into it... we’re going to probably one of the most remote places that any Breaking Boundaries course in the world goes to.

The seemingly awed students – many moving to physically position themselves outside the comfort zone or falling off the edge of ‘Panic Cliff’ – listened carefully:
—They’re rural indigenous Quechua communities that trace their lineage directly back to the Incan royalty... these are families that escaped the Spanish invasion...went up into this remote part of the highlands and settled in these little communities... we’ll be living with families in stone huts that are this tall [Frida indicates waist level] with nothing inside but a llama skin to sleep on and a fire in the corner.

‘Wow!’ utters Eleanor, breaking the unusual silence. ‘Oooh...sooo sweet!’ [i.e. good] whispers Scott. Sergio then speaks, translated by Frida:

—The place is called Nación Apu... they call themselves a nation because they have declared an independent territory within Peru where they have their own legal system...their own rules about the way they want to live according to their traditions and customs.

‘Oookaaay’ exclaims Ava, sounding and looking slightly daunted, if not disoriented, about what lay ahead.

6.2.2. A Strategy of Shock and Awe

With their framing of Nación Apu, the Instructors began to ‘stir the pot’, a strategy recommended in BB’s Educators Resource, which offers ‘some guiding lights to help Instructors frame their course’ (BB, 2013c:112):

Allowing the group to be in the comfort zone has its place; however, staying too long in the comfort zone can quickly slip into laziness and complacency...we sometimes need to ‘stir the pot,’ turn up the heat and throw them a challenge (ibid).

In interviews and discussions with me before, during, and after the Nación Apu visit, the Instructors spoke about their decision to go there in the very early stages of the programme and their intention behind the transformative pedagogic space:
—Nación Apu is a radical place...we wanted to start off the programme with something dramatic [Frida].

—The idea was to set the tone for the rest of the trip...it’s hard to go to Nación Apu and not be deeply affected [Owen].

—It will be a profound shock for them [Randall].

These intentions are consistent with the BB website’s ‘program itinerary’ which anticipates that students will have ‘deep’ and ‘dramatic’ interactions with the ‘vibrant peoples’ and ‘breath-taking landscapes’ to be found in Nación Apu (2013a). The principle aim, and claim, here is that students will experience a disorienting dilemma and profound, transformative learning. The Instructors’ decision to go to Nación Apu early on was also consistent with BB’s recommendations:

Start with a strong wake-up call for the participants, usually a dramatic and exceptionally different experience that illustrates the power of cross-cultural learning (2013c:12).

I describe the Instructors’ pedagogic strategy as a strategy of shock and awe, designed to stun the students into a sensitive state of receptiveness and readiness to learn and transform.

6.3. Going Beyond the Conquistadors: Entering the Independent Nation

Immediately following student orientation, the BB group travels to Nación Apu. We go by public bus via Cusco to Ocongate, the closest town to the boundary of the independent nation, located approximately six hours’ truck drive away. We travel with Wilfredo and his wife Bettina
who are members of the Nación Apu community and established BB contacts. The couple have escorted previous BB groups to the area but no longer live there on a permanent basis, instead dividing their time between Nación Apu and Cusco, where they also live and work. Our hosts also have a house on the outskirts of Ocongate where they invite us to participate in a welcoming ceremony after we settle into our guesthouse.

6.3.1. Preparing to Map Uncharted Territory

Following a dinner of chicken-foot soup we walk to Wilfredo and Bettina’s house, where we sit in a circle on the dusty courtyard ground. Wilfredo – who resembles the time he divides between Nación Apu and the tourist Mecca of Cusco, wearing a traditional handwoven ‘Chullo’ (Andean hat with ear flaps) and Poncho with blue denim jeans - begins talking, in Spanish, and Frida translates:

—The trek that we’re going to do together is a traditional trek... it’s like a pilgrimage through the heart of the Nación Apu territory...and only the Nación Apu people who are descendants of the Inca have walked there...Pizarro...the Spanish conqueror of the Inca never stepped on this land that we’re about to enter... during the Spanish conquest...four people escaped and two stayed in the lowlands...and two went up into the Highlands... one of them was named Apu...and that’s where the name comes from... it was the families with more energy...with more vigour...that went higher up into the mountains...which is the place that we’re gonna go now... it’s a place where it’s not easy to make out a living... the only thing that grows is potato...and if it weren’t for Pizarro...who came as far as Ocongate...he didn’t come further than this...they wouldn’t have gone up to the asshole of the world [everyone laughs].

Like the Instructors, Wilfredo – who is savvy to the wants of Western adventurers and benefits in various ways from being BB’s contact – makes sure to present Nación Apu as a place that only the hardiest can reach, thus appealing to the BB group’s desire to be travellers, not tourists. Furthermore, the prospect of conquering an itinerary item that eluded even the reach of the conquistadors presents the BB group with
an opportunity to enter a cultural space that is, apparently, almost untouched by the Peruvian state, let alone wider Western influences.

Nación Apu is, then, presented as a pure, uncontaminated, non-Western cultural space and is seen as an ideal place for BB students to ‘develop beyond conventional, Western paradigms’ and ways of being, to nurture an alternative ‘understanding of one’s relationship to others’ (BB, 2013c: 13). Wilfredo articulates this sentiment when he and Bettina proceed to perform a ritual, speaking in Quechua and asking for Mother Coca’s blessing for the BB group’s upcoming journey.

6.3.2 Sharing Coca and Turning Over a New Leaf

The BB group listens eagerly as Wilfredo begins:

—Mother Coca is sacred coca and through these leaves we relate with Mother Earth and with the Andes…the food that we eat…the air that we breathe…the sun that shines down upon us...are given to us by the Mother Earth... so all of the things that we have...the money that we have...the cars that we drive...the homes that we have...everything that you can imagine that’s been built in the world...it doesn’t mean anything... we must seek out other human beings and our relationships with other beings and we must care for each other and love each other without contaminating the earth around us...it’s important that we seek relationships with other people rather than physical things.

Our host then invites everyone to hold coca leaves to their forehead while repeating his thanks to Incan and pre-Incan deities, such as ‘Taita Inti’ (Father Sun), before blowing gently into the leaves, gesturing that they float on the breeze, into the mountains. Wilfredo ends with a welcome:

—Thank you for being here... think about all the years that your families worked to make it possible... all the money that was spent... congratulations and welcome.
Wilfredo’s explicitly anti-consumerist, and implicitly anti-capitalist, tone is, again, congruent with BB’s Freirean pedagogic ethos.

6.3.3. From Coca to Commerce

Immediately after the ceremony, Bettina and Wilfredo ask if we ‘would like to purchase any traditional weavings’. As we browse their wares, the swift transition from spiritual ceremony and anti-consumerist discourse to commercial activity somehow feels less uncomfortable than it does when, say, exiting a sacred site like Machu Picchu through the gift shop. We have been made to feel like special guests in a place that only a select few travellers, but not tourists, apparently have access to.

Nevertheless, there is a tension here. We are also being treated as tourists typically are. Moreover, buying Bettina and Wilfredo’s weavings can be seen as a way for BB group members to evidence the CCC they are accumulating. As Bourdieu (1979) notes, collecting artefacts is a common way to display CC; perhaps this partly explains Jay’s to-do list conviction (noted in the previous chapter) to ‘Get Andean weavings framed’.

What should we make, though, of the BB group’s desire to buy weavings from Nación Apu rather than more cheaply and conveniently from shops in Cusco? I suspect that these reasons are varied and include a well-meaning intention to support the Apu people, both financially and through an expression of cultural respect and affirmation. There is, of course, also a social pressure to buy from Bettina and Wilfredo, regardless of their assurances to the contrary. Purchasing merchandise is a typical feature of guided tours and is, here, embedded into the BB programme and its professional relationship with our guides.

I also propose, however, that these reasons perhaps include a desire to “touch” a perceived cultural purity and take home a piece of that authenticity. I will elaborate on this argument – with a nod to Douglas’s seminal work on cultural purity (2002) – throughout this chapter but, for now, suffice to say that the attraction of Nación Apu as a
transformative pedagogic space is closely connected to how the BB group construct it as a pure place, uncontaminated by any Western travellers, let alone tourists, except for previous BB groups who are exclusive members of the BB club. This purity is, then, also a rarity, making Nación Apu a source of particularly highly valuable CCC.

6.3.4. Singing in the Sun, Living on a Prayer

In the morning, our transportation arrives – a rickety flatbed truck. We pack ourselves and our stuff into the uncovered back section – a rectangular (20ft x 10ft) wooden crate mounted onto the truck’s wheelbase – along with some Nación Apu community members. The Instructors inform students that the vehicle – which doubles as a carrier of animals and supplies – is the only means of transportation to Nación Apu. I note that it is also a means to fulfil BB’s promise of rugged travel; if there were a more comfortable option, it is unlikely that we would use it.

Setting off under the glare of the mid-morning sun, the BB group spread out around the truck and the community members group together in a rear corner. The students start singing well-known US pop and hip-hop songs; this is emerging as a popular pastime, particularly during moments of discomfort and unfamiliarity. I sense that it functions, partially, as a coping mechanism for managing these moments – to feel more comfortable and regain a sense of familiarity in unfamiliar spaces. Although spirits are high as our truck climbs to the 13,000ft mountain pass marking the gateway to Nación Apu, and the students break into Bon Jovi’s ‘Living on a Prayer’ – ‘take my hand, we’ll make it I swear, whooohoo living on a prayer’ – everyone knows that testing times await.

6.3.5. Silent in the Shade, Sitting on Students’ Stuff

The feeling of BB group bonding generated by the students’ singing also fuelled, in my interpretation, a sense of separation between the BB crowd and the community members who looked on from the back of the
truck silently, smiling. The Instructors talk with them, trying, I sense, to ease the physical, social, and cultural divide. Following the example, some students also interact a bit with “the locals” which, as Gemma writes in her journal, helps to melt some initially icy feelings that she had:

—At first I was mad [angry] about the people – locals sitting on my stuff but I soon adjusted and made friends with one little girl.

Nevertheless, there was still a pronounced separation between “us” and “them” as we entered the so-called asshole of the world.

6.4. Fitting In, Settling Down, and “Shacking-Up”: Our First Homestay

We arrive in Jupa and Ethan notes that ‘this is the first time in my life that I’ve been in a place where no-one speaks English...which is really cool’, again alluding to the appeal of a place seemingly untouched by (anglophone) Western influence. Wilfredo introduces the BB group to the families that will be hosting us and then allocates pairs of students to families who then escort them to their respective homes for the night. I set off with Scott, Patrick, and a member of our host family – Rodrigo – with the echo of Owen’s whisper in my ear: ‘Oh man...this’ll be anthropological gold dust for you!’

6.4.1. Dressed to Impress

At Rodrigo’s home – a 7x12ft stone room with a straw roof – we crouch through the three-foot doorway, entering the dimly-lit interior to find who I (wrongly) assume to be Rodrigo’s wife Patricia and daughter Yolanda squatting on the earth floor, stirring a pot over an open fire. We
greet each other clumsily – Scott, Patrick, and I with our attempt at Quechua and Patricia in faltering Spanish. Three younger children sit in the corner and respond shyly when I ask their names – Maria, Lizbeth, and Roberto.

I sense a self-consciousness in the air as everyone adjusts to the new social space and each other’s unfamiliar appearance. Our host family’s clothes look like a combination of second-hand items sent from abroad and resold or donated in Peru, mixed with locally-produced garments. By contrast, our clothes are a combination of brand-new and slightly-worn designer-label adventure-travel apparel, the worn ones in particular helping to display the “adventurer credentials” of the wearer – at least to those familiar with this symbol – by alluding to off-road travel experience.

6.4.2. Big Packs, Stuff-Sacks, and the Space Between

Rodrigo invites us to set our stuff down at the opposite side of the room from where the family are gathered and sit down on the animal skins and woven blankets on the floor. We try to make ourselves at home but keep our wool hats firmly on our heads; it is cold and we are quite far from the fire. Given the rectangular shape of the room, and with the doorway being positioned in the centre (meaning that no one sits in the middle of the room because it would obstruct movement around the doorway), we are also quite far from the family.

Like our seating arrangements in the truck on the way here, the configuration of the space does not feel – at least to my cultural sensibilities – conducive to facilitating interaction between “us” and “them”. As we make space for ourselves, some small rodents scuttle off in the darkness to find a new hiding place. Our expensive gear (e.g. backpacks, sleeping bags in stuff-sacks, and inflatable mats) suddenly seems “inflated” and more ostentatious in this setting and we try to squeeze it into nooks and crannies to avoid taking up too much space.
6.4.3. Gathering (Gold) Dust in the Corner

Amidst the mild hubbub of us settling in, the family members speak to each other in Quechua, the children occasionally sneaking wide-eyed peeks at us. Having already consulted Wilfredo and Rodrigo, who both assured me it would be fine to video-record our stay in the house for my research, I request permission from the rest of the family and feel slightly surprised at how comfortable they appear to be about my filming in their home. No-one asks me any questions about the filming and I set up the camcorder in a top corner of the room. Like us, it spends a while adjusting to the dark, dusty, smoky environment, the silence broken only by Patricia blowing through a thin wooden tube to bellow the flames of the fire.

Scott and Patrick seem edgy; I suspect they are outside their comfort zones and firmly in the learning zone as they acclimatise to this socially intimate space. I also get the feeling that my presence is a reassuring influence, especially for Scott. They are not the only students who are experiencing a change of location in the Three Zone Framework; for example, Gemma’s journal entry that night reads:

I’m not sure what I was expecting but when I walked in, or more crouched through the 3ft door, I immediately entered my panic zone.

Though I have been in similar situations before, I also feel slightly uncomfortable, not least about the fact that my camcorder is gathering dust – physically and anthropologically – in the corner.

6.4.4. Mutton Dressed as Lamb, Tourists Dressed as Travellers

Scott seems as anxious as I am to document this once-in-a-lifetime experience and asks me ‘at one point can we get a picture with our homestay family?’ I answer that it would be better to ask them the
following morning, not only because of the improved light conditions but mostly so we do not risk coming across as rude (by asking for a memento of our stay before our stay). I feel aware that my answer is also shaped by the emerging “tourism taboo” within the BB group and my sense that taking photographs, particularly at this moment, would be an especially touristic thing to do. I do not allow myself to apply the same light of logic to my camcorder running in the corner.

Looking around the room incredulously, and shaking his head in disbelief, Scott starts a sentence but doesn’t finish it - ‘this is...this is just...’. He then asks me about the animal skins hanging from the walls; ‘are those pelts? What animal are they from?’ Scott doesn’t speak Spanish, and although Patrick does, he remains silent, so I voice Scott’s question. Patricia tells us it is sheep, lamb to be precise, but something is lost in translation and I realise that she is referring to a whole dead lamb lying near the skins. Rodrigo adds that the lamb was ‘killed by the rain’ (presumably in a flood), thus implying that it was not deliberately slaughtered for food. I am not surprised to hear this because I learned on previous trips to Nación Apu that meat is a dietary luxury for the community, rather than a staple food, being far more valuable than potatoes.

6.4.5. Maria Had a Little Lamb, and Other Stories

Scott asks whether we are going to eat the lamb and Rodrigo says that we can eat it if we (Scott, Patrick, and I) want to; Scott says ‘why not?’ but then asks me to check how long ago it was killed. Rodrigo assures us it has only been dead since the morning and is already slicing through the lamb’s underbelly, holding its rear legs with one hand while Maria holds its front legs to stretch it out. I say to Scott and Patrick that we should pay the family more for accommodating us if lamb was not originally on the dinner menu, because it is an additional cost to the family. The students agree readily and we vow to ask Wilfredo how much we should pay tomorrow morning. I tell Rodrigo that we are going to pay extra and he nods. As our host slices off the lamb’s leg, Scott turns
to Patrick and I and says ‘I’m feeling like we’re going to have the best story to tell tomorrow.’

6.4.6. Double Meanings and Twin-Roles

Scott, trying hard to interact with the family, offers to help prepare the lamb and I translate, asking Rodrigo if the family ‘needs any help?’; after a lengthy, considered pause he replies ‘yes we need help’. I ask him what kind of help they would like and he replies, with a wry smile, ‘How do you want to help me? ...help with this? [pointing at the lamb]’. Sensing a double-meaning in Rodrigo’s interpretation of the word ‘help’ (i.e. beyond help with food preparation to help in life more generally, for example financial assistance), and perhaps an undercurrent of sarcasm or even indignation, I translate verbatim his response to Scott. I realise more clearly that I have taken on the twin-role of intercultural interlocutor as well as language translator.

Having spent time in Nación Apu before, I am not surprised to see host families trying different approaches to asking BB group members for financial assistance and I suspect that this is a subtle and indirect attempt to do that. I am aware that Frida agreed to be Godmother to one of the young children in the community, carrying with it a level of obligation to provide financial assistance in some form or other. In the past, students and Instructors (and I) have often been asked to, for example, buy weavings or swap material possessions, and Instructors alerted students to this before arriving in Nación Apu.

Perhaps picking up on the same double meaning, Scott responds somewhat defensively to Rodrigo’s question: ‘oh well...I was just asking...being polite so...’. Rodrigo then gestures for Scott to go over and help with the lamb, which he does. As the sky darkens outside and dogs begin to bark, Scott says ‘this is by far one of the most...the best experience so far on this trip... for me...this is incredible.’

We have our dinner of boiled potatoes and lamb and afterwards it is getting late (around 8.30 p.m.) and Scott and Patrick want to sleep.
Patricia and the children lay out their blankets and begin getting into bed. I climb into my sleeping bag too and lie still for a while reflecting on the day, peering up at the animal bones and drying carcasses hanging from the rafters above me. The deathly silence is pierced by the odd giggle from the children but before long I drift off to sleep.

6.5. The Morning after the Night Before: Reflecting on the Homestay

Opening my eyes, I smell smoke and hear the rattling of pots and pans. It is 4.45 a.m. and while Rodrigo looks on, Patricia and the children are busy preparing breakfast, accompanied by two other children, a baby, and an elderly woman whom we haven’t yet met. Randall and Owen arrive and with the family, we have a breakfast of boiled potatoes and leftover lamb.

6.5.1. Leftover Meat and Meetings

After breakfast, we pack-up and say farewell to our host families, thanking them profusely. But before leaving Jupa the Instructors convene a group ‘check-in’ meeting to gauge how the students are feeling and create a space to share and reflect on their experiences from the night before. Finding a quiet space set aside from Jupa’s central area of communal activity, where our extra baggage is being loaded onto the llamas in preparation for the seven-hour trek to the next community of Cochamarca, the BB group gathers in a circle. Several students are enthused about the first day and night in Nación Apu. For example, Andrew and Scott both describe it as ‘incredible’, Scott explaining:

—Just...the joy of life that is had between them and us...is the same...and they don’t [even] have what we have.
Scott goes on to identify more reasons for his positivity: ‘their laughter...they’re content and they DO know what else is out there...you know...for visitors like us...’. Ethan is also buzzing about the experience and having written in his journal that the first night in Nación Apu was ‘one of the most amazing experiences of the trip, and of my life, so far’, when it is his turn to speak he says:

—I was commenting to Jay that I’ve just never...like this is just the most remote I’ll ever live and the most basic I’ll ever live and it’s just a really good perspective out on life... to always remember that these people are here doing their thing...living their life...and how happy they are with it.

Several students nod and murmur in agreement at Ethan’s and Scott’s comments. Yet, from a critical perspective, aside from the fact that these students feel able to draw generalised conclusions about life in the community after spending only one night in it, specific aspects of their accounts are also problematic. How can Ethan possibly know ‘how happy they are’? How could Scott so confidently know that the ‘joy of life...between them and us is the same’?

6.5.2. Poor but Predictably Happy: A Meeting of Material Inequalities

Numerous scholars have identified this perception of the supposedly happy lives of economically poor people as part of a “poor but happy” development discourse (e.g. see Crossley, 2012; Escobar, 1994; Nederveen-Pieterse, 2000). It is described as a romanticised narrative that risks, among other things, overlooking the importance and injustice of material inequalities and equating material poverty with emotional and spiritual enrichment (Simpson, 2004; 2005). Perceiving people at the “losing” end of material inequalities as happy enables those at the “winning” end to partially justify the inequality and feel better about
their relationship to it; this appears to be what some students are doing after their first night in Nación Apu. Although this is not one of BBs aims, nor the Instructors’, it has not yet been challenged.

It is becoming clear, based on comments made by students during the reflective check-in meeting, and comments written in their diaries shortly before and/or after it, that the issue of poverty and material inequalities is at the forefront of many students’ minds after their first night in Nación Apu. It also becomes apparent that several students are forming distinctly less “rose-tinted” perceptions of life in Nación Apu than Ethan and Scott. As we continue going around the circle, speaking in turn, some children approach and begin curiously playing around with the backpacks standing at our side waiting to be donned, some asking what they are, how much they cost, and what is inside them. The students could not help but become acutely aware of the material inequalities between the BB group and the Jupa community – Ava, for instance, noting in her journal that ‘I have more material possessions in my big backpack than they do in their entire lives’. Many of their accounts portray mostly uncomfortable experiences. For instance, Jay writes: ‘…it’s tough sitting here, on the other side of the room, with all of our gear on and comforts around us as they sit on the other side of the room in silence.’ Andrew appears even more unsettled by the disparity, writing:

I am at a loss for English words. Waiky = luna = moon. Inti = sol = sun. Laying down my sleeping bag on the llama cuero (pelt) and having so many possessions almost seems like an infraction. Every passing moment signals: this is the most powerful experience of my life.

The disparity in material wealth is particularly apparent during those moments when we are thrust into intimate social spaces with community members, such as the household kitchen-cum-lounge-cum-bedroom. In such spaces we are confronted with stark differences in material wealth that students (and community members) may not have ever faced before in such an immediate context. There is no walking away from it
– at least not until the following morning – but at this point it has become a prominent point in the reflective meeting, and in students’ minds.

### 6.5.3. Having Things and Knowing Things

Some students also make connections between material and extra material inequalities, for example linking material goods and intellectual “goods”. Eleanor for example poses lots of questions in her journal entry following the first night in Nación Apu:

> Do people in very rural areas know that there are many others who have a lot more material goods/knowledge of the world? If they do not, does this make them more appreciative of the few materials they do have? The Peruvians seemed so interested in all of our supplies that we brought which made many of us feel very uncomfortable... I wonder what is the one thing these individuals would want if they could have anything. What information is important and useful worldwide?

Eleanor makes a significant conceptual leap here, drawing what she appears to regard as a close connection between material goods and knowledge with a slash (/), and appearing to use the terms ‘knowledge’ and ‘information’ interchangeably. While it could be argued that Eleanor’s claim that ‘there are many others who have a lot more material goods/knowledge of the world’ than the people of Nación Apu contains some “truth”, at least in some senses, it also requires critical interrogation and qualification. Many commentators have noted that there are multiple forms of knowledge, each contextually situated and therefore each carrying different values in different places, spaces, and moments in time (e.g. see Andreotti and de Souza, 2012; Bell and Russell, 2000; de Santos, 2007; Smith, 1999). Eleanor does not appear – at least not in this place, space, and moment in time – to account for these multiple knowledges. Moreover, none of the Instructors or students have yet posed these critical questions in a group space.

Other students also construct similar chains of problematic logic to the ones used in Eleanor’s comments, as this journal entry by Gemma –
which explains how she felt when she lay down to go to sleep on the first night in Jupa – suggests:

As I layed down thankful for my sleeping pad to protect me from the chicken poop, I’d like to say I envied their simple way of life, their ignorance or simple mind of knowing only what is in that small village but I didn’t.

The direct linkage that Gemma draws between the material and extra-material inequalities – chicken faeces and the ignorance of Nación Apu community members – that she perceives is placed in particularly stark relief here, as is her thankfulness for her way of life.

6.5.4. Showing Gratitude for Sizeable Mercies

During the meeting, only a few students vocalised their thoughts on the meeting of material, and extra material, inequalities they were experiencing, but many more wrote about it in their journals. These comments often “glow” with the gratitude that students felt during their stay in Jupa. Gemma writes:

I just felt the greatest sense of gratitude. I felt so lucky to have a home that is a sanctuary. I felt lucky to have intellectually stimulating things such as books, museums etc. I noticed this when the 20-year-old did the 9-year-old’s puzzle for the 5th time. I felt so thankful for a clean home, a loving family... I felt thankful that I never had to lick my bowl out of fear that tomorrow I wouldn’t have enough to eat.

However, in addition to extrapolating a sense of intellectual poverty – or, as Eleanor seemed to imply, a knowledge deficit – from the material inequalities and deprivation that she observes, Gemma makes assumptions and allusions here about the lives of her host family after spending only a night with them; Is the family not a loving family? Do they indeed have to lick the bowl clean out of fear? I suggest that these
are unsubstantiated prejudices and preconceptions that Gemma projects onto the family and onto the pages of her journal.

6.5.5. Lotto Logic

What also emerges from Gemma’s reflections is that to understand and rationalise the material and extra material inequalities she perceives, the student invokes a ‘Lotto logic’ (Quinby in Simpson, 2004: 689). According to Simpson (2004), this is a common phenomenon among gap year students and is a logic that functions to explain away gross material differences through a fatalistic faith in the “luck of the draw” in which students simply see their wealth as lucky, and poverty as unlucky. A Lotto logic not only allows students to ‘retain their myopic concentration on the individual’ (ibid) – as I discussed in the previous chapter – rather than extending their focus to larger-than-individual social forces and concerns. It also implies that there is nothing that people can possibly do, as individuals or as collectives, to challenge and change inequalities because the production of inequality is seen as synonymous with the spin of a cosmic roulette wheel. By contrast, Freirean pedagogy is based on the notion that it is possible for people to learn how to challenge inequalities and bring about social change; yet there is no sign so far that this is being taught or learnt in this supposedly Freirean transformative pedagogic space. This important omission is, I suggest, due in part to the fundamental contradiction at the heart of BB’s enterprise.

As I mentioned in Chapter 1, the fact of BB applying a Freirean pedagogic framework in the context of a gap year education program for privileged students is a structural contradiction created by the improbable notion that BB students can learn to want to challenge the social power structures that privilege them, let alone become empowered to do so. Indeed, it is unclear at this stage – from any of BB’s literature or staff – even just in theory, what BB students might plausibly do to challenge those power structures from the privileged positions they hold within them. This structural contradiction surfaces
throughout the data. Gemma’s description of her experience, for instance, does not provide any suggestion that the contradiction is yet, in her case, being resolved; while Gemma expresses gratitude for her lifestyle – which she describes to me as ‘privileged’ on various occasions – she does not demonstrate any awareness of the structures and processes that produce that privilege, and the underprivilege that she perceives in the lives of the homestay family, let alone any motivation to want to do anything about this inequality.

Similarly, Madeleine documents a moment that, for her, poignantly embodied the inequalities that played on her mind during the homestay, but also shows no sign of wanting to do anything about those inequalities beyond feeling grateful that she is one of the “haves” and not the “have-nots”:

A moment that I found quite touching was the night of the first homestay when the little boy was so disappointed that my screwdriver wouldn’t fit in his toy to fix it. I remember feeling sorry for him but also just so grateful for all I had. I remember continuing to watch him struggle with the kitchen knife to open the toy.

Madeleine demonstrates empathy with the young boy, but it is expressed here in the form of pity for his situation and gratitude for hers. Though I do not wish to read too much into a single, short, journal entry, perhaps the most poignant part of Madeleine’s observation, from a Freirean perspective, is that rather than struggle together with the boy to try and solve the problem, she watched him struggle alone.

6.5.6. A Post-Freirean Resolution, Left Alone

As I outlined in Chapter 3, Curry-Stevens’ post-Freirean ‘Pedagogy for the Privileged’ (2007) responds to the structural contradiction highlighted above, and offers a partial resolution. But none of the stages of Curry-Stevens’ 10-stage ‘proposed model for the transformation of privileged learners’ (ibid) have thus far been engaged with in Nación
Apu. Although students such as Gemma and Madeleine show gratitude – which can play a valuable part in the transformative learning process that Curry-Stevens outlines, depending on how it is handled by the learning facilitator – there is no indication that their thankfulness is being integrated into a learning process that even engages with the first two stages of Curry Steven’s model (2007), in which subjects are brought to (1) understand ‘inequality as a form of oppression’ (46) and that (2) it is ‘structural and therefore enduring and pervasive’ (47).

This is unsurprising given that there is no mention of Curry-Stevens’ framework, or the structural contradictions posed by applying Freirean pedagogic principles in a BB programme context, anywhere in BB’s pedagogic materials nor in the Instructors’ pedagogic discourse. Nevertheless, it is surprising given that these two stages are also fundamental to the Freirean pedagogy that BB espouses. What is crucially missing, then, from the students’ learning experiences so far in Nación Apu is an attempt by any BB group members to explore the structural, systemic, asymmetric power relations that produce the inequalities that they observe.

Alongside this, and perhaps even more fundamentally with respect to the aims of transformative learning – in this context being not only a transformation in how students think about power structures but also a transformation in students’ structures of thinking (and being) – what is emerging from the data is that many of the students interpret Nación Apu community members, and their lives, as “simple”. I will argue that this interpretation is itself too simple, and is arguably indicative of a simplistic structure, or framework, for understanding the complexities of lived experience. However, while this simplistic frame of reference is being reproduced in some ways within the BB group in Nación Apu, it is also simultaneously being questioned by some group members who appear to be grappling with complexities, contradictions and confusion in a potentially transformative way.
6.6. Simplicity and Complexity: Confusions, Contradictions, Questions and Challenges in Nación Apu

After the check-in meeting in Jupa, we are ready to begin trekking to Cochamarca, the next stop on our tour of Nación Apu communities. Bidding the community of Jupa farewell, we stride off following the gentle whistling of Wilfredo’s flute. A mile or so into the trail, it occurs to me that amid the hustle and hubbub of trek preparations and the morning check-in meeting, neither I, Scott, or Patrick had remembered to ask our guide how much extra money we should pay our host family for the lamb after all.

6.6.1. A Whistle-stop Tour

As we walk, some of the students begin rapping together and I drop back a bit to talk to Scott, who is walking alone at the back of the pack, asking him for his thoughts about Nación Apu so far:

—I just wish I could do more for them... it just feels like it was just so quick... it was like a camp... it didn’t feel right to me to do that...to go into their home...sleep...wake up and leave... I wanted to feel...wanted to do more with them... It’s an experience I’ll never forget.

Having observed in the previous section that none of the students had so far expressed any interest in what they might be able to do in response to the inequalities they perceived in Jupa, Scott’s comment bucks this trend. While it is easy to point out problems with the way Scott articulated his concerns – for example, employing a discourse of “help for people”, rather than solidarity and “action with people” – he is nevertheless engaging with larger-than-individual concerns.

These concerns are principally framed by Scott in spatial and temporal terms; our “dipping in and out” of the communities’ homes, and lives,
felt rushed and was not only unsatisfying for him, but perhaps disrespectful to the families. Scott seemed somewhat confused as to why we stayed so briefly in Jupa if we were meant to be travellers on an immersive cross-cultural programme. I felt similarly and felt aware – as I did when suggesting to Scott the night before that we wait till morning before taking a photograph with our homestay family – that in some ways our visit felt more like tourism than (BB’s notion of) travelling, at least in the sense that our stay was fleeting, like we had treated the families’ homes as hotels, or rather hostels.

Scott’s confusion and concern at the pace of our visit to Nación Apu so far was not alleviated in Cocharmarca. We arrived late in the afternoon tired from seven hours trekking, met our new homestay host families, and ate dinner before going to sleep at sundown in anticipation of an early departure the next morning to the community of Quico Chico. Nevertheless, during breakfast the following morning, before setting off on trail, Wilfredo and the Instructors confirm that we will be staying in Quico Chico for a longer period of three to four days before moving on to our final stop in Quico Grande.

6.6.2. Celebrating Simplicity

As we start trekking to Quico Chico, I speak to Scott again. He talks a lot about the “simple” life he is witnessing, saying: ‘I just…I couldn’t believe what I was living... seeing the...simplicity of life here is...just...truly incredible’. Scott is not the only student who feels this way. For example, Ethan’s journal entry on the second night in Nación Apu suggests that, like Scott, the experience was a significant one and that he also sees a simplicity in the lives of the Nación Apu people:

These people still live by Incan traditions which manifests itself in a very simple “live off the land” lifestyle...I am learning some very valuable things, just from watching these people live. I have watched the way they interact with the land and I’m inspired by it. The respect they have for everything around them is inspiring.
Ethan clearly finds much to celebrate in the “simple” lives led in Nación Apu and on the trail, he tells Jay about the inspiration he is feeling: ‘I’m not saying I’m a fucking shaman right now but I feel like I’m learning a lot more about the land right now and I’m thinking about it a lot more than I ever have in my entire life.’

6.6.3. You Say Potato, I Say Primitive

Other students were feeling differently from Ethan and Scott about the simplicity of the lifestyle they perceived in Nación Apu. Madeleine wrote in her journal:

I’ve felt pretty shitty... it’s been really cold and rainy – not ideal for trying to recuperate, not to mention the complete lack of sanitation. This homestay experience has not been amazing or life-changing for me. We’ve literally eaten potatoes...and slept on dung covered floors. It has not been enlightening in the slightest, at least not yet. It has been a different experience for sure and it’s been something that I’ll probably not forget any time soon, but I’m too miserable right now to really appreciate/accept any of it. That sounds really horrible and insensitive but for the moment that’s honestly how I’m feeling, I think mostly because I’m super sick and in a god-awful cold and “primitive” place, which also sounds bad.

It is important to note that Madeleine had been ill since we began travelling to Nación Apu, which has clearly influenced her experience. Nevertheless, it seems to have influenced it by disgorging some strongly expressed perspectives on the “primitivity” of Apu peoples that Madeleine is aware are problematic. Similarly, Eleanor also expressed some misgivings about the life of the homestay family, in her journal:

My first homestay was nothing like I have ever experienced. My partner, I, the parents, and a baby all slept in the same room. When we began cooking dinner, the smoke from the fire filled our lungs and made us appear high. For dinner, we made the most bland potato soup I have ever tried. The poignant grey air pierced our eyes and there was no escape. I asked the family if they ever cooked potatoes in a different way and they looked back at me with bewilderment. With so much time cooking
potatoes and an abundance of free time, I would have thought they would have experimented a little more.

This comment again raises questions about Eleanor’s perception of knowledge in relation to her host family; what assumptions are being made here about the function and status of different forms of knowledge? Moreover, the student’s perceptions of “time” in Nación Apu, and particularly “free time”, raise questions which I discussed with her later on the trail. Asking Eleanor about her interpretations of life in Nación Apu, Eleanor tells me:

—I think you can appreciate something and also not want to do that...a way of life or an idea or something and still not want to do that... I mean I do think we have this idea...that people in Latin America work so hard all day long and then they don’t make very much money...or whatever... I don’t even feel that way all the time.

I check if Eleanor is referring specifically to Nación Apu, or to a recent trip to Nicaragua that she was telling me about earlier – a trip during which she also did homestays with Nicaraguan families, but in a very different context (in the capital city Managua). Eleanor has indeed switched her reference point back to Nicaragua and elaborates:

—But I think we do [have the idea that Latin Americans work hard all day long and don’t make much money]...and I don’t know if it’s always that true...some people I think do...and some people I don’t... I mean I know my [homestay] mum and my sisters... you know they made breakfast, lunch and dinner and they swept our house in the morning and then sat around all day...which is fine... but I think I work harder than that personally...I really do... when I’m at school...yeah it’s a different kind of work but...I didn’t feel like they were busting their asses off to make a living.

As Eleanor talks, I sense strongly that Frida, who was within earshot, is squirming with irritation at the student’s comments. I suspect this is not least because Eleanor is switching back and forth between very different
“Latin American” contexts (Jupa and Managua) as if they were interchangeable, especially after the Program Director introduced Nación Apu as an independent nation whose Incan-ancestors escaped the cultural and linguistic invasion of “Latin” influences. Frida looks to be itching to challenge the student but remains quiet.

6.6.4. Quiet Time or a Culture of Silence?

I suspect Frida stays silent in order to maintain the neutral position she is striving to uphold throughout the programme, and her pedagogic conviction to ‘step back and allow place to be teacher and classroom’. At the same time, I suggest that Frida is inadvertently reproducing what Freire would describe as a ‘culture of silence’ – the absence of critical dialogue about crucial issues of poverty, inequality, and power in spaces filled by the implausible pursuit of neutrality.

The Instructors’ decision, for instance, to choose Nación Apu – an independent indigenous nation – as a teacher and classroom is not a neutral decision. Rather, it is born from implicitly political motivations in addition to the explicit pedagogic intention of shocking and shaking-up the students. Aside from occupying a crucial position in transferring students from the comfort zone to the border of the learning zone and panic zone, Nación Apu provides a conducive environment for learning about inequality and poverty in the context of indigenous rights and the relationship between the state and indigenous groups. Yet so far, in the absence of attempts by the Instructors to more intentionally scaffold and guide this learning process, opportunities for potentially transformative ‘teachable moments’ are arguably being lost; the reproduction, in some cases, of prevalent, problematic, simplistic understandings and discourses is taking their place.

As we continue along the trail, Eleanor then asked me about my thoughts on our stay in Jupa. Unsure of how much I should reveal as a researcher, especially at this early stage of the programme, I sidestepped the question and said that it is difficult to form views after such a brief stay and that things are often more complex than they
seem. Like Frida, my critical alarm bells were ringing at Eleanor’s comments but I chose to remain quiet for reasons not dissimilar to the Program Director’s. I worried nonetheless that even though my identity and role as a researcher is different to that of an Instructor, I too was reproducing a culture of silence. The students and the Instructors were therefore not the only ones in the BB group wrestling with contradiction, confusion, questions and challenges in Nación Apu.

6.6.5. Wrestling with Ways of Being

Although Eleanor had shown a propensity to make simplistic, generalised statements – as had other students – other data suggest that she is no stranger to acknowledging the complexity of lived experience. For example, in the early days of the programme Eleanor writes prolifically and sensitively in her journal about the ongoing struggles she is having with defining and redefining the boundaries of her identities and ways of being in interactions with others:

My greatest struggle in life continues to be the search to find a balance between sticking to my convictions and wanting to change. My goal is to grow into the best version of myself. There are certain aspects of my personality that are so ingrained in my being, and I am most proud of. I fear that even to decrease these aspects of my being, I will lose myself... I have a lot of trouble meeting people halfway. What values are not compromisable? What principles should we alter? These are life questions that do not have simple answers and the solutions change depending on where someone is in his or her life. Am I only ever going to be close to people who think the same way I do?

In Nación Apu, Eleanor writes more about these interactions, journaling about connections she felt with a young girl she met:

These connections are multifaceted and complex. One part of me was scared to enjoy the little girl’s company because I was afraid I would become attached to her and I was leaving the village in a short time.
In these lines, Eleanor acknowledges the multi-layered complexity of social interactions and identity formation. The student also appears to be in a state of confusion, asking difficult questions and writing in some depth about the contradictions and emotional challenges she experiences with regard to regulating aspects of her personality in relation to her interactions with others. Eleanor was also asking critical, reflective questions about our presence in Nación Apu. Journaling about her stay in Jupa, she asks:

When one says this is a judgement free zone, what does that mean? Observing customs, interactions, and conversations is impossible without taking away some sort of opinion on what's occurred. To stop judging is to seize [sic] from thinking...life is full of contradictions.

Here, Eleanor not only acknowledges 'life’s contradictions’ in a general sense, but also finds a contradiction between what the BB group are doing in Nación Apu (e.g. observing customs and then reflecting on and discussing them) and how some group members, including Instructors, are trying to create a neutral, judgement free zone in which to do this. I sympathise with Eleanor’s opinion about the process of forming opinions and judgements and that there is a tension in the supposedly neutral space Frida is trying to create. Further along the trail, these feelings were confirmed when I talked alone with Frida who told me that she was indeed irked by Eleanor’s comments about (some) Latin Americans and found them offensive. I confessed that I found the comments problematic too, not least because they seemed to lack an appreciation of the complexities involved in making comparisons about people’s lives, let alone entire continents of people.

6.6.6. Guilty Comparisons, Guilty Pleasures

What also emerges from the data, then, is a comparative dimension to Eleanor’s thinking process, for example how she compares her personal
work ethic with her homestay mother and sisters’ work ethic. Other students also make comparisons between their lives and the lives of their homestay families in Nación Apu, such as Gemma and Madeleine whom I also speak to on the trail to Cocharmaca, joining the conversation they were having about the previous night in Jupa. Gemma says that:

—It definitely gave me a lot to think about... I guess I was just reflecting... they [the homestay host family] were just talking about their way of life and like... I’m not trying to compare...saying one is better...but just the differences.

Gemma appears to be confusing judgement with comparison here, as she is clearly comparing differences between ‘their’ way of life and her way of life, even if she is trying not to pass judgement on which is ‘better’. While it is perhaps unsurprising, and even unavoidable, that students make comparisons, the way that these comparisons are framed is problematic. For example, as my analysis so far reveals, many of the students tend to focus mainly on the differences between themselves and their host families, at the expense of the similarities.

Moreover, for some students – such as Gemma, Madeleine, and Eleanor – these differences are mostly framed in terms of deficits on behalf of the families (for example, Eleanor talking about how the potatoes are blander than she is used to, and Gemma listing the differences in ‘lifestyle’ that she is grateful for). Despite Gemma’s insistence that she is not making value judgements, they are implicit in her framing of the differences. During our conversation on the trail, Gemma then goes on to ask: ‘maybe I should have felt more guilty about how much I have?’ Madeleine then picks up on this point and explains to me that:

—A couple of us...we’ve been talking about...since we’re pretty privileged...how sometimes we feel kind of guilty about that...and that can be hard.
With reference to Curry-Stevens’ model for the transformation of privileged learners (see Appendix 1), Gemma and Madeleine’s comments raise some pertinent issues. By identifying as privileged, the students are engaging in ‘Stage 4: Locating oneself as privileged’ (2007: 48) of the 10-stage process. Moreover, by feeling guilty the students are acknowledging that benefits flow from privilege, which is a part of Stage 5.

However, although Gemma and Madeleine acknowledge some of the effects and products of privilege (i.e. benefits from “high” quality formal education and healthcare to the possession of the right tools to fix children’s toys) – as the data I have analysed throughout this chapter shows – there is little sign of them acknowledging the causes and implications of privilege, nor the processes of its production. As mentioned earlier, this involves considering relations of power.

Although Gemma and Madeleine acknowledge how much they have, and feel both grateful and guilty about how ‘lucky’ they are, there is no sign in the data that they have considered the relational notion that what they have is directly related to what others don’t have – that to be rich, others must be poor. Nor is this a concept that has been introduced by Instructors. Yet, with regard to Curry-Stevens’ framework, this is not necessarily an issue at this early stage of the programme as it takes time and careful pedagogic scaffolding to build-up to this unpalatable contention – to which students can be expected to react defensively and resistantly (Curry-Stevens, 2007).

6.6.7. Tiptoeing Around the Tipping Point

What is problematic here, though, is that students like Gemma and Madeleine are partially, and probably unintentionally, engaging with some of the learning stages that Curry-Stevens’ describes, but doing so without the support and guidance of careful pedagogic scaffolding and are therefore bypassing critically important stages of the process. Most notably, although the students’ guilt could be a potentially constructive emotion to harness within the transformative learning process for
privileged learners, it is also a potentially destructive emotion and must be handled carefully (Curry-Stevens, 2007). This is true not only regarding the ethical implications of exposing impressionable young people to potentially intense feelings of remorse, but as Curry-Stevens warns:

Pedagogically, it is important for the educator to help keep learners away from the “tipping point” of guilt where they become unlikely to take action (Curry-Stevens, 2007: 42/43).

Although privileged learners will likely feel some guilt during the transformative learning process, Curry-Stevens’ framework stresses the importance of first helping learners to realise that asymmetric power structures privilege and oppress everyone in different ways, at different times, and in different spaces. This leads to the need for an acknowledgement that privileged learners also suffer in some ways within these structures. For example, as I discussed in the previous chapter students such as Ava and Andrew feel pressure from their parents to pursue high-status career paths, but are interested in exploring other ones, thus causing them anxiety and stress.

Regardless of whether these forms of stress, or even suffering (though not oppression in the same sense as systemic, historic forms of injustice such as racism and classism) can be meaningfully compared to others, Curry-Stevens’ argues (2007: 46-47) that acknowledging their suffering helps privileged learners to: (1) find commonalities in shared experiences, and build empathy and solidarity amongst themselves; and then (2) do the same, but between themselves and those others who are suffering at the hands of oppressive power relations, but are positioned very differently than the BB students within those structures.

6.6.8. From the Us and Them to the US and Them

The processes of teaching, learning, and solidarity-building described above have not been evident so far in Nación Apu. Instead, rather than
finding commonalities in comparisons between themselves and their homestay families (except for Scott who finds the same “joy of life” in Nación Apu communities), students such as Gemma and Madeleine have focused on the differences.

Moreover, this is not the only problematic aspect of how comparisons are framed. The data suggest that a tendency to invoke a discourse of “us and them” is also prevalent in the ways that students are interpreting their experience and relating to Nación Apu community members. For example, several students found it difficult to find a connection with our hosts, and felt a distant separation from them, as Madeleine explained to me on the trail:

—I just felt like I shouldn’t have been there…which is weird… they were so happy to talk to us and show us what they were doing but I just felt out of place.

According to Simpson (2004; 2005) and others (see Greene, 2014; Martin and Griffiths, 2014) this feeling is not uncommon during cross-cultural encounters, and is often couched within the binary frames of reference – “us and them”. Critics argue that this functions to create distance between the former and latter, as their differences are accentuated and similarities overlooked. This distance can be used to dehumanise the other, enabling the justification of various violence’s against them, whether these be physical, cultural, economic, or epistemic. Moreover, these commentators also point out that it is not uncommon in such contexts for the “us” to be framed not only in terms of whatever group one is travelling with, but also in nationalist terms. This becomes apparent in Nación Apu, as one of Eleanor’s journal entries suggests:

Here, in Peru, individuals live off very little and do not seem to want very much more than they have. Is that culture? [...] Would these people benefit from coming to the USA? What could people learn from their experience in the USA? In the US, people are rarely satisfied with what they have.
Eleanor asks interesting questions here, but also makes broad generalisations again. Extrapolating from a short experience in an independent nation within Peru to making a claim about Peruvians, and making similar wide-reaching claims about people in the US, the student asks comparative questions about Jupa and her home country. Other students also compare Nación Apu to their home culture(s). For instance, Gemma who not only focuses on the differences between the two places in her comparison, but evaluates them and implicitly judges the US as superior, again expressing gratitude for her good fortune in living there:

I felt so thankful for...unlimited job opportunities, an un-sexist place...for clean streets.

I argue that the process of writing in the journal is functioning here as a vehicle for Gemma to perform, to herself (and I), her own personal “Thanksgiving” ritual, albeit without the table heaving with food, as is customary in the US. Such a ritual is a cultural expectation of the kind of “decent” and “virtuous” young US citizen, and global citizen, that Gemma is constructing herself to be. Similarly, by setting up a binary comparison between her life in the US and the lives of her host family in Nación Apu, Gemma also makes highly questionable inferences about US culture: is the US really an ‘un-sexist place’ with ‘unlimited job opportunities’? Regardless, what is apparent, as I have suggested, is that for some students “us and them” is also “the US and them”.

6.7. Managing Distance and Difference: Profound Pressure, Pop Culture, and Being Present
6.7.1. Soothing the Sickness for Home

Gemma is not the only student with the US on her mind. While everyone in our BB group is experiencing challenges in Nación Apu, some students are experiencing intense homesickness in the second week of the programme. Jay writes in his journal:

I got no sleep last night... my thoughts went all over the place. 'Why am I in this room so far from home?' I miss home. I don't want to do this anymore. Why did I leave Mom at home alone?... I felt my heart and it was pounding hard. I couldn't get it to slow down. I sat there, almost crying, tossing and turning for hours. I didn't want to be here anymore. I didn't think the 2-week homesickness would hit me, but it did – badly...I figured, if anything, music could calm me down. I tried Sufian Stevens, Bon Iver, and Bob Marley. They all sent me back home to my desk, my room, Mom...Dad. I was more homesick than I've ever been in my entire life. I put on ‘House of ‘Cards’ by Radiohead and felt my mind cry. I was sick. Sick of walking, sick of the shit on the floor, sick of the cold room, sick of the language barrier...sick of having a clogged nose, sick of the back pains, sick of squatting outside to shit in the middle of the freezing night while standing in the shit covered grass, sick of the faces of the Incan descendants around me, sick of the one month old baby crying next to me... it was less than two weeks into the trip and I was done. I felt so weak.

Jay is clearly a long way out of his comfort zone, perhaps even outside the learning zone on the edge of Panic Cliff. To cope, in addition to listening to music Jay fantasises about his favourite foods and films at home:

I miss my room right now. My room is the best. I left a piece of me at home. A diner cheeseburger up in my room watching Lord of the Rings is bliss. I can’t wait for that.

6.7.2. Fantasy, Familiarity, and Film as Mediator of Reality

As Jay’s journal entry suggests, certain products of popular culture – especially fantasy genre films such as the ‘Harry Potter’ and ‘The Lord of the Rings’ series – emerged as important resources for students
during the programme in various ways. Almost all the students seemed to enjoy regularly discussing these films, but for students like Jay they were more than just conversation topics and also had a powerful personal resonance, which he writes about in his journal:

I was thinking about Lord of the Rings a lot on today’s hike. I was thinking about Frodo and Sam and their journey. When I think about the rough moments in their trek, I can’t help but compare them to moments of my own. I thought about the strength their characters had and compare that to the way I approached the climb ahead of me. It gave me a ton of strength. I think it’s crazy that strength can be pulled from something that’s not there and never was there. Tolkien wrote my strength—a cool concept.

Jay writes here about how he uses The Lord of the Rings as a form of coping mechanism during tough times in the programme, turning this popular fantasy genre film into a kind of pop cultural resource. Jay uses this resource not only as a source of strength, but also as a channel through which to understand and mediate his new, unfamiliar experiences during the programme by comparing them to a fantastical “reality” with which he is more familiar. This mostly happened in rural, “remote” places like Nación Apu that were deemed to be both more “out there”, “unreal” alien experiences (i.e. taking students further away from their comfort zones and familiarity) yet paradoxically at the same time somehow more real experiences. Fantasy films became a mediator of reality.

**6.7.3. Hip-Hop ‘til You Don’t Stop: Slowing Time and Clearing Space**

To cope with the pressure and challenges he experiences in Nación Apu, Ethan, like Jay and many other students, also speaks regularly about fantasy genre films and other US pop cultural products. Some students – mostly Harrison, Nathaniel, and Andrew – also rap together regularly on the trail, sometimes repeating well-known US hip-hop tracks and other times creating their own vocal music.
Further down the trail, having heard many of the students rapping and talking about pop culture, the Instructors stop everyone and announce that we will all do a walking meditation for the next 30 minutes. Randall introduces the activity, instructing that everyone will walk alone, setting off from a starting point at staggered two-minute intervals, and engage in reflection and contemplation of the environment around them, whilst trying not to think of other distractions. Randall explains to students that the Instructors were prompted to initiate this activity because they had noticed that students were too often preoccupied with thinking, talking, or rapping about films, TV, music and other comfortably familiar aspects of US popular culture; this was not the purpose of coming to a “radically different” and “remote” independent nation. Instead, Instructors wanted students to “take in” the new, unique environment they were in. This was not an unusual approach for the Instructors to take and is consistent with BB’s guidelines, as this excerpt from the Educators Resource demonstrates:

Our Instructors work to constantly put their students in environments in which the student is compelled to be present. Our Instructors constantly work to “get their students’ attention” with wildly different, compelling experiences... Throughout the program, Instructors should continuously strive to throw students into a different reality (BB, 2013c: 87).

The Instructors were aware that students used pop culture chats as a coping mechanism, and entertained this to an extent. They did not, however, appear to recognise the function of pop cultural references as a conduit for students’ learning. Rather, Randall explains to the students that “being present”, or in other words being in the present time and place by more fully engaging with it, helps to momentarily block out thoughts, or even yearnings, for the familiarities and comforts of home. This opens oneself to the realities of the here and now, helping to transition from the comfort zone to the learning zone. The Instructors’ promotion of “being in the present” as a desirable way of being for students is also elaborated on in the Educators Resource:
so many new and different experiences will happen and the student will HAVE to be present to negotiate these moments. The more moments we have that are remarkable and wildly “foreign”, the more students will forget their past, eschew thoughts of the future, and focus on the here and now. And at those junctures, we can get our students to most clearly see themselves and their relationships to others; we can clear the students’ social landscape of the baggage that has built up at home, and give them a clean surface on which they can construct a more honest and authentic understanding of self and sense of place (BB, 2013c: 86/87).

The consistency between the promotion of “being in the present”, by both BB and the programme Instructors, evident here is also congruent with a broader context in the US (and more widely the “West”). As discussed in the previous chapter there is a predominantly White middle-class cultural zeitgeist for adopting and adapting Buddhist-influenced “Eastern” philosophies and practices, such as meditation and mindfulness, in the pursuit of personal well-being and happiness. Indeed, this contextual connection was also evident in the Transference workshop on personal happiness that I discussed in the previous chapter, and is also present in BB’s official affiliation and partnership with a Buddhist-inspired liberal arts university in the US.

I also suggest that the extract above, and the Instructors’ attempts to bring students into the present time and place, reveal undercurrents of the fixation with cultural purity I discussed earlier. I argue that the desire to find authenticity on a ‘clean surface’ uncontaminated by students’ cultural baggage is not merely driven by the desire for ‘a more honest and authentic understanding’ of self and place, or even simply personal well-being and happiness, but the desire for a “pure” form of cross-cultural capital.

6.7.4. The Pursuit of Pure CCC

What is emerging so far is, I suggest, the pursuit of a pure form of cross-cultural capital whose value increases in proportion to the perceived
alterity of the cross-cultural spaces inhabited by the BB group. The more different, or “wildly foreign”, a programme space is in relation to the spaces that BB group members are used to occupying in their home culture(s), the more valuable it becomes as a cross cultural commodity to be accumulated and transported back to the US. The need to maintain the “cultural cleanliness”, or purity, of the cross-cultural space by protecting it from external cultural influences, such as US pop culture, therefore becomes paramount in maintaining the alterity, and thus integrity, of the space. This is a point I return to in the conclusion. Moreover, the Instructors’ efforts to force the penetration of “the present” into the students learning experience in Nación Apu reveals an attempt to regulate the function of space and time as a mediator of that experience. Instructors were trying to maintain spatial and temporal boundaries around the ways in which students were processing their experience in Nación Apu.

6.8. Challenging Distance and Difference: Playing with Cultural Perspectives in Quico Chico

The difficulties of cultural difference and distance that many students are perceiving between themselves (as US, and global, citizens) and Nación Apu community members (as, effectively, non-Peruvian, non-global citizens) is both entrenched further and challenged in Quico Chico by the students’ participation in, respectively, a sacrificial ceremony facilitated by the community, and a perspective-shifting activity facilitated by the Instructors.

6.8.1. The Pachamanka (Sheep Sacrifice)

After arriving and settling in with our homestay families in Quico Chico, we prepare for one of the main activities we will be doing in the
community. Many of the students are excited to learn that we will be taking part in a sheep sacrifice, or ‘Pachamanka’, as an offering to Pachamama (Mother Earth), feeling that by doing this they will, as Scott said, be ‘really experiencing the authentic culture here’.

On the morning of our first full day in the community, we gather in the central community area and Wilfredo delivers a short speech thanking Mother Earth for the sheep that are lying on the ground in front of us, legs bound tightly together. Gemma – a vegetarian – describes the sacrifice in her journal:

We quickly started the animal sacrifice which included just cutting open an animal. There were 3 lambs with their feet tied together. The men grabbed a bucket and chopped away at the necks of the lambs. Blood began to squirt out and quickly filled the buckets. The lambs struggled and twitched but soon gave up as death took them. I know it’s necessary for these people to eat but it’s not fair the animals never had a chance.

Some other students are more enthusiastic about the sacrifice, particularly Scott, Nathaniel, Harrison, and Ethan who eagerly volunteer to assist. However, several students also express surprise and dissatisfaction because the ceremony was not what they expected. Noah captures the general sentiment, lamenting that the ceremony was:

very quick...over too quickly...and wasn’t very ceremonious or ritualistic... I felt they were just doing it for us.

This raises some questions about the (so-called) authenticity of the ceremony, or at least perceptions of authenticity, among the students. After the Pachamanka has finished Instructors asked the students to reconvene for another activity in which they will ‘read and discuss an anthropological article that raises various questions for discussion...including the meaning of ritual’.
6.8.2. The Rituals of the Nacirema in Nación Apu

The BB group reconvenes in Quico Chico’s central communal area, the site of the sheep sacrifice, where a small group of community members are sitting together chatting. The area is uncovered and the weather is typically cold, damp, and blustery with clouds of mist moving through regularly. The Instructors wish to find a quiet, sheltered space to conduct the reading and discussion activity but the nearby building they were hoping to use – a community member’s home which doubles as a communal meeting area – is too small for our 17-strong group.

The Instructors improvise by ushering the students around the corner of the building to a space which is more sheltered from the wind, the drizzle, and the community members’ gathering. I note that this is common behaviour for the BB group who conduct their intellectual, discussion-based activities in “private” spaces, at a distance from the spaces (and people) in which they participate in “culturally immersive” activities such as the Pachamanka.

Randall – who has a degree in social anthropology (as does Frida) – introduces the reading to the students. It is a short (approximately 1000 words) paper by Horace Miner called ‘Body Ritual among the Nacirema’, published in the American Anthropologist in 1956. The full article (see Appendix 5) features in BB’s Educators Resource, which introduces it like so:

This article is a classic of anthropological literature. In it Horace Miner gives readers a thorough and exciting ethnographic account of the myriad of taboos and ceremonial behaviours that permeate the everyday activities of the members of a magic-ridden society. Focusing on secret rituals that are believed to prevent disease while simultaneously beautifying the body, Miner demonstrates the importance of ceremonial specialists such as the “holy-mouth-men” and the “listeners” in directing even the most routine aspects of daily life amongst the Nacirema.

Randall tells the group that they are going to use the article ‘to discuss amongst ourselves about how to look at other cultures’. I notice Andrew
and Eleanor catching each other’s glance and smiling, as if silently sharing a private joke. Randall asks if any of the students have already read the article and Andrew and Eleanor raise their hands, as does Noah. The Instructor then requests that:

—Those of you who have read it before... when we have our discussion...maybe let people who are reading it for the first time...chime in first and share their thoughts on it before you start to share your observations.

As I am familiar with the article and the activity, having discussed the “lesson plan” beforehand with Instructors, I understand why Randall is requesting this; the article has a trick up its sleeve that will only be revealed towards the end of the discussion. Like watching a murder mystery with someone who has already seen it, those who have already read the article (it is used, for instance, in some schools in the US) already know the twist in the ending but must pretend they do not, or at least stay quiet, so as not to spoil the surprise for others.

### 6.8.3. Magic Tricks and Cultural Twists

Randall asks for a volunteer to read the article out loud and Nathaniel begins, revealing that the Nacirema are:

—‘A North American group living in the territory between the Canadian Cree, the Yaqui and Tarahumare of Mexico, and the Carib and Arawak of the Antilles.’

Nathaniel continues reading the article in its entirety, concluding with the final paragraph:

—‘Our review of the ritual life of the Nacirema has certainly shown them to be a magic-ridden people [...] But even such exotic customs as these take on real meaning when they are
viewed with the insight provided by Malinowski [9] when he wrote:

‘Looking from far and above, from our high places of safety in the developed civilisation, it is easy to see all the crudity and irrelevance of magic. But without its power and guidance early man could not have mastered his practical difficulties as he has done, nor could man have advanced to the higher stages of civilisation [10].’

Randall thanks Nathaniel and then starts a group discussion, asking for students to share their thoughts on the rituals described in the article and ‘anything that struck them as particularly interesting...or strange’. Ava answers ‘shoving hog hair in your mouth’ – referring to Miner’s description of a daily ‘mouth-rite’ ritual that ‘consists of inserting a small bundle of hog hairs into the mouth...and then moving the bundle in a highly formalised series of gestures’ – and says with a grin that she thought the ritual was ‘just plain weird’. Some of the group chuckle and Eleanor, Andrew, and Noah smile knowingly at one another again.

The students continue sharing their thoughts, Jay saying that the Nacirema’s underlying belief that the body is ‘just gonna be diseased...which is why they follow the medicine men’ is a premise that ‘just starts off so backwards’. Patrick then speaks, making a cultural comparison between the Nacirema and ‘Americans’ in the US:

—It seems like they [the Nacirema] believe that pain is a sort of healing aspect... I don’t wanna call it weird...because it’s just different than me... it’s just interestingly different to have a dentist – if you want to draw a similarity to our culture – to just go in and prod your teeth...and if you don’t have any cavities...to just make cavities and fill them up to purify yourself.

So you were saying it’s a little weird...a little different... how would you feel about just suddenly being thrust into that [culture]?’ Randall asks Patrick and the whole group. ‘I’d try and run away as soon as possible’ replies Ethan, and some students laugh. ‘I think it would be extremely hard for someone from a western culture to step in there to participate
and adopt this belief and way of life’ adds Patrick. ‘Mmm...a sense of conditioning’ Scott mutters, standing next to me, before saying:

—They’d probably feel the same way if they witnessed our culture... if it was flip-flopped...they’d be like ‘these guys are really weird’... I always look at it as... imagine if another culture or species witnessed us from outer space... its mostly a Western culture... and viewed us as just sitting in a room watching a box...staring at a screen.

Then Gemma, who hasn’t spoken yet, raises her hand to ask a question and tentatively queries: ‘Was this about our society?’

6.8.4. Subverting Perspectives

Randall confirms that Gemma has figured out the twist in the tale and that the article is indeed describing the students’ home culture in the US:

— Yeah definitely... so ‘Nacirema’ is ‘American’ spelt backwards!

There is a murmur of surprise and amusement amongst the group and some of the students appear to be quite disoriented by the revelation, as if they are processing the descriptions of the body rituals in this different light.

Eleanor then shares her views, coming across quite defensively and being critical of the article because the author ‘hadn’t asked anyone anything’ but had formed almost exclusively ‘negative’ views about the US, of which ‘some of those things are really not true’ from a mere ‘snapshot’ of ‘American’ culture. Eleanor continues to say that the author ‘was obviously trying to make a point’ but did not ‘really grasp...or totally understand’ American culture and ‘didn’t discuss any of the benefits’ of going to visit the doctor, or the dentist, or even just brushing your teeth. It seems to me that the main aim of the article had not yet been realised.
Although the author was clearly aiming to trick the reader into thinking that the rituals he describes are strange, backward, and uncivilised – and thus, in part, poke-fun at US culture – the purpose of the article is more broadly to critique classical anthropology. The “white Western gaze” is under scrutiny here, as is the exoticised register and language it produces when representing the Other.

As discussed thoroughly elsewhere (see Bhaba, 1994; Gupta and Ferguson, 1992; Said, 1979; 2007) the discourse of distance and difference produced through this anthropological register functions, among other things, to reproduce the discourse of them and us invoked by several students, as I discussed earlier. By using this problematic anthropological vocabulary to describe normative US cultural practices the author is comparing how differently we think about and represent familiar cultural practices and unfamiliar cultural practices. This raises various questions about power, positionality and perspective in relation to the representation and reproduction of the Other; these are questions that the Instructors are attempting to raise within the BB group through doing this activity in Nación Apu, where students are of course forming perceptions of the Other.

Randall points out that the article ‘was written by a Western scholar...by an American...about the US’ so his view is not a snapshot but based on a lifetime’s experience. ‘It wasn’t biased then...in any sense?’ questions Scott rhetorically and Randall agrees that it wasn’t, adding that: ‘the exercise was pulling himself outside of his own culture and looking into it as if you’re [he is] an outsider’. If students like Eleanor and Scott had not yet understood the main point of the article, Randall then explains it more plainly: ‘...really this article is more a comment on anthropology and about observing cultures...’. ‘Aha...I see’ says Scott, ‘more of a philosophical standpoint on anthropology?’ Randall agrees and goes on to explain the main reason that the Instructors used the article for this activity at this moment during the programme:
—Eleanor, I think the points that you are making are really valid...about not just coming in to a place for a day and making assumptions... but really trying to take time... ask a lot of questions... delay judgement... does that apply to our situation at all? We pass through places very...very, very quickly... we spend a day... we spend a day in every single place... so maybe a lesson that we can take from that is that a lot of assumptions and conclusions can be jumped to very quickly without having spent a whole of time in a place.

Here, Randall is verbalising the Instructors’ intention to, as I discussed earlier, encourage the students to suspend judgement about what they are witnessing in Nación Apu, a potentially transformative pedagogy of suspension according to Gunnlaugson et al (2005).

6.8.5. Challenging Problematic Discourses

Ava then points out the cultural baggage that the BB group members bring with them crossing from one cultural space into another, though also once again invoking the “poor but happy” discourse:

—But also...we already come here with specific biases from how we have lived our lives already... people here...they’re happy with what they have... but to us it’s so little...and so...frugal... I guess you could call it...that it just doesn’t seem how they could actually be happy.

This time the Instructors do challenge this logic: ‘Are they entirely happy with what they have?’ questions Randall, to which Ava shrugs her shoulders and says ‘don’t know’, thus immediately contradicting the claim she has just made – a realisation that, judging by her facial expression, then seems to dawn on her. Scott then comments on this question, also apparently changing his earlier thoughts in Nación Apu when he observed that the people were happy: ‘I know you were just posing the question “are they happy?” Truly I don’t know’.

Frida steps in, perhaps picking up on the perspective changes that appear to be taking place, asking students if they have seen anything
that is ‘...a surprise to our cultural sensibility... Something that perhaps shocks us a little bit?’ Ava answers that standards of cleanliness are different and Noah points out that the diet of potatoes has surprised him and shocked him, as has the way ‘they treat animals almost as pests’. Nathaniel then contributes:

—The age roles... in my first host family the father just talked to us the whole time while the kids were cooking... one of them was six years old and the other one was 13 that’s a very large amount of independence.

Scott adds to this:

—Our host father has a one-month-old son and he just hands it to his four-year-old to hold and take care of [...]it just really blew my mind... I was just shocked...completely by it... it just shows how conditioned we are about certain things we can do at an age.

Ethan picks up on these themes:

—If you live in the asshole of the world so to speak...you’re either serving a purpose or you’re taking up space and resources... it’s something you can only completely understand if you live this life for more than three days... I can’t imagine living this life for more than a week... I’m dead serious... it’s a really rough life...and I’m a pampered kid.

‘It really does give you a lot of respect and gratitude for what you have at home’ adds Ava, and Scott shares a view on this:

—What we think of as poverty in the states [...] they [pointing to the Nación Apu community members] don’t even view this as impoverished...I mean we do.

Frida queries Scott’s claim – ‘Do you think that they don’t view this as impoverished?’ – and the student struggles to muster a reply that is coherent with his claim:
—I don’t know about THEM as a community... and what I mean by that is... yeh you know... I don’t know that answer... if they view it as such... but they are living this way as a choice though.

Ethan disagrees with part of Scott’s comments:

—I’m not sure if I personally see it as impoverished... they have one of the best families I’ve ever seen... as an entire community... the way they support each other... its really admirable.

Noah agrees:

—It’s shocking just how much they really appreciate each other... when you’re in a big city like New York or LA you can walk by someone that has a pretty close personal connection to you, yet you don’t even acknowledge them... you just walk by them and you don’t even care about their lives.

Having listened to the students’ replies, Frida begins closing the session by explaining more about the article:

—The article mentions Malinowski...a very well-known and well respected anthropologist... he came up with a term that revolutionised the field of anthropology and the way anthropologists perceive their relationship with the places they do research... this concept is called cultural relativism... we can’t understand a different place or a different community without looking at it through our own cultural lens...so our life experiences...and our upbringing...and our culture...and the communities we live in create the lens through which we perceive the world and the only way we are able to understand...or evaluate...or question something new is through the lens with which we grew up in... I think if there’s one thing that maybe we could take away from these kind of experiences is maybe trying to look at our own culture through a different lens and see if it brings us new learnings and questions about where we come from... and I think that’s the beauty of travel... that we get to grasp these little pieces of the places we visit and bring them home with us.

Scott adds a more personal dimension to Frida’s suggestion:
For me...I’ll speak for myself...travelling and experiencing these cultures it’s more for a personal journey... it’s more of what you can learn and teach yourself... live the life that you wanna lead through what you’ve experienced... it’s okay to be selfish...in that way... there’s appropriate times to be selfish.

Randall builds on Scott’s comments by describing the John Muir quote that I discussed in the previous chapter: ‘...it’s basically talking about how he went out travelling in order to go inside himself and know himself better’. Randall then sets a piece of home(stay) work:

—There’s a little follow-up journal prompt that I want to give you guys... I know there’s loads of stuff that’s been going through your minds...so get down a lot of this stuff... the specific prompt that we wanted to give you guys is...the same sort of exercise of flipping your lens and basically write an observation of...yourself as...one of your hosts in these places...you have this guest coming...this young BB student...and just write a little about that...your observations of what they do...the things they bring... just try to inhabit that perspective and write a little bit about that...I’ll look forward to hearing some of those probably tomorrow or tomorrow evening when we are all together in Quico Grande.

6.8.6. Journaling and Journeying

Despite the excitement generated during the Nacirema activity, none of the students followed the journal prompt given by Instructors. I was surprised at this. Observing the activity, it felt like it was a watershed moment for several students. I suspect that there are various reasons for this; for example, some students appeared slightly embarrassed at not having figured out the article’s twist before being told. As Scott said to Frida when the group were dispersing and chatting after the activity:

—When I read this [the Nacirema article] for the first time it went way over my head... I did not get it at all.

Another possible explanation is that many students were realising that Randall’s follow up on the journal activity was unlikely to happen
because the pace of the programme so far had meant that many planned activities had been omitted for lack of time. Indeed, the Nacirema journal prompt activity was not followed up and never mentioned again during the programme. This was a lost opportunity to develop some of the potentially transformative processes that had been set in motion.

However, some students, such as Harrison, did write in his journal after the Nacirema activity, suggesting that he was having a transformative experience in Nación Apu:

> This experience has changed the way I perceive culture and has embedded a new aspect of culture when it comes to my global perspective... my perspective has been revolutionised by this experience... my whole perspective of encountering cultures has shifted... the way I perceive culture... my process of perceiving culture has shifted...forever.

Although Harrison did not actually write specifically about the Nacirema activity, I suspect that it helped to trigger and crystallise aspects of his perspective change, not least by providing the vocabulary of cultural lenses with which to see it. The suggestions of perspective change also emerged during the final reflective discussion about Nación Apu on the last day of the visit in Quico Grande.

### 6.9. Wrapping It Up: The Sleeping Bag Debrief

After our stay in Quico Chico, we make a final trek to the last community to host us, Quico Grande. On arriving, we settle in, make a brief visit to meet children in the community school, and then set about organising a much-anticipated football match against the Nación Apu team. The match is scheduled for later in the afternoon but in the meantime, the Instructors wish to fit in a debriefing discussion about our time in Nación
Apu to begin reflecting on it more deeply. We gather together in a cold, empty room, sitting around the edges of the floor in our sleeping bags.

6.9.1. Preparing to Transfer Power or Tightening the Hold?

Owen starts the session, telling everyone:

—This session is for us to reflect a bit on the adventures of the last few days... firstly we'd like to acknowledge that you guys have done a hell of a lot... even though BB is a rugged travel programme I doubt there are that many other programs out there... even with BB... where students are put through quite so much in the first two weeks... so we acknowledge that and we're really impressed with how well you guys have dealt with it... it was deliberately challenging... we talked about the whole comfort zone/panic zone thing... hopefully not too many of you were in the panic zone for too long but if you were on the edge... that kind of was deliberate and we're not going to apologise for that... that was kind of the idea.

Some of the student’s chuckle, almost it seems to me, out of relief at Owen’s acknowledgement and the implicit suggestion that the rest of the programme would not be quite so demanding. Scott responds:

—We talked about this... that you guys threw us into this... to try to test how we would react.

‘Well... yeaah’ replies Owen, somewhat reservedly, but under pressure from the students who agree with Scott in unison. Hearing Owen and Scott’s comments, it occurs to me that the Instructors use of a strategy of shock and awe also served an alternative purpose to that of shaking up the students and priming them for a transformative learning process, and I am reminded of a quote in the Educators Resource. The ‘Getting Students Attention’ section of the Resource opens with the following quote from an ex-Instructor:
I love guiding in developing countries, because unlike guiding in places like Australia and New Zealand, students who travel to developing countries are scared shitless, and they respect their Instructors because they know that they have to rely on them to keep things cool.

- Michael Carling, BB Instructor 2003-04

The logic being promoted here is of a disciplinary nature – of controlling students and maintaining Instructors’ authority. This functions to create a dependency on Instructors. Although this does not necessarily contradict BB’s Freirean philosophy of empowering students to take more power and control over the course of the programme, it sits uncomfortably alongside this aim. In the meantime, Owen swiftly moves the discussion on, focusing on how quickly the group have moved through Nación Apu and how they need to slow down now to reflect:

—A danger of doing so much in such a short period of time is that you quite quickly forget about things... it’s too overwhelming and so it kind of... falls out... so the idea of this is that we spend a bit of time reflecting and remembering what it was we actually did.

Owen invites students to share thoughts about their experience in Nación Apu and Eleanor answers, saying:

—People [in Nación Apu] know they don’t have that much [...] but I was wondering what you all thought about expanding it to not just material goods... like knowledge and in some ways, a broader knowledge of maybe just simple things but also... the world and different parts of that and I was wondering what you all thought about that.

Madeleine responds to Eleanor’s prompt:

—Well I was kind of thinking about that... just like how it’s different kinds of knowledge... like I could never gut a sheep but I could analyse Shakespeare... you know... stuff like that is just really crazy and really different.
Patrick then speaks, building on Madeleine’s comment:

—For real... it’s definitely a different kind of knowledge that they’re...that we in our separate communities I think are better off for...separately.

Through this reflective discussion on their experience in Nación Apu, the students appear to have begun to acknowledge the possibility of different kinds of knowledge. This is a potentially transformative learning moment, though it remains to be seen what and how students continue to learn about epistemological pluralism throughout the rest of the course. What also emerges from Patrick’s comments, however, is the idea of separating and segregating different kinds of knowledge and knowledge production into different spaces. This is a broader theme emerging from the Nación Apu pedagogic space and I discuss it more in the conclusion.

6.10. Conclusion

The main points I have made in this chapter have been attached to two main threads of argument that answer the pertinent secondary research question: What is the process, and content, of teaching and learning in a transformative pedagogic space? In the case of Nación Apu, I found that the process and content of teaching and learning in a transformative pedagogic space was both (1) transformative, and (2) reproductive, in different ways and at different times, in different spaces. I will now briefly recap the main points made in each of these two threads before synthesising them into a conclusion to the chapter.
6.10.1. The Explicit Pedagogy: A Pedagogy of Distance and Difference

The Instructors’ choice to go to Nación Apu in the second week of the programme, and the way the visit was introduced and framed to students, can be described a strategy of shock and awe within a pedagogy of difference and distance. This was an explicit pedagogic strategy in that it is consistent with BB’s instructional pedagogic discourse (Bernstein, 1994), and that the Instructors were open with me and the students about their intention to start the course with a “wake-up call”. The visit to Nación Apu was intended to cause a disorienting dilemma for students because the independent nation is geographically and culturally distant from the BB group, and a radically different environment from anything the students have experienced before.

6.10.2. (Unintended) Reproductive Functions

The strategy of shock and awe did indeed disorient students. However it caused them to use a coping strategy that involved thinking, speaking, and singing and rapping about familiar pop cultural products from the US. This practice was discouraged by Instructors who felt it would constrain the transformative potential of the pedagogic space because it allowed students to disconnect from their immediate environment – the learning zone – and return too easily to a familiar comfort zone.

Students found it particularly difficult to deal with the material and extra-material inequalities they perceived between their own lives and the lives of their hosts in the independent nation. I argued that, initially, the disorientation produced by this pedagogy of distance and difference was manifested in the reproduction of various problematic discourses that are, according to various commentators, common features of cross-cultural interactions, not least during gap year education programs. Many students were quick to jump to the conclusion that Nación Apu community members are “poor but happy” and not only appeared to equate material poverty with emotional and spiritual enrichment, but
also with extra-material poverty that was construed as a knowledge deficit.

Moreover, while students showed some evidence of reflecting on their privilege – which is an important stage of Curry-Stevens’ model for the transformation of privileged learners – this was mostly expressed, at least initially, in the form of pity for the Apu people and gratitude for what they (students) “have”. Many of the students used a Lotto logic to understand and justify these inequalities as the randomly distributed results of a cosmic roulette wheel; there was little to no attempt by any of the students or the Instructors to challenge this logic or begin to explore the structural, systemic relations of power that (re)produce poverty and inequality, nor indeed any sign that the students wanted to do anything about addressing the inequalities they perceived. I argued that this absence of motivation for action, or even critical interrogation into power structures was due in part to the Programme Director’s desire to remain neutral. However, I also argued that this “neutrality” was perhaps unsurprising given the structural contradiction that lies at the heart of BB’s endeavour: a Freirean pedagogic framework applied to the context of a gap year education program for privileged students.

Even more fundamentally, in addition to the substitution of simplistic frameworks for sophisticated frameworks in the understanding of perceived inequalities in Nación Apu, many students initially demonstrated problematic and simplistic understandings of Nación Apu communities as “simple” people. While some students celebrated and romanticised the supposed simplicity of life in Nación Apu, others complained about it being “primitive”. Furthermore, these comparisons were often framed within a “them” and “us” discourse that focused on the differences rather than the similarities between the BB group and the Nación Apu communities and, like the discourses described above, have been identified as frameworks that are commonly used by gap year participants to understand cross-cultural encounters. I also showed that what also emerged from the data was a propensity for students to equate “us” with the US and “them” with not only the entirety of the independent nation, but sometimes Peruvians, and even, in one case,
all Latin Americans. Yet, these instances of the unintended reproductive functions of the process and content of teaching and learning in Nación Apu do not tell the full story.

6.10.3. (Intended) Transformative Functions

Despite the reproduction of problematic and simplistic discourses and frameworks in Nación Apu, I argued that these reproductive functions of a supposedly transformative pedagogic space were also accompanied by some evidence of transformative teaching and learning. I showed for instance that while many students were simplifying the “objects” of their white Western gaze (the Apu people) they were also examining their own lives, ways of being, and identities with increasing complexity and sophistication. While this focus on the self does mirror the focus on individual, personal change rather than social and political change that I observed and critiqued in the previous chapter, it also included the beginnings of some critical reflexivity regarding students’ relationships to others and their own privilege. I also cautioned, however, that the potentially transformative process of students wrestling with difficult questions and contradictions involved volatile emotions such as guilt which, as Curry-Stevens argues, can easily become counter-productive if not managed intentionally and skilfully by educators; I suggested that this deft management was somewhat lacking in Nación Apu.

However, I also demonstrated that although Instructors did not explicitly engage students in carefully scaffolded investigations into power, privilege, and position ability in relation to the experiences they were having in Nación Apu, they did respond towards the end of the visit to some of the problematic discourses that were being reproduced by students. I discussed how the Instructors used Horace Miner’s Nacirema article to not only introduce the concept of cultural lenses, and critiques of classical anthropological approaches to observing, interpreting, and understanding the other, but also to try and shock the students into reconsidering how they were viewing their own experiences in Nación Apu, and how they were viewing the Apu people. This activity revealed
some of the complicated learning processes that students were experiencing as they attempted to reconcile the cognitive dissonance produced by the clash of their previous experience and previously held views with sudden exposure to a new experience and new perspectives. These processes were arguably transformative for some students who described “revolutionised” perspective change and showed evidence, at the end of the visit to Nación Apu, of beginning to critically question and challenge the very nature of knowledge and knowledge production while beginning to acknowledge the value of different knowledges, as opposed to assuming the superiority of their own knowledge system and perceiving different knowledges as a deficit within that system.

6.10.4. The Tacit Pedagogy: A Pedagogy of Pure Cross-Cultural Capital (CCC) Accumulation

In addition to arguing throughout this chapter that the explicit pedagogy of distance and difference used in Nación Apu produced both transformative and reproductive processes and content of teaching and learning, I also began to argue that the rationale underpinning this pedagogic strategy started to reveal a less visible, implicit pedagogy. This, I argued, was the hidden curriculum driving the group’s desire to travel as far as possible from their comfort zones to “remote”, hard to reach, rural places through rugged travel.

Picking up from my discussion of CCC in the previous chapter, I argue that the reproductive function of the pedagogy of distance and difference was to accumulate a rare form of CCC. This form is particularly valuable precisely due to the distance one must travel to gain it. Its uniqueness distinguishes it from other forms of CCC. This is a form of first-hand cross-cultural experience which increases in value the further one’s travel experience is from one’s normal everyday experience. This experience is converted into knowledge which further increases in value when one transfers it across the border from the “travelling” cultural context to the “home” cultural context in which it is “cashed in” in return for increased privilege and advantages, thus reproducing social
inequalities. Indeed, it can be argued, with some qualification, that the further afield one travels (geographically, culturally, and socially), the more CCC is gained in one’s social field.

Moreover, this (Traveller) CCC also increases students’ standing in white middle-class sociocultural contexts by enhancing their Global Citizens’ CV’s. The students become well-travelled, world-wise (and street-wise), open-minded, brave, border-crossing explorers with the all-important personal experience to back up their knowledge of the distant Other. The value of this cultural currency also lies in the exciting, sexy, personal transformations that students have surely undergone through their adventures in rugged travelling, not tourism, which add more allure to the glossy, cross-cultural gleam of the Global Citizen’s Curriculum Vitae.

The fact that this ‘transformative’ traveller-exclusive CCC is accumulated within the curriculum of a semi-formal education programme (in the sense that BB programmes have some affiliation with formal education institutions in the US), as opposed to, say, through travelling outside the boundaries of this type of pedagogic space, is the final distinction that separates this from the cross cultural capital accumulated by not only tourists, but even those travellers who do not travel as part of a BB programme.

The allure of Nación Apu as a distant and different place that only the hardiest people ‘with more energy and vigour’ can reach appeals to the BB group’s desire to be travellers not tourists. That the independent nation even escaped the reach of the conquistadors is more reason for the BB group to conquer this challenge on their itinerary, not only to prove their explorer credentials but also to tap into a cultural space that is apparently, almost untouched the Peruvian state, let alone broader Western influences. I argued that not only is Nación Apu seen as a distant and different place, it is also presented to students as a pure place, if not entirely untouched, and therefore uncontaminated, by Western influence then entirely untouched by any Western travellers, let alone tourists, aside from past BB groups who are exclusive members
of the BB club. This makes the CCC accumulated in Nación Apu extremely rare and therefore extremely valuable.

Thus, in this case the central contradiction that pulls taught the tension between the transformative and reproductive functions of the BB programme is the following. Precisely by creating a transformative pedagogic space such as the BB group’s visit to Nación Apu to try (at least ostensibly) and begin unravelling students’ enmeshment in the trappings of capitalist culture, the students are not only trapped in reproducing the inequalities of that culture but also widening them by furthering their own privilege through the accumulation of a rare and highly sought-after type of CCC.
Chapter 7

The Mountain that Eats Women

7.1. Introduction

In this chapter I analyse what happens when, following a temporary group split, six of the seventeen BB group members (myself included) comprise a subgroup that go on an organised tour of ‘Cerro Rico’ (Rich Mountain), a working mine in Potosi, Bolivia. Rich Mountain is notoriously nicknamed ‘The Mountain That Eats Men’ in reference to millions of miners – many of whom were slaves of Spanish colonialists – that have perished extracting silver from its depths since the 1500s. The Instructors’ main motivation for taking students down into the mine is to better understand Bolivia’s colonial and industrial history and link this to contemporary debates in Bolivia on child labour, environmental protection and development.

The chapter focuses on how the teaching and learning environment influences what is taught and learned in it. In chapter 3, I described pedagogic space as having a character, thus drawing attention to the human, and extra-human, qualities of a space, and their interaction. Space, then, is alive and intimately connected with time (Massey, 1994), building on Massey’s conceptualisation of space as – like the dynamic happening of time - a ‘process’ (Massey, 1991). With this understanding of space, I concentrate in this chapter mainly on answering the following secondary research question: how does the character of a transformative pedagogic space shape what happens in it?
The subgroup’s time in Potosi is oriented around the mine tour, but this main event is scaffolded by related pedagogic activities that happen before and after. These not only frame and give structure to the transformative pedagogic space, but also constitute part of it. I therefore include the activities in this chapter’s analysis. In fact, the reflective discussion about the mine tour that happened in the subgroup’s hostel room shortly afterwards, arguably becomes the “main event” of this chapter.

To contextualise the character of the transformative pedagogic space, this chapter begins by setting the scene through an analysis of significant incidents that occurred in the days immediately preceding the main event. This embeds the space in close, intimate relation to what is happening within the BB group at this stage in time and space, differing slightly from scene-setting discussions in previous chapters that have concentrated more on locating pedagogic spaces within the context of the entire BB programme and the broader landscape it is situated in. Moreover, while providing valuable background information this closer contextualisation also foregrounds the notion – outlined in Chapter 3 – that the boundaries of a pedagogic space are porous; the characteristics of one space bleed easily into another.

The notable background incidents I highlight are directly relevant to my analysis of the transformative pedagogic space, in which I focus on its gendered character. For instance, the week-long group split triggered on arrival in Potosi – whereby eleven BB group members, including all but one of the women, have decided to go trekking elsewhere in Bolivia instead – creates a mine tour subgroup with a very differently-gendered composition. Eleanor becomes the lone woman among Randall (Instructor), Ethan, Jay, Scott and I. Additionally, the split is immediately preceded by an incident in which Instructors are upset by witnessing a group of male students listening to rap music with misogynistic lyrics. These incidents raise various issues for analysis but for the purposes of maintaining coherence, clarity, and rigour within the scope and word constraints of this chapter, I focus on those issues relating to gender power relations. These relations are, in turn, entwined
in students’ and Instructors’ perceptions and representations of “the Other” which I began to unravel in the previous two chapters – in this case, the gendered Other.

Many points I make in this chapter are oriented around the unintended pedagogic consequences that unfolded during the reflective discussion. I argue that the gendered character of the almost exclusively male-inhabited pedagogic space – both in the mine and in the hostel room – contributed to shaping both socially reproductive and transformative teaching and learning in relation to gender issues of misogyny, homophobia, and sexual identity. This reflective discussion was the only instance I witnessed, throughout the programme, of students and/or Instructors engaging in a (relatively) critical and explicitly articulated conversation about social power relations. Yet, the gendered character of this engagement was unintended and unanticipated by Instructors, and was also a surprise to the students and I.

What also emerges from the data is how the discursive practices (or more specifically the behaviour and dialogue) of the subgroup change when transitioning between different types of space; for example, in the transition between “insider” subgroup-only private spaces and the less tightly-contained semi-public spaces the group temporarily inhabits with “outsider-Others” (tourists, guides, and miners). Analysing these transitions, I focus this chapter’s attention to gender power relations through the conceptual lens of “space” (and by inseparable association, “time”) I have used throughout this thesis. My analysis shows how the discursive practices of the BB group change between these spaces and how the content and process of teaching and learning changes with them.

I conclude the chapter by synthesising the main points just outlined to explain how they feed into one of the main veins of argument that runs through this thesis. Namely, following on from the previous chapters I explain in more detail how the content and process of teaching and learning in transformative pedagogic spaces is also a process of accumulating a particularly valuable form of “pure” cross-cultural
capital. Not unlike mining for silver, this accumulation process extracts, refines, packages, transports, and “cashes-in-on” a sought-after commodity. In the case of the BB programme, this commodity comes in the form of “worldly” cross-cultural knowledge, a particular form of knowledge possessed by an exclusively selective group of supposedly “global citizens” and legitimised by personal experience. The accumulation process is, then, also a form of knowledge production.

7.2. Unsettling Sediment and Sentiment: The Build-Up to the Mine Tour

In a cavalcade of 4x4 vehicles, we speed across 35,000-year-old layers of saline sediment on the southern Bolivian altiplano (high plateau), drawing closer to the small town of Uyuni where we will board a bus to Potosi. Having spent three days touring the Salar de Uyuni, the biggest salt flat in the world, much of the time sitting in the confined spaces of the 4x4s, a sense of exhaustion, cabin-fever and crankiness has descended over the group. There is also a tension in the air about incidents that have very recently occurred.

7.2.1. Patriarchy with a Pinch of Salt

On the Salar – a vast (4,086 square-mile) pancake-flat expanse of shimmering white – tempers were at times frayed as we spent hours driving under the blazing sun. At one point Frida and Randall were perturbed after we stopped for a break and most of the male students congregated around one of the jeeps, turned the stereo up to maximum volume and began singing and dancing to music – such as Kanye West’s ‘Hold My Liquor’ – with lyrics that critics (e.g. see Bailey, 2015) have condemned as misogynistic:
Bitch I’m back out my coma
Waking up on your sofa
One more hit and I can own ya
One more fuck and I can own ya

During the brief respite from being in the vehicles, Frida and Randall had started doing some yoga together on the Salar. Looking on from a few metres behind, and making implicitly sexual connotations about the Instructors’ yoga positions, Jay watches Randall and jokingly says to the other male students:

—Ooh...he’s getting empowered!

Ethan replies – ‘dude I feel like this isn’t the right soundtrack for that’ – and reaches to change tracks, choosing ‘Pussy, Money, Weed’ by ‘A$AP Rocky’:

Two blonde dykes wanna kiss all night
Fuck a dog ho’ [‘ho’ means ‘whore’] and the bitch gon’ bite
Hoes all in my jock strap
And my bitch white, but my cock black
Tell her pop that pussy like it’s worth somethin’
Cause I’m in love with that ass, she in love with the cash
And I’m takin’ it back and I’m takin’ her back
To the house just to bust in her mouth and I’m kickin’ her out.

The music being played by the students had gradually become edgier and louder, pushing the boundaries of acceptability in the BB group space. Perhaps sensing this, Ethan lowered the volume during parts of the song that, I suspect, he thought might be perceived as particularly offensive. Nonetheless, Frida and Randall had heard enough to be bothered. The Instructors did not say anything to the students about the music, but it became the topic of conversation when Randall, Frida, Eleanor, Sergio and I re-boarded our 4x4 to continue the journey. Yet, although the Instructors were disturbed by the student’s music selection, the discussion quickly shifted to a broader critique of the rap genre, Randall lamenting that:
—It’s just like...seriously? [i.e. are they seriously speaking about women in that dehumanising way?] It’s just the whole culture.

Without delving too far into the well-documented debates around gender politics and hip-hop music (e.g. see Bailey, 2015; Rebollo-Gil and Moras, 2012) I note the rapid shift of focus to the Instructors’ ire: it has moved from the male students’ choice of rap artists and tracks to a sweeping critique of the ‘whole culture’ surrounding entire musical genres. Although it can be argued that misogyny is common in some forms of rap and hip-hop – musical genres and subcultures that, in the US at least, are mostly populated by, and associated with, Black men – Randall’s extrapolation arguably risks reproducing problematic tropes and simplistic ways of interpreting and representing. Aside from the far less commonly heard critique that misogyny can easily be found in, say, the cultural products of White men, critics of rap and hip-hop often imply connections between sexism and supposedly broader, Black cultural, ethnic, and racial traits. I am not claiming that Randall was doing this, intentionally and/or consciously, but the framing of his comment and the subsequent discussion certainly did not challenge this problematic insinuation, something one might expect on a transformative education programme influenced by Freirean critical pedagogy.

Furthermore, by focusing on the ‘producer end’ of the producer-consumer supply chain in the rap and hip-hop music market, the framing of the conversation diverts attention away from the male students as consumers of misogynistic cultural products. This also skirts around, rather than engages with, difficult questions regarding the reproduction of violent, sexist discourses on the Salar. Far from steering students into the (potentially transformative) learning zone, this enables them to sit in the comfort zone, safe in their 4x4s from uncomfortable challenges to not only their musical tastes, but their value systems and habitus (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990).

Having already chosen not to question the students’ music selections at the time – thus being consistent with the strategy of trying to maintain
a politically “neutral” pedagogy, as discussed in previous chapters – the diverted discussion also enables Instructors to avoid talking about their decision. Moreover, they also avoid – intentionally and/or consciously or otherwise – having to decide whether they should initiate a potentially difficult, complicated, and confrontational discussion with the male students in future. Thus, the Instructors’ decision – or ‘non-decision’ as some theorists of power would describe it (e.g. Lukes, 2005) – also enables them, like the students, to sit back in the comfort zone.

The programme’s overarching pedagogic imperative to avoid the comfort zone as much as possible is, then – as I began discussing in the previous two chapters – not being implemented consistently with regard to all aspects of the programme. Rather, it is being applied selectively to certain aspects – including for example, some physical, cultural, and emotional dimensions of the experience – but not being applied to the political dimension of the programme pedagogy. Instead, in the interest of political neutrality, Instructors are holding back from expressing their points of view to avoid influencing students’ perceptions. As I argued in previous chapters, this is an illusion that is antithetical to BB’s Freirean ethos.

But if this pedagogy of conflict avoidance, or more specifically ‘political-difference avoidance’, has been characteristic of the programme, the generalisation in Randall’s comments is uncharacteristic. There are various possible explanations for this anomaly, including how aspects of the character of the space may have influenced the framing of the comments and the discussion. For example, the forward-facing seating arrangements made it difficult to have a detailed conversation, particularly with the noise of the moving vehicle – not to mention the heat, cramped conditions, and general weariness of the passengers.
7.3. The Devil at the Door: First Impressions of the Mountain that Eats Men

As we arrived in Uyuni and transferred quickly onto the bus to Potosi, I could have sliced through the atmosphere with the machete protruding from Jay’s backpack (a souvenir from our visit to the Amazon a few weeks before). Instead, the group would be sliced through the middle the following day, with eleven group members travelling on to Sucre for a week-long trek, leaving six of us in Potosi to visit the mine.

Arriving at our destination – the second highest city in the world at 4,090 metres (13,420 ft.), the group mood feels considerably lower than the altitude as we clamber off the public bus onto the road at a busy junction. We hail taxis to our hostel and pull-up to the ‘Koala Den’ past midnight. As Randall wearily disputes the taxi fare with the driver, the group shuffles and scrapes through the hostel’s narrow entrance way carrying backpacks, group camping gear, and half-empty travel snack bags. According to our group’s Lonely Planet guidebook (Benchwick and Smith, 2013), the ‘colorful and clean’ Koala Den (or ‘Koala’ for those on first-name terms) is recommended as:

a favourite for its traveler-friendly facilities and backpacker-social vibe. The dorms and rooms are cozy, with bedspreads that have designs ranging from Dr Seuss to Garfield. Amenities include a kitchen, a TV room with a DVD collection, book exchange, free internet access, 24-hour hot showers, heating from 6pm, and a pleasant lounge area (214).

This does not sound like the kind of uncomfortable environment that should attract our group of rugged travellers, but we are exhausted and the comfort zone sounds appealing at this moment in time. We enter the lounge area, a brightly-painted orange and purple courtyard. It certainly seems to be a popular spot for backpackers, and appears to be a meeting point for agency-organised tours to the Cerro Rico mines; a five-foot high advertisement, in English, proclaims:
The Best Mine Tour with Koala Tours...Highly recommended by the guidebooks.

More text promoting the tour is overlaid onto a Disney-fied cartoon drawing of a group of implausibly bare-chested and pale-skinned miners. Floating above them, overseeing their work, is a devil.

### 7.3.1. The Devil’s in the Detail: Stripping Out the Pre-Tour Scaffolding

The cartoonish devil – a typically Luciferian depiction of a red man with horns and a goatee – is clearly designed to be recognisable to Western travellers as a Satan figure. It is also recognisable, though, to the BB students as a reference to the ‘Tio’ (‘Uncle’ in Spanish), a devil figure who, according to miners, presides over the Rich Mountain mines. The students are aware of this reference as the Instructors have introduced, broadly, the history and cultural context of the mines to them before the group’s arrival in Potosi. Rich Mountain is regarded as centrally important to the history of Bolivia and Latin America, not to mention global capitalist expansion; and on the way to Potosi, Frida reminded the students about The Mountain That Eats Men.

— [It has] claimed the lives of over 8 million miners...mostly indigenous and African slaves...since the Spanish began extracting...taking...silver in the sixteenth century.

Frida went on to summarise historical accounts of Potosi that describe it as a city that dropped from its heights as one of the largest and richest cities in the world during the 16th century to today being one of the poorest cities in the world, in one of the poorest countries in South America (UNICEF, 2014). This riches-to-rags story forms the historical backdrop to the group’s visit to the city, and the mine.

Today, Rich Mountain has become something of a tourist attraction in Bolivia – it was the subject of a 2014 BBC documentary ‘The Mountain
that Eats Men’ – albeit for the relatively small number of tourists (compared to neighbouring Peru, for example) that visit it within Bolivia’s nascent tourist economy and infrastructure. Now a near empty shell riddled with tunnels and holes and in danger of collapse, ‘Rich Mountain’ has become something of a symbol, for Bolivians and tourists alike, of the country’s historical oppression at the hands of colonial power (see Galeano, 1997; Strosnider et al., 2014). Yet, according to tour guides (ex-miners) I spoke to during previous visits to the mine, Rich Mountain is also, for many – including many of the miners that spend much of their relatively short lives (average 40-50 years’ life expectancy) in those tunnels – a symbol of pride, hope, and a steely resolve to forge an anti-imperialist, self-deterministic future that balances natural resource extraction and consumption with respect for Pachamama (‘Mother Earth’) whilst also warming to the economic potential of tourism.

At present, Rich Mountain continues to be mined for various resources such as tin and zinc, but also generates income through tourist tours into the mines. These tours are organised by various tour companies, reportedly in partnership (or at least with the agreement of) the miners’ union. Miners receive some material reward from tourists, although it is unclear if this is anything more than the Coca leaves, cigarettes, water, and dynamite that tourists are highly recommended to bring the miners as gifts.

This contextual background to the rich mountain mines is one that Instructors planned to explore further with students by showing them a documentary film called The Devil’s Miner – as they usually do when visiting Potosí – as a preparatory activity before entering the mines. El Minero del Diablo is a documentary about a fourteen-year-old Bolivian boy and his twelve-year-old brother who work as miners in Rich Mountain. During a brief synopsis of the film on the way to Potosí, Owen explained to the group that watching and discussing it before visiting the mine helps to set the tour in socio-historical context and is a useful way to introduce some of the challenging themes and issues, such as child labour, that students are likely to encounter in Rich Mountain. This
is the Instructors main reason for including the mine visit on the programme itinerary.

However, the group’s copy of the film has gone missing since the previous semester so the activity is therefore bypassed this time. Nonetheless, Randall hopes that the students will instead have an opportunity to engage with some of the issues the film raises by doing an activity with members of a local child-led, child Labour union, as BB groups usually do in Potosi. The plan is for Eleanor, Ethan, Scott, and Jay to each spend a day working alongside a child from the union in various income-generating activities such as shoe shining, newspaper selling, and grave tending in the cemetery. But for reasons beyond Randall’s control, logistical problems mean that the students do not get to participate in the activity. This means that both context-setting pedagogic activities prior to the mine tour – that usually happen in BB programmes – have not happened this time. This is, following the group split, another significant incident that is shaping the character of the pedagogic space.

7.4. Poop scales, Pringles, and Dangerous Gasses: Gender Power Relations in the Pre-Tour Group Check-In

Following the morning’s disappointment with the child union and the departure of the trekking sub-group to Sucre, the Potosi sub-group are sitting around in a circle, on their beds, in their hostel room. We are waiting to begin a group meeting. A poster adorns the otherwise bare walls with a message that reinforces the perceived virtues and benefits of travelling: ‘Viajar es Conocer’ [To Travel is To Know].

As the other women in the BB group have gone to Sucre, Eleanor is now sharing a room with four men – Randall, Scott, Jay, and Ethan (I have a separate room to audio record the day’s observations and fieldwork notes in private). This is a doubly unusual situation in a BB programme;
it is very rare for BB groups to be this gender-imbalanced, and it is unusual for women and men to share sleeping quarters.

In this case, Eleanor has agreed to share a room with the other members of the group because the only other available bed in the hostel is in a more expensive private room and the extra cost of this room would be subtracted from the group’s overall budget, thus leaving everyone with less money for other activities. There is, therefore, a clear set of social pressures surrounding Eleanor’s agreement.

7.4.1. Machetes and Macho Posturing: Male Students Marking the Space

As we are about to begin the meeting Jay starts waving his machete around casually in the air, seemingly obliviously, and says: ‘I have a lethal weapon in my room right now’.

Scott responds, alluding to the classically masculine image of a rugged adventurer-traveller, represented in US pop culture by the likes of Indiana Jones, Crocodile Dundee, and Bear Grylls, though with historical antecedents in the colonial exploits of Christopher Columbus, Marco Polo and others:

—You should get a picture biting it...holding it in your mouth.

It is becoming apparent that although there is a woman staying with the men, it is already starting to be tacitly demarcated as the men’s room, a male space. The male students’ comments are playful but nevertheless invoke – inside a protective layer of sarcasm – the signs and symbols of a deeply entrenched, highly gendered hetero-normative discourse. This is a narrative that poses daring, fearless, adventurer-travellers invariably as men; it is not far-fetched to suggest that the image conjured by Scott is reminiscent of an “alpha male” hunter-gatherer preparing to hack his way into the wilderness. By extension, this well-trodden, outdated narrative path positions women as tame domesticated home-dwellers that need to be provided for, and
protected, by crude weapon-wielding men. While some people might be satisfied with this script, others are not; these discontents include not only women but men who, in addition to rejecting this positioning of women, object to being associated with the ‘explore and conquer’ mentality of ‘man’s dominion over nature’, where women symbolise nature and men represent culture (Ortner, 1974).

There is a power geometry (Massey, 1994) structuring and ordering this gendered symbolism. Men are explorer-travellers in this story, moving freely and extensively across space and time and gaining resources, not least knowledge – after all: ‘Viajar es Conocer’, to travel is to know. By contrast, in this spatialised framing, women are pictured as more static, their movements more contained within the “safer” boundaries of the homestead and local area. As Massey (ibid) points out, power geometry refers to (among other things) the extent to which different types of people are able or not to choose to be mobile. The concept also helps explain the connection between geographic mobility and social mobility, particularly in an era of globalisation. Kaufmann et al (2004) have described this as:

> motility...a new form of social inequality. It is related to, but not subsumed by, social or spatial mobility. Motility as it relates to goods, information and people, is differentiated in terms of access, competence and appropriation, where the local and geopolitical context is emphasized as a fundamental consideration (754).

The concept of power geometry helps to reveal that not everyone is a "global citizen" – at least not in the same way – despite the rhetoric of universal inclusiveness surrounding the term and related discourses.

So, the male students are beginning to make their mark on the space and Scott has encouraged Jay to document this manliness – albeit encoded within “innocuous” tongue-in-cheek humour – by taking a photograph as evidence of the students’ traveller credentials. If ‘to travel is to know’, the male-student travellers are subtly, and perhaps unintentionally and unconsciously, attempting to exert a degree of
control over not only what happens in the hostel room but what is known
in it, and moreover what is known about it by others at a later point in
time (i.e. by seeing the photograph). Randall is not the only one
regulating the content and process of the knowledge being produced in
this pedagogic space.

7.4.2. Checking-In and Checking-Out: Regulating Public
and Private Spaces

Randall suggests that the group do a ‘check-in’ because one hasn’t been
done for a while. Check-ins are usually done at least every 2-3 days and
involve each group member updating the others on his/her ‘happy’s and
crappy’s’ (highlights and low points of recent days) and emotional and
physical health. The latter involves describing one’s ‘ins and outs’ by
quantifying them on the water scale and ‘poop scale’; the first is a
number stating how many litres of water one has drunk (‘ins’) so far
that day, and the second is a number from 1 to 5 indicating the density
of one’s faeces (‘outs’), with diarrhoea and constipation at either
extreme of the scale.

The check-in is done ostensibly for Instructors to monitor the health and
well-being of students during the programme. However, numerous
gender theorists have written extensively on the regulative, patriarchal
discourses that exercise checks and balances on bodies of all shapes,
sizes, sexes and genders (e.g. see O’Farrell, 2000; Ussher, 2002). I
argue that the check-in is an example of regulative discourse (Bernstein,
1994) being extended from the realm of public (within the BB group)
pedagogic discourse to the more private, intimate regulation of students’
bodily functions.

With everyone sitting comfortably on their beds, Scott goes first. After
sharing his ups and downs, and ins and outs, he also says that he has
been feeling ‘super gassy’. Jay then calls on Eleanor to speak, saying
‘rockin’ Eleanor?’ and picking up his machete again, slowly slicing it back
and forth through the air. Pausing from eating a tube of Pringles crisps,
Eleanor begins to tell us that:
—My ins have been like two...and my outs have been...

At this precise moment Scott farts deliberately and loudly, stopping Eleanor in her tracks; laughing, he apologises insincerely. Eleanor, seemingly stifling a surprised smile, glances at Randall for a response, which the Instructor gives:

—That was perfectly timed with outs!

Everyone laughs, and Scott apologises to Eleanor in a somewhat insincere manner:

—Er...I didn’t mean to disrespect the way you were talking man...because that’s serious news [i.e. sarcastically describing Eleanor’s health update as important]

With the apparent complicity of the Instructor (and I, given my silence), some of the male group members are now amplifying the characterisation of the space as a men’s space; this happens through interrupting Eleanor, engaging in “typically boyish” behaviour, and even referring to Eleanor, in laddish vernacular, as a ‘man’.

When it is my turn to share my ‘happy’s and crappy’s’, my phone rings; it is TIGO (the main mobile phone service provider in Bolivia) who, I tell the others, bother me regularly with offers. Jay says:

—TI...GO the fuck away!

Everyone laughs again and he continues, waving his machete again and playfully shouting:

—Blade me bitch!

Ethan pretends to reprimand him:
—You cannot say that!

But Jay says he can, and repeats the phrase.

7.5. Descending into Darkness: The Mine Tour

The following morning, we gather for the mine tour in the hostel lounge, along with other foreigners, where the tour agency rep is waiting to chaperone us to the tour bus. As we wait for everyone to arrive, the television behind the reception desk is playing what looks like a strangely familiar, yet unfamiliar, sit-com. The students are trying to figure out what it is, and whether it is a US import like many television programmes in Latin America. Scott says:

—I think it’s like a Fresh Prince of Bel-Air thing.

He is right; it looks very much like the 1990s US comedy ‘The Fresh Prince of Bel-Air’ – starring Will Smith and focused on the daily escapades of a fictional, wealthy African-American family in Los Angeles – but almost like a Bolivian imitation of the famous show. I wonder, as we leave for the bus, if this is mainly because of the Spanish dubbing.

7.5.1. Sports-Talk, the Sundance Kid and the ‘Sexy Llama-Fuckers’: Male Tour Guides Marking Out the Space

We board the tour bus, a private minivan rather than the revamped, garishly painted ex-US school buses that service many of the public bus routes in Potosi (and throughout Bolivia). Arriving at the tour agency’s office we meet Jorge, a young man (28) from La Paz who will be the private tour guide for our BB sub-group. The other tourists are also divided into small groups and allocated different guides.
Jorge is wearing a replica Italian ‘Civil Aviation Authority’ sweatshirt, and with a red bandana around his neck looks almost like a Bolivian Butch Cassidy. Our guide hands us incongruously clean overalls, mining helmets, and steel-capped boots which we don enthusiastically, while other tourist groups do the same around us.

Jorge seems well-versed as the joke-cracking, “Top-Gun wing-man” type guide he appears to think we want and expect from him. He ushers our group into a tightly-packed unit and excitedly urges us, in well-practised English, to form a circle and stack our hands on top of one another’s in the middle. It reminds me of the “huddle” formed by athletes before basketball and football (and other team sports) contests in the US. ‘Ok chicos [guys]’ shouts Jorge:

—We count three and then...[shout] SEXY LLAMA FUCKERS...yes?

Before I know it, our hands are ascending and descending in unison; ‘3...2...1... SEXY LLAMA FUCKERS’ we shout, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, volume and tone. Feeling as confused and unsettled by Jorge’s unexpected behaviour as some of the other tourists around us seemed to be, I sense that some other members of our group are also a bit taken aback as we re-board the bus.

During the short ride Jorge makes conversation with some of the tourists at the back of the bus. Continuing his efforts to both lighten-up and sex-up a distinctly heavy, unsexy, overall-clad experience, our guide then supplements his bizarre bestial reference with an injection of more specifically-gendered horseplay. Jorge begins joking about one of the other guides (Manuel) whom he clearly knows well and is sitting at the front of the bus. Our guide shouts across the passengers, at Manuel:

—He is real miner... he has three wives and five sons... nah...he has two boys...like ladyboys... [laughs hysterically].

A couple of the passengers laugh at Jorge’s “affectionate” machismo and he continues his teasing, calling out loudly to Manuel and sniggering:
—His name is not Manuel...its Manuela.

After this light-hearted attempt to publicly “emasculate” his friend, Jorge then reaches out and prods one of the women passengers, asking where she is from. The woman answers ‘Michigan’ and Jorge replies, loudly asserting his masculine heterosexuality but seeming almost bored of his own caricatured response:

—Ah...Michigan... beautiful girls in Michigan eh... sexy.

**7.5.2. Chicos, Chickens and Chicks: Students’ Different Tolerances to Sexism**

Arriving at our destination, Jorge stands up and calls out loudly:

—Okay my group...let’s go chicos... it’s the best of the best group...sexy llama fuckers... [gestures to go with him]...chicken fuckers [referring to the other group] stay here.

Eleanor is visibly unimpressed with Jorge’s antics and Ethan empathises with her:

—Yeah...I don’t like that anymore.

Scott turns to Ethan and says:

—I’m kinda okay with it actually.

Eleanor retorts:

—Of course you are!
And Ethan again supports her:

—Yeah dude...I’m not surprised at all.

Eleanor and Ethan are referring to Scott’s own machismo which has been on display, albeit with less explicit vulgarity then Jorge’s, at times during the programme. For instance, some weeks beforehand Eleanor explained to Scott that she spells ‘woman’ as ‘womyn’ to challenge why ‘woman should have “man” in it’.

Scott replied sincerely:

—Ah yeah...I remember some chicks at my college that did that too.

Seemingly unaware of the irony in his response, Scott’s apparent obliviousness to the symbolic violence imbued in this zoomorphic term for describing women highlight the different students’ sensibilities to normalised (and thus relatively subtle) manifestations of gender power dynamics in everyday language. Indeed, this and other similar terms were used regularly by male students throughout the programme, as they are more widely in popular parlance in the US and beyond. Though quite possibly used with innocuous intent, numerous scholars have argued that terms like ‘chick’ and ‘bird’ (the UK equivalent) are far from harmless as they function precisely to try and render women harmless (non-threatening) to men’s positions of power (e.g. see Adams and Donovan, 1995; Holmes and Meyerhoff, 2008). More specifically, terms like this function to dehumanise, demote, and infantilise – portraying women as cute and easily-controllable “pet-like” playthings for men (e.g. see Baker, 1975; Fontecha and Jiménez Catalán, 2003). Like the cages that contain chicks and birds in domestic settings, these terms are part of a regulative discourse that seeks to domesticate and contain women.

But without continuing too far into a discourse analysis of the sexist, symbolic violence reproduced through the discourses discussed above, suffice it to say that the difference of opinion between the students on
the tour bus begins to reveal the very different thresholds that each student has for tolerating machismo. Yet it also demonstrates how their relationships to macho discourses, or at least the performance of those relationships, have altered between the hostel room and the tour bus. Whereas no objection was raised by any group members, including Randall and I, to the subtly (or not so subtly in the case of Scott’s flatulence) gendered discourses on display in the hostel room, some group members are beginning to raise objections to the displays of explicit, sexualised, patriarchy being publicly performed by Jorge. As this chapter progresses, I will begin to explain this.

7.5.3. Freddie Mercury and Mother Earth: Homophobia and Mixed Feminisations

After alighting from the bus, with Jorge and Manuel shouting ‘sex machine...sex machine’ at each other across the road, we enter a small storage room containing various supplies of mine tour equipment (explosives, helmets, torches, batteries etc.), packets of toilet paper, a pile of board games (e.g. monopoly), and some plastic figurines of different spiritual deities (e.g. Geisha, and ‘Tio’ – the devil who presides over the mines). The room is decorated with posters of scantily-clad women, US fighter jets, and the local football team. Jorge calls our attention:

—Alright Chicos who is the manager in your group? Her?

Our guide looks disbelievingly at Eleanor and asks her to flex her biceps, which he then squeezes to mockingly test if she is physically strong enough to be the manager. Jorge then briefs us on the tour, switching from flagrant sexism to erudite, sincere, sensitively-shared information and advice about the mines and miners. Perhaps wanting to connect with our group by finding cultural common ground, Jorge’s delivery is sprinkled with “fun-facts” about the US Western (film) Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid (1969) which is set in Bolivia.
After demonstrating how to assemble a stick of dynamite and playfully looping it around Ethan’s head, feigning to light it, Jorge then produces a clear plastic bottle of what looks like cleaning fluid and passes it around for everyone to sniff. He pours himself a capful, declaring triumphantly:

—Alcohol...96 percent pure alcohol...whisky Boliviano.

Clearly wanting us to witness his pride over the purity of the alcohol – and perhaps a connection between this purity of spirit and the national spirit, so to speak, of his homeland – Jorge also boasts his manly credentials when Ethan asks him incredulously if he drinks it:

—Yes my friend...and it’s like beer for me...like monkey pee... it’s good... the miners...if they want good silver in the mines [...] they have to give to the Mother Earth pure alcohol.

Pouring some alcohol on the ground for Pachamama (Mother Earth) in the customary Bolivian manner, Jorge points at Jay, asking his name and then continuing:

Jay...for example...he doesn’t want to drink pure alcohol? Then he’s gay for the miners...like Ricky Martin or Freddie Mercury!

Some of our group reluctantly respond to this comment with polite chuckles. They once again look slightly baffled, perhaps not only with Jorge’s regular use of scattergun homophobia but also with the apparent tensions and inconsistencies in the differently feminised characterisations of planet Earth and male homosexual popstars he deploys; whereas Earth is a powerful, revered mother who can handle her hard liquor, the popstars cannot stomach the strong Bolivian whisky because they are the kind of effeminate ‘ladyboys’ Jorge poked-fun at Manuel(a) for fathering.
Jorge raises his capful of alcohol, says ‘cheers’ in Quechua and performs a singing-drinking ritual in Spanish before downing the liquid. He then offers me a capful ‘in the name of the miners’, indicating that the bottle should go around the circle. I tell him that we can’t perform the ritual because the students are not allowed to drink during the programme. Scott – seeing an opportunity to use cultural sensitivity as a rationale for challenging BB’s strictly enforced ‘Red Rules’, as he has often done during the programme – voices support for Jorge’s proposal:

— I don’t know... I think it’s [refusing to drink the alcohol] compromising the validity of this tour.

Randall shakes his head slowly and conclusively and Scott suggests that I alone drink it which I eventually do as a gesture of goodwill.

Finally, Jorge invites us to buy gifts for the miners and a man who has been loitering at the doorway steps forward and offers us choices of coca leaves, bottles of water, dynamite, or a ‘special gift package’ containing all three. We make our choices, by now well-used to the procedure of goods being unveiled for purchase immediately after educational inputs from tour guides (à la buying weavings in Nación Apu, as described in the previous chapter).

Meanwhile, Jorge tells us we will have a five-minute break before ascending Rich Mountain towards the mine entrance. After telling us to ‘watch your cameras’ [i.e. be careful for thieves] our guide then sees some friends and walks off towards them speaking in Quechua and then making chicken noises, shouting:

— Oye chicken fuckers! Chicken fuckers!
7.5.4. Finding Fool’s Gold in the Refinery: The Ongoing Search for Purity

Waiting for Jorge to return, signs of discontent with his conduct continue to emerge in the group. ‘I’m not gonna lie, I’m not digging [i.e. liking] our team name [i.e. Sexy Llama Fuckers]...not a big fan...’ says Ethan, and the others agree, with Ethan adding: ‘It’s bestiality’.

Jorge re-joins us, giving Randall a ‘Dap greeting’; this is a form of handshake – composed of a series of grasps, slaps, and fist-pumps – originating among some African-American groups in the US but now more widely used in the US and beyond (Lundmark, 2009), having been exported via globalised US pop cultural products such as the television show that was playing in the hostel reception earlier. Jorge exclaims expectantly:

—Like Will Smith...you know?

Several students roll their eyes and Randall replies unenthusiastically:

—Yeah... The Fresh Prince of Bel-Air.

As we start walking uphill to the mine, Ethan, referring to Jorge, whispers to me ‘this guy’s an idiot’ and I agree. Castigating myself internally, I then reflect on our crude and totalising assessment of our guide’s character and regret my agreement. I choose not to discuss it further with Ethan at this moment – thus reproducing the very ‘culture of silence’ I have critiqued Instructors for reproducing – but keep reflecting on Jorge’s behaviour. I suspect that our guide is, far from being a fool, strategically enacting ways of being (a tour guide) that he thinks will entertain and please our group. Nevertheless, I remain silent.

It is not the first time today that Jorge has mimicked a normatively African-American mannerism, and I wonder why this behaviour seems to have been received with ridicule among the male non-African-American BB students who regularly engage in similar mimicry (for example, Ebonics – or black vernacular – and rapping), as I discussed
in the previous chapter. While Randall’s damp response to Jorge’s Dap handshake is more understandable given that Instructors regularly try, as discussed in the previous chapter, to “cleanse” pedagogic spaces of the contaminating external influence of US pop culture, the students’ response is more puzzling. I return to this puzzle in the reflective discussion later in this chapter.

On the way to the mine entrance we briefly visit the refinery. Walking past a pile of silvery rubble, Jorge picks up a piece asking ‘do you know this, Chicos [guys]?’. ‘Its name is Zinc’ he continues, pointing to a white, glinting part of the stone:

— and this, the yellow, it’s the fool’s gold... it look [sic] like real gold but it’s the fool’s gold.

Our guide then escorts us around a corner to show us piles of white sacks:

— This is concentrated Zinc [...] it’s ready... its 80% pure.

Jorge points towards the main building in which the sacks of concentrated zinc and other minerals are refined and guides us down. Picking up a piece of rubble on the way and showing it to Jay, Ethan says sarcastically:

— That’s pure zinc right there... can’t beat that.

In the refinery building, amid the chugging of loud machinery, Jorge explains the mechanical and chemical purification processes through which the mined minerals are separated from the dirt and then cleaned, dried, and sold. But most of our group now seem to be losing interest in Jorge’s detailed explanations. Scott instead asks “the million-dollar question”:

— How much silver is left in the mines?
I found myself surprised by Jorge’s answer - ‘54...56 million of tonnes... enough for 10 to 15 years more’ – as I thought the mines had been stripped almost bare by the Conquistadores. Meanwhile, Jay picks up a rock from a nearby pile and asks Jorge if there is any silver in it. Jorge tells him:

—It’s mixed...both sides...silver, lead, tin and zinc.

‘MIXED!’ repeats Jay, raising his voice in a feigned disappointed tone, but also appearing genuinely disappointed. ‘Mixed!’ echoes Ethan in a similarly downbeat tone. Although the students are playacting, I suggest that these, and other comments above, again point to a preoccupation with purity that I have already began to discuss in this thesis. Whereas in the previous chapter the allure of purity was a more abstract one in the sense that the Instructors and students were attracted to places and spaces they perceived as culturally and epistemologically pure, in this case the students are ostensibly attracted to the more tangible purity of pure silver.

In the previous chapter I discussed how the BB group was averse to inhabiting spaces perceived as culturally contaminated by outside “Western” influences, and particularly tourists; here in the mine refinery, the students are averse to the more narrowly-defined notion that the silver is contaminated by other metals. Although there are obviously differences between these types of purity-seeking, there are also, as I will continue to unpack during this chapter, perhaps more similarities than meet the eye.

Seeming to sense that the group is getting impatient and wanting to get stuck into the ‘sexy’, ‘business’ bit of the tour (i.e. going into the mine and seeing some real silver) Jorge promises we will enter the mine soon, but first pulls out some silver from his pocket as if by magic. ‘Ah ha!’ exclaims Scott, and Randall inquires: ‘that’s the silver?’ ‘That’s the silver’, confirms Jorge holding out a shiny, sandy lump in the palm of his hand. Ethan exclaims:
Jorge passes some of the silver around for the group to hold, explaining that:

—It’s 80 percent pure silver...ok? 80 percent pure... It’s good...good money.

‘About how much...right there in your hand?’ probes Scott. ‘A thousand dollars’ answers Jorge, telling Eleanor as she holds the silver that:

—You can buy a boyfriend...or husband.

Putting aside Jorge’s sexism for a moment, this interest in the monetary value of the silver is no doubt related to the preoccupation with its level of purity; the purer it is, the more it is worth. As I argued in the previous chapter, this can also be said of the cultural capital that the BB group accumulates from the pure cultural spaces it seeks out and temporarily inhabits during the programme. Moreover, perhaps I prematurely and mistakenly put Jorge’s sexist characteristics aside from the purity-seeking characteristics of this transformative pedagogic space; as I will begin suggesting over the course of this chapter, the two are intimately related.

7.5.5. In the Mouth of the Mountain that Eats Men: Travellers Become Temporary Tourists

Having completed our visit of the refinery, we approach the mine entrance, passing miners scurrying back and forth. Jorge tells us that there are 15,000 miners working in the mines from the ages of 13 to 65. Scott asks Jorge:

—How do the workers feel about the tourists taking pictures of them?

The student phrases his question in such a way as to enquire about the appropriateness of himself and other members of our group taking
photos, but also being careful not to equate us with tourists. Presumably unaware of the traveller/tourist distinction made within the BB group, Jorge assures Scott that he need not worry because:

—They [the miners] like tourists.

Congregating outside the mouth of the mine, we sneak ominous peeks into its opening. Fronted by a stone archway facade and propped up by aged timber beams, it is rectangular, slightly skewwhiff, and smaller than I remembered. It looks like a doorway to an unwelcoming house in the hillside and part of me is surprised that Jay and Ethan have not compared it to a scene from Lord of the Rings (which they often do, as discussed in the previous chapter).

Jorge warns us that it will be very dusty and hard to breathe inside ‘la Montana que come hombres’ (The Mountain that Eats Men). Although we will not be in the mine long enough (3 hours) to be at risk of the pulmonary silicosis that slowly colonises miners’ lungs with powdered poison and shortens average life expectancy to 40 years, Jorge still advises us to buy and wear one of the face masks he has brought with him. No-one buys one but Jorge takes off his own red bandana and gives it to Eleanor in an act of chivalry, insisting that she wear it. ‘You have girlfriend?’ Jorge asks Jay, who shakes his head in reply. ‘My sister is single if you want’, our guide jests. Undeterred by the silent response, Jorge continues:

—You know Meg Ryan? My sister is like Meg Ryan...90/60/90.

Our guide gestures to indicate the shape of his sister’s body (i.e. 90/60/90). But then, suddenly, Jorge’s facial expression turns serious and he begins speaking about the mine, moistened Coca leaves oozing from between the gaps in his teeth:

—So we have to work together in the mines...all for one...one for all...ok? Like brothers.
'Like brothers' echoes Jay, and then repeats it again louder:

—BROTHERS baby!

Ethan joins in and Jorge turns to Eleanor, who is not joining in, teasing her:

—Eleanor! Eleanor del jardín [Eleanor from the garden] ...Eleanor la Peligrosa [Eleanor the dangerous].

After our guide’s reference to Eleanor’s close connection with nature (by virtue of being a woman, a well-established association as mentioned earlier in this chapter), and the perceived threat she poses as a woman resistant to Jorge’s machismo (I sensed that our guide had begun to pick-up on Eleanor’s visible distaste for his behaviour), we prepare to enter the mine. Jorge says ‘Yes to photos in the mine...ok...like tourists’ and summons a group photograph before we enter. After taking the picture we turn to face the mine, Jorge extending a “gentlemanly” invitation to Eleanor:

—Ladies first!

7.5.6. Into the Depths: Enclosed in an Oppressive Space

Filing into the mine – a workplace for 15,000 miners between the ages of 13 and 65, as Jorge tells us – we trade the relatively fresh air of the Rich Mountain-side for the stagnant, sweaty climes of the mine tunnel. Switching on our helmet torches, the dark, dusty tunnel becomes dimly illuminated. The atmosphere is heavy, the weight of the mountain and hundreds of years of human toil and death hanging over us, propped up by ageing wooden beams. Crouching over to avoid hitting my head on protruding, craggy rock or the bundle of gas pipes running overhead, we walk silently through the tunnel, alongside a mine cart track.

A faint rumble emerges from the darkness ahead of us and Jorge hurriedly ushers us into the cavity in the wall, telling us that a cart is coming and we can take photos of it if we want to. Before we know it,
the rumble has become the clattering of a mine cart stacked high with rocks. The cart flies narrowly past us at full pelt, being pushed by two running miners. We walk on and are soon confronted by the Tio, a wooden and papier-mâché effigy of the devil deity that presides over the mine and the mine safety within it. Like the depiction of Tio in the hostel, the effigy is Luciferian – complete with goatee and horns. He has a cigarette in his mouth and various more scattered around his feet as offerings, along with alcohol and other gifts. The Tio effigy is accompanied by an effigy representing the slaves that worked in the mines, and a representation of Sir Francis Drake who transported some of those slaves to Potosi and returned to Britain with silver-lined pockets.

As we continue walking, sloshing our way through groundwater in silence, the tunnel begins to narrow, the ceiling lowering. Jorge takes us on a shortcut and before long we are crawling on our hands and knees, and then slithering on our chests through tiny openings in the rock face. As we get deeper into the mine, the overbearing heat intensifies and I’m sweating profusely inside my overalls. It is difficult to breathe and my lungs are straining for oxygen.

When we get to a slightly more spacious opening, we congregate for a moment. Ethan asks Jorge if the spaces we are passing through will get any smaller, assuring our guide that he is ‘not claustrophobic’, but expressing his relief when Jorge says they won’t. We continue, briefly catching glimpses of other tourist groups being guided through different sections of the mine.

In places, we stop to witness the miners at work and Jorge – an ex-miner turned guide – describes the average working day and the miners lives to us. Jorge tells us to bring out the gifts that we have brought for the miners and give them to them. These mostly consist of coca leaves and bottles of water, a staple diet for the miners, the coca leaves helping to stave off hunger and alleviate the effects of altitude. When we come across miners that Jorge is friends with, he introduces us, and more than one occasion introduces Eleanor to them in Spanish as ‘soltera’ – a single woman. One miner replies loudly and excitedly:
—Ah...SOLTERA...SOLTERA! Quiero soltera! [Single women! I want/love single women]

Eleanor looks uncomfortable but no one in our group says anything about this behaviour, though everyone seems to be tiring of it as we come towards the end of the tour. After three hours in the mine, we are relieved to resurface into the bright sun and relatively fresh air. As we board the tour bus to return, Jorge offers to untie the bandanna he has lent Eleanor from her neck, but she tells him to:

—Stay away from me.

Scott, who is standing in front of Eleanor and boarding the bus, hears this and frowns, turning to Eleanor and reprimanding her:

—Eleanor...come on girl...you gotta be a little nicer.

Our guide seems a bit put-out and once on the bus, tries to lift spirits by calling out to everyone:


We arrived back at the tour agency offices, hand our garments back in, and say goodbye to Jorge. Eleanor reluctantly shakes his hand and thanks him for the tour and I arrange to meet with our guide later that evening for an individual interview.

7.6. Bringing Things to the Surface: The Post-Tour Reflective Discussion

After the mine tour, the BB group has some free time. Randall and Eleanor visit some hot springs outside the city and the others stay in
Potosi to relax and reflect on the morning’s activities. We all meet in the “men’s” hostel room in the evening, each of us sitting or lying on one of the beds and chatting. Scott again starts farting frequently – territorialising the space – which eventually annoys Randall who protests, ‘come on man’. Scott stops.

7.6.1. Lap-Sitting and Little Babies: Pushing the Boundaries with Sexual Connotation

Jay and Ethan ask about the hot springs and Eleanor starts to reply but is interrupted by Randall, who describes the experience. When Randall finishes, Eleanor adds to his account, speaking about the crowded public bus journey there:

—We basically sat on each other’s laps!

Scott, playacting, melodramatically screams ‘WHAT!’ Everyone starts laughing at the implicit insinuation that Eleanor and Randall had started an intimate relationship and the student denies this, laughing:

—That’s not what I meant...sorry.

Randall diffuses the risqué joke by explaining:

—NO...no...we were in a super cramped trufi [minibus] on the way back and had to sit in the aisle on our backpacks...not on each other’s laps...I was on those two plump Bolivian ladies’ laps though...I had my arms resting on either of their thighs...it was really comfortable.

Jay agrees ‘those Bolivian ladies are comfortable’, at which point most of the group are in hysterics at the thought of ‘Cholitas’ (Bolivian women “traditionally-dressed” in typically rotund dresses and bowler hats) being used as comfy chairs. Moving on without any questions or reflection about the symbolism couched in this image, and protectively
padded in its humour, Ethan then decides to poke more fun by returning to the insinuation that the Instructor and student have started a romance. He pushes the boundaries of the joke by alluding to sexual activity (which, like any more-than-professional relationship would be a clear violation of BB rules, not to mention ethical principles):

—So...we got a little BB baby running around somewhere?

Whereas Ethan was quick to condemn Jorge’s risqué, sexualised humour during the mine tour (to other students, though not to Jorge), and indeed to support Eleanor in frowning-on Scott’s “being okay” with them – for example on the tour bus – his behaviour has now changed in the hostel room. Though in one sense he is of course “just having a bit of fun”, the rules of the game have changed somewhat and he has now assumed the role of boundary tester, rather than boundary regulator. Moreover, the character of his boundary testing, in this highly gendered pedagogic space, is highly gendered; the punchline of the joke is premised on the imagined sexual exploitation of the male Instructor-female student power relation and the resultant pregnancy (probably unplanned) and childbirth.

While I am suggesting that the discursive practices of Ethan and other subgroup members have changed as they transition from the mine tour to the hostel room, it is crucial to point out that I am not suggesting that Ethan is maliciously, intentionally, or even necessarily consciously, playing on the problematic premise of his joke. However, the premise is nevertheless present beneath the comic veneer, and this appears to be acknowledged within the subgroup; the joke proves to be a step too far and Scott and Jay step in to say:

—No dude.

Having now assumed the role of boundary regulators, at least temporarily and in support of Randall, Jay and Scott quickly move the conversation on to reflections about the mine tour.
7.6.2. Mine Impressions: Selective Criticism, Overlooking Sexism

Randall begins by asking for everyone’s impressions, in turn, of what struck them about the tour. Ethan starts, quickly switching back to being thoughtful, sensitive, and critical of the crass, macho behaviour he witnessed:

—Our guide definitely at first had me on the wrong foot... I was sort of bummed because I really wanted to learn about it [the mine]. I made a realisation that the way those miners act and the way they treat each other [e.g. with playful homophobic and bestial insults] is born from the work they do... I think it is so dangerous and the life expectancy is so much shorter...that the bond they have...is so strong...that it’s sort of okay to do that...that’s why they’re just so crazy to each other... it was still very off-putting... I’m sure you [referring to Randall] said something to him at some point because he cleaned up his act throughout the tour.

Randall corrects Ethan, clarifying that:

—I actually didn’t say anything to him...Scott said something to him at the very end of the tour... my impression was that maybe he just read us.

My impression though, was that Jorge had “read us” but only to a certain extent. Throughout the tour our guide seemed to have gradually picked-up-on our disapproval at his homophobic humour, which Scott complained to him about at the end. However, I did not notice Jorge toning down his explicit sexism at any point. I suggest that this is probably because none of the men in our group expressed any objection to this, including Scott who complained specifically about the homophobia. For my part, I had once again contributed to maintaining a culture of silence – despite strongly objecting to Jorge’s behaviour – in the interests of maintaining the integrity of my participant observer role. But aside from further interrogating the ethical and political implications of my role, I had now also begun to wonder if Ethan and
Randall’s agreement that Jorge ‘cleaned up his act’ suggests that the men in our group not only failed to express objection to our guide’s sexist behaviour but have consciously or unconsciously overlooked the issue entirely.

Randall then asks Jay for his reflections, and the student starts by imagining:

—What it would be like to work in the mine and what it might do to your mind... after years and years of working in that environment and specifically working in the darkness... It’s just like an anthill... or being a rat... you’re just running through these tunnels and performing pretty simple acts of manual labour... I was thinking a lot about the setting... the environment.

Like Jay, I am also thinking about the environment, and what is taught and learned in it, but focusing on the mine as a part of a pedagogic space – a space that we are occupying for a much shorter period. My sense so far is that, like the miners that Ethan described earlier, the bond between the male BB students is strengthening in some ways in this highly gendered pedagogic space, but that Eleanor’s gradual squeezing-out to the margins is accelerating. Thus far, aside from not being an accepted member of the male students’ informal “cool club”, the only female student in the space has endured (relatively) subtle manifestations of patriarchal power in the hostel room, and overt sexism during the mine tour. Moreover, she appears to be the only member of our group who has noticed this, let alone expressed any resistance to it.

7.6.3. The Sad Act of Tourism: Constructing Hierarchical Typologies of Tourists, and Travellers

After a brief pause Jay continues:

—Another thing I thought was kind of sad... I think one of the main reasons that guy [Jorge] was acting that way...because he just thought that... probably...tourists appreciated it [...] I didn’t
even really think that those [comments] were coming from him... I just thought he was saying them because he was like 'I'm just going to be a fun guy that the tourists want to be with and give them a fun time'.

There seems to be agreement among the group that Jorge was, as Jay suggests, performing for us. This would come as no surprise to many social theorists who agree that social interaction is performative (e.g. see Austin, 1962; Butler, 1997b; Goffman, 1959). Yet, few if any of those theorists suggest, as Jay seems to be alluding to, that by performing socially a so-called “social actor” is not being “oneself”. It is now generally accepted, at least in the academic literature on identity and personhood, that people have multiple, rather than singular, identities which they strategically perform for different purposes, at different times and in different spaces (e.g. see ibid; Burke, 2003). While Jay’s suggestion that Jorge’s behaviour is not ‘coming from him’ is far from conclusive evidence that the student conceptualises identity as a singular, static set of “authentic” characteristics, it arguably points towards this understanding.

In any case, the student frames Jorge’s objectionable behaviour within our guide’s misguided desire to create a “fun” experience – which Jay did nonetheless enjoy despite his reservations:

—More than anything it was really fun running through there [the mine] unlike anything I’ve ever done before.

But the student goes on to express other criticisms of the tour:

—The only thing I didn’t like was just seeing the other people that were down there that were in the same positions us... the other tourists.

This comment suggests that Jay did see our BB subgroup as tourists as well as, or instead of, travellers (or at least temporarily, in the specific time and space of the mine tour), something that the students and Instructors have resisted throughout the programme. Randall then asks Jay why he didn’t like seeing the other tourists, and he answers:
—I really didn’t like that the one guy [a tourist] was working with them [the miners]...like shovelling and shit... I just thought that was stupid... I don’t think you need to shovel to get the experience of what it’s like... it just seemed like ‘get a shot of me shovelling’... it’s not even like seeing what it’s like to be a labourer because you’re just doing it for five minutes [...] I was taking video myself but I really didn’t want to use flash... but there was a whole line of people in there always talking and using flash... that was really bothering me.

Perhaps picking-up on some of the question marks hanging over Jay’s comments, Eleanor teases him:

—I thought you were a traveller Jay?

‘I am a traveller’ Jay retorts. Although Jay has conceded that we, the BB group, are also tourists, he is now distinguishing between different types and levels of “touristy” behaviour. The student is trying to maintain a boundary between his apparently less-distasteful videoing of the miners at work, and the “flashier” more obnoxious practices of the other tourists. Jay’s efforts to sketch out a rough typology of tourists are similar to the attempts, by many BB group members throughout the programme, to not only accentuate the tourist/traveller distinction but also to create hierarchical distinctions between types of travellers we encountered on our journey. For instance, during a recent unplanned encounter with backpackers in a restaurant on Isla del Sol (Island of the Sun), some of the BB students seemed dismissive of their dinner companions’ claims to be proper travellers. This was mainly based on the backpackers’ drinking copious amounts of alcohol and boasting of the ‘partying’ they had done during their extended period away from home. The BB students later explained to me that the backpackers were not ‘real travellers’ because they were carrying these hedonistic home-cultural practices with them. I also detected, though, a defensiveness from the students about being teased by the backpackers for not being allowed to drink alcohol or party on the BB programme.
So, there is reflection and criticism from some of the students, during this reflective discussion, towards other tourists. There is no evidence thus far, however, of any critical reflection about the ethical questions surrounding the very presence of tourists, including us, in the mine observing the miners working in the first place. These are critical questions that Frida – who had, earlier in the programme, spoken to me of her personal dislike of the mine tour as a form of ‘human zoo’ – usually raises on BB programmes during the pre-tour scaffolding activities (i.e. the devil’s miner film and the child union activity). However, as mentioned earlier, in this case these activities were omitted and Frida – who is, in any case, newly committed to a neutral pedagogic approach – is unusually not present in Potosi. So far, this has shaped the character of the transformative pedagogic space in that these critical questions have not been raised or explored in depth. Instead, the character of the male-dominated pedagogic space is taking a different, more explicitly gendered shape.

7.6.4. Not Going With the Flow: Gendered Interruptions and Profound Impacts

Randall moves the discussion on, asking Eleanor about her impressions of the mine tour. Eleanor starts talking but stops and starts as she gets repeatedly interrupted by the other students:

—I just thought it was...

[other students interrupt, talking amongst themselves]

—... I just thought it was...

[other students interrupt again]

Eleanor is the only member of the group who is interrupted in this way, which strikes me as happening far more often than usual (compared to the rest of the programme) in this particular pedagogic space. This is unsurprising, perhaps, if one considers studies showing that men
interrupt women far more frequently than women interrupt men (see Smith-Lovin and Brody, 1989; Zimmerman and West, 1975) – one technique among many for trying to control what happens in a space. When Eleanor is finally able to speak, she starts where Jay left off, speaking about tourists:

—I know you said it was more touristy... and I thought it was more touristy...probably...than it would have been with that other guy [referring to a BB contact – an ex-miner – in Potosi who was originally going to guide us in the mine, but was unavailable]...but I did not get the sense that those miners were acting at all and I just felt that they were really in their element... and it just was super super intense... just how strong those men are...damn man!

Eleanor continues, describing how being in the uncomfortable physical environment of the mine and witnessing the miners at work there was a moving experience:

—that was crazy... I struggled through that place... I definitely had trouble breathing... I just wasn’t getting enough oxygen... I felt like I had a layer of chemical liquid in the bottom of my throat at all times... I had read a little bit about it and none of the dying stuff [Jorge telling us of miners he knew that had recently died, and pointing out weak miners that would probably die soon] was surprising because I had already known about that... but just seeing it there...when our guide pointed out one of the guys...and said that guy there is really sick and he is still working...I thought that was really intense.

‘I couldn’t see what was wrong with his face... did anyone see?’ asks Jay, and Eleanor answers:

—His eyes...kind of like were not totally white... it was redder...and they were shut more... his eyelids were kind of poufy and his cheeks were definitely puffed out... I just thought ‘wow you’re seeing the effects’ [...] walking through the place... I was like ‘whoa that guy died here’... just that idea you go to work in the morning and think ‘I could die today’...that is a serious possibility... that’s kind of wild to me... you’re almost willingly putting yourself in such danger every day.
Eleanor seems to have been more profoundly impacted by the mine tour, at least at this moment in time, than the other students who have reflected on the experience so far. Though there are questionable aspects of her comments – for instance the notion that miners willingly put themselves in danger – the other group members do not question her, or even interrupt this time. Eleanor keeps talking, moving on to another significant aspect of the mine tour:

— and here’s what I have to conclude: I really disliked the guide... I did think he was inappropriate... I’m not gonna lie... I felt extremely uncomfortable with the sexist misogynistic attitude... jokes... comments... of actually a lot of the men in the mine [referring to some miners who also made offensive comments to her]... I think the sad part was [...] I felt like I did not want to ask questions because I was so turned off by him... I was actually just disgusted by him.

Jorge’s conduct clearly had a big influence in shaping Eleanor’s experience during the tour. But if the student’s learning about the mine itself was impinged by the characteristics of our guide, his contribution to the character of the pedagogic space also unintentionally shaped the pedagogic content and process in unexpected and potentially transformative ways, as I will now discuss.

When Eleanor is finished, Randall calls on Scott to share his impressions - ‘Scott my boy’:

— Today was a really powerful experience for me... it didn’t really hit me at all until we got in there... once we got into that mine... just the life that I never knew about for the 29 years of my life... the culture here since the 1500s [...] what they had to do for work... I’m still kind of sitting with it and a little bit speechless because it was so humbling for me... it’s so different from the life I lead... I just kept thinking about the people that did that to make a living.
Like Eleanor, Scott also describes being profoundly impacted by the experience and is reflecting, with humility, his own life position in relation to that of the miners.

7.6.5. Purity Versus Performance: Cultural Contamination in the Pedagogic Space

Scott then follows on from Eleanor’s comments about Jorge:

—And I kind of saw some of the same points of views about the guide and how the tour was set up... I've done tours like that [...] in other countries and that's kind of the facade... the mannerisms that these guides put on for a show... and he did kind of go over the top [but]... I thought his humour was okay... I think that he kind of went too far with the gay jokes.

Scott does not mention any objection to Jorge’s sexist behaviour, and goes on to speak, as Jay did, about different types of tourism and our guide’s “true” character:

—What he said at the end was very moving to me...because that is a topic I’m exploring [Scott is researching the topic of ecotourism for an extended study project, as part of the BB programme]... although this [the mine tour] wasn't ecotourism...it was tourism [...] and when he [Jorge] invited us to his home...whether or not that was true...I thought he was being really true to himself... I saw him as a true individual there... I just think that his gay jokes and his 'fuck this...fuck that’ was just an act.

Ethan agrees with Scott, also splitting Jorge’s identity into who he “really is” (his pure, authentic being) versus the social actor (an impure charlatan) who merely recites someone else’s lines:

—Yeah...I talked to Pablo and I was just like ‘this guy’s an idiot’ and Pabs [my nickname] was like ‘yeah he’s an idiot’...I think that now after thinking about it a bit more...the way he was acting was almost...sort of sad...because...it’s like a laugh at you type
thing... it’s not like a laugh with me... it’s that this guy can’t speak any English but he knows how to say ‘fuck, cunt, gay’... I feel like a normal tourist... like some ridiculous tourists would think that’s hilarious... it’s really just laughing at you and it’s laughing at your lack of English skills... that was so sad to me... I saw him say to a guy on another bus ‘hey...fucking gay’... I’m sure a lot of tourists crack-up [laugh hard]... they are not cracking-up because the guy’s actually fucking gay... it’s because... look at this ridiculous man who thinks it’s funny... it’s sad... it’s like a sell-out... and I think it is an act... it’s not who he is... like with the fresh Prince of Bel air handshake... maybe he gets tips for it?

Ethan’s comment reminds me of my discomfort at simplistically labelling Jorge ‘an idiot’. The student’s strong feelings about Jorge’s ‘sad act’ – and particularly his recollection of our guide’s Will Smith-style handshake - also reignites my puzzlement at the students’ eyeball-rolling responses to Jorge’s imitation of certain “Western” ways of being.

There are various possible explanations for this, but my hunch is that these possibilities may well include an attempt (conscious or unconscious) on behalf of the students to regulate the infiltration of “their” national cultural products into “their” pedagogic spaces. Although the students show some forms of subtle resistance against Instructors trying to prevent US pop culture entering certain pedagogic spaces (as I discussed in the previous chapter), the Instructors are nevertheless BB-group insiders. By contrast Jorge is an outsider who is, arguably, a living, breathing representation of cultural impurity to the students in the form of a caricature of those “touristy”, “inauthentic” elements of globalisation that they so wish to avoid. Jorge is an embodiment of the “tourist taboo” within the BB group. Although students like Jay have conceded that they too are tourists (at least during the mine tour), they have also created a hierarchical typology of tourists and do not want to be – or be seen to be – the type of obnoxious macho tourist that Jorge reflects, in their eyes – at least not in public spaces.

Moreover, in the unusual absence of most of the Instructors during the mine tour, in this case the students exercised their own agency and adopted the role of Instructors. This enabled the students to try and maintain the boundaries around some pedagogic spaces – usually those
in which they interact with others beyond the container of the BB group – keeping them pure by being free from cross-cultural contamination. This in turn enables, as explained in the previous chapter, the extraction and accumulation of particularly valuable pure cross-cultural capital from those unpolluted spaces.

In this sense, the mine tour is a more contaminated space than, say, Nación Apu as it is populated by tourists. If this is not unpalatable enough for the aspiring travellers in our BB group, English-speaking Bolivian tour guides like Jorge inadvertently serve to highlight the impurity of the pedagogic space by aping particular “Western” ways of being. By performing a social act that he thinks the BB group wants to see, I suggest that Jorge embodies and reflects the cultural contamination that the group seeks to avoid. In a sense, our guide is a mirror in which the BB group sees an unedifying reflection of itself. So, on one level we may be unimpressed by what we perceive as Jorge’s bigoted humour through a combination of being offended, and needing to be seen to be offended for the purposes of political correctness. However, on another level we may be disapproving of aspects of our guide’s character because we see, uncomfortably, those very same aspects of ourselves reflected in it.

7.6.6. Exploding Gender Myths: Confrontation and Accidental Engagement with Gender Power Dynamics

After Ethan’s contribution, Scott then continues to speak about Jorge, but this time he becomes nervous, his voice wavering as though he is about to initiate a potential confrontation:

—Also...I know that this is like a safe circle...and I just want to mention this...and it’s to you Eleanor... I understand that you felt very uncomfortable and I truly believe that you were uncomfortable...and I agree that he was misogynistic at times...but he was genuinely nice to you throughout a lot of the time... like offering you the bandanna...and then when you were struggling to take off your bandanna and he offered to take it off...you kind of shoved [gestures] and said ‘get away from me’
to him...and that really upset me... just because he shared that tour with us and he was actually a genuine guy...aside from all those comments... and I just think that was kind of uncalled for... in the future maybe if you feel uncomfortable...just address it to him... I think that was really passive aggressive and rude to him...especially when it came after he said 'I'm sorry about these bad jokes'... but in saying that I still want to validate your feelings...that you maybe felt offended I guess.

Eleanor snaps, visibly incensed at what she presumably perceives to be Scott’s inability to comprehend the implications of Jorge’s behaviour, but also perhaps the student’s unsolicited advice and his self-appointed position as "validator” of her feelings. Her voice quivering with rage, Eleanor raises her voice:

—I think that you have no fucking idea what I was feeling... I really do...and it didn’t happen to you... I think it was so very unnecessary that you said that to me...and I think that if someone said all those comments and made me feel really uncomfortable I don’t want them touching me...at all...at all...and I really don’t think that’s unnecessary... it didn’t happen to you... [voice choking with emotion] and it won’t as much probably... I think that you’re right it’s not right to yell at someone...and I didn’t... I just said ‘don’t touch me’... I don’t care if he was trying to help me...and do I think he’s a nice guy? Sure...whatever that means... 'Nice guy’ is such a general term... and do I think he had good intentions? Yeah I do... but he also just said some really inappropriate...really offensive comments...and that’s a good percentage of what he said... I still enjoyed the tour but I think it was really inappropriate for you to say that to me... I think that you just have no idea.

Startled, Scott searches for a reply and Randall steps in:

—I think that’s fair... I think especially considering that Eleanor is one female in a group of all men...we should give her that advantage... because a lot of the stuff he [Jorge] was saying just didn’t really mean anything to us and...it was targeting Eleanor a lot...you feel alright about that Eleanor? Now?

Scott interrupts Eleanor as she is about to reply, saying ‘I didn’t mean to...I was not trying to attack you in any sense’, and she then continues:
—I just don’t think I did something so bad… if I said ‘fuck you just get off of me’…maybe… all I said was ‘don’t touch me’… yeah I did say it harshly but…he asked me if I was married and had kids…and…‘sleep with me’…and shit like that… and other men [guides and miners] did that while I was going in [to the mine]… so what if you aren’t trying to be mean?… you were… you offended me… and you just made me feel super numb.

Randall then says sorry to Eleanor for his part in not intervening during her experience on the tour:

—Yeah…and I apologise Eleanor for not…sort of saying anything about that earlier during the tour… it definitely was inappropriate and I’m sorry that you had to deal with that […] I think if any one of us was gay and had to put up with all that shit that he was saying throughout the tour… I would have been pretty pissed off.

The apology seems appreciated by Eleanor, but it also underscores the point I made earlier: that the male members of the group, including the Instructor, are only now beginning to see Jorge’s sexist behaviour and take it seriously. Moreover, Randall’s comment also shows that he can only empathise with Eleanor’s anger towards misogyny by imagining what it would like to be gay and subjected to Jorge’s homophobia. It seems to me that this is underpinned by two problematic and prevalent phenomena: 1) that a person can, or should, only be offended by bigotry if it is directed at them personally; and 2) that sexism, and gender politics and power relations more broadly, are only relevant to women.

Ethan’s next contribution appears to substantiate my contention in some ways, and suggests that it needs elaboration:

—I use all sorts of gross words… I have a foul mouth as you very well know… ‘gay’ is one thing that I say from time to time because I started saying it when was in middle school… but because I have a lot of really good friends who are gay it’s definitely changed my perspective on the word and I got offended just through hearing it…just so aggressive… so obviously demeaning and…de…masculating [sic]… I think that’s the big thing for me…
I know a lot of gay guys... I've got a really good friend who's gay... and you wouldn’t know it... he's almost like a macho man... plays D1 [Division I] sports... pretty built [muscly] just like fucks around like any other guy... like punches you [gestures play-fighting]... but he's gay... I don’t like it in the context of being demasculating [sic] and I took a lot of offence to him [Jorge] saying that... if he [Ethan’s macho gay friend] was there I think he would've fuckin’ gone nuts on him [i.e. physically attacked Jorge]... really... left the tour probably but do some damage before.

Aside from illustrating Ethan’s normative notion that “typically” homosexual men are slender, effeminate, non-sporty and averse to play-fighting, his response to Jorge’s homophobia prompts me to adjust the first of my two earlier points (above). Unless Ethan is a closet homosexual, his offence at Jorge’s comments does not appear to be personal in the most direct sense. However, Ethan feels the insults personally in two ways: 1) through the offence that he imagines his close gay friends would take; and 2) the emasculation he sees in Jorge’s understanding of homosexuality. The latter is the ‘big thing’ for Ethan because, I suggest, it challenges him personally by challenging the very idea of what it means to be a “real man” – a true, genuine, authentic, pure man.

Some of the points I am making here start to emerge at this point in the reflective discussion as Randall begins to model some critical reflection in the form of reflexivity:

—I'm curious...because I've observed this in myself a little bit afterwards... a lot of those gay comments I had noticed and taken offence to almost more than his sexist comments and misogyny even though both were there and both were pretty strong...and I'm curious what your thoughts are on why that was...because...not to place judgement, but I don’t think that any of us here is gay...we're also neither women...but for some reason it seemed like that first one [the gay comments] struck us a lot more than...
Scott interrupts and starts speaking but, unlike when Eleanor is interrupted and then usually stops speaking and waits for her next opening, Randall continues, stifling the interruption:

—...than his really rude sexist comments.

Scott then says what he wanted to say:

—Yeah can I just say...Eleanor...I honestly didn’t know that it was that bad [Jorge’s sexism] I thought it was just the playful tour guide jokes.

‘Yeah I just heard “are you single?” and stuff like that’, Ethan chips in, agreeing with Scott, who continues:

—Yeah...or ‘date my brother’...I didn’t hear all the other stuff so I could kind of agree...you saying ‘get away from me’...if those things were said to you...then yeah.

Seeming, like Scott, to disregard the seriousness of Jorge’s ‘playful jokes’, Ethan agrees again:

—Yeah... I just don’t think I heard as many of the other comments [i.e. Jorge asking Eleanor to sleep with him]... I think the comments I did hear...can easily be taken as rude...because I think they are just rude...but the other ones were just so blunt...the gay comments... there was no grey area...it was so black-and-white... it was like ‘you’re fucking gay...you’re a bitch’.

Ethan’s comment suggests that he interprets and understands Jorge’s sexist behaviour within an evaluative framework based on polite social etiquette, rather than social/gender power relations. He therefore describes Jorge’s comments as rude – which on one level they surely are – but does not regard them to be as serious as Jorge’s homophobia because it was expressed more explicitly, or ‘bluntly’. While this analysis makes sense within the framework is using, it is questionable if placed within a framework of social power analysis; as many theorists of power have noted, it is arguably the less explicit, and therefore less visible,
forms and expressions of power that are most pervasive and insidious (e.g. see Bourdieu, 1990; Hayward, 1998; Lukes, 2005). Ethan goes on to rationalise why Jorge’s sexism was less serious to him:

—Also I’m not a woman... all the schools I’ve ever been to have always been very...cautious... no not cautious...just...very proper in that way... I don’t hear sexist comments often... all the communities that I’ve been involved in...soccer teams...high school...middle school...college...most if not all of my interactions and communications with people...have just been very non-sexist...equal terms [...] I think that women have reached a point where it’s mostly equal.

Ethan’s explanation seems to support my suggestion above, showing that his understanding of the ways that gender power relations function is limited to observable explicit comments. In pointing this out I am not criticising the student, but highlighting the need for students to learn about power relations in ways they have not yet done during the BB programme. However, such issues are now arising in this discussion, and Eleanor responds swiftly to Ethan’s claim, disagreeing and beginning to make a similar point to the one I am making:

—I’d really challenge that... because yeah of course we have made huge improvements...or whatever... yeah we are equal in the books or laws... I’d just be really surprised if women were really really equal wherever you are... I’ve been in leftist communities my whole life and they’re still just... women get paid 60 cents to the dollar [...] I would really challenge you to say they’re completely equal even where you live.

Ethan replies, pointing out that Eleanor has altered the wording of his claim slightly but significantly:

—I respect that... I think I didn’t say ‘completely’...I said ‘mostly’ equal... I was talking gays in comparison to women from where I was and in that sense it’s not even a competition... in that sense gays are much, much more belittled...demasculated [sic]...embarrassed...and yeah I agree there’s still... women get paid less in job environments... and I think there are other certain
things... but [...] at least in my interactions and in my life I’ve just noticed a greater conflict...and prejudice for gays... far greater.

Scott then contributes:

—I would have not cared at all about the tour guide if he didn’t drop [say] the gay jokes... I should have been more aware still...about the sexist jokes... you know I’ve been on tours with my ex-girlfriend and she got picked on a lot by the tour people in Costa Rica and I thought it was funny... and I didn’t think anything too much of it... and honestly in my life I don’t see women being treated unequally... I just don’t... and so I guess I didn’t pick up on it as much as the gay rights thing... yeah it’s unfortunate.

Scott goes on to talk about what happened after he complained to Jorge at the end of the tour:

—And he’s like ‘I’m sorry’... and then he asked me if I was gay [everyone laughs]...and I was like, ‘No, I’m not gay’... see he just doesn’t get it! [laughing].

Scott’s comments, and to a lesser extent Ethan’s, suggest that they also perhaps don’t “get it” with respect to gender power relations in the US, or anywhere else, given that they believe that women are treated equally, or mostly equally, to men. This is perhaps not surprising considering that they have not experienced life as a woman, but also that they are unlikely to have had the opportunity to engage in learning about gender power relations. Certainly, this is the first time they are doing so during this ‘transformative’ learning programme, albeit as an unintentional function of the pedagogic space, shaped by its specific character.
7.6.7. Coming Out of the Culture of Silence: Opening-Up the Discussion

The tension and antagonism in the hostel room has now subsided somewhat and suddenly given way to a more relaxed, open, and even intimate learning environment. Perhaps the changed character of the pedagogic space helped one of the students (who will remain anonymous but has consented to the use of this specific data) to share something with the group that was deeply private and personal to him:

—My dad had the courage to tell me that he was...just confused about his sexuality...and he said it that way... in my mind I just think [he’s] 'gay'... all I could think was 'how brave'... it’s just a super brave thing... to tell your son who you know is straight... and today just seeing the cowardice behind the opposite side... at the same time I don't put it on that guy [Jorge] at all... I didn’t really take personal offence to it... I just think it’s a shame that people aren’t seeing things so clearly and have ideas like that... so it’s just a really powerful observation... I’m just glad to be in a room of people that I just think...have good viewpoints on the whole situation.

Ethan says:

—It was super humbling today... seeing these grown-ups like throwing around that kind of slang...it was just like 'Dude you’re so ignorant'...you don’t know anything...it was just a shame... you never know who’s around when you say that stuff.

Scott agrees – ‘man that’s so true’ – but Eleanor again picks up on some of the problematic aspects of Ethan’s comment. Though not questioning the notion – even if just a figure of speech – that Jorge doesn’t know anything, Eleanor takes issue with Ethan’s emphasis on the risk of being heard saying something offensive by the “wrong” people:

—I don’t think it’s just about people who are around...I think no matter when you’re saying that.
Eleanor is interrupted again, this time by Jay, who clarifies that what Ethan means is that if the wrong people are around, then:

—It’s especially hurtful to [those] people.

But Eleanor continues, saying:

—I also think it’s not so black-and-white.

Scott interrupts her this time, asking what she means, and she replies:

—I’ve started to question this idea of gay...straight...bi...I just think that...

Jay interrupts again:

—Well, it’s just like love is love...if you love the person it’s like...

This time Eleanor interrupts back, insisting:

—No, that’s not what I mean... my point is that...I really do believe that sexuality is a spectrum.

7.6.8. Sexuality as a Spectrum: Students Deconstructing Simplistic Constructions

Scott and Jay both interrupt to question Eleanor about what she means by ‘a spectrum’, but Randall draws the line, trying to create space for Eleanor:

—Wait, just wait... let Eleanor speak.

Eleanor reiterates the Instructors request – ‘yeah, y’all are just like...’ – and then continues:

—Like you just talked about ‘quote/unquote’...always being gay or always being straight...’
But Jay stops her yet again:

—Well, you don’t have to say ‘quote/unquote’ for that.

Randall begins losing his patience at the male students’ repeated interruptions, and repeats:

—Can you just LET Eleanor speak...please.

This time Eleanor finishes what she wants to say, which is to begin deconstructing the binary gendered constructions of man and woman:

—So either they felt they should be straight and they were a closet gay...or they ‘quote/unquote’ changed or transformed into gay... I don’t think I really believe that... I’ve started to believe it’s this spectrum... you might consider yourself straight but I don’t think there’s totally straight... I think every straight person has thought about gay ideas and every gay person has thought about being with someone of the opposite sex... I think both of those things... I don’t think you’re always just one way or the other... I think there’s a range... maybe you might be closer to one or really close to another... but I don’t believe that you transform into gay or transform into straight.

Ethan joins the conversation again, apparently stimulated by Eleanor’s ideas:

—I totally respect your spectrum... I completely agree with that idea... I’ve never heard about that... the idea about the spectrum... for sure I think it’s not completely black-and-white.

There is a pause following this comment and Randall uses it to reflect on the discussion:

—That was awesome... and just fascinating... because who would’ve thought a visit to a mine...would have sparked that conversation... I feel like it just illustrates... travel and learning... and how what it turned out... what we talked about most was just
like the thoughts that our guide brought up…and all those issues and stuff like that.

Randall is, however, also keen to more specifically discuss the mine experience with students. After a short break – during which Scott takes off his shirt and does press-ups on the hostel room floor – the group does this. This latter part of the discussion is shorter than the earlier focus on gender and although it does focus on some of the elements of the mine tour that Instructors usually focus on – for example, child Labour and the exploitation of workers – themes of gender, power, and sexuality keep popping up throughout. For instance, Randall talks about how seeing how the mining ‘raped’ the mountain, made him consider his position on global infrastructures of mining.

The feminisation of the mountain presented by Randall’s comment is underscored by Ethan, who reminds us of the broader feminisation of Mother Earth, or Mother Nature, and comments on the hypocrisy of mining and revering Pachamama:

―It’s non-genuine... yes we care for Pachamama as long as she provides for us... I don’t hold it against you [the miners] because I understand that they don’t have any other choices [but] it’s just blatantly hypocritical to mine through this mountain and then simultaneously be worshipping Pachamama... Yeah...I do need to do this to support my family... to eat tonight... but at the same time you don’t need to throw Pachamama into the mix if you’re hurting her.

Eleanor responds:

―I think they go in and give offerings to Tio [the Devil deity that oversees the mines and the miners] because it’s like ‘I hope I’m OK today’...it’s just like an offering.

‘It’s like a peace of mind type thing’, adds Jay, bolstering Eleanor’s comments now rather than interrupting her.
—Yeah...it’s not as much their love of the earth as much as ‘please save me’...that’s what I felt about the whole Pachamama-Tio thing.

Ethan speaks, also now supplementing Eleanor’s comment:

—Yeah...and he [Jorge] also said...these minerals come from Tio literally having sex with the mountain...because the mountain’s a woman...and Tio is a man...and the silver is their offspring...and the minerals are like their fertility right...and that’s why he’s [the Tio effigy in the mine] got the penis...because it represents his fertility.

‘Is he confused about his sexuality?’ jokes Eleanor, and everyone laughs.

7.7. Conclusion

In this chapter I analysed what happened when a subgroup of BB-group members – comprised of five men and one woman – went on a tour of the Cerro Rico mines in ‘The Mountain That Eats Men’, and had a reflective discussion about it in their hostel room. The chapter was mainly oriented to answering the following secondary research question: how does the character of a transformative pedagogic space shape what happens in it?

In constructing a response to this question, the central tenant of my argument has been that a combination of unusual and unplanned circumstantial factors created a highly gender-imbalanced pedagogic space whose character shaped the process and content of teaching and learning in unusual and unplanned ways. This complex and sometimes contradictory set of temporary, space-and-time-specific learning “outcomes” can be understood as both reproductive and transformative in different ways. I will now elaborate on this answer by organising the key points made in the chapter under the main themes that emerged and then synthesising them into a more detailed response to the research question. I identify the following main themes in this Chapter’s
analysis, many of which are underlying themes that have emerged over the past two analytical chapters:

1) The character of the pedagogic space shaped what happened in it in unplanned, unpredictable ways, highlighting a discord between pedagogic intentions and outcomes and the coexistence of reproductive and transformative learning processes;

2) A culture of silence (Freire, 1972) in relation to explicitly political issues as Instructors attempted to be neutral;

3) A fixation with accessing “purity” and evading cultural contamination in the accumulation of CCC;

4) The prevalence within the BB group of binary frames of reference, but also the challenging of these frames.

7.7.1. The Character of the Pedagogic Space Shaping Pedagogic Process in Unpredictable, Contradictory Ways

I pointed out that on arrival in Potosi, the BB group split created a Potosi subgroup that was highly gender-imbalanced, a group dynamic that was intensified by Eleanor’s sharing a bedroom with three male students and a male Instructor. I argued that in the unplanned absence of two pre-tour scaffolding activities (the activity with the child union, and the watching and discussion of the devil’s miner film) that usually frame the “character” of the mine tour – for BB-students – around issues of child labour and worker exploitation, a “character vacuum” was created. This “empty” space was largely filled by the newly re-gendered character of the space.

This change immediately reconfigured the character of the subgroup which quickly became shaped by increasingly more explicit patriarchal discourses. I argued that this feature was amplified in the overall character of the transformative pedagogic space – of which the social composition of the subgroup is an important component – by the
unplanned, sexist behaviour of our mine tour guide and other misogynistic elements of the overwhelmingly male-populated, masculine spaces we inhabited during the mine tour. For example, use of terms like ‘chick’ to describe women – common among some male students in the BB group – were now accompanied by our tour guide’s sense of humour, based on flagrant sexism and references to bestiality.

However, the story of the mine tour is not a simple story about the reproduction of patriarchal discourses in a nominally ‘transformative’ pedagogic space. Instead, there are parallel and complex counter narratives of transformative discourse and student agency woven throughout this story. I suggested that this web of narratives was spatially patterned, to some degree, by arguing that within the overall character of the masculine-gendered transformative pedagogic space, the discursive practices of the subgroup changed markedly between different spaces. I suggested that these changes are different ways of interacting with different types of “Other” and I discussed them with regard to the subgroup’s transitions from:

1) the mine tour bus – in which we mix with a certain set of outsider-Others (including some women) on the way to the mine – to;

2) the time inside the claustrophobic, physically and emotionally oppressive mine – in which we also interact with a different set of outsider-Others (miners, all of whom are men) in a way that is differently contained and controlled in time and space – to;

3) the hostel room where no outsider-Others are present but the subgroup nevertheless engages with a specific set of ideas about gendered Others from the different “insider-Other” perspectives of one gendered Other (the lone woman, from the men’s perspectives) and five gendered Others (the five men, from the woman’s perspective). In this environment, the subgroup is stationary and has more agency to control the space and time used for the discussion activity than was possible during the tour agency-organised mine visit. This means that Randall,
but also the students, are more able to try and regulate what happens between the four walls of the room.

What emerges, then, from the Rich Mountain pedagogic space is the notable discord between the Instructors’ pedagogic intentions for the space, and the “outcomes” (immediate). Whereas Instructors intended for the space to be an exploration of issues of historical and contemporary human and environmental exploitation in Bolivia, I have argued that the features, or character, of the mine tour instead brought gender power relations to the surface. In many ways, the pedagogic space reproduced social power relations; Eleanor had a difficult time and experienced sexist behaviour towards her. Yet, in some ways these unexpected experiences led to a discussion about gender equality and sexual politics that was potentially transformative.

7.7.2. A Culture of Silence

Throughout the chapter, my analysis demonstrated instances in which the Instructors and I chose to remain silent rather than engage students with challenging, explicitly political issues. Whilst this has been a consistent theme across my three analytical chapters, in the Rich Mountain pedagogic space the culture of silence was starker as blatant instances of sexism were left unchallenged on numerous occasions. For instance, I discussed a situation on the Salar de Uyuni in which most of the male students were enjoying listening to loud music with misogynistic lyrics. I also discussed situations in which Eleanor was exposed to sexist behaviour by our tour guide Jorge. Although bothered by this, neither the Instructors nor I challenged these behaviours. I argued that this was consistent with their politically neutral pedagogic strategy and functioned once again to maintain a culture of silence, rather than critical dialogue, in this case about the topic of gender power relations. This is inconsistent with BB’s Freirean-inspired pedagogic ethos and the overarching pedagogic imperative for Instructors and students to be outside the comfort zone as much as possible. I pointed
out that BB’s overarching pedagogy was, then, being applied selectively in different times and spaces in relation to different aspects of the programme. BB-group members might regularly feel uncomfortable by, say, feeling tired and hungry, but rarely because their most deeply-held worldviews and political positions were challenged openly and explicitly.

7.7.3. Accessing “Purity” and Evading Contamination

I elaborated the argument I began in the previous chapter – that in their pursuit of CCC, BB Instructors and students are drawn to people and places they perceive as culturally pure. I discussed how during the reflective discussion in the hostel room – which became a large part of the main event of the pedagogic space, and thus this chapter – Jorge’s behaviour became a focal point of the mine tour. All subgroup members were unimpressed by elements of our guide’s demeanour, but as I pointed out, Eleanor was the only person who objected in the first instance to his sexism, as well as his homophobia.

In analysing the different reactions of the subgroup members to Jorge’s behaviour, and the changes in their own behaviour in relation to it in different spaces, I suggested that our guide represented the tourist taboo within the BB group. The students seemed disappointed that Jorge’s behaviour is not an expression of his supposedly authentic, genuine, and ultimately pure, being. This might also reflect, as I suggested earlier, a sense of disappointment on their part that he, and we, may not be the purely authentic travellers we have been constructed as throughout the programme. Jorge’s habitus (Bourdieu, 1990) incorporated some Western ways of being which marked him out as culturally impure to the students. Along with the other tourists on the mine tour, our guide’s well-rehearsed performance for tourists reminded the subgroup members that they were tourists, not travellers, at least in this time and space. This polluted the transformative pedagogic space, contaminating it with unpalatable characteristics that reflected aspects of the student’s habitus (ibid). This meant the pedagogic space lost much of its purity, and made it less attractive as a source of CCC.
To salvage some of the cultural purity of the space, the male students attempted to maintain boundaries, which included resistance to Jorge’s bringing US pop culture into the space.

What also emerged so distinctively in this chapter’s analysis though, is that purity-seeking also manifested, in this transformative pedagogic space, in the form of gendered perceptions of what constitutes a “real man” – uncontaminated by any feminine characteristics – and a pure woman – the essence of femininity uncontaminated by masculine characteristics. These gendered preoccupations have been well discussed in the relevant literature (e.g. see Ehrlich, 2014; Tellis, 2012). The notion of maintaining female purity has historically found various forms of cultural expression, perhaps most crudely in the idea of women maintaining their virginity until marriage. The premise in this idea is that a woman’s body should not be entered-into by a man until she enters-into marriage with a man, thus preserving her bodily boundary intact, and her internal world therefore pure and unpolluted, lying in wait for the first and only man to cross its boundaries (ibid).

Yet if this pedagogic space can be seen as reproductive rather than transformative in the sense that it is reproducing essentialised, heteronormative ideas of what properly constitutes men, women and proper relations between them, it also produced other unplanned but potentially transformative learning processes. Scott and Eleanor’s altercation about Jorge’s behaviour towards her inadvertently catalysed a discussion about sexism, homophobia and gender power relations – not only in Bolivia but back home in the US. This led, once the dust had settled, to one of the students feeling comfortable enough to share the deeply personal story of his/her father’s recent ‘coming-out’ as a homosexual and some of the implications. This eventually led to a potentially transformative discussion about the spectrum of sexuality which challenged binary frames of reference.
7.7.4. Binary Frames of Reference

I suggested, then, that the hostel room discussion had now become characterised by a spirit of more open, collaborative critical enquiry and dialogue which ended with students deconstructing the binary and rigid constructions of sexual preference – “straight” and “gay” – and reconceptualising them along a spectrum of sexual behaviour. I suggest that this is an example of that element of transformative learning which concerns the breaking-down of simplistic structures of mind and action and the creation of more complex, sophisticated, nuanced frames of reference. In this sense, then, The Mountain that Eats Men (and Women) was also the The Mountain That Eats Ideas About Men and Women, or at least helped students mine and chew over these ideas.

Nonetheless, my analysis also revealed the prevalence within the BB group of binary frames of reference, which are both products and (re)producers of overly simplistic ways of thinking and being. These have manifested in various ways so far in this (for example, the Spectrum Activity analysed in chapter 6 and interpretations and representations of the ‘poor but happy...simple lives’ people in Nación Apu). Perhaps most fundamentally, with respect to conceptualisations of identity, the tourist/traveller binary distinction reinforces the notion that BB group members are, in an ontological sense, one or the other of these singular identities. This, as opposed to an understanding in which they can be both at different times and in different spaces, or in a less ontological sense, that they are just people who engage in both travelling and tourism, rather than being travellers and/or tourists.
Chapter 8

Conclusion

8.1. Chapter Outline

In this chapter I synthesise my responses to the research questions in the previous three chapters to address the overarching question: What constitutes transformative pedagogic space? I begin by recapping and developing the key points I have made thus far, identifying and elaborating the prominent analytical themes in relation to each secondary research question. I organise and present my points in response to each of the three secondary research questions – SQ(1), SQ(2) and SQ(3) – in turn, but each set of points also addresses the cross-cutting secondary research question: How do power and space function in a transformative pedagogic space? Next, I pick up on the core lines of argument and combine them into a conclusion to my thesis, articulating how I have made an original contribution to knowledge, not only in relation to the substantive content of my arguments but also in methodological terms by highlighting the contribution made by my particular use of critical ethnography. Finally, I discuss the limitations of the research and make recommendations for future research and pedagogic practice in the field of transformative education.
8.2. Recapping and Developing the Main Themes and Arguments: Revisiting the (Secondary) Research Questions

8.2.1. Research Question SQ(1)

_What pedagogic devices are used in a transformative pedagogic space and what are their underpinning rationales, intentions, and functions?_

Various pedagogic devices are used in a transformative pedagogic space, and in the case of the BB programme I analysed several but focused mainly on three: (1) The Three Zone Framework; (2) The Spectrum Activity; and (3) The Storytelling Activity. I showed that there are differences and similarities between the underpinning rationales, intentions, and functions of these devices, but focused on the similarities as they relate to the main themes that emerged in my central line of argument. I argue that the three pedagogic devices are intended to provide BB students (and Instructors) with a type of ‘mental map’ (Kitchin, 1994; Lynch, 1984) – a spatialised conceptual, emotional, and social guide to collectively and individually navigating the transformative pedagogic spaces they were entering.

The pedagogic rationale behind these devices is that orienting the students by providing frames of reference to scaffold their experiences is useful for guiding impressionable young people through the ‘disorienting dilemma’ (Mezirow et al, 1978) involved in transformative learning. This scaffolding is seen by BB staff as necessary to responsibly guide students out of The Comfort Zone and as close as possible to the edge of Panic Cliff, but to prevent them falling off the edge. Indeed, this rationale underpins BB’s pedagogic ethos more broadly; students’ experiences are structured by the close daily involvement of Instructors, a feature that differs from many other gap-year programmes in which participants are left to their own devices. The pedagogic devices I analysed are, then, part of teaching and learning strategies that are
seen by BB staff as necessary features of the programme and form part of its visible, explicit, instructional pedagogic discourse (Bernstein, 1994). The conscious intention behind these devices was made clear by Instructors to students.

I also argue, though, that these pedagogic devices have a less visible, implicit, or tacit, function within BB’s regulative pedagogic discourse (ibid). The extent to which this parallel function is intentional, and/or the extent to which Instructors and students are conscious of it, varies between individuals. The pedagogic devices function as mental maps that steer students towards safe, albeit challenging, learning experiences during the programme, but also guide them towards the accumulation of a particularly exclusive form of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986) that I termed ‘cross-cultural capital’ (CCC). This cultural capital can reap highly valuable rewards for BB students, such as entry into an Ivy League University, thus reproducing their privilege and undermining BB’s transformative Freirean aspirations.

My conceptualisation of CCC is distinct from other uses of the term, and from ‘cosmopolitan capital’ (Weenink, 2008) because it can only be accumulated by crossing a cultural boundary to physically enter another cultural space. For the border-croosser to gain CCC, the perception of entry into a space of cultural Otherness can be made both by people in the cultural space – or ‘social field’ (Bourdieu, 1986) – the border-croosser has exited and/or by people in the cultural space the border-croosser enters. The greater the perceived Otherness between the cultural spaces, the greater the value of the CCC accumulated – although the value is also determined by the perceived quality and quantity of time spent in the Other space, as I will elaborate shortly.

The capacity to accumulate CCC is unevenly distributed within ‘power geometries’ (Massey, 1994) that position certain people – such as BB students, Instructors and I – as particular kinds of so-called “global citizens” who can harness the forces of globalisation to their advantage. If globalisation is characterised by space-time compression (Harvey, 1989; Massey, 1994), then these privileged global citizens exploit this
compression; they are, so to speak, in the right space at the right time. Geographical and cultural mobility is, then, closely connected to (upward) social mobility.

By contrast, others connected to the BB programme – such as most of the people the BB group encountered in Bolivia and Peru – are less mobile and thus less able to accumulate CCC. Many have not travelled much within their own countries, let alone internationally. Although some – for example BB students’ homestay host families – may accrue some type of CCC through their exposure to foreign students, it is less clear (because this was not the focus of my thesis) exactly what type this is and what advantages it confers upon them. Thus, despite the rhetoric of universal inclusivity connoted by the term “global citizenship” (Dower and Williams, 2002), asymmetric power geometries mean that some people are less able to be global citizens than others. This configuration of power geometry benefits BB group members.

To elaborate further on CCC and how it is accumulated during the programme; there are different strains of this cultural capital, with different values, that are accumulated in different ways. It is possible, for instance, to accumulate a certain type and quantity of CCC by engaging in the tourism that was so discouraged by BB staff and students. For example, a tourist visiting Machu Picchu might gain CCC because there is a cultural cache associated with seeing this globally renowned sacred site. This could garner interest, respect, and even envy from friends, family and colleagues. However, it is highly unlikely that this strain of CCC would help the tourist gain the types of advantage gained by students’ during the BB programme. This is, I argue, partly due to the familiarity of Machu Picchu; as an established tourist attraction, its (perceived) Otherness is diluted.

In this sense, globalisation creates a paradox for the CCC-accumulating mobile global citizen. The contested but popular perception that globalisation is defined by cultural homogenisation – or even 'McDonaldization' (Ritzer, 1993) – at the hands of Western cultural hegemony and the “invisible hand” of free market capitalist expansion
that this entails, presents a dilemma. Whilst the proverbial “shrinking of the global village” has, through space-time compression, enabled increasing numbers of people to more easily and quickly accumulate CCC by travelling farther to enter Other cultural spaces for short periods of time, those spaces are increasingly perceived to be less different than they once were. To maximise CCC accumulation, the tourist can respond to this conundrum in two ways: (1) by cumulatively amalgamating trace quantities of CCC from numerous cultural spaces, an approach evident in the proverbial “bucket list” phenomenon in which tourists sightsee as many cultural sites as possible within a limited time and tick them off their list; and (2) by venturing further off the tourist trail, which may require going beyond one’s comfort zone, and entering less familiar territory, redefining oneself as a traveller rather than a tourist.

So, the more concentrated and pure the (perceived) Otherness of a cultural space, the more valuable the CCC to be gained from it. The dilution and contamination of Otherness at Machu Picchu by the infiltration of predominantly Western cultural influences partly explains BB Instructors’ reluctance to visit the site with students, as discussed in Chapter 1; there is limited CCC to be excavated from this place, which is seen as “touristy” and thus incongruent with BB's “off the beaten track” traveller ethos.

The heavily-promoted distinction made between travelling and tourism – and more fundamentally, travellers and tourists – during the programme is what Bourdieu would describe as a cultural distinction. I argue it is connected to social class distinction. For BB Instructors and students, tourists come lower down in the pecking order than travellers; hence, tourists’ ways of being in other cultural spaces were sometimes scorned during the programme. Whilst this social stratification is partially based on well-intentioned, if questionable, notions – for example that tourists are less culturally sensitive than travellers – it is founded on privilege, rooted in unequal power relations that delineate boundaries of possibility (Hayward, 1998), enabling and constraining a person’s ability to be a tourist or a traveller. Whilst being either of these types of “explorer” requires privilege, and both types can be enacted by
a range of social classes, to be a BB student “traveller” requires unique privileges that most tourists could not afford. Subtle social class differences aside, having the time and money to pay over $13,000 for three months in South America without generating income is beyond most people’s financial means.

Yet, during the programme BB students and Instructors never (demonstrably) critically interrogated the assumptions and implications of the tourist/traveller distinction they regularly and dogmatically reproduced. This too, is a product of power and privilege. As Kimmel says: Privilege is invisible to those who have it (2016). To add to this, as I have elaborated throughout this thesis, many theorists of power would contend that power is least visible to those who benefit most from it (e.g. see Kimmel, 2003; Lukes, 2005). Moreover, even if one glimpses their own privilege – perhaps during a moment of transformative learning – I argue it is a further privilege not to be compelled to explore, understand and address this social advantage. This is a luxury less-afforded to the less privileged who must be acutely aware of life at the lower end of the social scale to try and survive its challenges and overcome its obstacles to their “getting on” in life. The lack of critical reflexivity by BB Instructors and students during the BB programme is anathema to Curry-Steven’s ‘Pedagogy for the Privileged’ (2007). Rather than BB group members critically unpacking the tourist/traveller distinction as an opportunity for Freirean conscientisation, it reproduced social stratification. It was imperative for BB Instructors and students to construct identities as travellers and maintain this distinction in the narratives they formed about their programme experience. Once again, BB’s transformative aims were (unintentionally) undermined.

The preoccupation with constructing BB group members as travellers not tourists – and the associated disparaging of tourists and tourism – was underpinned, then, by the compulsion to not only accumulate CCC, but an even rarer, more exclusive and valuable strain of CCC. This is accumulated through a transformative learning experience – or rather the perception of others that one has experienced a transformation – and I describe it as ‘cross-cultural transformation capital’ (CCTC). There
is a positive cultural value within the cultural spaces which BB students and staff inhabit, that is attached to the experience of profound learning and change. This is particularly true of transformation experienced through travel, which is commonly regarded as an innately positive thing to do because it “opens the mind” and “broadens horizons”. Travelling is seen as a catalyst for transformation, and in many middle-class circles the international Gap Year is a ‘rite of passage’ (Beames, 2004) for worldly wannabes, for young upwardly-mobile global citizens. It is the means of accumulating CCTC.

So, whereas CCC can be gained by a tourist on a day trip to Machu Picchu, it is unlikely that she would be able to credibly claim that it was a life-changing experience and use this to gain significant social and cultural advantage. There is, then, a hierarchy of experiences within the ‘economy of experience’ (Heath, 2007: 91) surrounding travel (not least gap year travel) in which tourists/travellers trade. By contrast, BB students and Instructors are in a better position to make such claims after spending three months in South America engaging in challenging experiences like, for instance, the time-spent in Nación Apu and gathering CCTC from these places and spaces. These hierarchies of place, space and experience are, then, closely connected to BB Instructors’ (and students’) perceptions of relative transformative potential. The more touristy a place, space and experience is perceived to be, the less potentially transformative it is perceived to be. What emerges from this analysis is an intersection of hierarchies of social (class) status, place, space and experience – all inextricably and intimately connected to the accumulation of CCTC.

However, I also discussed numerous instances throughout the thesis in which students willingly engaged in touristic activities – for instance insisting on visiting Machu Pichu despite learning from Instructors that it was not a “traveller” type place. So, what also emerges from my analysis is that not only did BB Instructors and students seek to define themselves as travellers, but that they also incorporated elements of the alternative tourist strategy – “bucket listing” – for optimal CCTC accumulation. In fact, the BB group created a hybrid strategy that
delicately balanced the two CCC accumulation strategies mentioned earlier (gathering trace quantities of CCC from numerous cultural spaces, or by venturing further off the tourist trail). I argue that they exploited their mobility within power geometries to maximise CCTC accumulation.

This function of the pedagogic devices goes unspoken during the programme because, I contend, it is a reproductive function that contradicts BB’s transformative pedagogic intentions by widening social inequalities through extending the cultural advantage of already-privileged BB students. In this sense, the pedagogic devices function “secret treasure maps” that constitute part of BB’s hidden curriculum within its ‘regulative pedagogic discourse’ (Bernstein, 1996) – a curriculum so hidden, however, that it is perhaps also largely invisible to many BB staff and students. If not invisible, it is certainly a secret in the sense that it is never mentioned within the BB group. This ‘culture of silence’ (Freire, 1970) is antithetical to BB’s Freirean ethos but inadvertently maintained by Instructors’ commitment to political “neutrality”. It is not, however, the only taboo within the group, as my response to the next research question demonstrates. Moreover, I will also demonstrate that the reproductive function of the pedagogic devices does not preclude the possibility that the pedagogic spaces created during the programme can be transformative in some ways.

8.2.2. Research Question SQ(2)

What is the process, and content, of teaching and learning in a transformative pedagogic space?

The process and content of teaching and learning in a transformative pedagogic space can be both transformative and reproductive. In many instances these parallel processes happened in the same place at the same time during the BB programme, as the following table shows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformative</th>
<th>Reproductive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some students experienced processes of profound personal change. For example: Ava transforms into a “happier more confident” person and discovers her creative calling in life; Ethan discovers a deeper appreciation for the natural world; and several students become more grateful for “what they have”.</td>
<td>Students’ transformations were largely personal in nature and disconnected from a sense of social transformation. There is little to no evidence of students developing a motivation and commitment to ‘criticising the world and changing it’ as ‘critical global citizens’, which was BB’s aim. Eleanor appears to deepen her well-established commitment to social change, but this does not really constitute a transformation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were instances of students’ developing more sophisticated frameworks and processes for engaging with complex issues. For example: Ethan held contradictory thoughts and feelings in suspension during the Spectrum Activity, implicitly rejecting the binary spectrum framework and creating a suspension space; students began deconstructing the binary poles of sexual orientation in their discussion after the mine tour.</td>
<td>Simplistic, binary frames of reference were used to frame the teaching of fundamentally important aspects of the programme, thus reproducing dualistic “Western” ways of thinking and being, rather than going beyond them as was BB’s aim. For example: the crucial traveller/tourist distinction; and the agree/disagree poles of the Spectrum Activity (although this prompted students to take a stance on political issues, it reproduced a limited framework for considering them and could have been structured differently to allow a multiplicity of responses).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was some evidence of students changing perspectives through critical engagement with important issues. For example: Harrison experiences a “revolutionised” perspective change in his understanding of cultural difference; Ethan, Jay and Scott appear to change (or at least consider changing) their perspectives on sexual orientation (and to a lesser extent gender inequality in the US), somewhat persuaded by Eleanor’s conception of a spectrum of sexual identities.</td>
<td>With a few exceptions (see left), Instructors reproduced a culture of silence about sensitive socio-political issues and power relations, through a pedagogy of political neutrality. For example: Instructors’ decided not to challenge students about the misogynistic music lyrics they sang along to on the Salar de Uyuni.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a contradiction between these transformative and reproductive processes. From a Bourdieusian perspective this can be understood as symptomatic of a structural contradiction at the heart of BB’s enterprise. This is a conceptual tension between the very notion that an exclusive education programme for privileged students could facilitate personal transformation and contribute to a (Freirean) process of social change that challenges inequality; the former arguably negates the latter because the benefits accrued from personal transformation (i.e. through CCTC) extend students’ privilege even further, thus exacerbating social inequality. This tension is never explicitly engaged with in the process and content of teaching and learning during the BB programme. To do so would necessitate engaging with the notion that poverty and inequality are relational, presenting BB staff and students with a difficult conceptual and ethical pill to swallow; the (social and cultural) value of the programme for BB students is determined in relation to its lack of value for less privileged people who do not participate in it.

Leaving aside this theoretical impasse, though – and assuming a less pessimistic post-Freirean perspective – there is another type of contradiction between the reproductive function of BB programmes and its transformative Freirean aims. This happens in relation to an explicit instructional discourse and an implicit regulative discourse (Bernstein, 1996). In the case of the visit to Nación Apu, for example, the explicit pedagogy of distance and difference used by the Instructors attempted to shock and awe the students into experiencing transformative learning. However, it also implicitly affirmed Instructors’ authority and created a mechanism of dependency towards them (and I as the researcher).

The Instructors intended and anticipated that Nación Apu would be a transformative pedagogic space for students for reasons rooted in notions of distance and difference; the independent nation is geographically and culturally distant from the BB group, and a radically different environment from anything the students have experienced before. By ‘allowing place to be teacher and classroom’ in Nación Apu, Instructors anticipated that students’ learning would be oriented around
issues of poverty, inequality and indigenous rights. In a sense it was as students struggled to make sense of the material and extra-material inequalities they witnessed.

However, the culture of silence created through Instructors’ commitment to neutrality created a political-pedagogic vacuum – an “empty space” largely filled by pedagogic processes that reproduced dominant, problematic discourses (e.g. many students saw the Apu people as ‘poor but happy’) that were rarely explicitly and critically interrogated in BB group spaces. This trend was sometimes bucked though, for instance when Instructors facilitated the Nacirema reading and discussion, which generated critical reflexivity and prompted students like Harrison to ‘revolutionise...the way I perceive culture’. However, these examples were, in my view, too few and far between.

The challenges that students experienced through being exposed to cultural distance and difference often appeared to manifest in a coping strategy that invoked familiar pop cultural products from the US. The Instructors’ disapproval of this, and their attempts to regulate students’ behaviour by exhorting them to ‘be present’ in the time and space illustrated, in my view, an attempt to maintain the perceived cultural “purity” of the Nación Apu pedagogic space. This was underpinned by the compulsion to accumulate a particularly valuable, pure form of compressed CCTC. In this analysis, Western cultural influences are seen to “contaminate” the pedagogic space and thus devalue the CCTC to be gained from it. So, the more distant and different the pedagogic space is from what the BB group defines as normal (i.e. normal life for them in the US), the better.

I also point out that the attempt by Instructors to regulate what happens in certain spaces highlights the importance of power and space as conceptual-analytical categories through which to understand what happens in transformative pedagogic spaces. Using this conceptual lens helped me to see a spatial-pedagogic pattern that emerged during the programme. Instructors and students used particular kinds of spaces for particular activities at particular times, and mostly kept – consciously or
otherwise – these spaces and activities strictly segregated from each other. ‘Mind-domain’ (i.e. intellectual, thinking) activities usually took part in quiet, isolated, “private” spaces only occupied by BB group members, and distanced from non-group members. For example, the Nacirema activity happened around the side of a building sheltered not only from the wind, but from Nación Apu community members.

These mind-domain activities almost always utilised pedagogic techniques based on principles of “rational” verbal dialogue, and very rarely (apart from, for example, the Spectrum Activity) incorporated somatic, kinaesthetic, affective techniques. Instead, mind and body-domain approaches to teaching and learning were kept separate from one another. This is, I suggest, a reproduction of Cartesian dualism as manifested in pedagogic discourse and rubs uncomfortably against BB’s holistic pedagogy and its conviction to move beyond Western ways of being (BB, 2013c). Conversely, “experiential”, “whole-body” activities often took place in the company of non-BB group members, and mind-domain activities were far less common among the BB group in these types of spaces. For instance, very little reflective discussion took place among the BB group in the presence of non-BB group members. I will describe this phenomenon as pedagogic segregation.

I conceptualise this phenomenon as an extension of the pursuit of purity, and more specifically pure (compressed) CCTC. A special private, safe, enclosed space is reserved for the “uncontaminated” production of cognitive, rational, reflective knowledge, which happens exclusively amongst BB participants. By contrast physical, embodied, “get your hands dirty” learning is segregated from the cognitive reflective “retreat” spaces and involves – indeed relies upon – the participation of BB group “outsiders” who are not invited to participate in the higher-order thinking activities.

Although BB’s experiential pedagogic ethos is premised on getting out of the classroom and learning in “real-life” situations, the process of pedagogic segregation that I identify raises question marks over how this culturally immersive approach is implemented in practice. How
immersed do BB group members and non-group members become in the different facets of each other’s lived experience? While these different groups do interact in certain kinds of activities, such as slaying sheep, I contend that a kind of “portable classroom” is carried about by the BB group and kept separate from its surroundings. This private classroom is used for specific kinds of intellectual “higher order” knowledge production that is unpolluted by any outsider involvement and aids the CCTC accumulation process.

A good example of this pedagogic segregation is the post-mine tour discussion which took place in the privacy of the BB group hostel room, without the participation of our tour guide, despite him being a central focus of the discussion. Using this example is also helpful for elaborating on the process of knowledge production, and thus CCTC accumulation, during the programme and, moreover, how the character of a pedagogic space shapes this process.

8.2.3. Research Question SQ(3)

How does the character of a transformative pedagogic space shape what happens in it?

The characteristics of a transformative pedagogic space can shape what happens in it through a combination of intentional pedagogic devices (which can function in intended and unintended ways) and sets of unplanned circumstantial factors. For example, in my analysis of the Rich Mountain mine tour and the subsequent discussion, I argued that a series of unpredictable events created a highly gender-imbanced pedagogic space whose character shaped the process and content of teaching and learning in unusual and unplanned ways. This complex and sometimes contradictory set of temporary, space-and-time-specific learning “outcomes” is both reproductive and transformative.

I also pointed out that the character of the pedagogic space changed notably from one place to another. For instance, the male students switched from casually reproducing patriarchal heteronormative
discourses in the hostel room before the tour, to expressing resistance
to Jorge’s machismo during it (though notably his homophobic behaviour
but not his sexist behaviour). This highlights the pedagogic segregation
I mentioned earlier – a process I will now elaborate.

Based on my analysis of transformative pedagogic spaces in this thesis,
I argue that their characters shaped processes of pedagogic segregation
in various ways. For instance, in the case of the Rich Mountain pedagogic
space, in addition to the separation of different gender discourses
already discussed, other distinct pedagogic segregations were apparent.
For example, the mine tour engaged students in physically immersive,
emotional, ‘head, hands and heart’ (BB, 2013c: 203) whole-body
learning with group outsiders but did not feature intellectual,
conceptual-analytical pedagogic processes; by contrast, the privacy of
the hostel room reflective discussion did.

Linking back to where I left off in my discussion of CCTC accumulation
at the start of this chapter, I will now argue and conclude that this type
of pedagogic segregation plays an important part in the process through
which BB group members gather experience and produce knowledge
(and thus accumulate CCTC) during the programme. To do this, I first
use the process of mining, refining and distributing silver as an analogy,
to highlight that there can be a close connection between the character
of a pedagogic space and what happens in it.

The process of accumulating CCTC can be described in a series of stages
that correspond with the stages of the silver-production cycle. Moreover,
each of these stages also corresponds roughly with the patterns of
pedagogic segregation I observed in the Rich Mountain pedagogic space,
and in other spaces during the programme. The following diagram
illustrates the stages of the process (the darker blue fields describe the
character of each stage of the process, and the lighter blue and orange
fields describe the related processes with respect to, respectively,
mining silver and accumulating CCTC):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1: Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silver is extracted from the mine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience and knowledge (E and K) is extracted from the mine during the tour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2: Categorisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside the mine, the silver is sorted into different quality categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the mine, the raw E and K is made sense of by students sorting it into different meaning categories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 3: Refinement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the refining plant, the silver is refined and impurities removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the hostel room, the E and K is refined and purified through reflective discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 4: Packaging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The pure silver is packaged for transportation and sale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The pure E and K is packaged (e.g. in the Storytelling Activity) for transportation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 5: Transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The silver is transported internationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The E and K is transported internationally, across cultural boundaries when students return home.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 6: Currency Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The silver is sold in some form, to specific types of people, thus being converted into financial currency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The E and K is &quot;cashed in&quot; (as CCTC), in specific social fields, for cultural advantage in the US.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This process of CCTC accumulation is, then, a process of knowledge production in which each stage has a distinct character and happens in a specific type of space at a specific time. The regulative pedagogic discourse (Bernstein, 1996) used - unintentionally and/or unconsciously, or otherwise - to facilitate this knowledge production attempts to maintain the boundaries around what is taught and learned in pedagogic spaces that are segregated from one another, or strongly ‘classified and framed’ (ibid)

To elaborate, this pedagogic segregation facilitates a specific and unique form of knowledge production involving the extraction, filtering, refinement, and dissemination of forms of knowledge which rapidly and substantially increase in cultural value (both in the US and within a globalised knowledge economy). The value of the knowledge produced (as CCTC) increases greatly and rapidly because:

(1) it is based on a rare type of “hands-on”, “up-close and personal” experience, in short supply in the US and in global knowledge marketplaces; very few people are likely to have had the experiences that BB students have during the programme (e.g. living with families in Nación Apu, a community usually off-limits to Westerners);

(2) the moment in which students’ experience and knowledge is imported from one cultural space (e.g. Bolivia) to another (e.g. USA), the knowledge acquired, and the acquirer, both undergo a form of transformation. The knowledge changes from something ‘known’ about ‘the Other’ in the Others’ cultural space (closer to the “object” of knowledge, but less valuable) to something ‘known’ about ‘the Other’ in the knower’s cultural space (more distant, yet more valuable). For the BB student, the moment of importation is a “coming of age” achieved through gap year travel, a Western middle-class “rite of passage” (Beames, 2004). The knowledge acquirer is transformed from a “naive, parochial, adolescent” to an experienced traveller and worldly adult – from a local denizen to a global citizen. Thus, the knowledge and the knowledge-acquirer both increase in cultural value;
(3) the value of the knowledge and the knowledge-acquirer gained by BB participants does not decrease over time but is likely to increase and/or generate further gains. Knowledge and personal experience are, at least within the 'economy of experience’ (Heath, 2007) in many Western cultures, often regarded as timeless, and indeed “priceless”.

In a sense, then, this process of knowledge production can be seen as transformative for the BB students (e.g. see point 2 above). However, as I have argued, although it may be personally transformative it is also socially reproductive. The character of the transformative pedagogic spaces shaping this process of pedagogic segregation assists BB group members to exploit, unintentionally or not, the forces of globalisation to accumulate CCTC; it enables them to manipulate space and time in such a way as to compress it in what amounts, I submit, to a pedagogic manifestation of space-time compression (Harvey, 1989). I now conclude this section, therefore, by contending that the process through which BB students and Instructors accumulated CCTC was itself compressed.

8.2.4. From Space-Time Compression to Compressed CCTC Accumulation

I pose compressed CCTC accumulation as a process that takes place through the kind of cross-cultural education experience offered by a gap-year programme such as BB’s. When applied in this pedagogic context, the concept of space-time compression describes a process in which a high quality and quantity of cross-cultural teaching and learning experiences are gathered by BB group members across a wide range of cultural spaces in a (relatively) short space of time. It is as if these experiences are being stuffed hurriedly into Nathaniel’s shopping basket of Other ways of being (as discussed in Chapter 5). In this case, the accumulation is compressed into three-months within the BB students’ gap year. This relatively brief period is especially condensed when considering the lifelong advantage that will accrue from the BB students’ gathering of this form of CCC.
This form of cultural capital, and the process of its accumulation, is distinct in some ways from the types of capital that have enabled students and Instructors to access the programme. The latter have, in many cases, been accumulated over long periods of time (e.g. family wealth gained over generations), and for the most part gathered from within one’s familiar social spaces. The boundaries of these familiar cultural arenas may include geographical borders that are relatively localised (i.e. forms of capital accumulated in a relatively contained physical area) though there are likely to be some exceptions to this as the types of students that come on BB programmes are often relatively well travelled, as are their families, in comparison to the US population.

By contrast, the compressed CCTC accumulated by the BB group was gained in a disproportionately short time-span relative to the value of the capital gained. Moreover, it was gathered precisely by physically travelling outside one’s social field, in this case also crossing geographic and cultural boundaries. Again, this suggests that spatial (and temporal) characteristics are central to the type of CC gained from the programme, and the rationale underpinning the programme pedagogy. In this case, the character of the transformative pedagogic space shapes what happens in it by compressing the CCTC-accumulation process.

Furthermore, this form of CCC is also compressed in the sense that it is gathered in the BB programme through the kinds of “uncomfortable, rugged, remote, immersive, authentic” cross-cultural experiences that travellers not tourists are seen to have; but at the same time, and often in the same spaces, these accumulation channels are compressed together with elements of the “comfortable, snap-happy sightseer, trinket-collecting, inauthentic” tourist experience. Although the latter way of being in another cultural space is a taboo on the BB programme, it nevertheless took place alongside the former. For instance, The Rich Mountain mine tour is, by definition, a tourist attraction.

So, although BB group members constructed themselves as adventurous travellers, the programme is clearly not “too adventurous”. Group members do not push the underpinning rationale of adventurous
travel to its extremes by, say, spending six months alone with the Nación Apu community. That would push the travellers – and possibly the Apu community – too far outside The Comfort Zone. Instead, a hybrid strategy is employed in which Instructors enable students to dip into a variety of cultural spaces to facilitate the optimal accumulation of CCTC and guarantee the expected ‘transformative’ success of the BB programme.

As I have outlined in this section (especially in the six-stage diagram), the process of compression I refer to also indicates not only how CCTC is accumulated at its source – outside the students’ familiar social fields – but also how it is converted, or ”cashed-in”, at its destination within the student’s social field. For example, as I discussed in Chapter 5, during the Transference phase Instructors facilitated the Storytelling Activity in which students prepare transformative “traveller’s tales” about their programme experience to tell others upon their return home. Students are required to compress three months’ worth of diverse experiences across a range of spaces and places into three differently time-bounded stories to recount in specific types of spaces. So, in addition to being compressed in time, these stories are likely to be told in a single space (e.g. a corridor, classroom, or parent’s kitchen) far removed from the multitude of spaces and places from which students gathered the material for the stories – material that also amounts to CCTC.

As suggested in my silver-mining analogy, this process is analogous to a form of cultural currency conversion; BB students accumulate CCTC by crossing into Bolivia and Peru and gathering experience/knowledge, but that experience needs to be converted – just as Bolivianos and Peruvian Soles would to US Dollars – if they are to maximise its value within students’ familiar social spaces in the US. This process of conversion is then, like the process of accumulation at the source, also highly compressed in time and space.
8.3. My Original Contribution to Knowledge

In this section I will first synthesise and develop the main themes, arguments and conceptual contributions outlined above to address my primary research question: What constitutes transformative pedagogic space? Second, I will describe how my use of critical ethnography made it possible to answer the research question in the way I have, explaining and justifying how my methods not only enable a contribution to knowledge in the areas of transformative learning and pedagogy, and development education (specifically in the context of gap year programmes), but also to the methodological literature.

8.3.1. A Synthesis of the Main Themes, Arguments and Conceptual Contributions

To answer my primary research question, my original contribution to knowledge consists of the following components:

1) Transformative pedagogic space is constituted by and through complex, changing processes of power. By addressing the lack of research into power and transformative pedagogy, this thesis has provided insights into how structures, systems and relations of power shape pedagogic processes and short-term learning outcomes. I have made empirically informed inferences about how invisible, symbolic power sometimes shaped students’ and Instructors’ ways of being in unintended, and possibly unconscious, ways. I argued that some of the unintended pedagogic processes that happened during the BB programme were culturally and socially reproductive, but also that some unintentionally facilitated (potentially) transformative learning.

This showed that transformative pedagogic space is constituted, in some cases, by significant contradictions. With regard to socially reproductive features, in the case of the BB programme this included seemingly insurmountable structural contradictions; for instance, by participating in the ‘transformative’ programme, already-privileged BB students were
reproducing the systems that produce social inequality by extending their own cultural advantage over other non-BB students.

But my analysis also revealed sub-structural contradictions at the level of the micro-practices that helped constitute the transformative pedagogic spaces. For instance, in my analysis of the Spectrum Activity in chapter 5, I showed that the ‘neutral’ space that was spontaneously created in the middle of the spectrum – albeit unplanned by the activity facilitator Frida – appeared to be used at the same time by different students for both reproductive and (potentially) transformative learning.

My thesis therefore makes a critical contribution to the empirical and theoretical literature on transformative pedagogy, illustrating in ethnographic detail how both transformative and reproductive learning can be triggered unintentionally – but also how transformative intentions do not necessarily lead to transformative outcomes – and offering explanations as to why, in the case of the BB programme, this was. This also contributes, moreover, to the development education literature by, for instance, providing a response to Martin and Griffiths’ proposal (2012) for trying to minimise the possibility of problematic ‘unintended consequences’ when development education is facilitated by and for people from the global North, while in situ in contexts in the global South. Martin and Griffiths suggest that more structured ‘courses’ of teaching and learning should be used, employing a transformative postcolonial pedagogy and facilitated by ‘differently knowledgeable others’ with the capacity for critical reflexivity (ibid: 918). As I suggested in Chapter 1, and throughout the thesis, the BB programme ostensibly matches this description, not only in terms of BB’s pedagogic rhetoric but also in the sense that the programme Instructors do possess these characteristics and did intend to facilitate this type of programme. Although the programme arguably achieved its aims to some degree, my analysis suggests that it often fell significantly short despite its highly structured nature, partly because Instructors often attempted to maintain political neutrality which opened up spaces for the reproduction of problematic discourses by students.
My analysis of how political, economic and cultural manifestations of neoliberal (and neo-colonial) ideology influenced the shaping of socially reproductive pedagogic spaces during the programme (e.g. through the pursuit of pure CCTC) also contributes to other similar strands of theory and practice in the development education literature, as I discussed in chapter 2 (e.g. see Chaput et al, 2010) by providing a fine-grained micro-analysis – based mainly on participant observation – of the interplay of power, space and pedagogy during the programme. My conclusions do not necessarily contest Martin and Griffiths’ proposal, but rather raise questions about it and highlight the need for more research – particularly ethnography – into the function of power, space and place in structured development education abroad experiences.

2) To understand how a transformative pedagogic space can be unintentionally reproductive, I used Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital but adapted and evolved it for use in the specific context of a cross-cultural education programme. This involved elaborating the concept to explain a specific form of cross-cultural transformation capital (CCTC), only available to groups of rugged travellers like the BB group. I elucidated how the tourist/traveller distinction constructed by BB Staff and students is a ‘cultural distinction’ (Bourdieu, 1996), related to social class stratification and promulgated through a pursuit of cultural “purity” – a search for supposedly authentic spaces to be found as far as possible from the polluting influence of tourists, and Western culture. Through my analysis, I theorised a process of knowledge production through pedagogic segregation, thus highlighting the conceptual value of ‘space’ to research in educational contexts. I also showed how the process of accumulating CCTC during the programme can be conceptualised as a process of compression. This is a pedagogic manifestation of ‘space-time compression’ (Harvey, 1989) in which BB group members not only reproduce but re-entrench their privileged positions within global ‘power geometries’ (Massey, 1996), thus being the beneficiaries of the unevenly-distributed benefits of globalisation. The disaggregation and elaboration of one of Bourdieu’s signature concepts into a specific strain of CC peculiar to the 21st Century knowledge economy, and my
application of Harvey’s and Massey’s concepts to a detailed description of the CCTC accumulation process, is arguably my most significant contribution to knowledge.

The contributions outlined above not only counter the preoccupation with temporal frameworks for understanding transformation in the transformative learning literature, but also add to debates in areas of development education. For instance, as I introduced in chapter 2, Laurie and Baillie Smith's recent work (2017) in the area of volunteering and development critiques 'relational conceptualisations of space' on the grounds that they are prone to over-determining problematic 'hierarchical spatial imaginaries' (Baillie Smith and Laurie, 2011: 556) and subsequently reifying static geographies of volunteering and development. These geographies have, it is argued, 'segregated particular settings and types of volunteering' and produced fixed, limited, and decontextualised understandings of volunteers diverse experiences in these settings while 'side-lining the temporalities associated with such fixings' (Laurie and Baillie Smith 2017: 95). The authors unsettle these geographies by exploring how 'hidden geometries' can create more complex, messy and unexpected 'spaces of coming together' for different actors involved with volunteering in development (ibid). Whilst I acknowledge that Baillie Smith and Laurie's work is more concerned with the production of problematic geographies at an organisational and institutional level (i.e. the state, civil society and the corporate sector), I suggest that my thesis contributes to the discussion they have started and complicates it somewhat, albeit speaking from the level of micro practices in the production of pedagogic spaces. My thesis deploys several concepts similar to the ones that Laurie and Baillie Smith critique – for instance, relational space, hidden (power) geometries and (pedagogic) segregation – but, inversely, concludes that these conceptualisations have helped, rather than hindered, the revelation of types of unexpected, complicated, and sometimes contradictory hybrid spaces that the authors refer to. Again, this conclusion does not necessarily contest Baillie Smith and Laurie's points but does highlight the need to continue this discussion, and
particularly to continue refining these conceptual constructs into a set of more precisely articulated, contextualised tools for analysis in this area of educational theory and practice.

3) Many of the reproductive pedagogic processes that were unintentionally facilitated during the BB programme were enabled by a pedagogy of political neutrality and a culture of silence (about “difficult” socio-political issues). This subordinated the socio-political aspects of students’ learning to the personal learning and change they underwent. Drawing on Curry-Stevens’ post-Freirean ‘Pedagogy for the Privileged’, I argued, then, that transformative pedagogic space is (or should be) constituted by pedagogic processes that incorporate and connect the personal and socio-political dimensions of transformative learning. By applying, appraising, and adapting Curry-Stevens’ framework in the context of the BB programme – thus responding to her invitation to try-out and develop her framework in different settings – I take her work forward in several ways.

First, I exploit one of the major strengths of Curry-Stevens' work – a translation of Freire's abstract concept of 'conscientização' (critical consciousness) into an operational 'proposed model for the transformation of privileged learners' (2007) – by incorporating key elements of her detailed 10-step model into a fine-grained critical ethnographic analysis of the pedagogic processes experienced by privileged BB students (and Instructors). Although recent scholarship (e.g. see Case, 2013: 4) has called for, and begun to develop, 'a coherent model for effective privilege studies pedagogy', there is a distinct lack of research – including within the literature on development education – that presents analysis of (ethnographic) empirical data in relation to such models. My thesis addresses this, and in the process analyses several aspects of the pedagogic spaces created during the BB programme that appear to challenge and sometimes confound the types of transformative learning process Curry-Stevens' advocates. Through such an analysis, I have highlighted, in ethnographic detail, the importance of context to Curry-Steven's framework and raised questions
about whether more flexibility needs to be built into her model to account for contextual contingencies.

Second, I have exported Curry-Stevens’ framework from the social work discipline in which she mainly locates her scholarship and imported it into the disciplines of transformative pedagogy and development education. Curry-Stevens' work offers potential for both researchers and practitioners who wish to better understand processes of transformative teaching and learning in development education. This discipline-crossing process enabled me to explore the importance of sociocultural and geographical context in relation to Curry-Stevens' framework by applying it in a context that is similar in some ways to, but also markedly different from, the Canadian classrooms in which she initially developed her model for use in workshops on social justice with adult social workers and educators. By using Curry Stevens' work in conjunction with Andreotti’s (2006) postcolonial frame of reference for distinguishing ‘soft versus critical’ approaches to global citizenship in development education (introduced in chapter 1), I combine a focus on transformative pedagogic process and development-related content (e.g. poverty), a combination rarely undertaken in the literature featuring (empirical) research. This contributes to debates in the transformative education literature about the need to define precisely what transformative learning looks like in a specific context, in terms of what kinds of changes it involves in the substantive content of people's perspectives and points of view in relation to issues in that context. It also addresses a lack of research into development education (especially in the context of gap year programmes) that presents analysis of (ethnographic) empirical data in relation to such models. Moreover, my use of Curry Stevens’ work is pertinent to debates over the efficacy of ‘doing’ development education in ‘developed world’ contexts that are culturally and geographically far removed from the ‘developing world’ context at the heart of this form of education (e.g. see Martin, 2013; Martin and Griffiths, 2014). By referring to Curry-Stevens' work in relation to the pedagogic spaces facilitated by BB in Bolivia and Peru, and by drawing on the concepts of power geometry, space-time compression and cross-
cultural capital, my research has highlighted the importance of place and space in shaping the teaching and learning process and foregrounded how these concepts interact with forms of defaced power.

Third, although Curry-Stevens’ post-Freirean framework re-contextualises and develops Freire's work in important ways, my use of her framework has elucidated how it retains both the strengths and shortcomings of Freire's approach. Indeed, the major strength of Curry-Stevens’ work – its practical applicability (as discussed earlier) – remains constrained by the main limitations of Freire's approach, namely an exclusive fixation on the conscious, cognitive 'mind domain' as the sole site of learning. Although Curry-Stevens' model articulates different stages of critical transformative learning in tangible, observable steps and can therefore be applied by researchers and educators alike, using her framework in my research context has highlighted its shortcomings.

Whilst much of the analysis in my thesis has been oriented around the extent to which BB Instructors and students demonstrated development of critical consciousness in their teaching and learning, my attention to the function of invisible, symbolic power in the pedagogic spaces I studied has also pointed to the importance of non-verbal, non-cognitive, unconscious pedagogic processes and the body domain as a site of (transformative) learning. This aspect of my research has revealed that Curry-Stevens' framework is currently inadequate for accounting for these forms of power in processes of teaching and learning, and I have pointed to directions in which it might be developed. Drawing on concepts of defaced, invisible power and habitus, there is a need to further develop ways for educators to facilitate conscious and unconscious transformative learning in the body domain – a form of bodily 'conscientização' – and methods for researchers to interpret and understand this process.

4) Tying together the contributions above, I suggest that - in a broader, theoretical sense - transformative pedagogic space is constituted through a process of teaching and learning that facilitates the demarcation, crossing, and re-configuring of boundaries. By 'boundaries', I refer to any type of threshold - e.g. geographic, cultural,
psychological, emotional - that marks the place where one type of space ends and another begins. For instance, to apply this theorisation in relation to Ethan’s experience in the Spectrum Activity, would be to understand Ethan’s suspension between contradictory feelings of nationalistic pride at being a US citizen and critical reflection on the global impact of US resource consumption as his suspension on the boundary between two spaces, each containing a different self-identity.

In this theorisation, the forms of transformation facilitated are determined by the types of boundaries, and the extent of transformation by the way in which they are crossed and reconfigured. Although the amount of time spent in the new space by the boundary-cropper also helps determine the form and extent of transformative learning, this theorisation is principally spatial. In this sense, it challenges the predominately temporal lens through which transformative learning is viewed (common in the literature) and the related contention that transformative learning is an irreversible process, conceived as a period located at a point in linear time. Beyond a spatialised theorisation of what constitutes transformative pedagogic space, my contribution here is, then, to provide an empirical example of the importance of space as a lens through which to study transformative education, and educational spaces more broadly, thus addressing the late arrival of these areas to the ‘spatial turn’ (Warf and Arias, 2009) of recent years in critical geography and sociology.

### 8.3.2. Methodological Contributions

As discussed earlier in this thesis, most research into transformative educational experiences focuses on the learning outcomes of self-identified transformed learners, based on self-reported data collected retrospectively. There are very few ethnographic studies on transformative education – including within the context of development education – and even fewer critical ethnographies. There is also an absence of attention to power in transformative education research, and by extension little methodological consideration of how to study the
function of different forms of power in transformative pedagogic processes. By conducting a critical ethnography focused on the interplay of power, space and place in the transformative pedagogic spaces created during the BB programme, I have contributed to filling this gap in the literature. Specifically, my thesis makes a methodological contribution to knowledge in the following ways.

First, my thesis contributes to probing the definitional boundaries of what constitutes a community, or culture, as the object of ethnographic research. As I discussed in Chapter 4 (‘Methodology’), ethnographers typically spend several months or perhaps years living with a community that existed prior to the researchers’ (physical) arrival and that exists after their departure from the lived spaces of community members' daily lives. By contrast, although my three-month long fieldwork period was unusually short for an ethnography, it is also unusual in the fact that it encompasses the entire lifespan of the community I studied. This feature of my research enabled me to observe BB Instructors and students from the starting point to the endpoint of their physical existence as a teaching and learning community, thus allowing me to create a type of temporal and spatial "baseline" and "end-line" for my interpretations of participants' 'ways of being' during the programme, helping to inform my analysis of the processes of reproduction and/or transformation that Instructors and students participated in.

Second, as I also discussed in Chapter 4, the context for my critical ethnography also diverges from more conventional ethnographies which tend to study people doing 'ordinary activities' in 'naturally occurring settings' (Brewer, 2000:6). By observing and analysing BB students and Instructors doing “extraordinary activities” (i.e. activities that they could never ordinarily do at home in the US, and which were designed to be transformative), as well as more ordinary activities (albeit in an unfamiliar context for students), my thesis questions some of the premises and orthodoxies of conventional ethnography and contributes towards developing a different strain of ethnographic research. Moreover, my use of a conceptualisation of ‘space’ as being constituted by and through power (à la Harvey, Lefebvre, and Massey) questions
the very notion of 'naturally occurring settings' precisely by exposing the function of invisible power in the naturalisation of space as a supposedly apolitical, neutral category of human experience.

Third, I have reinterpreted the conventional focus of critical ethnography on 'marginalised voices', or 'the voices and experiences of subjects whose stories are otherwise restrained and out of reach' (Madison, 2004:5). Rather than focus on the voices of marginalised people (or rather, people that have been perceived as marginalised in some way) I chose to focus on the voices and experiences of privileged people (or rather, people that have been perceived as privileged in some way) but did so in relation to how those BB Instructors and students engaged, or not, with perspectives that have been marginalised by dominant discourses. I attended, then, to how forms of power functioned to privilege the teaching and learning of certain ideas, concepts and values while marginalising others during the programme.

My focus on the function of invisible power produced a convergence of process and content in my research. Given that Curry-Stevens' framework, and the concept of 'conscientisation' (conscientização), was central to my study, my methodology and conceptual framework overlapped considerably in the sense that my approach to the research resulted in my observing and interpreting how forms of invisible power (in the shape of dominant discourses) militated against BB teaching students about invisible power, and other forms of power. Instead of interrogating forms of power and thus enhancing the transformative potential/qualities of the pedagogic space, Instructors, by attempting to maintain neutral political positions, allowed problematic discourses to be reproduced during the programme (e.g. the 'poor but happy' narrative used by some students to make sense of their experiences in Nación Apu).

Fourth, my use of video-recording, audio-recording and photography contributes to methodological knowledge by providing examples of different strategies for data gathering, storage and analysis. By video recording the main structured pedagogic activities during the
programme, as well as a significant proportion of other activities, I was able to revisit pedagogic spaces I had observed in real time by re-watching recordings after the event. This was invaluable in developing my analysis of the event by augmenting my initial impressions and interpretations with new insights that were generated through repeated scrutiny of video recordings. This method enabled me to observe numerous details which I had initially overlooked while making field notes during my real-time observations.

Moreover, by video recording on a regular basis, and discreetly, I felt that the Instructors and students quickly became accustomed to this research method. This helped create an environment that was conducive to research participants being more relaxed, open and forthcoming while being recorded than they might have been if I had only used the video-recorder occasionally. My approach also helped me to gain consent for filming in intimate settings which are extremely difficult to access (e.g. filming inside homestay families homes in Nación Apu); for instance, our guide Wilfredo had become accustomed to my filming during the days prior to our arrival in Nación Apu and his initial uncertainty about my video camera appeared to ebb away as he willingly translated while I explained the purpose of the video camera and my research to homestay families before requesting and gaining their consent to film inside their homes.

Similarly, my strategy of carrying an audio recorder with me at all times proved highly effective in enabling me to record impromptu discussions with and between research participants. The knowledge that I would have verbatim recordings of these interactions lessened the pressure I would have felt to somehow remember exactly what participants had said, in order to accurately quote them, whilst writing down my memories of conversations afterwards, or scrambling to take notes during discussions which would interrupt the flow of the discussion, and which is also very difficult to do in certain situations, for example when trekking through the mountains in the rain. Furthermore, carrying my audio record at all times also enabled me to use it as a device for recording my own field notes by speaking into the recorder. This enabled
me to record my thoughts and in a manner that was less inhibited by
the need to shorten and edit my thoughts in order to write them more
efficiently. Moreover, by using some of my data – for example,
photographs – to double up as "reciprocal offerings" to BB students,
Instructors and other staff and programme associates to thank them for
consenting to my research, I have demonstrated how data can be used
for multiple purposes.

Fifth, my methodology, and the context of my research, extends that
element of critical ethnography which seeks to 'give something back' to
the people of studies to the point where it begins to overlap in some
ways with action research methodologies. The initial idea and impetus
for my thesis was born during my experience of being a BB Instructor
and wrestling with the challenges of engaging students with issues of
power and privilege. This, then, was 'the problem' (as it is often
described in action research), at least in my view, that needed
addressing. In order to develop the transformative pedagogy employed
by BB, I felt that we needed to know more about the teaching and
learning processes it entailed, and therefore set about conducting this
study. Although my positioning and involvement in the programme
during the fieldwork was far more distanced than it would have been if
I were conducting action research (thus helping to distance my
methodology from action research methodology) my contributions
towards developing BB's transformative pedagogy, since finishing the
fieldwork, are congruent with the ethos of action research. By providing
verbal and written feedback for BB instructors, and a written research
report tailored specifically for BB's practical use (and presented by BB
instructors to other staff), I have attempted to "feed something back"
to the organisation. I also hope to complete the "feedback loop" by
putting the conclusions of my research into practice by leading another
programme as a BB Instructor.
8.4. Limitations and Recommendations

My original contribution to knowledge in this thesis is limited in several ways. I will now outline these limitations and then make recommendations for how future research could address them. Following this, I then end the thesis by making recommendations for transformative educators – particularly those working with privileged learners – by way of returning to the Bolivian bus ride that began this thesis. In this imaginary return journey, I articulate what I might have done differently – and indeed what I intend to try out in my future work as an educator – based on the lessons learned through this research.

8.4.1. Short-Termism: The Importance of Time, Over Time

This thesis is limited in the sense that its analysis is strictly timebound. It does not focus on BB students’ medium-term or longer-term learning processes or outcomes. I set out to explore pedagogic processes during the BB programme, but this necessarily means that the scope of the research does not extend beyond the students’ departure from Bolivia. The students (and Instructors) will presumably continue to learn and change in ways connected to their programme experience. This might include forms of transformative learning, including learning linked to social change.

The theoretical, methodological, and practical challenges of conducting research to understand the BB students and Instructors’ post-programme learning trajectories would be considerable, but worthwhile. While some research has focused on learners after a transformative educational experience, this has not, to my knowledge, been linked to prior ethnographic research into that same experience. This is, then, a gap in the literature that needs addressing. Moreover, there is little longitudinal research into transformative learning trajectories after a transformative educational experience, which could foreground the function of time – and space and place – in shaping learning. I have
maintained contact with BB group members and plan to follow up on these recommendations in future.

8.4.2. A Focus on the 'Final Product'

My analysis was not only time-bound in terms of its focus on BB students' learning trajectories, but also temporally and spatially contained within the 'on-the-ground', 'delivery' phase of BB's transformative educational endeavour. I did not pay much attention to the other phases, people, and processes through which BB creates, maintains and develops its pedagogic ethos and the organisational culture and practices which feed into the in-country delivery of its programmes. My analysis therefore focused on the 'final product' of BB's activities, at least in the sense that the Bolivia and Peru programme was the culmination of the life-cycle of one BB programme.

By omitting to investigate the people and processes that play an important part in reproducing BB's pedagogic ethos – for instance, the organisation's Director, managerial team, and pedagogic advisers – I was only able to paint a limited picture of the programme's life-cycle. I was unable, for instance, to provide an interpretation of how particular notions of transformative teaching and learning are translated when communicated across different times, spaces and levels within the BB organisation, and the ways in which different forms of power shape these notions into the 'final product' that instructors attempt to deliver during the programme. This could have provided more insights – using Hayward's 'defaced' power framework (1998) – into the social boundaries that enabled and constrained instructors’ ways of teaching, and ways of being, during the programme. If I were to undertake the research again (or similar research), I would consider conducting interviews with other members of staff and, if possible, participant observation of activities in BB's headquarters in the US.
8.4.3. Selective Stories

The large quantity of qualitative data I gathered during fieldwork was challenging to manage and analyse. Whilst any form of research inevitably tells a selective story, the amount of data I gathered coupled with the microanalysis I conducted meant that I told a very selective story based on a small proportion of the data. Moreover, my narrow focus on a single BB programme using critical ethnography not only limits the generalisability of the research, as I discussed in detail in the ‘Methodology’ chapter, but also the replicability of the study. Although I have suggested that my conclusions will be of interest, relevance and use beyond the particular context of my study, the empirical observations on which they are founded are highly context contingent. It remains to be seen whether the pedagogic processes I observed are common in other BB programmes, and/or other gap year education programmes. I suggest that further research in these areas is needed so as to inform a critical, comparative dialogue about what constitutes transformative pedagogic space in these contexts.

Although this is to be expected in an ethnography and is not a serious limitation, it does illuminate a more serious one, both in my research and in the literature more broadly: the perspectives of BB programmes associates did not feature prominently in my thesis. What, for instance, are the perspectives of homestay host families? Do they accumulate CCC by hosting students and if so, what form and how? What is Jorge’s interpretation of the Rich Mountain mine tours he gives? My relative lack of attention to programme associates in the thesis is, I think, the biggest limitation of the research. Particularly considering that I conducted a critical ethnography focusing on power relations in pedagogic processes, the absence of programme associates' perspectives from my narrative is itself reproductive of the power relations I critique. This arguably represents an ethical and political contradiction in addition to an academic limitation and is something I would seek to redress if I conduct similar research in the future. There is a need for more research focusing on the experiences of people “Other” than gap year students in the spaces they occupy during cross-cultural encounters.
8.4.4. What is the Impact?

When I describe my thesis to people, the first question I am invariably asked is: ‘So, does the programme work or not?’ My reply is invariably: ‘Yes and no – it’s complicated’. Although this research provides a critical analysis of the transformative and reproductive pedagogic process that occurred during the programme, it is not – and did not attempt to be – an impact evaluation of the programme. This may be seen as a limitation and might disappoint some transformative educators, or researchers, who are looking for conclusive answers about the transformative impact of such programmes and/or how to create transformative pedagogic templates that are guaranteed to “work” across time and space in different cultural contexts. This study does not provide an example of how evaluation, or teaching, of this type can be carried out.

It could be interesting and useful to develop more sophisticated quantitative and qualitative tools for research that asks ‘did she or didn’t she (transform)?’ questions – particularly in relation to socially transformative post-Freirean frameworks. However, I would more readily recommend further ethnographic explorations into the nuances and contradictions of transformative pedagogic processes, rather than research orientated around learning outcomes which are assessed at an arbitrary point in time – with the assumption that time is linear. More of the former may not provide the inevitably elusive “transformative template” but might provide researchers and educators with examples of more sophisticated ways of thinking and being with regard to the complexities of understanding and practising transformative teaching and learning.

8.4.5. Irresistible Power

Although this thesis addressed the lack of attention to power in transformative pedagogy, it was limited by often referring to a post-Freirean framework. This approach theorises transformative learning as
a conscious awareness of the ways in which (oppressive) power operates, and a conscious resistance towards it. Although I highlighted the shortcomings of this framework and addressed them to an extent, the thesis did not engage adequately with the question:

*Can the unconscious, socially reproductive function of ‘invisible’ symbolic power be resisted and transformed unconsciously?*

This question poses considerable theoretical and methodological challenges. However, in this thesis I have highlighted some of the conceptual tools and techniques that could be usefully developed to help address the question. For instance, using Bourdieu’s concept of habitus in combination with socio-spatial analysis of power relations would help researchers to observe (potential) unconscious transformations in learners’ bodily hexis and use of social space. I suggest that this could be a rich vein to explore.

Alongside this challenging and specific recommendation, however, I also suggest that there is a broader need to anchor transformative education in an attention to power. Building on the post-Freirean work of Curry-Stevens, I suggest that transformative educators refocus on the connections between personal and socio-political transformation and explicitly engage learners in learning about the forms and functions of power, including symbolic invisible power. This might include attention to how power operates in transformative pedagogic spaces but should, at the very least, as Curry-Stevens suggests, engage learners in considering their own positions in structures and systems of asymmetric power. As I have shown in this thesis, the power-riddled “nature” of spatiality can be harnessed to help solve the “riddle of power”; or, in other words, the intellectual puzzle of how to see invisible, symbolic power and analyse how it functions at the micro-level of daily social and pedagogic interaction.
8.4.6. Deconstructing but not Reconstructing

Despite employing a critical ethnographic methodology which explicitly declares its transformative pedagogic ambitions, my thesis is limited by generally failing to suggest alternatives for reconstructing the pedagogic practices it deconstructs/critiques. This is a limitation of the thesis specifically rather than the entire research process given that I have, for example, provided BB Instructors and other Staff with verbal and written feedback and a research report containing practical pedagogic suggestions and recommendations for enhancing their practice (as outlined earlier in the thesis). This limitation of my thesis is arguably a common feature of most academic research and is particularly pertinent for 'critical' forms of scholarship that purportedly wear their progressive political-epistemological hearts on their sleeves. My point is not that academic work should be indistinct from activism, but that academic rigour can be enhanced when academic work explicitly articulates the political agendas of its authors, but also when alternative possibilities (to whatever is being analysed/critiqued) are proposed and used as a basis for critical comparisons. For instance, when critiquing The Spectrum Activity in Chapter 5, I might have considered alternative ways to structure the activity, for example using a 'rhizomatic' multilinear structure that facilitated a wider (non-binary) range of possible responses by BB students. This would have enabled me to enrich my analysis by bringing other perspectives to bear on my critique of the uni-linear spectrum, not least Deleuze and Guattari's (1980) use of the concept of 'rhizomes' to critique dualistic modes of thinking and being.

As an attempt to redress this limitation somewhat, I now discuss how the lessons learned in the thesis could be applied in practice. To do so, I end the thesis – by way of a Postface – by returning to the Preface of my thesis, an uncomfortable journey in a Bolivian bus.
Postface

Are You Sitting Uncomfortably?

Final Reflections on Band-Aids, Bus Rides and “Other” Journeys

So, then, based on the conclusions of this thesis, what might I have done differently on the Bolivian bus ride? There are no easy answers to this question, and plenty more to explore, but I have a few tips for myself and other educators. While “neutrality” is a fallacy and transformative educators surely cannot maintain a pedagogy of silence in the face of defaced power, they must think carefully about how to challenge the social boundaries that constrain and enable fields of possibility. As Curry-Stevens’ warns, privilege gets defensive when probed, especially if privileged learners feel like their hardships have not been acknowledged and empathised with. When Bianca shouted that she was ‘raised in poverty’ she was looking for recognition of her experience, and of her parents’ hard graft. The fact that we were midway through the programme and I had not heard her rags to riches story, is telling; as an Instructor, I had not facilitated opportunities for group members to bond and build solidarity in the face of power through sharing experiences of “suffering” at its (invisible) hands. As Curry-Stevens says, this is a necessary step before accepting that inequality and injustice exists, and ultimately that we are implicated in the oppression of others.

A good start would be to engage students in learning about power, its different faces, forms and functions. Placing power at the centre of the BB programme’s focus from Orientation to Transference might have made my note on the bus less abrupt, shocking, threatening. Gradually introducing students to the possibility that participating in the BB programme might extend the privilege of each of us, could increase the chances that we work together to find ways to mitigate this reproductive function. Paying more attention to context would also have helped. Our
group was tired, hungry and uncomfortable on the bus. It was probably not the best time and place to take students further out of their comfort zones, or the right pedagogic space in which to try an experiential approach to feeling the physical discomfort of standing, or the psychological discomfort of remaining seated. Next time, I would be more sensitive to the character of the pedagogic space before attempting the ‘stir the pot’ (BB, 2013c: 112). More tact was needed. After all, the power of “the plaster” in Alabama lay in its subtlety.

Now, looking back on that transformative moment – seemingly facilitated with intent by my Media and Cultural Studies Lecturer – that triggered the start of my journey to writing this thesis, something occurs to me. It feels strangely fitting that my revelation about race, privilege and power happened in a pedagogic space – a classroom inside a former church, in fact – that sat at the geographic heart of a place that sits at the historic heart of the US Civil Rights movement. Described in Martin Luther King’s 1963 *Letter from Birmingham Jail* as ‘probably the most thoroughly segregated city in the United States’, my temporary home-away-from-home was home to infamous library and lunch-counter “sit-ins” that would raise national awareness of systematic racism. This was one of many forms of resistance, but perhaps the most celebrated of these occurred down the road in Montgomery, where – on December 1st, 1955 – Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat for a white passenger on the bus.


---

10 The Breaking Boundaries references here refer to real BB source material but are not fully/accurately referenced in order to maintain anonymity.
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## Appendices

### Appendix 1: Proposed Model for the Transformation of Privileged Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Examples of Learning in Each Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence-shaking process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Awareness of oppression</td>
<td>I understand how inequality exists and that I can name it oppression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Oppression as structural and thus enduring and pervasive</td>
<td>I understand how power is at work to create this oppression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Locating oneself as oppressed</td>
<td>I have been a victim of discrimination and I have felt heard and supported in my pain about this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4: Locating oneself as privileged</td>
<td>I also have a privileged identity. I have been on the beneficiary end of power inequities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5: Understanding the benefits that flow from privilege</td>
<td>My privileged identity has allowed me to benefit from these unjust structures and to succeed in my life in the following ways... This means I might not have been as responsible for my achievements as I have understood in the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6: Understanding oneself as implicated in the oppression of others and understanding oneself as an oppressor</td>
<td>I am responsible for the continued oppression of others either through what I do or what I fail to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence-building process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7: Building confidence to take action—knowing how to intervene</td>
<td>I can step forward with ideas about what to do to create change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 8: Planning actions for departure</td>
<td>I will do this when I leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 9: Finding supportive connections to sustain commitments</td>
<td>I have some connections to others who will support me in this work. I know where to go to connect to others who are working on this topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 10: Declaring intentions for future action</td>
<td>I announce to others what I plan to do when I leave. Making this commitment to others raises expectations that I will do it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Curry-Stevens, 2007: 51)
Appendix 2: BB’s Three Main Programme Phases

1) The *Skill Development* phase, which lasts approximately 4-5 weeks and involves Instructors taking a directive role in leading activities, taking on responsibilities, making decisions, and demonstrating skills. In this first phase students take a ‘back seat’ in terms of leading and decision-making. Although the students actively participate in the programme, they are positioned firmly as students who follow the Instructors’ lead;

2) The *Enacting* phase, which also lasts approximately 4-5 weeks, involves students practising what they have learned in the first phase. Students are asked to ‘step-up’ and take on more responsibilities, and more power of sorts. For example, students might organise a group excursion and go to the bus station to buy tickets. They may also have more say and decision-making weight during group meetings in relation to the programme itinerary and daily schedule;

3) The *Empowerment* phase is designed to facilitate students taking more control over the course and Instructors taking more of a back seat to ‘lead from behind’. Students have the power to plan the itinerary for the final two weeks of the programme and are expected to rotate roles, in turn taking the position of group leader. During the empowerment phase students are expected to facilitate many aspects of the running of the programme, with minimal guidance and support from Instructors when necessary. Instructors still participate in the programme but the premise is that power relations between Instructors and students is altered.
Appendix 3: BB’s Programme Components

BB programmes feature the same set of components, each one being a type of learning activity. Each BB programme must engage students with each of these components, although different programmes place greater or lesser emphasis on different sets of components (descriptions have been re-worded slightly to maintain BB’s anonymity, and the total number of components has been reduced for the same reason):

1) Low-Cost Travel – rather than travel in relative luxury, students travel by whatever means available (i.e. public bus, on foot, mule etc.).

2) Staying in Homes – when possible, students stay with ‘typical’ (i.e. low-income) local people in their homes for extended periods, rather than staying in hotels/hostels.

3) Trekking – students undergo at least one physically demanding trek lasting between one and twenty days across remote terrain.

4) Development Focus – students learn about a variety of international development-related issues through meetings with development professionals working in country.

5) Internships/Personal Research Projects – students independently research a topic of their choice throughout the programme, which can involve internships with local people/organisations, and present their study to all participants at the end of the programme.

6) Language Learning – students take intensive language classes in commonly and widely spoken languages (e.g. Spanish in Bolivia), and optional classes in indigenous languages (e.g. Quechua).

7) Academic Inquiry – in relation to the cultural context, each programme places emphasis on different themes that are explored by students in relative academic depth.
Appendix 4: Mezirow’s Revised (1994:224) 11-Phase Model of Transformative Learning:

1) A disorienting dilemma

2) Self-examination with feelings of guilt or shame sometimes turning to religion for support

3) A critical assessment of assumptions

4) Recognition that one’s discontent and the process of transformation are shared and others have negotiated a similar change

5) Exploration of options for new roles, relationships, and actions

6) Planning a course of action

7) Acquiring knowledge and skills for implementing one’s plans

8) Provisionally trying out new roles

9) Renegotiating relationships and negotiating new relationships

10) Building competence and self-confidence in new roles and relationships

11) A reintegration into one’s life on the basis of conditions dictated by one’s new perspective

Body Ritual among the Nacirema

HORACE MINER
University of Michigan

The anthropologist has become so familiar with the diversity of ways in which different peoples behave in similar situations that he is not apt to be surprised by even the most exotic customs. In fact, if all of the logically possible combinations of behavior have not been found somewhere in the world, he is apt to suspect that they must be present in some yet undescribed tribe. This point has, in fact, been expressed with respect to clan organization by Murdock (1949: 71). In this light, the magical beliefs and practices of the Nacirema present such unusual aspects that it seems desirable to describe them as an example of the extremes to which human behavior can go.

Professor Linton first brought the ritual of the Nacirema to the attention of anthropologists twenty years ago (1936: 326), but the culture of this people is still very poorly understood. They are a North American group living in the territory between the Canadian Cree, the Yaqui and Tarahumare of Mexico, and the Carib and Arawak of the Antilles. Little is known of their origin, although tradition states that they came from the east. According to Nacirema mythology, their nation was originated by a culture hero, Notgnihsaw, who is otherwise known for two great feats of strength—the throwing of a piece of wampum across the river Pa-To-Mac and the chopping down of a cherry tree in which the Spirit of Truth resided.

Nacirema culture is characterized by a highly developed market economy which has evolved in a rich natural habitat. While much of the people's time is devoted to economic pursuits, a large part of the fruits of these labors and a considerable portion of the day are spent in ritual activity. The focus of this activity is the human body, the appearance and health of which loom as a dominant concern in the ethos of the people. While such a concern is certainly not unusual, its ceremonial aspects and associated philosophy are unique.

The fundamental belief underlying the whole system appears to be that the human body is ugly and that its natural tendency is to debility and disease. Incarcerated in such a body, man's only hope is to avert these characteristics through the use of the powerful influences of ritual and ceremony. Every household has one or more shrines devoted to this purpose. The more powerful individuals in the society have several shrines in their houses and, in fact, the opulence of a house is often referred to in terms of the number of such ritual centers it possesses. Most houses are of wattle and daub construction, but the shrine rooms of the more wealthy are walled with stone. Poorer families imitate the rich by applying pottery plaques to their shrine walls.

While each family has at least one such shrine, the rituals associated with it are not family ceremonies but are private and secret. The rites are normally only discussed with children, and then only during the period when they are being initiated into these mysteries. I was able, however, to establish sufficient
rapport with the natives to examine these shrines and to have the rituals described to me.

The focal point of the shrine is a box or chest which is built into the wall. In this chest are kept the many charms and magical potions without which no native believes he could live. These preparations are secured from a variety of specialized practitioners. The most powerful of these are the medicine men, whose assistance must be rewarded with substantial gifts. However, the medicine men do not provide the curative potions for their clients, but decide what the ingredients should be and then write them down in an ancient and secret language. This writing is understood only by the medicine men and by the herbalists who, for another gift, provide the required charm.

The charm is not disposed of after it has served its purpose, but is placed in the charm-box of the household shrine. As these magical materials are specific for certain ills, and the real or imagined maladies of the people are many, the charm-box is usually full to overflowing. The magical packets are so numerous that people forget what their purposes were and fear to use them again. While the natives are very vague on this point, we can only assume that the idea in retaining all the old magical materials is that their presence in the charm-box, before which the body rituals are conducted, will in some way protect the worshipper.

Beneath the charm-box is a small font. Each day every member of the family, in succession, enters the shrine room, bows his head before the charm-box, mingles different sorts of holy water in the font, and proceeds with a brief rite of ablution. The holy waters are secured from the Water Temple of the community, where the priests conduct elaborate ceremonies to make the liquid ritually pure.

In the hierarchy of magical practitioners, and below the medicine men in prestige, are specialists whose designation is best translated “holy-mouthmen.” The Nacirema have an almost pathological horror of and fascination with the mouth, the condition of which is believed to have a supernatural influence on all social relationships. Were it not for the rituals of the mouth, they believe that their teeth would fall out, their gums bleed, their jaws shrink, their friends desert them, and their lovers reject them. They also believe that a strong relationship exists between oral and moral characteristics. For example, there is a ritual ablution of the mouth for children which is supposed to improve their moral fiber.

The daily body ritual performed by everyone includes a mouth-rite. Despite the fact that these people are so punctilious about care of the mouth, this rite involves a practice which strikes the uninitiated stranger as revolting. It was reported to me that the ritual consists of inserting a small bundle of hog hairs into the mouth, along with certain magical powders, and then moving the bundle in a highly formalized series of gestures.

In addition to the private mouth-rite, the people seek out a holy-mouthman once or twice a year. These practitioners have an impressive set of paraphernalia, consisting of a variety of augers, awls, probes, and prods. The use of
these objects in the exorcism of the evils of the mouth involves almost unbelievable ritual torture of the client. The holy-mouth-man opens the client's mouth and, using the above mentioned tools, enlarges any holes which decay may have created in the teeth. Magical materials are put into these holes. If there are no naturally occurring holes in the teeth, large sections of one or more teeth are gouged out so that the supernatural substance can be applied. In the client's view, the purpose of these ministrations is to arrest decay and to draw friends. The extremely sacred and traditional character of the rite is evident in the fact that the natives return to the holy-mouth-men year after year, despite the fact that their teeth continue to decay.

It is to be hoped that, when a thorough study of the Nacirema is made, there will be careful inquiry into the personality structure of these people. One has but to watch the gleam in the eye of a holy-mouth-man, as he jabs an awl into an exposed nerve, to suspect that a certain amount of sadism is involved. If this can be established, a very interesting pattern emerges, for most of the population shows definite masochistic tendencies. It was to these that Professor Linton referred in discussing a distinctive part of the daily body ritual which is performed only by men. This part of the rite involves scraping and lacerating the surface of the face with a sharp instrument. Special women's rites are performed only four times during each lunar month, but what they lack in frequency is made up in barbarity. As part of this ceremony, women bake their heads in small ovens for about an hour. The theoretically interesting point is that what seems to be a preponderantly masochistic people have developed sadistic specialists.

The medicine men have an imposing temple, or lati pso, in every community of any size. The more elaborate ceremonies required to treat very sick patients can only be performed at this temple. These ceremonies involve not only the thaumaturge but a permanent group of vestal maidens who move sedately about the temple chambers in distinctive costume and head dress.

The lati pso ceremonies are so harsh that it is phenomenal that a fair proportion of the really sick natives who enter the temple ever recover. Small children whose indoctrination is still incomplete have been known to resist attempts to take them to the temple because "that is where you go to die." Despite this fact, sick adults are not only willing but eager to undergo the protracted ritual purification, if they can afford to do so. No matter how ill the supplicant or how grave the emergency, the guardians of many temples will not admit a client if he cannot give a rich gift to the custodian. Even after one has gained admission and survived the ceremonies, the guardians will not permit the neophyte to leave until he makes still another gift.

The supplicant entering the temple is first stripped of all his or her clothes. In every-day life the Nacirema avoids exposure of his body and its natural functions. Bathing and excretory acts are performed only in the secrecy of the household shrine, where they are ritualized as part of the body-rites. Psychological shock results from the fact that body secrecy is suddenly lost upon entry into the lati pso. A man, whose own wife has never seen him in an excre-
tory act, suddenly finds himself naked and assisted by a vestal maiden while he performs his natural functions into a sacred vessel. This sort of ceremonial treatment is necessitated by the fact that the excreta are used by a diviner to ascertain the course and nature of the client's sickness. Female clients, on the other hand, find their naked bodies are subjected to the scrutiny, manipulation and prodding of the medicine men.

Few supplicants in the temple are well enough to do anything but lie on their hard beds. The daily ceremonies, like the rites of the holy-mouth-men, involve discomfort and torture. With ritual precision, the vestals awaken their miserable charges each dawn and roll them about on their beds of pain while performing ablutions, in the formal movements of which the maidens are highly trained. At other times they insert magic wands in the supplicant's mouth or force him to eat substances which are supposed to be healing. From time to time the medicine men come to their clients and jab magically treated needles into their flesh. The fact that these temple ceremonies may not cure, and may even kill the neophyte, in no way decreases the people's faith in the medicine men.

There remains one other kind of practitioner, known as a "listener." This witch-doctor has the power to exorcise the devils that lodge in the heads of people who have been bewitched. The Nacirema believe that parents bewitch their own children. Mothers are particularly suspected of putting a curse on children while teaching them the secret body rituals. The counter-magic of the witch-doctor is unusual in its lack of ritual. The patient simply tells the "listener" all his troubles and fears, beginning with the earliest difficulties he can remember. The memory displayed by the Nacirema in these exorcism sessions is truly remarkable. It is not uncommon for the patient to bemoan the rejection he felt upon being weaned as a babe, and a few individuals even see their troubles going back to the traumatic effects of their own birth.

In conclusion, mention must be made of certain practices which have their base in native esthetics but which depend upon the pervasive aversion to the natural body and its functions. There are ritual fasts to make fat people thin and ceremonial feasts to make thin people fat. Still other rites are used to make women's breasts larger if they are small, and smaller if they are large. General dissatisfaction with breast shape is symbolized in the fact that the ideal form is virtually outside the range of human variation. A few women afflicted with almost inhuman hypermammary development are so idolized that they make a handsome living by simply going from village to village and permitting the natives to stare at them for a fee.

Reference has already been made to the fact that excretory functions are ritualized, routinized, and relegated to secrecy. Natural reproductive functions are similarly distorted. Intercourse is taboo as a topic and scheduled as an act. Efforts are made to avoid pregnancy by the use of magical materials or by limiting intercourse to certain phases of the moon. Conception is actually very infrequent. When pregnant, women dress so as to hide their condition. Parturi-
tion takes place in secret, without friends or relatives to assist, and the majority of women do not nurse their infants.

Our review of the ritual life of the Nacirema has certainly shown them to be a magic-ridden people. It is hard to understand how they have managed to exist so long under the burdens which they have imposed upon themselves. But even such exotic customs as these take on real meaning when they are viewed with the insight provided by Malinowski when he wrote (1948:70):

Looking from far and above, from our high places of safety in the developed civilization, it is easy to see all the crudity and irrelevance of magic. But without its power and guidance early man could not have mastered his practical difficulties as he has done, nor could man have advanced to the higher stages of civilization.
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### Appendix 6: Soft Versus Critical Global Citizenship Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Soft Global Citizenship Education</th>
<th>Critical Global Citizenship Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty, helplessness</td>
<td>Inequality, injustice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of the problem</strong></td>
<td>Lack of ‘development’, education, resources, skills, culture, technology, etc.</td>
<td>Complex structures, systems, assumptions, power relations and attitudes that create and maintain exploitation and enforced disempowerment and tend to eliminate difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification for positions of privilege</strong></td>
<td>'Development', 'history', education, harder work, better organisation, better use of resources, technology.</td>
<td>Benefit from and control over unjust and violent systems and structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis for caring</strong></td>
<td>Common humanity/being good/sharing and caring. Responsibility FOR the other (ar to teach the other).</td>
<td>Justice/complicity in harm. Responsibility TOWARDS the other (for to learn/decide with the other) — accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grounds for acting</strong></td>
<td>Humanitarian/moral (based on normative principles for thought and action).</td>
<td>Political/ethical (based on normative principles for relationships).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What needs to change</strong></td>
<td>Structures, institutions and individuals that are a barrier to development.</td>
<td>Structures, belief systems, institutions, assumptions, cultures, individuals, relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What for</strong></td>
<td>So that everyone achieves development, harmony, tolerance and equality.</td>
<td>So that injustices are addressed, more equal grounds for dialogue are created, and people can have more autonomy to define their own development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What individuals can do</strong></td>
<td>Support campaigns to change structures, donate time, expertise and resources.</td>
<td>Analyse own position/context and participate in changing structures, assumptions, identities, attitudes and power relations in their contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How does change happen</strong></td>
<td>From the outside to the inside (imposed change).</td>
<td>From the inside to the outside (negotiated change).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal of global citizenship education</strong></td>
<td>Empower individuals to act (or become active citizens) according to what has been defined for them as a good life or ideal world.</td>
<td>Empower individuals to reflect critically on the legacies and processes of their cultures and contexts, to imagine different futures and to take responsibility for their decisions and actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential benefits of Global Citizenship Education</strong></td>
<td>Greater awareness of some of the problems, support for campaigns, greater motivation to help/do something, feel good factor.</td>
<td>Independent/critical thinking and more informed, responsible and ethical action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential problems</strong></td>
<td>Feeling of self-importance or self-righteousness and/or cultural supremacy, reinforcement of colonial assumptions and relations, reinforcement of privilege, partial alienation, uncritical action.</td>
<td>Built, internal conflict and paralysis, critical disengagement, feeling of helplessness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(Andreotti, 2006)