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Abstract:

An Education for Positive Peace: A Study of the Influence of the Jesuit Educational Model of the Casa de la Solidaridad Immersion Program

Supervisor: Jeanette Rodriguez, PhD

This research paper begins with the thematic research question: Is the Casa de la Solidaridad (Casa) educational model a form of peace education, and to what extent does this model contribute to the formation of agents of positive peace? I hypothesize that the Jesuit educational model of the Casa program is a form of peace education that contributes to the formation of agents of positive peace (social justice). To test this hypothesis, I begin by exploring the theoretical links between Chadwick Alger’s model of peace education and the Jesuit educational model of the Casa program. I then explore student perceptions of the impact of the Casa program on their personal development and on their long-term commitment to promoting positive peace by asking two additional questions: (A) How does participation in the Casa de la Solidaridad program influence student understanding of the program’s three key educational goals: (1) education for justice, (2) men and women for others, and (3) global citizenship? (B) How have these three goals (education for justice, men and women for others, and global citizenship), if at all, influenced students’ vocational choices after their completion of the program?

To explore the impact of the program on student development, I used a descriptive case study model. To gain insights into the effects of the Casa experience on students, I conducted 24 interviews primarily using in-depth questionnaires to gather my data. To develop a thick description of the Casa experience, I used both theoretical insights and coding methods.

The findings showed that respondents felt they were profoundly impacted by their experience in the Casa program. In particular, the direct experience in Salvadoran communities through their praxis placement produced a deep sense of solidarity and generated a yearning, and in many cases a feeling of responsibility, to use their vocation as a means of advancing social justice. Based on my findings, I conclude that the Jesuit educational model of the Casa program is contributing to the formation agents of positive peace through a form of peace education.
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Chapter One: Introduction

I make two honest confessions to you, my Christian and Jewish brothers. First, I must confess that over the past few years I have been gravely disappointed with the white moderate. I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negro’s great stumbling block in his stride toward freedom is not the White Citizen’s Councilor or the Ku Klux Klanner, but the white moderate, who is more devoted to ‘order’ than to justice; who prefers a negative peace which is the absence of tension to a positive peace which is the presence of justice; who constantly says: ‘I agree with you in the goal you seek, but I cannot agree with your methods of direct action’; who paternalistically believes he can set the timetable for another man’s freedom; who lives by a mythical concept of time and who constantly advises the Negro to wait for a ‘more convenient season’…I had hoped that the white moderate would understand that the present tension in the South is a necessary phase of the transition from an obnoxious negative peace, in which the Negro passively accepted his unjust plight, to a substantive and positive peace, in which all men will respect the dignity and worth of human personality (King 1963).

Martin Luther King Jr. wrote the Letter from a Birmingham Jail after being arrested for a non-violent civil rights protest organized by the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights and by King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference in Birmingham, Alabama. King argued that the only means of stopping direct violence towards African Americans and in overcoming the more pernicious injustices of a culture and a legal system that systematically repressed African Americans was to stop the direct violence (negative peace) and to create the conditions where “all men will respect the dignity and worth of human personality” (positive peace) (King 1963). King believed that the only means of securing negative and positive peace was through a grassroots social movement for social justice. King and other civil rights leaders used religious values to inspire and to frame the civil rights movement, while they utilized church groups, such as the Christian Movement for Human Rights and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, as the basis for organizing a grassroots movement (Harris 1994).

This historical example provides a useful illustration of some of the key themes of this essay. In particular, it demonstrates how civil society groups can advance positive peace through various peace tools. While King’s movement primarily used non-violent protest as a means to create social change, he also

---

1 The term peace tools is based on Chadwick Alger’s (1996, 2002, 2003) work (explained below) and refers to techniques used by different groups to create the conditions of positive and negative peace.
used peace education to inspire and to empower a vanguard of the civil rights movement for social justice. This paper focuses specifically on the concept of peace education as a means to foster social change for peace by exploring the Jesuit educational model of the Casa de la Solidaridad (Casa).

What is unique about the Jesuit pedagogical approach is that along with teaching for academic excellence, it seeks “the service of faith and the promotion of justice” (Arrupe 1973). Fr. Ignacio Ellacuría S.J., the former rector University of Central America (UCA), which was a university at the forefront of using the Jesuit pedagogical model to promote social justice, called on Jesuit universities to seek social change:

The first and most evident [goal of a Jesuit university] … has to do with culture, with knowledge, and the use of the intellect. The second, not so evident, is that it must be concerned with the social reality – precisely because a university is inescapably a social force; it must transform and enlighten the society in which it lives. But how does it do that? How does it transform the social reality of which it is a part?...The university must carry out this general commitment with the means uniquely at its disposal: we as an intellectual community must analyze the causes; use imagination [to creatively] discover remedies; communicate to our constituencies a consciousness that inspires the freedom of self-determination; educate professionals with a conscience, who will be the immediate instruments of such a transformation; and continually hone an educational institution that is academically excellent and ethically oriented (1982).

Like King’s religiously based social movement for positive peace, the goal of the UCA, especially from 1980 to 1989, was to create the conditions of a socially just society in El Salvador by using the institutional force of the university and by educating students for the promotion of social justice.

In the previous quote taken from a speech by Fr. Ignacio Ellacuría, S.J. he argued that a Jesuit university “must be concerned with the social reality – precisely because a university is inescapably a social force”(1982). The social

---

2 The ‘Jesuit educational model’ refers to the pedagogical methods of the Society of Jesus. The Society of Jesus is a religious order of the Catholic Church. Individual priests are known as Jesuits or collectively as the Jesuits. The Jesuits have been involved in education from soon after their founding in 1540. According the Society of Jesus in the United States there are 3,730 Jesuit educational institutions throughout the world, educating just over 2.5 million students, including 28 Jesuit universities in the United States (http://www.jesuit.org/index.php/main/jesuits-worldwide/academia-and-education/)

3 S.J. (Society of Jesus) is used as a title for Jesuit priests.

4 I use the term social justice as it is defined by Catholic Social Teachings, which is the theoretical foundation of the normative view of society embraced by the Jesuit order and thus in Jesuit education. This will be further explained below.
reality for the majority of Salvadorans in the 1980s was one of poverty and of political repression. At the time “approximately forty percent of the population lived in poverty, one-third lacked access to safe drinking water and adequate housing. Sixty percent did not have access to basic health care” (Toton 2006: 37). These social problems were a product of vast inequality as the country’s power and wealth were in the hands of roughly two percent of the population (ibid). Any efforts to “effect change by the poor were consistently met with repression, and from the late 1970s until the Peace Accords were signed in 1992, El Salvador was engaged in a civil war” (ibid: 37). Toton (2006) further explains that for the UCA’s leadership these conditions called on the university to transform society:

For the UCA’s leadership, the condition of the poor and the systematic repression of [Salvadorans’] efforts to change their situation constituted a denial of reason itself. They argued that it was irrational for the vast majority of human beings in a society to be denied access to the basic goods, services and the power they need to secure their lives and live in dignity. The powerful in society are acting irrationally when they are indifferent to or prefer this situation, and take steps to actively prevent the poor from securing their basic human rights. The UCA’s leadership believed that were the university to ignore this reality or cooperate with it, the university itself would be acting irrationally. Thus the choice for the university came down to acting rationally or irrationally, preferring the truth or living a lie. In choosing to participate institutionally in solving the problem of injustice in El Salvador, the UCA’s leadership chose reason and truth (37-38).

The Jesuit administrators at the UCA sought to transform this unjust reality by shaping all university activities towards the promotion of social justice. They believed the mission of Jesuit education, as inspired by a rich history of Catholic Social Teachings (CST) and influenced by the founders of the Society of Jesus, called them to “educate professionals with a conscience, who [would] be the immediate instruments of…transformation” of Salvadoran society – a transformation for social justice (Ellacuría 1982). In living out this calling they utilized the five-stage Jesuit pedagogical model to educate students for justice and to instill in them a sense of solidarity with the marginalized of

---

5 There is some debate about exactly when the civil war in El Salvador began. In this paper I refer to the start of the civil war as 1980 based on Belisario Betancur (2001) truth commission report on the Civil War.
Salvadoran society. Through this process they sought to develop students who would seek social change in the country. This thesis explores the impact of a similar Jesuit educational model by examining student development in the Casa program in El Salvador.

The Casa educational immersion program in El Salvador was founded on a commitment to continuing the work of the leadership at UCA in using the Jesuit educational model as a means to develop agents of social justice. Kevin Yonkers-Talz (2003), a co-founder of the Casa program, explains that the mission of the Casa is “quite simply the promotion of justice and solidarity through the creation of a meaningful learning experience which integrates direct immersion with the poor of El Salvador with rigorous academic study” (26). For Yonkers-Talz (2003), the students of the Casa program are called to “become leaders in the movement to globalize solidarity” (26). To achieve this mission the Casa program seeks to educate students for the promotion of justice, for solidarity through educating “men and women for others” and for “global citizenship” (ibid: 26).

1.1 Research Questions and Research Approach

I first encountered the Casa program and met Casa students during a three-month internship in El Salvador in 2008. I was intrigued by students’ sense of solidarity with the Salvadoran people and by their commitment to engage in social justice work. I returned to El Salvador in 2010, and I again had an opportunity to meet with Casa students and administrators. Reflecting on these experiences and on the Casa’s educational goal of developing agents for the promotion of social justice, I became interested in understanding the extent to which the educational model of the Casa could be seen as a form of peace education for positive peace. These reflections led to the development of my thematic research question:
(1) *Is the Casa’s educational model a form of peace education, and to what extent does this model contribute to the formation of agents of positive peace?*

To help explain my approach to answering this question, I have developed the following flow chart *(see Figure 1 - following page)*:
I begin this paper by developing my argument that the Casa’s educational model is a form of peace education. To explore this link, I begin my research by outlining the theoretical foundations of this paper (box A). Alger (1996, 2002, 2003) has identified many peace tools that peacemakers can use to create the conditions of positive and negative peace. Peace education (box 1.1) is one of those tools. Peace education uses a pedagogical method to form agents committed to a vision of peace and moves them to action by inspiring a quest towards their vision of a peaceful society (ibid).

Figure 1 captures the hypothesized links between peace education (box 1.1), the formation of agents of peace (box 1.2), and the development of a condition of peace (box 1.3). The movement from peace education (box 1.1) to
agents of peace (box 1.2) is representative of Alger’s hypothesis that an effective peace education will give students a normative vision of a peaceful society and inspire them to “quest” towards that vision (Alger 2009: 40). The movement from agents of positive peace (box 1.2) to peace, again represents Alger’s (1996, 2002, 2003) theory that a successful peace education will lead students to take action to advance their vision of a peaceful world.

To develop an operational definition of peace (box 1.3) I use Galtung’s work on positive and negative peace, as Alger has done. I then use R.J. Rummel’s work to establish the link between social justice and positive peace. Finally, I use Catholic Social Teachings (CST) to develop an operational definition of social justice. Although there are many approaches to defining social justice, I use CST because it is the theoretical basis of the Jesuit educational mission embraced by the UCA in the 1980s and the Casa program today.6

I then focus on developing my hypothesis that the Jesuit educational model of the Casa program is a form of peace education that contributes to the formation of agents of positive peace (box B). To demonstrate that the Jesuit educational model is an example of a form of peace education, I begin by exploring the historical example of the UCA from 1980 to 1989. I use this example because the Jesuit leadership at the UCA during the 1980s is one of the clearest examples of a university or university program using the Jesuit educational model as a means to form agents of social justice for social change. I also explore the UCA model of the 1980s because it has had a profound impact on the development of the Casa’s educational approach.

The goal of the Jesuit educational model of the UCA in the 1980s, and consequently of the Casa today, was (is) to move society towards peace by educating students to seek social justice. In the second row of Figure 1, I follow the pattern of Alger’s model of peace education, which moves from

---

6 CST have provided the theoretical foundation for the Jesuit order’s concept of justice, which I will demonstrate in Chapter Two, is a notion of justice as social justice. Throughout this paper I use justice and social justice interchangeably when referring to the Jesuit educational model of the “promotion of justice”. To avoid confusion, remember the Jesuit concept of justice is one defined as social justice.
peace education to the formation of agents of peace to the advancement of peace through student action. In my example, the Jesuit educational pedagogy (hypothesized form of peace education) leads to the development of agents of social justice (positive peace) to create a socially just society (condition of positive peace). The Jesuit pedagogical goal is to instill students with a vision and commitment to seeking social justice through the Jesuit pedagogy (box 2.1). The Jesuit pedagogy seeks to develop students who will take action to advance social justice, thus becoming agents of positive peace (box 2.2).

Finally, the Jesuit model assumes that by training men and women to be agents of social justice (positive peace) they will collectively transform unjust social structures to foster a socially just society (box 2.3). Ultimately, I argue that based on Alger’s model and R.J. Rummel’s description of the link between social justice and positive peace, the Jesuit educational model, advanced by the UCA in the 1980s and the Casa today, are examples of a form of peace education.

Once I have developed this argument, I test my hypothesis that the educational model of the Casa program is contributing to the formation of agents of positive peace by exploring the outcomes of the Jesuit educational model through two additional research questions:

(A) How does participation in the Casa de la Solidaridad program influence student understanding of the program’s three key educational goals: (1) education for justice, (2) men and women for others, and (3) global citizenship?

(B) How have these three goals (education for justice, men and women for others, and global citizenship), if at all, influenced students’ vocational choices after their completion of the program?

In essence, I try to understand how key components of the Jesuit educational model of the Casa program have shaped students’ goals and how
those goals relate to the promotion of social justice. Thus, I focus, in question A, on exploring student perceptions of the key educational goals of the Casa program. The following flow chart provides a visual representation of these goals:

![Flow Chart: The Educational Model of the Casa de la Solidaridad]

The primary goal of the Casa program is “the promotion of justice and solidarity” (Yonkers-Talz 2003: 26). There are two pedagogical mechanisms to develop students’ committed to the promotion of justice and solidarity (Mind and Heart - box 1 & 2). The first is to educate for justice by fostering a vision of a just society, often through analysis of situations of injustice (mind → intellectual grasp of justice) and through direct exposure to situations of injustice (heart → emotional connection to conditions). The second is to develop men and women for others by developing an emotional connection to...
the victims of injustice (heart → internal feeling of solidarity). Taken together these mechanisms are meant to create a will to action for the promotion of social justice. The Casa program also seeks to globalize students’ sense of solidarity by educating for global citizenship (box 3). Thus, in this paper I have identified education for justice, men and women for others, and global citizenship as the three main educational goals of the Casa program. In question B, I focus on uncovering if and how students perceive themselves as living out the mission through their vocational choices. In conclusion, I seek to test the impact of this pedagogical approach by ascertaining the extent to which students developed an understanding of the educational goals of the Casa and the extent to which they perceive themselves as living out those goals through their vocational choices.

1.2 Methodology

My focus on the pedagogical outcomes of the Casa program to illustrate the extent that the program is a form of peace education demands a complex multidisciplinary approach to this paper. On the conceptual level, this paper is rooted in political science, as I am seeking to understand the links between peace and social justice to develop my hypothesis that the Jesuit educational model of the Casa program is a form of peace education. To understand the impact of this model, however, I have used insights from pedagogy and educational psychology. Although it is a complex formulation, I have benefited greatly from a host of generous advisers in my foray out of my disciplinary background and into pedagogical studies.

To explore the student outcomes of the Casa program, I used a descriptive case study model with the goal of developing a thick description of how participants feel they were influenced by their experiences in the Casa program. To gather my data I conducted 24 interviews using questionnaires and email correspondences, as well as triangulation methods. I utilized both
theoretical insights and coding methods of content analysis to surface key patterns and themes in participants’ responses.

By only drawing on 24 students out of a total of over 160 total graduates since the beginning of the program, I face the obvious research barrier of generalizability. Cognizant of this obstacle, among others discussed in Chapter Three, my research does reveal important trends and patterns, while also developing a foundation for future research. I have also remained astutely aware of possible research biases due to my personal experience as a Jesuit educated student, my close association with the program and past encounters with the co-director, Kevin Yonkers-Talz. I have maintained a careful awareness of these biases throughout my research, while I have also sought to randomize my data to reduce biases. With these limitations in mind, I have arduously sought to minimize their influence.

1.3 Research Gaps

Since the end of the Cold War there has been increased focus in peace studies on the role of non-governmental people’s organizations, including NGOs and grassroots movements, in promoting positive peace (Alger 2003). In particular there has been extensive research into the role of International NGOs (INGOs) in relation to both positive and negative peace (Alger 2003). There has also been thorough research into the role of social movements in promoting positive peace. There has not, based on my investigation, been research conducted in relation to the Jesuit education model as a model of peace education. Nor has there been research into the outcomes of the Jesuit educational model in relation to developing agents of positive peace. Thus, my overall approach of exploring the Jesuit educational model of the Casa program as an example of a peace education program is a unique contribution.
1.4 Detailed Organizational Overview of this Study

Chapter Two (Literature Review) provides an overview of the pertinent literature and research pertaining to this study. The chapter is organized into four sections. Section one provides an overview of the emerging focus on positive peace in peace studies and provides an overview of Alger’s concept of peace education and a clarification of the operational definitions of positive peace and social justice. Section two uses the UCA in the 1980’s as a historical example of how the Jesuit educational model is a form of peace education. Section three turns to an examination of foundations of the Jesuit educational model of the UCA and the Casa by exploring the development of the Jesuit pedagogy. Finally, section four provides a summary of the Casa program as contemporary example the Jesuit educational model as a form of peace education.

Chapter Three (Methodology) focuses on the design methodology of this case study, which is a descriptive qualitative case study. In all there are ten main sections, which detail the methodological approach used in this paper.

Chapter Four (Findings) presents an overview of the data from the questionnaires and other supplemental sources. The chapter is divided into three sections. Section one presents the case study framework. Sections two and three present the findings of underlying research questions (A) and (B).

Finally, Chapter Five (Discussion) presents a summary of the findings and discusses how my findings relate to the Jesuit educational model as a form of peace education. Section one provides an overview of the case study structure. Sections two through five discuss the implications of the findings of underlying questions (A) and (B). Section six explores the limitations of this study. Section seven concludes this research essay by answering the thematic research question and by suggesting avenues for future research.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

To develop my hypothesis that the educational model of the Casa program is a form of peace education, which contributes to the formation of agents of positive peace, it is necessary to provide a survey of the literature pertaining to the main themes of this essay. To provide a comprehensive overview of key themes I have divided this chapter into four main sections: (1) Positive Peace: “If you want peace, work for justice”, (2) The UCA from 1980-89: A Model of Peace Education, (3) The Jesuit Pedagogical Tradition, and (4) The Casa de la Solidaridad: Educating Agents of Positive Peace.

The first section provides a description of the emerging focus on the concept of positive peace in peace studies. It also explores the role of peace education in developing agents of peace. Particular attention will be dedicated to explaining the operational definitions of positive and negative peace and social justice. The second section uses the UCA from 1980-89 as a historical example to illustrate how the Jesuit educational model can be seen as a form of a peace education. The third section explores how the Jesuit pedagogical method seeks to develop agents of social justice. The fourth section presents a detailed overview of the Casa program.

2.1 Peace: “If you want peace, work for justice”

Thanks to early breakthroughs in the field of peace studies and the consequential debate surrounding controversial theorizing by Johan Galtung and others, peace studies today is an “established and thriving field with a range of journals, a number of research institutes such as the Peace Research Institute of Oslo (PRIO) and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), many centers in universities and colleges, and an international body, the International Peace Research Association (IPRA)”

---

7 Stated in a message from Pope Paul VI for the celebration of the Day of Peace, 1 January 1972. In this message Pope Paul VI discusses the need to work for social justice to achieve peace in the world.
The work of peace studies academics is also widely utilized in praxis, as UN peacekeeping and peace building interventions have dramatically expanded in frequency and scope since the end of the Cold War (Collins 2007).

The end of the Cold War ushered in optimism for an expanded role for the UN and has also generally expanded the role of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and people’s movements in promoting positive peace nationally and internationally (Alger 2003). Chadwick Alger (2003) uses the metaphor of adding “drawers to the peace builder’s tool chest” in explaining the expansion of peace studies since the 1950s and in describing the expanded role of new actors in promoting peace. Alger (2003) details the emergence of new peace tools by explaining:

After the Cold War humanitarian intervention and prevention diplomacy were added. Simultaneously there has been growing involvement of NGOs/People’s Movements who have created a number of tools to complement those invented by states: track II diplomacy, conversion from military to civilian production, defensive defense, nonviolence, citizen defense, self-reliance, feminist perspective and peace education (96).

To illustrate the expanded conception of peace studies and peace praxis, Alger developed the following table (Figure 3):
This table traces the development of various peace tools used to create the conditions for peace, which requires both negative and positive peace, and to address shortcomings of previous approaches to building peace (Alger 2003: 96). For example, Alger (2003) describes how after the failure of states to maintain a condition of negative peace, with the outbreak of WWI, the “League of Nations founders created three peace tools to respond to the inadequacies of the tools of balance of power and traditional diplomacy: collective security, peaceful settlement and disarmament/arms control” (96). In the aftermath of WWII, there was recognition that these tools were insufficient to secure a condition of peace, so the “UN added [tools of] functionalism, self-determination and human rights in the Charter [Charter of the UN]” (ibid: 96). After WWII the types of peace tools expanded to include positive peace tools (row II in table).
2.1.1 Peace Tools for People’s Organizations

The goal of Alger’s table is to illustrate how new threats to security have demanded the development of new peace tools. The final column (VI) focuses on peace tools utilized by NGOs and people’s movements to create the conditions for peace. Alger combines NGOs, INGOs and people’s movements and uses people’s organizations (PO) as “a useful short title for the growing involvement of people outside of government in world affairs in general, and peace issues in particular” (Alger 1996: 34). This category naturally includes the role of private universities, such as the UCA, or private university programs, such as the Casa program, which are non-governmental groups in civil society.

According to Alger (1996) the role of POs has increased dramatically since the end of the Cold War. He explains that, “there have been growing involvement of [POs] who have created a number of tools to complement those invented by states [and international organizations]: track II diplomacy, conversion from military to civilian production, defensive defense, nonviolence, citizen defense, self-reliance, feminist perspectives and peace education” (96). Of course POs use other peace tools to create the conditions for peace, such as promoting human rights (#8 in column III) and economic development (#10 in column IV), but Alger argues that POs have also invented certain tools. Alger (1996) explains how POs “have been the inventors and advocates of at least eight new peace tools”: Second Track Diplomacy (15), Conversion (16), Defensive Defense (17), Non-violence (18), Citizen Defense (19), Self-reliance (20), Feminist (21), and Peace Education (22) (34).  

2.1.2 Peace Education

This paper focuses on the role of peace education in creating the conditions for peace. Alger (1996) argues “peace education with a

---

8 For a detailed description of these tools see Alger 1996: 35-41.
comprehensive view is essential because it will probably be the only occasion in which young people are challenged to put into words their vision of a peaceful world” (40). He further argues that a “comprehensive peace education deepens insight on peace potential, particularly with respect to certain *positive peace tools*, and most specifically those requiring broad participation” (emphasis added) (ibid: 40). Alger argues that a comprehensive view of peace is essential in peace education, “Because of the emphasis on extreme conflict and violence by the media, and because the academic study of international relations tends to emphasize the same phenomena, young people tend to assume that a world with widespread violence is inevitable” (ibid: 40). Further, “As a result, when students are asked to describe their personal vision of a peaceful world, they find it difficult to describe anything other than what they perceive the world to be like. But peace education with a broad perspective cultivates the capacity of students to perceive widespread peace in the world, and significant achievements in efforts to diminish the scope of peacelessness” (ibid: 41).

To develop a comprehensive peace education, Alger argues that peace educators should help students develop a vision of a peaceful society and the means and inspiration to make that vision a reality (1996: 40). Ultimately, he argues that one needs to approach “peace education as a quest for ways through which one’s personal vision of a peaceful world could be achieved” (ibid: 40). Alger’s ideal model of peace education requires:

(1) [A] very intensive study of the present state of human relations with a broad perspective. (2) It also requires systematic thinking about strategies for change based on knowledge about the past successes and failures of these strategies. And (3) it constantly challenges students to clarify and revise their preferred future (ibid: 41).

The ultimate goal is to use this process of peace education to develop individual students or agents who will actively seek to create peace.
2.1.3 Peace: Positive and Negative

To develop an operational definition of peace, I use Johan Galtung’s work on positive and negative peace. In Galtung’s 1964 editorial in the first addition of The Journal of Peace Research he offers a clear definition of the terms negative and positive peace: “Thus, there are two aspects of peace as conceived of here: negative peace which is the absence of violence, absence of war—and positive peace which is the integration of human society (emphasis in original) (2). To understand what he means by positive and negative peace, one needs to understand what he means by violence.

In Galtung’s formulation, violence, in the broadest sense, is when “human beings are being influenced so that their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realizations” (Galtung 1969: 168). He goes on to explain why he rejects this narrow concept of violence – “according to which violence is somatic incapacitation, or deprivation of health, alone (with killing as the extreme form), at the hands of an actor who intends this to be the consequence” (168). He further explains that if this “were all violence is about, and peace is seen as its negation, then too little is rejected when peace is held up as an ideal…highly acceptable social orders would still be compatible with peace” (ibid: 168).

A key aspect of this understanding of violence is the point that the realization of an actor’s “potential” needs are below his/her “actual” attainment (ibid: 169). Galtung’s clarification of this disparity is worth quoting at length:

Violence is here defined as the difference between the potential and the actual, between what could have been and what is. Violence is that which increases the distance between the potential and the actual, and that which impedes the decrease of this distance. Thus, if a person dies from tuberculosis in the eighteenth century it would be hard to conceive of this as violence since it might have been quite unavoidable, but if he dies from it today, despite all the medical resources in the world, then violence is present according to our definition…In other words, when the potential is higher than the actual the condition is by definition avoidable and when it is avoidable, then violence is present (1969: 169).

To further clarify this idea of violence, I will turn my focus to clarifying the difference between subject-to-subject violence (personal violence) and to
violence when no subject acts (structural violence). Personal violence is when an actor is directly carrying out violence, such as hitting an agent (physical violence) or directly threatening them (psychological violence). Structural violence on the other hand can be seen “as a broad rubric that includes a host of offensives against human dignity: extreme and relative poverty, social inequalities ranging from racism to gender inequality, and the more spectacular forms of [non-personal] violence that are incontestably human rights abuses” (Farmer 2003: 7).

With structural violence there is no longer an actor (subject) that directly harms another, rather:

The violence is built into the structure and shows up as unequal power and consequently as unequal life chances…Resources are unevenly distributed, as when income distributions are heavily skewed, literacy/education unevenly distributed, medical services existent in some districts and for some groups only, and so on…Above all the power to decide over the distribution of resources is unevenly distributed. The situation is aggravated further if the person is low on income and also low in education, low on health, and low on power – as is frequently the case because these rank dimensions tend to be heavily correlated due to the way they are tied together in social structure (Galtung 1969: 171).

Based on this elaboration of Galtung’s conceptualization of violence, R.J. Rummel (1970) succinctly describes the separation between positive and negative peace and their connection to the concepts of social injustice and social justice:

[Peace] has two sides: absences of personal violence and absences of structural violence. We shall refer to them as negative peace and positive peace. For brevity the formulation ‘absence of violence’ and ‘social justice’ may perhaps be preferred…The reason for the use of the terms “negative” and “positive” is easily seen: the absence of personal violence does not lead to a positively defined condition, whereas the absence of structural violence is what we have referred to as social justice, which is a positively defined condition (23).

Thus, positive peace can be described as “social justice [equals] realized human potential [equals] absence of structural violence” (ibid: 23). In other words, reformulating this conceptualization into Galtung’s (169) framework where positive peace means the “integration of human society”, which in the
view embraced in this paper means the attainment of social justice. If achieving positive peace requires the attainment of social justice, then how do we define social justice?

2.1.4 Social Justice

The term social justice was first coined by a Sicilian Jesuit priest, Luigi Taparelli d'Azeglio, in 1840 and given exposure by Antonio Rosmini-Serbati (1848) in La Costituzione Civile Secondo la Giustizia Sociale (Zajda, S. Majhanovich 2006). Taparelli d’Azeglio was of the neo-Thomastic (referring to Saint Thomas Aquinas) school and was instrumental in shaping the Catholic Church’s philosophical stance on their normative view of society as being a socially just society (Solari 2009). His conceptualization of social justice, built off the Thomastic formulation of a natural law framework of justice, stressed the role of distributive justice in meeting the needs of all and thus strengthening the condition of the community (Solari 2009).

Although developed by a Jesuit in 1840, the term social justice has only been part of official church teaching since 1905 (Krier Mich 2003: 80). There have been many approaches to defining social justice, but because the Jesuit educational model of the UCA and the Casa are primarily rooted in a rich history of Catholic Social Teachings (CST), I primarily focus on the meaning of social justice in CST. Pope Pius XI, who frequently used the term in his teachings, defined social justice as follows:

It is of the very essence of social justice to demand from each individual all that is necessary for the common good…. [I]t is impossible to care for the social organism and the good of society as a unit unless each single part and each individual

---

9 See R.J. Rummel (1970), “Understanding Factor Analysis” and Kenneth E. Boulding’s (1977), “Twelve Friendly Quarrels with Johan Galtung” for keen critiques of Galtung’s theory of structural violence. Both articles critique his work for emphasizing equity at the expense of liberty, among other critiques. Because my focus is on linking the conceptualization of social justice used by Jesuit universities with a concept of positive peace, rather than reformulating Galtung’s work, I do not dedicate much space to these critiques.

member...is supplied with all that is necessary for the exercise of his social functions (Cronin 1955: 124-25).

Pius XI’s definition of social justice is rooted in a commitment to protecting the dignity of every human being, which can be restated as protecting the basic human rights of individuals.

The commitment to protecting human dignity and fostering human rights is embedded in a rich history of CST. CST is a broad term encompassing all of the social teachings of the Catholic Church. Krier Mich explains that, “When Catholics tell the story of our social teachings we tend to focus on the encyclicals and pastoral letters” (2003: 1). The tradition, however, also encompasses the insights of many theologians, priests, and grassroots laity movements. CST are generally recognized to have begun in 1891 with *Rerum Novarum*. This publication marked the beginning of the development of an identifiable body of social teaching in the Catholic Church. According to Pope Benedict, the purpose of CST "is simply to help purify reason and to contribute, here and now, to the acknowledgment and attainment of what is just…. [The Church] has to play her part through rational argument and she has to reawaken the spiritual energy without which justice…cannot prevail and prosper". The collective body of CST addresses issues of justice and peace by exploring concerns of economics, social organization, wealth and poverty.

There are three Papal encyclicals, which taken together present a comprehensive overview of the Catholic Church’s operational definition of social justice: *Pacem in Terris* (1963), *Gaudium et Spes* (1963), and *Popularum Progresso* (1968). These documents were written during or soon before the Second Vatican Council. These documents can be found in a number of different sources. The best-known collection is: O’Brien, David J. and Shannon, Thomas A., eds, (1992). *Catholic Social Thought: The Documentary Heritage*. Maryknoll, N.Y: Orbis.

---


12 As stated on the previous page, social justice was not officially incorporated into Catholic Social Teachings until 1905. From 1891 to 1905 CST embraced a natural rights framework of justice; however, in 1905 various documents within the Church began to reformulate the understanding of justice in CST as social justice.

13 See Krier Mich’s (2003), *Catholic Social Teachings and Movements*, for a complete overview of the key texts in Catholic Social Teachings.

14 Throughout my citations of the Papal Encyclicals texts I will list the paragraph (par.) where the text can be found. Based on my research this is a common method of citing Papal Encyclicals. All of the
after the influential period of the Vatican II conference (1962-64), which was a transformative and immensely progressive period in the history of CST (Krier Mich 2003).\textsuperscript{15} Vatican II gathered together church figures and laity to address both social questions on the Church’s role in modern society and on doctrinal issues. In particular, the Council focused on social, political, economic and technological issues.

Pope John XXIII released *Pacem in Terris* in 1963 to clarify the Church’s definition of human rights, which are the foundation of a socially just society. Pope John XXIII begins by linking human rights to peace, arguing that if societies want peace they must respect “the order laid down by God” (par. 1). The first principle of a well ordered and productive society must be:

That every human being is a person, that is, his nature is endowed with intelligence and free will. By virtue of this, he has rights and duties of his own, flowing directly and simultaneously from his very nature. And as these rights and obligations are universal and inviolable so they cannot in any way surrendered. (par. 9)

Pope John XXIII goes on to specify these rights he begins with the social and economic rights (Krier Mich 2003: 103):

Beginning our discussion of the rights of man, we see that every man has the right to life, to bodily integrity, and to the means which are necessary and suitable for the proper development of life. These means are primarily food, clothing, shelter, rest, medical care, and finally the necessary social services. Therefore, a human being also has the right to security in cases of sickness, inability to work, widowhood, old age, unemployment, or in any other case in which he is deprived of the means of subsistence through no fault of his own (par. 11).

In subsequent paragraphs (12 through 27) Pope John XXIII outlines seven categories of human rights, which notably included a commitment to economic rights, including a commitment to a living wage, which Pope John XXIII describes as wages “sufficient, in proportion to available funds, to allow him and his family a standard of living consistent with human dignity”, as well as political rights such as freedom of assembly and association, and the right to participate in public affairs. The categories, according to Krier Mich (2003),

\textsuperscript{15} Gaudium et Spes was the only document of the three that was an official Vatican II text.
“were grouped into two sets according to the two Covenants of Human Rights of the United Nations: (a) the Covenant of Civil and Political Rights and (b) the Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights” (105). The basic human rights outlined by Pope John XXIII in 1963 have remained the foundational understanding of the necessary conditions for any state to uphold to protect the dignity of the human person (Krier Mich 2003: 105).

*Gaudium et Spes* further defined the term social justice by elaborating the idea of human rights as key indicators of a just society. The text begins with a cultural analysis in non-technical language that it refers to as reading the ‘signs of the time’. The next section presents the Church’s understanding of the dignity of the human person – endowed with freedom, intelligence, and moral sensitivity. Human dignity and human nature are essentially social; “by their innermost nature persons are social beings and unless they relate themselves to others they can neither live nor develop their potential” alone (par. 12). The bishops draw out the implications of this vision of the human person:

...whatever insults human dignity, such as subhuman living conditions, arbitrary imprisonment, deportation, slavery, prostitution, the selling of women and children; as well as disgraceful working conditions, where men are treated as mere tools for profit, rather than as free and reasonable persons; all these things and others of their like are infamies indeed. They poison human society, but they do more harm to those who practice than those who suffer from the injury. Moreover, they are a supreme dishonor to the Creator (par. 27).

*Gaudium et Spes* shifted the methodology of the Church from a deductive model, rigidly reading Church doctrine in an a-historical framework and applying it to human situations, towards an inductive model, applying theological insights to the conditions of the poor and marginalized of society. Building off the foundation of social justice, *Gaudium et Spes* defines injustice more clearly; injustice is ‘whatever insults human dignity’ thus embracing a rights based framework to understand social justice.

Pope Paul VI began work on *Populorum Progresso* in 1963 at the beginning of Vatican II and completed the encyclical two years after the completion of Vatican II in 1967. The Encyclical corroborated the call for the
Church to promote social justice and argued that the means to create a socially just society was through development. The text was rooted in the “French School” of development over the “American School” (Krier Mich 2003: 155). The French school emphasized “integral development”, which was rooted in promoting comprehensive development focused on the development of social justice by promoting social and economic rights. Whereas, the “American School” fervently focused on GNP growth as the best means of development and de-emphasized the importance of social and economic rights for all. Like Pope John XXIII before him, Pope Paul VI believed that achieving peace meant the development of a socially just society or as Pope Paul VI stated, “development is the new name for peace” (ibid: 155).

As I have demonstrated, in the tradition of CST the measurement of social justice in any society is based on how well the human rights of individuals are being met. To state it simply, the basic human rights outlined by the two Covenants of Human Rights of the United Nations, as corroborated by Pope John VI and reinforced in subsequent decades, are the basic indicators of social justice. Social justice is achieved when the human rights of all are met. This is quite a broad explanation, but it does adequately portray the connections between positive peace, social justice, and human rights. The Jesuits at the UCA in the 1980’s and the Casa program today have both built off this normative idea of social justice as the vision for their foundational goal of the promotion of justice, which I will elaborate on in subsequent sections.

2.2 The UCA from 1980-89: A Model of Peace Education

What makes the UCA’s leadership so extraordinary is that they allowed the reality of the suffering that surrounded them to place a moral claim on the conscience and the very soul of the university, so much so that both they and the university were transformed into becoming effective instruments for justice and peace in El Salvador (Toton 2009: 36)

Throughout the 12-year civil war (1980-92), but particularly under Ignacio Ellacuría’s leadership (from 1980 until his assassination in 1989), the
UCA was used as an “instrument for justice and peace”. The UCA leadership sought peace in El Salvador primarily through two of the peace tools identified by Alger: *non-violent social change* (20) and *peace education* (24). First, they sought to combat the injustices of the Salvadoran reality by cultivating a people’s movement for non-violent social change through community organizing and through a process of consciousness raising. To raise the consciousness of Salvadorans, they used academic research to highlight the injustices committed by the military dictatorship at the time and revealed their findings in journals, articles, newspapers and community forums. They also used peace education to develop “promoters of social change” (Cordina 2000; Alger 2003).

The goal for Ellacuría, S.J., and others at the UCA was “to institutionally further justice, compassion, and peace, not in principle, in theory or in the abstract, but in the concrete reality in which it exists...[by using] the university’s powerful intellectual, professional, technical, and social resources to analyze, propose solutions, and actively contribute to solving the poverty and injustice in El Salvador” (Toton 2009: 21-22). They sought to build a socially just society on three levels: (1) through the intellectual community to “analyze causes” of injustice and to “creatively discover remedies” to those injustices; (2) to raise the “consciousness that inspires the freedom of self determination” amongst the Salvadoran public through *proyección social* (social projection); and to (3) “educate professionals with a conscience, who will be the immediate instruments of...transformation” (Ellacuria 1982).

To analyze the root causes of injustice in El Salvador at the time, UCA designed the curriculum so, “Each academic discipline, from its own perspective, was charged with the responsibility to know the country and the

---

16 I chose to limit my analysis of the UCA from 1980 to 1989 because Ignacio Ellacuría, S.J., and five other Jesuit leaders, all who were murdered in 1989, were some of the key leaders in shaping the institutional commitment of the UCA for social change in El Salvador. Although the UCA remained a powerful force in Salvadoran society after their deaths in 1989, the period from the outbreak of civil war in 1980 until their deaths in 1989 marks a distinct time in the UCA’s use as a force for social change.

17 The numbers (20) and (24) refer to the peace tool numbers indicated on Alger’s *The Emergence of Peace Tools* graph at the beginning of this chapter.
forces at work in it, to analyze them in depth, and to propose attainable goals and solutions” (Toton 2009: 22). This included both classes and research centers. For example, in 1986 Ignacio Martín Baró S.J., one of the six Jesuit priest murdered in 1989, founded El Instituto de Opinión Pública (IUDOP) (the Institute of Public Opinion) at UCA. The goal of the IUDOP was and continues to be as follows: “The IUDOP addresses, with scientific rigor, the public opinion on the social, political, economic and cultural situation of the country. In this sense, the IUDOP studies and analyzes various social phenomena affecting El Salvador and Central America”.  

18 In the late 1980s, Martin Baró, S.J., used public polling to assess support of the military government and to uncover voting fraud in elections.

Data on the social reality of El Salvador found through the IUDOP and other research centers, such as the UCA human rights center headed by another one of the murdered Jesuits, Segundo Montes S.J., was published in international journals, global media, local media, and through UCA based publications. The goal of these publications was to raise the consciousness of Salvadorans to the social realities of El Salvador. Often the publications addressed issues that the military backed government had attempted to cover up, such as poverty levels, voting fraud, jobless rates, murder rates, and general government corruption (Sobrino 1990). The goal of their efforts was to explain the social reality of the injustices faced in the in El Salvador and to demonstrate to Salvadorans and to the international community that something must be done. Ultimately, it was an appeal to the conscience of the world to take action to pressure the military government of El Salvador to stop their perpetration of human rights abuses.

The final means of creating social transformation in El Salvador was by “educat[ing] professionals with a conscience, who will be the immediate instruments of…transformation” (Ellacuría 1982). The leadership of the UCA knew that “the majority of students at the UCA came from upper class families

---

and would become the future teachers, lawyers, journalists, physicians and public officials in short, the leaders of Salvadoran society” (Toton 2006: 39). One of their concerns was that in educating these students to be future leaders of Salvadoran society they were simply acting as the channel through which more privileges would flow to the already privileged, thereby reinforcing the system of privilege (ibid). According to Toton (2006), “They were well aware of the fact that the knowledge and skills acquired in universities, and even Catholic universities, have contributed to the exploitation of the poor and marginalized worldwide” (40). To avoid educating students who would simply reinforce an already unjust social structure, the leadership at the UCA used the Jesuit pedagogical method as a means to “educate professionals with a conscience” who would act as “promoters of social change” (Cordina 2000: 19). In particular, this was a dedication to educate students for social justice as inspired by development in CST and especially by Fr. Pedro Arrupe, S.J.

The inspiration to teach students to be promoters of social justice was particularly inspired by *Populorum Progressio* (1967), which called on Catholic institutions to promote development and peace by promoting social justice. This call sparked a re-evaluation of the Jesuit pedagogy at all Jesuit schools including the UCA (Cordina 2000). The 1971 Synod of Bishops, dealing with *Justice in the World*, argued that social justice should especially be at the forefront of Jesuit education by calling on all Jesuit universities to seek an "education for justice" (ibid: 19). In 1973 at Tenth European Congress of Jesuit Alumni in Valencia, Father General Pedro Arrupe S.J., the Superior General of the Jesuit order from 1965 to 1983, reflected on the calling to educate for justice asking the alumni of Jesuit universities in the audience: "Have we educated you for justice? Have you been educated for justice?...I believe that we Jesuits have to answer humbly 'no, we have not educated you for justice'" (ibid: 19). Arrupe then insisted the failures must be remedied by insisting that Jesuit universities should educate “*men and women for others* and *agents and promoters of change*” (ibid: 19). This goal called on professors at Jesuit universities to cultivate “agents and promoters of change”
by empowering students with the knowledge of the social reality and with the intellectual tools to use their vocational specialties to seek social justice, or as defined here, positive peace (ibid: 19). The Jesuit leaders at UCA, from 1980-89, utilized the Jesuit pedagogical tradition to educate students to be agents of positive peace in El Salvador.

2.3 The Jesuit Pedagogical Tradition

The former Superior General of the Society of Jesus, Peter-Hans Kolvenback, S.J., lucidly captured the Jesuit pedagogical mission of today in a June 7, 1989 speech at Georgetown University:

“Our purpose in education, then, is to form ‘men and women for others.’ The Society of Jesus has always sought to imbue students with values that transcend the goals of money, fame and success. We want graduates who will be leaders concerned about society and the world in which they live. We want graduates who desire to eliminate hunger and conflict in the world and who are sensitive to the need for more equitable distribution of the world’s goods. We want graduates who seek to end sexual and social discrimination and who are eager to share their faith with others...In short, we want our graduates to be leaders-in-service. That has been the goal of Jesuit education since the sixteenth century. It remains so today.

In other words, the Jesuit model of education seeks to raise the consciousness of its students to dedicate themselves to compassion, not the idols of today’s culture, and to use their intellectual tools to combat social injustices. According to Robert A. Mitchell, SJ, (1988) “Spurred by papal encyclicals and the strong social teachings of recent popes and our own American bishops, Jesuits institutions have tried to focus attention on the great questions of justice and fairness that confront our age; economic problems, racism, and unemployment in our own country; peace and war and the proliferation of arms; and poverty and oppression in the third world – to cite some examples” (111). To address these social injustices the Jesuit pedagogical method seeks to develop the whole person – mind, heart and will:
The Jesuit Pedagogical framework

To develop the whole person for the promotion of justice, the Jesuit pedagogical system uses five steps to train students: context, experience, reflection, action, and evaluation. In the following quote, Korth (2003) provides a succinct introduction to the Jesuit pedagogical methodology:

Faculty of a Jesuit university begin with a consideration of the factors and context of students’ lives, [then] faculty create an environment where students recollect their past experience and assimilate information from newly provided experiences…Faculty help students learn the skills and techniques of reflection, which shapes their consciousness, and they then challenge students to action in service to others. The evaluation process includes academic mastery as well as ongoing assessments of students’ well-rounded growth as persons for others (281).

In essence, the learning process begins as a freshman enters university studies, where educators take into account the social setting from which they are coming. From that point, professors and administrators challenge students to grow in heart, mind and will.
2.3.1 Context

All students are the product of a social setting and an environment. The first stage in the Ignatian pedagogy is to uncover and recognize the social position of students:\textsuperscript{19}

Since human experience, always the starting point in Ignatian pedagogy, never occurs in a vacuum, we must know as much as we can about the actual context within which teaching and learning take place. We as faculty need to understand the world of our students, including ways in which family, friends, social pressures, politics, economic, media, and other realities impact them (Korth 2003: 281).

As previously discussed, the Jesuit leadership at the UCA was astutely cognizant of the context of students as coming from a privileged upbringing, which often meant they had been isolated from the suffering of the poor. A key concern for the UCA’s leadership was to foster a sense of solidarity amongst the elite students they were educating, so that the students would be in solidarity with those on the margins of society, rather than reinforce the unjust social system of the era (Toton 2006). One means of cultivating solidarity and inspiring a dedication to the promotion of justice was through direct experience.

2.3.2 Experience

Experience in the Jesuit pedagogy means to “‘taste something internally’, which involves the whole person – mind, heart, and will – because without internal feeling joined to intellectual grasp, learning will not move a person to action” (Korth 2003: 282). Helping students experience the social realities of the of those on the margins of society involved “an eclectic mix of direct activities (such as conversations and discussions, simulation, role plays, laboratory investigations, field trips, service projects, etc.) and vicarious activities (reading, listening to a lecture, etc.)” creating a cognitive as well as an affective response (ibid.). At the UCA in the 1980s a key means of experiencing the suffering of poor Salvadorans was through a 600-hour

\textsuperscript{19} “Ignatian Pedagogy” refers a co-founder of the Jesuits, St. Ignatius of Loyola (1491-1556). He was an influential figure in developing the foundations of the Jesuit pedagogical mode.
community service requirement (Toton 2006: 6). The Good Samaritan parable was used by Juan Ramón Moreno, S.J. (1990), one of the Jesuits killed in 1989, as an example of how a cognitive and affective response to suffering can create a will to act:

The Samaritans gaze is very different – the gaze of one open to the situation of others, because he has a heart of solidarity, because he is capable of committed love. Consequently what his gaze captures in suffering, in excruciating reality, affects him to the point where he is ‘moved to pity’ (104).

According to Moreno, this is compassion in action. Where the heart is opened to stand with the other, to feel with the other, and to help the other. Through experience with marginalized populations one is challenged to empathy, which develops into solidarity. Moreno (1990), eloquently explains this process:

Luke [in the story of the Good Samaritan] uses the Greek verb splanchnizomai, which the Gospels repeatedly apply to Jesus. Literally it means that one’s guts are stirred. And one’s guts are affected when there is something foreign irritating them, something that must be expelled and gotten rid of, if one is to be at rest. This is compassion in the strong sense of the word. Solidarity with others leads to being identified with them so that their pain, their passion, become one’s own (com-passion), and they pain one to the point of being unbearable: they have to be relieved, something must be done to change the situation of suffering. That leads to action, to doing something that relieves the suffering of the other, which is also one’s own suffering (ibid: 104).

This emphasis on experience is rooted in the principle that experiencing the injustices of the national reality transforms students and drive them to change the injustice that leads to the suffering experienced by the marginalized.

2.3.3 Reflection

This is an essential part of the Ignatian spirituality and is a process where the students reflect on their experiences. The reflection helps students more fully understand the root causes of what they experience. It provides them with a chance to reflect on what they have learned and to chart a path to action. Reflection is:

...a thoughtful reconsideration of some subject matter, experience, idea, purpose, or spontaneous reaction, in order to grasp [an experience] significance more fully. Thus, reflection is the process by which meaning surfaces in human experience by understanding the truth being studied more clearly; understanding the sources of one’s sensations or reactions in the consideration...Reflection is a formative and a liberation process that forms
Experience and reflection further help students see the national reality, but they also challenge students to ‘judge’ the conditions around them. The move from experience to reflection to action is an integral part of the ‘conscience raising’ of the individual student. They see injustice around them, they judge the roots of those injustices, and then they are challenged to act on behalf of justice.

2.3.4 Action

Action means combating the sources of oppression and marginalization in society. It is fighting for social justice. The solidarity with others gained through experience is, “For Ignatius…shown in deeds, not words. Faculty hope that students are impelled to move beyond knowing to action – action that is for the welfare of society” (Korth 2003: 283). The goal of a Jesuit education is to instill a dedication to social justice within the heart of every student, so that they will use their vocation to promote social justice.

2.3.5 Evaluation

The final stage of the Jesuit pedagogy is evaluation. The Jesuit pedagogy is concerned with more than simply academic mastery, it also seeks to form well-rounded individuals to be persons for others. Evaluation means a “periodic evaluation of the student’s growth in attitudes, priorities, and actions consistent with being a person for others” (Korth 2003: 282). This process involves mentoring, journaling, and self-evaluation. It is a process of systematic reflection.

2.3.6 The UCA and the Jesuit Pedagogy

The Jesuit’s at the UCA used the Jesuit pedagogical tradition to foster a vision of a peaceful and just society by teaching according to the context of the culture students come from and by developing an intellectual commitment to justice. To move students to action, the Jesuit pedagogical tradition emphasizes
the role of *experience* to build a sense of solidarity. The UCA attempted to create a sense of solidarity in their students by requiring each student to complete 600 hours of service learning in the poor neighborhoods and communities of El Salvador (Toton 2006). The hope was that through witnessing the struggles of marginalized Salvadorans and through a process of guided *reflection* students would develop solidarity. This sense of solidarity would compel students to action on behalf of justice. Because the UCA leadership knew the privileged students they were educating would likely become the future professional class of El Salvador, they hoped these students would use their vocations as a means of advancing social justice, thus becoming agents or promoters of positive peace. Finally through a constant process of *evaluation* students would deepen their commitment to social change and constantly seek new avenues to pursue social justice.

2.4 The Casa de la Solidaridad: Educating Agents of Positive Peace

The Casa immersion program is founded on a commitment to continuing the educational mission of the six assassinated Jesuit leaders of the UCA. To achieve this goal, the Casa uses the Jesuit pedagogical model presented above to foster the “promotion of justice and solidarity” by students (Yonkers-Talz 2003: 26). Like the UCA, the Casa’s mission is inspired by Pedro Arrupe’s 1973 call to “educate for justice” and to develop students who will be “men and women for others” and “agents and promoters of social change” (1973).

The Casa program was started in 1999, on the 10th anniversary of the assassination of the Jesuits at UCA, by Dean Brackley S.J., a Jesuit theologian from the Bronx who had gone to work in El Salvador after the six Jesuits were killed in 1989, by Steve Privett, S.J., provost of Santa Clara University at the time, and by Trena and Kevin Yonkers-Talz.

I chose to study the Casa Jesuit immersion program because it is deeply inspired by the social change oriented educational model of the Jesuits at the
UCA and because it provides a contemporary example of educating students for social change and positive peace. The following description of the Casa Program from the Casa website concisely summarizes its goals and inspiration of the program:

Dedicated to fostering ‘men and women for others,’ Casa de la Solidaridad is a unique community based learning program. Here you can develop your intellectual potential, strengthen your ethical and religious values, and learn to become a socially responsible global citizen…The program draws inspiration from the lives of the six Jesuits, their housekeeper and her daughter who were murdered at the University of Central America (UCA) on November 16, 1989 and from all the people of El Salvador who suffered during the civil war, especially those who were killed in their struggle for solidarity and social justice.

What sets the Casa program apart from the UCA, however, is that it seeks to educate students for global solidarity. Dean Brackley, S.J., a co-founder of the Casa program, argues “Jesuit universities in the U.S. are in a position to play a signal role in the formation of a new generation of international solidarity—not just people for others, but specifically people for the crucified majorities of poor countries in the world” (Brackley 2000: 5). For Brackley (2000), students need to become aware that in many cases the unjust social conditions of the world’s poor, “are carried out in our name and with our tax dollars” and although “we all have different vocations…silence and inaction amount to a complicity unworthy of our deepest Christian and human vocations…We want [students] to understand the world’s suffering and the causes of that suffering, as well as possible solutions…we want them to be morally prepared to change the world when they leave the university” (emphasis in original) (ibid: 5).

According to Yonkers-Talz (2004), the program co-director, there are eight key components of the Casa program to educate promoters (agents) of social justice:

1) The praxis course (learning the realities of theoretical concepts through engagement in Salvadoran communities)
2) The relationship with the Salvadoran community

---

The pedagogical approach of the Casa program is ultimately rooted in the Jesuit model discussed in section two: context, experience, reflection, action, and evaluation. These components are applied to the 15 to 20 students from various universities in the United States as they participate in the four-month Casa immersion program. The Casa has admitted students for fall, spring and summer semesters since 2001. Most students come from one of the 28 Jesuit universities in the United States, but the program is open to all universities in the country. The students live together in large houses run by the Casa program in San Salvador, which are located blocks from the UCA campus. Each week students spend two days in the campo (the countryside) participating in service learning projects in a poor community. Three days are spent in the classroom where students take five five-credit classes (economic development, praxis, advanced Spanish 1, advanced Spanish conversation 1, El Salvador’s civil war, Latin American theology, politics in El Salvador, Salvadoran literature, sociology of public communication). Students are required to take a Spanish course, unless they demonstrate a high level of Spanish ability, and they are required to take the praxis course. In this context, praxis means putting theory into action. By learning from their work in the campo, students are utilizing the theoretical knowledge they have learned for concrete action.

A key element of the Casa program is its emphasis on praxis education. According to material from the Casa program, the praxis is one of the most important aspects of the immersion experience:

A significant aspect of your Casa experience will include field placement or what we refer to as praxis site. In the praxis site, you will be placed within a small community.
where you will accompany and develop unique relationships with the local Salvadoran people. Learning amidst the gritty reality of these poor communities will be one of the most important aspects of your immersion experience.²¹

The praxis placement emphasizes the role of direct experience in fostering solidarity and inspiring students to action. As I explained above, the goal of direct experience with “the gritty reality of these poor communities” is to “‘taste something internally,’ which involves the whole person – mind, heart, and will – because without internal feeling joined to intellectual grasp, learning will not move a person to action” (Korth 2003: 282). Helping students experience the gritty realities of these poor communities involves “an eclectic mix of direct activities (such as conversations and discussions, simulation, role plays, laboratory investigations, field trips, service projects, etc.) and vicarious activities (reading, listening to a lecture, etc.)” creating a cognitive as well as affective responses (282). In an informal conversation I had with one of the professors from the Casa program, Fr. Mark Ravizza, S.J., he explained that these communities become the classrooms in which students find solidarity and a commitment to action on behalf of justice through the heartbreaking and inspiring interactions with marginalized Salvadorans (M. Ravizza. personal communication, 15 October 2010).

In his research of the Casa program Kevin Yonkers-Talz (2004) has identified the praxis experience as one of the most important components of the Casa experience. In his research, he explained how:

First, exposure to the realities of people living in poverty while living in a different culture created dissonance, challenging values and beliefs (cognitive), sense of self (intrapersonal), and relationships (interpersonal). Second, support for students’ transformation came via opportunities for personal and communal reflection, community living and experience with poor Salvadorans, and assignments that integrate students’ experience in marginal communities with academic disciplines. Maturity in all three dimensions of development occurred when students experience optimal combination of challenge and support (168).

Yonkers-Talz concludes by highlighting the importance of experience in finding solidarity with those on the margins and in one’s own self authorship and the discovery of a vocational calling:

Certainly not everyone needs to have an immersion experience in El Salvador to find her or his way. Our bias at the Casa, however, is that the poor, those who struggle to survive and suffer unjustly, have a great deal to teach us about ourselves and our world. Encountering the realities of the poor is challenging at many levels. When provided with the optimal amount of support, however, these experiences can effectively foster students’ development, enabling them to find that which gives life deep meaning. Doing so enables them to participate in creating a more peaceful and just world, one where all people, especially the poor, can live with dignity (Yonkers-Talz 2004: 184).

According to Yonkers-Talz’s findings, exposing students to the realities of the social conditions around them, such as in El Salvador, helped to foster a sense of solidarity and inspire a commitment to action on behalf of social justice.

Like the UCA, the Casa’s commitment to developing students to promote social justice is a form of peace education. The Casa embraces the same pedagogical methods as the UCA. Unlike the UCA, however, it focuses on globalizing a sense of solidarity through educating students for global citizenship. Because the Casa uses the same pedagogical model as the UCA, it can act as a proxy to assess the effect of this pedagogy on student development.

I started this paper with the hypothesis that the Jesuit educational model of the Casa program is a form of peace education that contributes to the formation of agents of social justice (positive peace). In this chapter I have argued that positive peace can be equated with social justice. Further, I have demonstrated, that based on the influence of CST on the goals of the Jesuit educational mission, the Casa’s goal of promoting justice is a commitment to promoting social justice. Based on these links, I have argued that the Jesuit educational model of the Casa program is a form of peace education, specifically an education for positive peace. I now turn to an empirical exploration of the outcomes of this educational model by examining the extent to which students understand the educational goals of the program and if and how they live out those goals through their vocational choices.
Chapter Three: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This is a qualitative case study examining the impact of the Casa program on graduates. At the time of this study, the Casa program had been accepting students for 11 years. From its inception in 1999 there has been over 160 graduates of the Casa program. I have not participated in the program, but I have had contact with student graduates over the years, and I have made two separate visits to the program: first, in 2008 while participating in an internship in El Salvador and second, in 2010 for field research for this study.

In Chapter Two, I hypothesized that the Jesuit educational model of the Casa program is a form of peace education that contributes to the formation of agents of positive peace. In Chapters Four and Five, I test this hypothesis by exploring the outcomes of the program through students’ perceptions of the impact of the program by asking two questions:

(A) How does participation in the Casa de la Solidaridad program influence student understanding of the Jesuit educational mission in three key areas: (1) education for justice, (2) men and women for others, and (3) global citizenship?

(B) How have these goals (education for justice, men and women for others, and global citizenship), if at all, influenced students’ vocational choices after their completion of the program?

This chapter discusses the reasoning behind the basic method of research, the selection of this case, the methodological approach, the research design, as well as the limitations of the study.
3.2 Method

This study involved 24 questionnaires sent out to former participants in the Casa program. I also utilized information published on the Casa program website and on individual student blogs to enrich my analysis of their experience. Further, I conducted a range of informal interviews with both administrators from the Casa program and with Jesuit university administrators, primarily, but not exclusively, at Seattle University. The student interview candidates were all graduates of Jesuit universities and ranged in age from 21 to 30.

3.3 Case Selection

I chose to look at the Casa program to explore the Jesuit educational model for two reasons. First, I choose to study the Casa program because of the anecdotal evidence I had found during my time in El Salvador in 2008, in which I witnessed the influence of the Casa program in developing students’ commitment to living in solidarity and seeking social justice. Second, I also chose to study the program because of its dedication to continuing the educational tradition of the UCA, which, as I explained, is one of the clearest examples of using the Jesuit educational model to promote social change.

3.4 Methodological Approach

A common understanding of a case study is captured by Schramm (1971) in explaining that, “The essence of a case study, the central tendency among all types of case study, is that it tries to illuminate a decision or set of decisions: why they were taken, how they were implemented, and with what result” (6) Because I am trying to understand how the Casa program has influenced graduates’ understanding of the Jesuit mission and how that influence is expressed in their behavior, vis-à-vis vocational choice, a case
study model is the appropriate choice for my research. Yin explains that, “In general, case studies are the preferred strategy when “how” and “why” questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context” (Yin 2003: 1). In studying the vocational decisions of Casa graduates, I am fundamentally seeking to understand “how” and “why” their Casa experience has shaped their vocational aspirations. I am interested in describing how the participants themselves perceive and define the impact and meaning of the program experience, which further calls for a qualitative case study. Glatthorn emphasizes the importance that qualitative research places upon the perceptions of individuals, and Merriam points out the “qualitative researchers are interested in understanding the meaning people have constructed” (Orlando 2007: 88; Glatthorn 1998: 34; Merriam 1998: 6).

In particular I choose a descriptive case study model for my research. A descriptive case study is conducted in order “to shed light on a particular phenomenon” (Salazar 2008: 49; Gall, Gall, & Borg 2003). Descriptive research is used to describe the characteristics of a population by directly examining samples of that population by surveys, interviews, and observations (Salazar 2008; Glatthorn 1998). The goal of case study research is to provide a detailed description of a particular situation, organization, individual, or event. This study focused on an organization, “the Casa program”, and on an “event”, the three-month long exchange program of the Casa in El Salvador, and on “individual(s)”, graduates of the Casa program.

### 3.5 Research Design and Rationale

In this research the intent was to discover from the graduates of the Casa program the role of their experience with Jesuit education at the Casa program in the development of their understanding of the Jesuit mission and how those ideals shaped their vocational choices. I used a case study methodology because it is an effective means to shed light on a given phenomenon within a
“bounded” system (Salazar 2008; Yin 2003; Creswell 1998; Stake 2005). In this study, the phenomenon is the perceived effect of Jesuit education on the attitudes of Casa students as expressed through their vocational choices (the Casa program being the “bounded system”).

According to Salazar (2008), “A case study by its very design is descriptive. The research attempts to depict a phenomenon and conceptualize it”. The purpose of case study is not necessarily theory building, but the data analysis may be so compelling that a theory may emerge (Stake 2005). A case study is a unit of analysis (Patton 2002). In this study the first level of analysis were the students. Their experiences were cross-analyzed to look at the larger unit of analysis, which was the Casa program. The primary unit of analysis was the students, as I focused mainly on the extent to which their perspectives on aspects of the Jesuit mission and on their vocational choices developed during their time in the Casa program. In a case study, the major questions are not questions of opinion, but of the sensory experience (Stake 2005). The focus of this study was to ascertain the perceptions of students, and for them to make generalizations about their vocational formation and their experience in the Casa program (Salazar 2008).

In utilizing the case study method I primarily used a questionnaire method, while also relying on document analysis and some supplemental interviews. In particular I utilized a triangulation approach that is “a process of using multiple perceptions to clarify meaning, verify the repeatability of an observation or interpretation” (Stake 2005: 454). Using multiple sources of data to interpret student experiences provided a more thorough overview of their experience. The majority of my questionnaire participants had completed their Casa experience between three and seven years ago, thus in some cases participants mentioned difficulty in remembering the impact of their Casa experience. In many instances I was able to supplement particular student questionnaire responses with reflections that had been posted on the Casa website during their experience, with information provided in a 2008 survey of 60 graduates of the Casa program and/or through reading student blogs written
during and just after their Casa experience.\footnote{Follow this link to read student reflections from 2001 to 2006: \url{http://www.scu.edu/studyabroad/casa/students/reflections.cfm}}\footnote{Follow this link to access the 2008 student survey: \url{http://www.scu.edu/studyabroad/casa/alumni/updates.cfm}} Triangulation was particularly effective in this research paper because of the wealth of student reflections available on the Casa website, through blogs, and through alumni updates of the home universities of certain students. The Casa program encourages frequent reflection, which as discussed earlier in Chapter Two is a key component of the Jesuit pedagogical model (See section 2.4.3 - Reflection). This emphasis on reflection combined with a technologically savvy population was extremely beneficial in my data collection process.

3.6 Data Collection

3.6.1 Questionnaire Methodology

The overall goal of in-depth qualitative interviewing is “learning how people construct their realities—how they view, define, and experience the world” (Taylor & Bogdan 1998: 102). I initially contacted Casa participants via email.\footnote{Copies of the “recruitment email” and the “follow-up email” can be accessed by contacting the author, Lucas Franco at: lucas.albert.franco@gmail.com} Out of 95 participants initially contacted, I followed up with 24 respondents upon receiving confirmation of interest in participating. My second email outlined the information I had attached including a consent to participate form (Appendix A) and two questionnaires (Appendixes B and C). The first questionnaire (Appendix B) was a simple participant intake questionnaire. The goal of the questionnaire was to provide basic descriptive information about the participant and to gain basic biographical information to enrich my understanding of the participant’s background. The second questionnaire (Appendix C) was a more in-depth questionnaire focused on answering my research questions and thus ascertaining student perceptions on
the influence of their Casa experience on their understanding of key pillars of the Jesuit mission and on their vocational choices.

In designing my questions I was guided by Taylor and Bogdan’s suggestion that, “Probably the best way to start off interviewing informants is by asking open-ended, descriptive questions” (1998: 102). Since the primary goal of a case study is to “[learn] how people construct their realities—how they view, define, and experience the world” (ibid), I focused on descriptive questioning. In other words, my focus was on understanding the experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience (Seidman 1998; Yin 2003).

My initial intent was to conduct questionnaires and follow up with in-depth interviews if I did not feel I had developed sufficient data through my questionnaires. In most cases a questionnaire would not provide sufficient data to thoroughly understand the experience of individuals, as responses to questionnaires are quite short. But in this case, I believe the emphasis placed on written reflection both at Jesuit universities in general and particularly within the Casa experience meant that the participants in this research had thorough experience with written reflections, and thus were able to provide detailed descriptions of their experiences. I also benefited immensely from the use of triangulation, which Stake explains as, “Triangulation has been generally considered a process of using multiple perceptions to clarify meanings, verifying the repeatability of an observation or interpretation” (Stake 2005: 454). To triangulate my findings I incorporated public reflections of participants found on the Internet, including student blogs and online surveys.

3.6.2 Internet Resources

The wealth of personal reflections posted on the Casa website and on personal blogs allowed me to triangulate my data. The 2008 reflections of the students posted on the Casa website provided an overview of student experiences, which supplemented my questionnaire data. Further, student blogs
from their time in the Casa program provided an even more in-depth week-to-week overview of student experiences. What was particularly valuable about the blogs was the fact that they were written during their experiences. Thus, they provided valuable insights into key moments and experiences that particularly shaped or inspired student understandings of the Jesuit mission and their vocational choices.

One problem with relying too heavily on these two sources of data is a self-selection issue. The Casa program is likely to only post positive experiences on their website, as the reflections are primarily used as recruitment tools for future students. While reading the online reflections, I saw that all of the reflections were quite positive and emphasized the impact of the Casa experience. There is also an issue of a lack of candor in student reflections. The students knew their reflections would be shared on the Casa website, and were thus likely influenced to write more positive reviews of the program.

Student blogs are subject to the same biases. Knowing that blogs are public sources of information, students are likely to restrict their candor. In my reading of student blogs there was an impressive degree of frankness, but it is likely that self-selection did influence student blogs.

Despite these shortcomings of these two supplemented data sources, both student reflection and student blogs were valuable information about the Casa program and student experiences. They also provided an invaluable source of contact information for recruitment.

### 3.7 Recruitment Approach

In recruiting participants for my research I relied on publicly available information and the “snowballing technique” (Taylor & Bogdan 1998: 94-95). I primarily relied on publicly available contact information on the Casa website. In the 2008 survey, Casa Alumni Updates, nearly half of the approximately 140 student reflections listed their emails under a section in the
survey, which requested their contact information if they were willing to be contacted to share their experiences. In order to recruit participants I began with an email inviting students to participate in my research. The initial invitation email included a brief introduction, a description of my interest in the Casa program, and an overview of what would be needed from participants if they agreed to participate.

Once I received participation confirmation, I sent out a second email with three attached forms and an explanation of the materials. First, I attached a Consent to Participate form (Appendix A). I was particularly concerned with making participants feel their responses would be protected, thus I provided a thorough description of the Form and the lengths I would take to protect the data. Second, I attached the intake survey, which I explained was meant to provide basic information about each participant (Appendix B). Third, I attached the participant questionnaire (Appendix C) along with a concise discussion of the questionnaire. The final request made in the second email to participants was a request for further contacts of former Casa students.

This request provided the basis for my utilization of the snowballing technique for participant recruitment. Taylor and Bogdan summarize the snowballing technique as a simple process: “start with one person or a small group of people, win their trust, and ask them to introduce you to others” (Taylor & Bogdan 1998: 32). About 30 percent of the research participants were recruited using this approach. I found this approach particularly fruitful in gaining new recruits, as often those who provide further contact information for other Casa students would contact those students and recommend participation in my research.

Overall the utilization of the combination of these two techniques served as a very productive means of recruitment. Out of the 95 students contacted, 24 agreed to participate in my research. These 24 provided the meaningful sample needed to conduct my interviews.
3.8 Data Analysis: Coding and Theory

The data analyzed are from written responses to the questionnaires, from the intake surveys, from information gathered on student blogs, and from publically available surveys on the Casa website. In general there are many methodological approaches to data analysis, all which depend on the research questions, the approach, the working hypothesis, if one exists, and the desired outcome (e.g. theory building, descriptive, portraiture) (Salazar 2008: 56).

When conducting a textual analysis there are generally two positions a researcher can take with regard to the text. From these two basic approaches, many others are derived (Salazar 2008; Bernard & Ryan 1998). The first is a positivist approach, which seeks to uncover empirical facts or causes, and “methodologically relies on the reduction of text to codified themes or concepts” (Salazar 2008: 56). The second of these two approaches is either referred to as the humanistic (Bernard & Ryan 1998), or the phenomenological or interpretivist (Taylor & Bogdan 1998). This second approach involves “interpretation and the search for meaning from the perspective of the individual” (Salazar 2008: 56). My stance as the researcher embraces the second perspective in my drive to understand the “social phenomena of the individual and how he or she experiences the world” (56).

The methodology of this study was a descriptive case study, which sought to construct a “thick description” (Stake 2005; Patton 2002) attempting to take the reader into the world of the subject being examined. According to Emerson (1983: 24), “Thick descriptions present in close detail the context and meanings of events and scenes that are relevant to those involved in them.” A descriptive case study does not necessarily seek to answer “why” questions, which would structure the results into an analytic framework (Patton 2002). Nor does it seek to necessarily generate theory according to the grounded theory approach (Salazar 2008; Stake 2005).

However, even in utilizing a humanistic, phenomenological or interpretivist stance, it is still often necessary to code data, which includes the
positivist approach. In reviewing the questionnaires, student blogs, public reflection documents, and the intake survey, this study utilized a method of content analysis (Patton 2002), which sought to surface patterns of words and themes. Patton (2002) explains content analysis as being “used to refer to any qualitative data reduction and sense-making effort that takes a volume of qualitative material and attempt to identify core consistencies and meanings” (453). Based on this understanding, this study organized the data into “core meanings.” To clarify, Patton (2002) explains that “core meanings found through content analysis are often called patterns or themes…[furthermore] The term pattern usually refers to a descriptive finding, for example, ‘Almost all participants reported feeling fear when they rappelled down the cliff,’ while a theme takes a more categorical or topical form: Fear (emphasis in original)” (453).

In order to uncover these “core meanings”, Talyor and Bogdan (1998: 145) provided a three-step process of analysis: “First, look for words and phrases in informants’ own words and vocabulary that capture the meaning of what they say and do…Second, as you note a theme in your data, compare statement and acts with one another to see whether there is a concept that unites them...Third, as you identify different themes, look for underlying similarities between them”. Together these provided a repeating process that continued until a proposition surfaced that could be grounded in the data. Within grounded theory methodology, this is also known as “constant comparison” (Glaser & Strauss 1967). This proposition may or may not develop into a generalized theory. As explained previously, descriptive case study seeks to identify some of these propositions, and not necessarily generalize them into a replicable theory (Salazar 2008: 58).

My final case report also draws on insights from theory. As discussed in the literature review, the overall educational mission of the Casa program is rooted in the Jesuit pedagogical tradition. This pedagogy “strives to develop men and women of competence, conscience, and compassion…[through a] collaborative process between and among faculty and students that fosters
personal and cooperative study, discovery, creativity, and reflection to promote lifelong learning and action in service to others” (Korth 2003: 280) or as Cordina (2000) put it, to develop “agents/promoters of social change” (19). They do this by creating the conditions, laying the foundation, and providing the opportunities for the continual interplay of the student’s experience, reflection, and action to occur (Korth 2003: 281). The core assumptions of how this process works, as outlined in Chapter Two (See Figure 4), are a basis for my analysis of the Casa experience.

Jack Mezirow (1991) provides further insights into the power of direct experience through his theory of “transformation of meanings perspective” (Mezirow 1991). He explains that, "Perspective transformation is the process of becoming critically aware of how and why our assumptions have come to constrain the way we perceive, understand, and feel about our world; changing these structures of habitual expectation to make possible a more inclusive, discriminating, and integrative perspective; and finally, making choices or otherwise acting upon these new understandings” (Mezirow 1991: 167).

This “perspective transformation” is initiated with a “disorienting” dilemma,” which can include such dramatic occurrences as death or illness, but also may result from “an eye-opening discussion, book, poem, or painting or from efforts to understand a different culture with customs that contradict our own previously accepted presuppositions” (Mezirow 1991: 168). He proposes phases of transformation that may include as many as ten steps, starting with the disorienting dilemma, and moving through self-examination (perhaps with accompanying feelings of guilt or shame), critical assessment, planning a course of action and eventually a “reintegrating of one’s life on the basis of conditions dictated by one’s own perspective” (Mezirow 1991:169; Orlando 2003). This theory has been particularly insightful in exploring the core meanings of student experiences in their praxis work in El Salvador during the Casa.

I have also drawn further insight from Kevin Yonkers-Talz’s use of the Baxter Magolda’s Learning Partnerships Model to explore student
development in the Casa. Through Yonker-Talz’s research into the Casa program, he makes two conclusions: “First, exposure to the realities of people living in poverty while living in a different culture created dissonance, challenging values and beliefs (cognitive), sense of self (intrapersonal), and relationships (interpersonal). Second, support for students’ transformation came via opportunities for personal and communal reflection, community living and experience with poor Salvadorans, and assignments that integrate students’ experience in marginal communities with academic disciplines. Maturity in all three dimensions of development occurred when students experience optimal combination of challenge and support” (2004: 168).

Yonkers-Talz concludes by highlighting the importance of experience in finding solidarity with those on the margins and in one’s own self-authorship and the discovery of a vocational calling, which has also emerged as a central theme in my research.

The results of my analysis were assembled into a “case report” (see Chapter Four) from which a final case study narrative was composed into a rich descriptive picture or story of which the reader is easily able to enter (see Chapter Five) (Stake 2005; Patton 2002; Salazar 2008: 56-57). Essentially, my case report provides a description of the respondents’ narratives of how they describe the impact of their experience in the Casa program. I used coding methods and theoretical insights to reveal “core meanings”, which provided insights into how students perceived their experience (Patton 2002: 453).

3.9 Validity and Bias

In seeking to develop reliable findings, I was concerned with developing construct, internal and external validity. According to Yin (2003: 34), construct validity refers to “establishing correct operational measures for the concepts being studied”. This is particularly important and difficult in qualitative case studies, and the weakness in operational measures of many qualitative studies has been the source of critique for many case studies (Yin 2003). To minimize
the possibility of weak measures, Yin suggests three case study tactics to establish construct validity, which I employed in this case study: (1) use multiple sources of data; (2) establish a chain of evidence; (3) have key informants review draft case study reports” (Yin 2003: 34).

The primary focus of my research has been to measure student understanding of the Jesuit mission based on three particular concepts (education for justice, men and women for other and global citizenship) and to discover the influences that have shaped their vocational choices. The questionnaire asked very specific questions pertaining to these goals, which provided a foundation for construct validity. Furthermore, I utilized Yin’s three tactics to develop construct validity. First, I used multiple sources of data by embracing a triangulation process as discussed earlier. Second, the multiple sources of data provided a diverse and comprehensive data set to develop a chain of evidence. Third, I had thorough editing assistance from key informants including Dr. Edward Salazar who has written extensively on the Jesuit pedagogy and student development, my thesis advisor Dr. Jeanette Rodriguez, as well as an array of other informants. Taken together, these tactics were of great assistance in securing construct validity for my research.

Merriam (1998: 201) explains internal validity as “deal[ing] with questions of how research findings match reality.” Furthermore, Merriam points out that “human beings are the primary instrument of data collection and analysis in qualitative research,” which is how we access reality in this form of investigation. Based on this, I provide an account of my self-awareness as an “instrument of data collection” as such factors may influence my perception of reality (Orlando 2006). In discussing these factors I also highlight possible areas of self-bias and discuss ways in which I have sought to minimize the influences of those biases.

I am a white male with an educational background in political science, Latin American studies, theology, and peace and conflict studies. I am not Catholic, but I have found profound inspiration in the message of Catholic Social Teachings through my undergraduate experience at a Jesuit university,
Seattle University. My commitment to the core principles of Catholic Social Teachings, particularly the overall ideal of striving towards a socially just world, has inspired me to participate in a year of urban service work at a non-profit agency in Seattle, Washington (USA) through the Jesuit Volunteer Corp Northwest from 2010 to 2011.

Throughout my experience at Seattle University and currently in Jesuit Volunteer Corps I have experienced exciting personal growth and transformation. During my Jesuit education a number of immersion experiences in Guatemala, in El Salvador, and in Mississippi, had a particularly influential impact on my own understanding of the Jesuit ideals and on choosing my vocational path, which ultimately led me to pursue peace and conflict studies. Although I had not yet developed an understanding of positive peace when applying to the Peace and Conflict Studies program at the University of Oslo, I was inspired to apply by my own intellectual embrace of the adage ‘if you want peace, work for justice’. In other words, my own view was that a normative understanding of a peaceful state as one built off a foundation of social justice. My commitment and excitement for the Jesuit pedagogical model and social goals, as well as a curiosity in the student experience, ultimately led me to my research into the Jesuit pedagogy, mission, and student vocational choices using the Casa graduates as the basis of my casa study.

In recognizing the influence the Jesuit pedagogy and mission has had on my life, I recognize aspects of personal bias that I may bring to this study. I also recognize potential bias from meeting the director of the Casa program in El Salvador, Kevin Yonkers-Talz. I am also aware these influences may create an inclination to select positive data that would reflect a positive evaluation of the Casa program as a whole. To minimize the influence of these potential biases, I have sought to keep a critical awareness of their potential influence and have sought techniques or mechanisms to minimize that influence. Overall I found the same mechanisms suggested by Yin (2003) to secure construct validity as effective in securing internal validity: (1) use multiple sources of
data; (2) establish a chain of evidence; (3) have key informants review draft case study reports” (Yin 2003: 34) (see beginning of section for complete description).

External validity “deals with the problem of knowing whether a study’s findings are generalizable beyond the immediate case study” (Yin 2003: 37). My research was a qualitative, descriptive case study, my research focused on student understandings of the Jesuit mission based primarily, but not exclusively, on their Casa experience and how that understanding shaped their vocational choices. Because of the limited scope, the small sample size, and the descriptive nature of this study, the results are not really generalizable.

3.10 Reliability

Yin (2003) describes the objective in developing reliability “is to be sure that if a later investigator followed the same procedures as described by an earlier investigator and conducted the same case study all over again, the later investigator should arrive at the same findings and conclusions…The goal of reliability is to minimize the errors and biases in a study” (37). Yin further explains that, “The general way of approaching the reliability problem is to make as many stops as operational as possible and to conduct research as if someone were looking over your shoulder” (ibid: 38). In this vein, I have sought to explain my methodology in meticulous detail, as well as share all of the documents developed for participant outreach. Yin suggests two mechanism in particular for developing reliable results: (1) “use case study protocol” and (2) “develop case study data base” (ibid: 34). Clearly, as shown by the explanation of my methodology and by the appendixes at the end of this chapter, I have gone to extensive lengths to secure reliable conclusions.
Chapter Four: Findings

This study investigated how students were impacted during their time in the Casa program. I investigated their perception of the impact of the program through an exploration of three key components of the Jesuit educational model of the Casa: education for justice, men and women for others, and global citizenship. I then explored how their experiences and understandings of these goals influenced their vocational choices. My primary goal was to understand if, and how, the Jesuit educational model of the Casa program had motivated students to take action to promote social justice. As I discussed earlier, for Alger (1996), an effective peace education model develops agency for the promotion of peace. Thus, to explore the efficacy of the Casa’s model as an example of a peace education model, I examine the impact of the program on fostering student agency.

This chapter presents my key findings of this qualitative case study of the Casa program. The findings are presented successively following the order of my research questions:

(A) How does participation in the Casa de la Solidaridad program influence student understanding of the programs three key educational goals: (1) education for justice, (2) men and women for others, and (3) global citizenship?

(B) How have these three goals (education for justice, men and women for others, and global citizenship), if at all, influenced students’ vocational choices after their completion of the program?

I begin by briefly explaining the case study framework by which I have structured this research.
4.1 Case Study Framework

The methodology of this study was a descriptive case study, which sought to construct a thick description attempting to take the reader into the world of the subjects being examined (Stake 2005; Patton 2002). A thick description “present[s] in close detail the context and meanings of events and scenes that are relevant to those involved in them” (Emerson 1983: 24). To understand the meaning students attached to certain events and to look for patterns in their responses, I used both coding methods and theoretical insights to reveal “core meanings” (2002: 453). To help reveal core meanings, I used a three-step process of analysis. First, I looked for words and phrases in informants’ own words and vocabulary that capture the meaning of what they say and do. Second, I compared their statements with one another to see whether there is a concept that unites them. Third, I looked for underlying similarities between what they had said to reveal patterns and key themes (Talyor & Bogdan 1998: 145).

4.2 Jesuit Mission Understandings

To help guide the reader through my findings, I return to Figure 2 as a means to illustrate the main themes of my findings chapter (see following page):
The Casa program uses the Jesuit pedagogical model as a means to achieve their education goal of developing men and women who will seek the “promotion of justice and solidarity” (Yonkers-Talz 2003: 26). In achieving this goal it seeks to educate “the whole person – mind, heart, and will” in order to move students “to action” (Korth 2003: 282). To foster a will to action, the program seeks to first develop an intellectual understanding of situations of injustice. It also seeks to develop an emotional connection to situations of injustice in order to develop a sense of solidarity. Finally, the program seeks to globalize this sense of solidarity by educating for global citizenship. Taken together these components are meant to cultivate a will to action for the promotion of justice.

I highlight these themes here because throughout my findings, the mind, the heart and the will to action components of the Jesuit pedagogical model are
present. The responses to my categories (education for justice, men and women for others, and global citizenship), which I identified as key themes of the Casa’s educational goals, overlap in relation to the core components of the Jesuit pedagogy, so it is helpful to have the aforementioned model in mind as one reads through my findings.

4.2.1 Question A: Education for justice

I began by asking participants to explain whether there were particular experiences during their time in the Casa program that influenced their understanding of education for justice. In general I was surprised by the overwhelming number of participants that identified their praxis experience as being the most influential component in shaping their understanding of education for justice. The vast majority of the participants experienced a shaping of their notion of education for justice both through interpersonal encounters with the struggles of Salvadorans they met or with the interactions combined with classroom exploration of justice issues.

For example, Anne explored how accompanying the community at her praxis site helped her realize that with the privilege of her education comes a responsibility to work for justice:

[The Casa program] brought all that I had learned about economic and social injustice to a much deeper level for me. My praxis site, Jayaque, was extremely influential for me…As a result of my praxis days, I formed many friendships and would spend most free weekends with my new friends in their houses. I remember the first time I spent the night at Juan’s (name changed) – the house was made of rusting tin, had no running water, dirt floors, a “shower area” made from black plastic, and his mother had to cook using firewood in the same area where everyone slept. The harsh reality of living in poverty had been hard for me to grasp before seeing my friend’s house first hand, and learning about his struggle to study and keep food on his family’s table. We were the same age, but his life options were so much more limited than mine, and my immediate responsibilities so much less urgent. For me, what I learned from Juan and his family helped me to understand the concept of an “education for justice”. With the privilege of my education comes much responsibility and a call to work for the empowerment and liberation of the poor and marginalized, helping to bring a voice to communities that often don’t have one.
The direct exposure to what Anne saw as injustice challenged her to recognize her own privilege and to use her education to stand in solidarity with those on the margins to seek justice.

Kathy expressed a similar sentiment explaining how “the praxis experiences on a whole shaped my understanding” and that, “Engaging in a reality that is suffering deepened my understanding of an education for justice by educating me on so many injustices that I now cannot comfortably ignore.”

Like many participants, Molly described how witnessing injustice on an emotional level through her Casa experience sparked her commitment to using her education to seek justice:

My experiences at my praxis site, in Colon, shaped my understanding of an education for justice on a very personal level. It’s one thing to study and learn about a situation from a book, the newspaper, or a presentation. But it’s a completely different scenario when you see, taste, smell, hear, and live the experiences, when the people are opening up to you, and when you begin to open up to them. The relationships that grew during my time in Colon deeply impacted my sense of what it means to study and live a life that works towards justice…Another important aspect of learning about justice with the Casa program is the learning that occurred with the other students in the program. I was continually challenged and inspired by their presence, ideas, and actions. The chance to learn from all of them really expanded my awareness of justice.

Molly also emphasized how important the community living design of the Casa program was to her awareness of justice as being with others facing similar challenges provided a vibrant setting to discuss and inspire one another.

After exploring respondents’ understanding of education for justice and how that understanding was shaped, I turned to uncovering if, and how, their time in the Casa program shaped their understanding of justice and to explain their vision of justice. I asked these questions to provide a deeper context of how they experienced and sought to live out an education for justice. Almost all respondents expressed a deep dedication to standing in solidarity with those on the margins to seek justice. I included this line of questioning to develop a more complete understanding of their vision of justice. Also, as I will explain in more detail in Chapter Five, I was interested in exploring how the
respondents’ conception of justice relates to the operational definition of social justice developed in CST.

What was remarkable to me, as the investigator, was how many respondents replied that the Casa program had profoundly influenced their idea of justice by witnessing ‘heart breaking’ injustices, to paraphrase Rachel. Many expressed having only a vague intellectual understanding injustice before their time in the Casa, while feeling a much more complete understanding after their time in the Casa. Mckenzie Leigh explained this deepening of understanding through witnessing injustice as she described, “Everyday I witnessed injustice and it was primarily through my continual witness of the small little injustices that exist day after day that I was able to start clarifying my thought on justice in the positive.”

Katie explained how the Casa not only helped her understanding of justice through witnessing injustice, but provoked a call to seek justice:

In the face of so many injustices, it’s hard not to think about what needs to change to make things more just. It was a shift for me because without seeing, learning about injustice through classes and experiencing through Salvadoran’s stories of the injustices in the world, I could not have developed such a personal mission to strive towards a just society and know that each of us as individuals and as community need to play a critical role in making that happen.

Julia captured the sentiment of many students in describing how intellectually learning about injustice in the classroom and witnessing injustice on an emotional level through experience roused a personal commitment to clarify what justice meant and to explore the her role in promoting her vision (developing a will to action): “More than anything, I was witnessing an example of an unjust society which in turn led to conversations about how to transform it into a more just society.”

In further questioning, I sought to uncover how students had come to envision a just society and whether or not they felt they were actively seeking that vision in their lives. Ultimately, I was curious how their experience of witnessing injustice had shaped their vision of justice and had inspired them to work towards justice. On one hand, I was curious how they defined justice and
whether or not it was a similar conceptualization to the notion of social justice presented earlier. On the other hand, in questioning how they saw themselves as living for justice, I gained insight into how respondents saw their vocational choices as advancing justice. What was remarkable is almost every respondent shared a vision of justice that demanded some degree of distribution, so that the human rights of all could be met. I found that the vision of justice sketched out by students was remarkably similar to the idea of social justice promoted in CST. Further, almost all students expressed a yearning to seek that vision.

Respondents expressed a range of conceptualizations of a *just society*. There were two mains themes emerging from the respondents. First, was a vision that demanded near total equality and distribution of resources. For example, Ginsberg explained his vision of justice as, “No rich, no poor, people sharing in common…” Katie shared this focus on equality explaining; “I think [my idea of a just society] most closely resembles a socialist society – helping those who cannot help themselves. Taking all sides into consideration, based on love and tolerance rather than hate and fear. Power in the hands of many rather than a few.”

Second, was a capabilities approach in which justice demands equal opportunity, but not necessarily equal distribution of resources:

A *just society* is a place where diversity is viewed as an asset, and where all people have the same rights, opportunities and are able to provide for their families. It would be a place where no one uses or gains power or privilege at the expense of another, and where everyone’s basic needs are met (Allie).

Throughout almost all of the responses was an emphasis on the social aspect of justice in the sense the needs of the collective or ‘common good’ were essential to achieving justice.

After exploring respondents’ vision of justice, I sought more context around my overall commitment to uncovering how participants were influenced by their Casa experience by questioning if they currently saw themselves promoting their vision of justice. These contextual responses have
provided further insight into student vocational choices, which I will explain in more detail in Chapter Five.

Overall there were three categories of answers to the question of whether or not student’s saw themselves as seeking justice in their lives: yes, trying to, and no. Most participants believed they were seeking justice in their lives either on an interpersonal level and/or through their vocational choice. Kathy, for example, said that “a truly just society will begin on the relationship level” and in that sense she saw herself living justice by the way she approaches “all interactions with others with compassion and understanding.” Lynn sees her work with the Inter-Faith Committee on Latin America as the primary means to advance a just society: “Working for a just immigration system, support for communities throughout Central and South America, educating local communities about things going on here and abroad are just a few ways we work for a just society.” Others, like David and Jose, feel that they are not doing enough to promote justice. David, for example, sees himself as promoting justice on an interpersonal level, but he feels he is not doing enough to change structural injustice or what he called “the big picture.” All of these responses provide interesting insights into issues that the respondents currently face in living out their aspiration to seek justice, which most identified as being profoundly shaped by their Casa experience.

4.2.2 Question A: Men and Women for Others

In addition to exploring how the Casa program influenced student understanding of an education for justice, I sought to ascertain if, and how, their experience influenced another key component of Jesuit education: “men and women for others”. The Jesuit pedagogy emphasizes direct experience with situations of injustice, with the goal of fostering solidarity or developing men and women for others.

I began by asking participants how they understood the term men and women for others. In terms of participant understanding of the term men and
women for others there was a general theme of community throughout almost all answers. This focus on community values also provides further insight into students’ social or communitarian understanding of justice. Respondents defined the concept as putting the needs of the community as central to all decisions one makes as an individual. Many explained this as recognition of the interconnectedness of humanity. In general there were two interrelated, and at times overlapping, patterns of responses under the theme of community. Although each pattern represents a prioritizing of individual action, nearly all participants explicitly or implicitly expressed a notion of solidarity in recognizing the importance of walking with others, especially those on the margins, to advance the cause of justice. Kathy captured the notion of solidarity expressed by many explaining men and women for others “means living in a way that focuses on how our lives hold responsibly for lives and well-being of others.”

A first pattern was primarily seeing men and women for others as recognition that all individual actions affect the greater community. Thus, they sought to think of every decision in terms of its impact on the common good. For example, Anne, understood men and women for others as a call, “To live my life and make decision not solely based on my own best interests, but on the interests of my neighbors, my community, etc.” Ginsberg shared Anne’s notion of recognizing the larger impact of individual decision explaining, “To live [as a man or women for others] means to live ones life in such a way that all desires and actions do not begin and end with me.”

A second pattern was defining men and women for others as a call to use one’s vocational talents in service to the greater good or common good. In line with this, Allie said men and women for others “means putting your skills, talents, and passions to work in ways that improve the world we live in and better the lives of others.” Kristina described men and women for others as, “To live in a place where my own deep vocational desires meet the needs of those at societies’ margins.”
I next sought to explore if and how participants’ experience in the Casa program shaped their understandings of what men and women for others meant. The overwhelming majority of respondents described that the Casa program had profoundly shaped their notion of men and women for others. A few respondents did not feel the Casa program had shaped their vision of men and women for others, but in all three cases they experienced the Casa program as sparking a deeper exploration of the concept, which later developed, enforcing a previously held notion or broadening their perception. For example, Ellie said the “Casa experience did not change my idea of a man or woman for others, but definitely enforced it for me.”

For the majority of respondents that felt the Casa had influenced their idea of men and women for others, there were a number of patterns that emerged in terms of how their idea was shaped through experiences and encounters. Some developed their understanding of the idea through classroom experience as Lisa explained her “philosophy of suffering class with Mark Ravizza was incredibly important in shaping this view.”

Others found an understanding by witnessing examples of men and women for others. Karin Lopez, for example, found meaning in the response of Casa students to a natural disaster while they were in El Salvador, explaining that, “To witness the way all the Casa students immediately mobilized to respond to the needs of their praxis communities (and others) was truly incredibly…it showed me what it meant to be a person for others: to respond to needs without hesitation and to give of your substance.” Anne found meaning in, “The example set by many of the scholarships students.” In seeing how Julio, the coordinator of her praxis site, “interacted with his family, supported his mother, was a good role model to his nephews and nieces, not to mention to all the scholarship students was very inspiring to me.” Julio was “perhaps the busiest person I had ever met…but all he was doing was towards the betterment of his community…that was his motivation – it was very unselfish…[Julio] was an inspiring model” of how to be a man/woman for others” (Anne).
Many Casa students found their meaning of men and women for others through the personal revelations their interaction at their praxis sites with Salvadorans. Megan found tangible meaning through her praxis site:

The Casa provided a tangible way of shaping notions of what it means to be a woman for others...The opportunity to reflect and think critically about unjust systems is essential, but even more important, perhaps, is physically placing ourselves in those unjust systems and building relationships with people that suffer the most from our failing structures. I am grateful to Casa for the opportunity to tangibly be a woman for others, rather than just talking about it in a classroom, far away from the reality of the poor.

Megan’s reflections demonstrated another pattern present in many answers, which was the influence of witnessing suffering in shaping their idea of men and women for others. For Julia, witnessing the struggles of others helped me “realize the incredible gifts that I have been given.” Recognizing her own privilege provoked a feeling of responsibly; “The Casa program helped me come to terms with the responsibility that comes from being an educated person from the developed world” (Julia). As she explained later, this responsibility was a calling to live in “solidarity with the poor” and accompany them in their struggle for justice (Julia). For her, this solidarity was a way of living as a woman for others.

A common theme present in most responses was the importance of relationships. Many respondents recognized the meaning of men and women through witnessing the commitment of others to fostering strong relationships, like the influence of Jose for Anne, or by feeling the care of others as an example of men and women for others. Ana’s responses exemplifies this second point, as being “the recipient of the grace of so many men and women for others of El Salvador” illustrated her idea of being a woman for others. For many, these relationships were not only about being with others, but it was about being with them in their struggle for justice:

Again, my praxis class shaped my understanding of being a man for others. It showed me that being a man for others isn’t simply doing community service or volunteering. It involves standing with others in community. It involves working together to understand oppressive social structures. It involves a commitment to non-
violence, community-building, and solidarity. ‘Community service’ and ‘volunteering’ are important components to this idea, but there is so much more.

Kathy shared David’s commitment to solidarity and felt a personal commitment to the struggles of those she had formed relationships with, so much so that her “personal liberation” was bound with the liberation of others. For her this was what men and women for others meant:

My Casa experience influenced this idea a lot and can be summed up by the Lilla Watson quotation that says, ‘If you have come here to help me, you are wasting your time. If you have come because your liberation is bound with mine, then let us work together.’ My Casa experience was so powerful because of the ways I found myself connected to people in such a different context and culture from my own. To be a woman or man “for and with others” now holds more weight to me and also means a woman or man whose liberation is bound with others’ liberation (Kathy).

I next sought to discover whether or not participants currently feel they are living as men for others. This is particularly interesting in relation to explanations like Kathy’s, as many respondents felt a profound yearning to stand in solidarity with the marginalized Salvadorans they had met during their time in the Casa program. All of the respondents answering this question felt they were currently acting as a man or woman for others. There were primarily two ways in which respondents saw themselves as living as a man or women for others; first, on an interpersonal level, and second, on a professional level. Further, most respondents answered with a degree of hesitation either stating that they were “trying to” or they “hoped” they were living as a man or woman for others.

Allie’s response provides an example of the commitment to living as a woman for others on an interpersonal level, as she explained living as a woman for others “is more about the day to day choices I make.” In these choices she tries to strengthen “relationships with friends and family”, while she also tries to “remember to consider, with every action, every decision, how someone else might be affected by what I do, whether it’s where I buy my coffee or how patient (or not) I am with a co-worker” (Allie). Ginsberg also saw his means of being a man for others on the interpersonal level, as he feels “the course of
[his] life is directed towards harmonious relationships with other people and with the earth.”

Many respondents focused rather on how their work was an example of living as a man or woman for others. Karen Lopez, for example, replied that she felt she was a woman for others because, “Both [her] jobs involve advocating for other people and helping in various ways.” Megan also saw her current work, or in her case volunteer work, as living as a woman for others. Megan is currently “a Jesuit Volunteer in Nicaragua, working with a Nicaraguan organization called Cantera, which does community organizing.” She further explains that “throughout [her] time since the Casa, [she] has tried to create a space for both accompaniment and activism, reflection and action, recognizing in it all that we work together because we are bound together” (Megan).

David’s response captures the sentiment of many responses in that he is constantly trying to live as a man for others on both an interpersonal level and a professional level through his job choice:

I consider myself to be a man for others. Of course, I also admit my shortcomings. Although I am not currently doing social work, I was social worker for two years before moving to Chicago last January. I am a support for my roommates, friends, and family. I try to get involved with fundraising on DePaul’s campus, around Chicago, and around the world. I am currently applying to Masters of Public Policy programs with the hope of forming public policy that will strive for justice and equality.

What I found most interesting, it that like David, nearly all of the respondents expressed a deep desire or ‘hope’, as many respondents said, to live as a man or women for others. This was a surprisingly powerful feeling for nearly all respondents.

4.2.3 Question A: Global Citizenship

In addition to the key themes of education for justice and men and women for others, I sought to explore a third key component of the Casa’s educational goals, which is to teach students “to become a socially responsibly
global citizens” (Yonkers-Talz 2003: 26). The concept of global citizenship has gained prevalence in Jesuit education in general appearing in more and more mission statements of Jesuit institutions. For example, Dean Brackley’s, S.J., discussion of the emerging centrality of global citizenship, or global engagement, presented in the literature review is one of many examples of the growing emphasis on global citizenship in Jesuit education. Because of the prominence of this concept in Jesuit education in general and particularly in the Casa program, I sought to explore respondents’ understanding of the concept and how their Casa experience influenced that understanding. In particular, I asked students if they felt they were living as global citizens, and if so, if they could share particular ways in which they saw themselves as a global citizens.

I then turned my focus to the Casa program, asking if and how the Casa program influenced their idea of global citizenship. In my first round of questioning, I did not ask about this concept. However, after observing the frequency of global citizenship in reading participants responses and by reflecting on the use of the term in Casa materials, I decided to follow up with questions on global citizenship (see bottom of Appendix C for questions). I further felt this question was important in comparing the Casa program with the UCA, as global citizen is an area where the Casa has expanded the educational mission of the UCA. In my follow-up questioning, I received responses from half (12) of all total participants (24).

As I mentioned above, I first sought to ascertain if students felt they were living as global citizens and what that term meant to them. In my role as investigator, I was quite surprised that every respondent said they saw themselves as global citizens. In defining what being a global citizenship meant to them, there was a range of patterns, but the common theme of solidarity with all people, no matter their citizenship or culture, was present in all answers.

One pattern present in many answers was an idea of collective responsibility. Lisa, for example, said, “that we all have a responsibility to each other, to care for ‘the least of these’ among us.” Many expressed a feeling of responsibility in the way global citizenship calls them to recognize the impacts
of their decisions. Alex expressed this sentiment in explaining that global citizenship called him, “To understand the increasing interconnectedness of all people around the world and to understand how certain policies and actions will impact populations around the world.”

Others framed their responses in terms of community expressing how global citizenship was recognition of our interconnectedness as human beings. Erica understood global citizenship as trying to “make decision based on how they affect...[her] global community” and that being a global citizen meant, “knowing that your choices are linked to everyone in this world.”

A particularly interesting pattern was a diminution of the significance of nation-state borders. This was illustrated by Hannah’s response in stating, “Being a global citizen would mean ignoring the lines drawn by political borders of one’s own country and instead seeing everyone as belonging to the same group.” Lisa expressed a similar view of global citizenship as transcending nation-state borders in explaining that being a global citizen meant care for the marginalized “wherever they may be” and that “borders do not determine our loyalties.”

As I mentioned earlier, the theme of solidarity was present in most responses. Hannah, for example, described that “being a global citizen would mean having a solidarity with others, regardless of where they live” and that “being a global citizen implies a certain amount of humility, especially on the part of people from wealthy nations, to leave behind their luxuries of citizenship in their own country and instead see themselves in solidarity with the rest of the world.” What was interesting about the centrality of the concept of solidarity in most answers was that for most, global citizenship called them to extend the principle of men and women to a global scale.

I then dug deeper to discover specific ways in which respondents saw themselves as living as a global citizen. In general, there were two ways in which respondents saw themselves as acting as global citizens: (1) through personal awareness of the global impact of their choices and (2) through profession engagement in global issues (vocational choice).
Megan illustrated the first point in trying to maintain an astute awareness of how her personal choices, especially in relation to consumption, affect the global community, as she explained that she tries “to be constantly aware of what and how I am consuming…what I eat, wear, buy, and where it comes from, etc.” Molly discussed this point on a more abstract level, as she explained that, “I think, process, and evaluate life and situations differently as my understanding of global citizenship continually changes.” This way of thinking has encouraged her “to be considerate and globally responsible as I can when it comes to the things I choose to purchase and the ways I choose to spend and use money and other resources.”

Most respondents focused on the way they engaged through their professional choices. Lynn, for example, feels she is living as a global citizen “when [she] works[s] for social justice and human rights at the Inter-Faith committee on Latin America.” Through that work she “maintain[s] friendships around the globe.” Kristina also saw her professional engagement as a means of being a global citizen, as she described, “Once I become a nurse midwife, I would like to travel to other countries (particularly developing ones) to participate in exchanges with other midwives where we learn from one another and share our wisdom and experiences with one another.”

My final question on global citizenship sought to reveal if and how respondents’ experiences during the Casa program had affected their understanding of what it means to be a global citizen. Nearly all of the answers expressed being affected by their personal experience with Salvadorans through their praxis placement as shaping their understanding of global citizenship. Hannah astutely captured the affect of the Casa experience shared by many students:

For me, being a global citizen means that things I saw and lived in El Salvador cannot and do not stay in El Salvador; they are not El Salvador’s problems, but the world’s. A huge part of this was meeting people and, for the first time in my life, seeing poverty in a real way. Instead of learning statistics and facts about El Salvador in a class, living with and growing close to people who were actually living the reality was completely different. It is impossible to think of people as statistics or facts when you know them, have been to their house, and have met their family.
think that knowing people personally made me understand that being a global citizen is not about nationality or borders, but about people.

Like Hannah, many felt an expansion of their scope of community to a global level by realizing how similar the interests and passions of the people of El Salvador were to their own. Lynn shared this sentiment in that her everyday encounters with Salvadorean at her praxis site “remind[ed] me that we’re not so different from each other, and in being so connected, we need to support one another when we can.” For Molly the direct connection with Salvadorean’s and particularly her experience with the tribulations of poverty at her praxis site sparked a commitment to global solidarity and action. For her, a quote from her liberation theology course profoundly described her feeling of solidarity: “Once you know, you can’t not know.” For Molly, “taking these experiences [in El Salvador] to heart has widened my view of the world and made me a more compassionate and global citizen.”

Similar to what I have discussed earlier, in many cases respondents took their meaning of men and women for others and simply applied the theme of solidarity to a global scale. Like Molly expressed, many felt a call to solidarity after experiencing the struggles of Salvadoreans. Once they witnessed the suffering, they “can’t not know [it]” (Molly) and for most this called them to action. I will return to this point in Chapter Five, but I now focus on if, and how, respondents live out the ideals of an education for justice, men and women for others, and global citizenship in their vocational choices.

4.3 Question B: Vocational Choice

This research question focused specifically on exploring how the Casa experience influenced participants’ long-term vocational aspirations. As I hypothesized in the Literature Review, the aspiration of the Jesuit educational model used by the Casa program, strives to develop men and women dedicated to social justice or what I have also called agents of positive peace. In asking students about their vocational choices, I was curious to uncover how the
educational values of the Casa program and the experience in general had influenced their vocational choices. In other words, I sought to explore how students saw their own agency as currently advancing social justice.

In almost every case the participants said the Casa had influenced their vocational choices. Their vocational aspirations were rooted in their commitment to living out the ideal of an education for justice, striving to be men and women for others, and living as a global citizen. Participants shared common aspirations of seeking justice through their vocational choices, but expressed many different vocational paths of promoting justice. In general, I identified two categories of experiences that were particularly influential in respondents vocational choices: (1) community living, (2) relationships with professors and administrators in the program and (3) praxis experience.

For Mckenzie Leigh, the Casa student community “helped [her] to recognize that [she] does desire to work to address the needs of [her] community.” To live out this aspiration Mckenzie Leigh volunteered in Jesuit Volunteer Corps in New Orleans the year after she graduated college. She now works for a rural hospital in Oregon “trying to find health care coverage for the uninsured whom enter our doors.” Julia also found vocational inspiration in the Casa community or as she explained, “In particular, it was the experience of living in community that encouraged me to seek my current vocation of being a volunteer,” which she is currently doing through her participation in Jesuit Volunteer Corps International in Peru. Julia felt the Casa community “challenged [her] to live more honestly”, which “proved to be a transformative experience.”

Other students identified professors and Casa staff as being most influential on their vocational aspirations. Gingsberg for example was influenced to join the Jesuit priesthood by Fr. Mark Ravizza, SJ. For Ana, she discovered her vocational calling of working as a financial advisor with economically poor families by “running with Trena (the Casa co-director) in the mornings”, which was “particularly motivational as she shared with [Ana] her own experiences.”
For the majority of participants, their praxis experience was most influential on their vocational aspirations. Katie, for example, discussed how “[she] became passionate about the idea of greater change, systems change, community organizing and macro work” through her praxis experience in Las Delicias. Ultimately, this passion led her to “serve community through relationship building as a Community Organizer at a domestic violence agency in a White/Latino neighborhood” (Katie). Kathy found similar inspiration at her Praxis placement, as she “[had previously been interested in social work, but] [her] praxis site influenced [her] to feel more strongly towards this pursuit.” She also shared that, “More generally, the Casa experience as a whole inspired [her] to really want to find a vocation that will give [her] the opportunity to connection with other who are struggling.” This reflection from Kathy is a sentiment expressed by nearly all respondents, a desire to live as men and women for others in the promotion of justice through their vocations.
Chapter Five: Discussion

So, we must fix our vision not merely on the negative expulsion of war, but upon the positive affirmation of peace. We must see that peace represents a sweeter music, a cosmic melody that is far superior to the discords of war... All that I have said boils down to the point of affirming that mankind's survival is dependent upon man's ability to solve the problems of racial injustice, poverty, and war; the solution of these problems is in turn dependent upon man squaring his moral progress with his scientific progress, and learning the practical art of living in harmony... This call for a worldwide fellowship that lifts neighborly concern beyond one's tribe, race, class, and nation is in reality a call for an all-embracing and unconditional love for all men... in spite of the tensions and uncertainties of this period something profoundly meaningful is taking place. Old systems of exploitation and oppression are passing away, and out of the womb of a frail world new systems of justice and equality are being born... Here and there an individual or group dares to love, and rises to the majestic heights of moral maturity (King 1964).

Martin Luther King Jr. helped to forge a social movement for positive peace in the United States by cultivating civil society support through people’s organizations, such as the Christian Movement for Human Rights and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and through churches and universities around the country. These organizations helped to raise the consciousness of Americans to foster an “all-embracing and unconditional love for all men” (ibid). King’s vision of a peaceful society where the dignity of all people would be respected inspired millions of Americans to join in his quest for social justice in America. These Americans joined with King to help breakdown the “Old systems of exploitation and oppression,” and to struggle for social justice (ibid). Martin Luther King Jr.’s dream, however, of a socially just society where there is both positive and negative peace remains elusive. Today, as in 1964, the “call for a worldwide fellowship that lifts neighborly concern beyond one's tribe, race, class, and nation is in reality a call for an all-embracing and unconditional love for all men” remains an imperative call (ibid).

One means of developing such profound solidarity and commitment to action is through peace education. The Jesuit pedagogical model of the Casa program provides an example of an educational model committed to promoting a “more peaceful and just world” (Yonkers-Talz 2004: 184). One means of creating a more peaceful world, for the staff at the Casa program, is by
educating individual agents committed to the promotion of justice – what I have called agents of positive peace.

The historical case of the UCA in the 1980s is an example of how a form of peace education has been used to develop agents of positive peace committed to social change. The Jesuits at the UCA believed they were called to “educate professionals with a conscience, who [would] be the immediate instruments of…transformation” of Salvadoran society – a transformation for social justice (Ellacuría 1982). In living out this calling the Jesuit leadership at UCA utilized the Jesuit pedagogy in the hope of cultivating solidarity by moving students to live as men and women for their fellow Salvadorans and to inspire students to seek social justice. The Casa program in El Salvador continues the peace education model of the UCA, as it has been educating students to be promoters of social justice for the last eleven years.

5.1 Research Questions and Study Structure

(1) *Is the Casa’s educational model a form of peace education, and to what extent does this model contribute to the formation of agents of social justice (positive peace)?*

To highlight the overall framework of my research paper and to describe what I have done thus far, I have inserted Figure 1 from the Introduction to provide a visual representation of my thesis framework:
To answer the first part of my thematic research question, *is the Casa’s educational model a form of peace education, and to what extent does this model contribute to the formation of agents of positive peace?* I provided, in Chapter Two, a detailed description of Chadwick Alger’s framework of peace tools to secure positive and negative peace. I also explored his explanation of peace education, and his concept of how an effective pedagogy of peace education forms agents committed to a vision of peace and moves them to action by inspiring a quest towards their vision.

After detailing Alger’s model of peace education, I developed an operational definition of positive and negative peace based on Johan Galtung’s work. I then used R.J. Rummel’s work to establish a clear connection between...
social justice and positive peace. Finally, I used CST to develop an operational definition of social justice. Ultimately, I demonstrated through this discussion that the terms social justice and positive peace can be used interchangeably, as “positive peace…[is] the presences of [social] justice” (King 1964).

I then used the historical example of the UCA’s educational model and discussed the educational goals of the Casa program to establish my hypothesis that the Jesuit educational model of the Casa program contributes to the formation of agents of positive peace through a form of peace education (box B). Through my discussion of the educational model of the UCA, the structure of the Jesuit pedagogy, and the educational model of the Casa, I demonstrated how the mechanisms of the Casa’s pedagogical model (box 2.1) seek to develop agents of social justice (box 2.2) to move society towards a condition of positive peace (box 2.3). Based on my discussion of the educational goals of the Casa program, I have argued that the program’s central goal of developing promoters of justice and solidarity is a form of peace education.

To test my hypothesis with empirical evidence (box C) that the educational model of the Casa program contributes to the formation of agents of positive peace through a form of peace education, I have sought to understand how key components of the model have shaped students’ goals and how those goals relate to the promotion of social justice. To reorient the reader to the key components of the Casa’s educational model, I have again inserted Figure 2:
In general, as I will explain below, my findings have revealed the importance of the synergy of the intellectual (box 1 - *mind*) and the emotional (box 2 – *heart*) components of the pedagogical model of the Casa program in fostering a will to action on behalf of justice. If, as Alger (1996) suggests, that an effective peace education should inspire students to act on behalf of their vision of a peaceful society, then I believe that the aforementioned finding is a critical component of an effective peace education. In exploring how the goals (*education for justice, men and women for others, and global citizenship*) of the Casa’s educational model have influenced students’ commitment to living as agents of social justice (*through their vocation*), I uncovered overlapping patterns and themes present in all areas of questioning. The overlapping responses, however, reinforced the centrality of my primary finding that experience-based learning was the most important aspect in fostering a will to action.
5.2 Findings: Education for Justice

To understand the impact of the Casa experience on participants’ understanding of an education for justice, I explored, based on their perceptions, how respondents’ understanding of education for justice changed during their time at the Casa program. Most participants explained that they began the Casa program with an ambiguous understanding of education for justice, while they left with a more holistic understanding and a commitment to action for justice. David, for example, felt he had a limited understanding of the term before his experience, while his experience in the Casa deepened his understanding:

Before the Casa, I saw justice as service. This is, lending limited amounts of my time and energy to help others. I didn’t think of it on such a societal level—learning about and speaking out against injustice structures, cycles, and institutions. [After the Casa experience David’s perspective changed, as he] no longer viewed my education in terms of textbooks, tests, and classrooms, but as a means, an opportunity, and a responsibility to make a difference in the world and help people… My idea of ‘service’ became one of ‘justice’. Working in community, and working in collaboration with the oppressed became central to achieving any sort of lasting change.

Karen Lopez had no knowledge of the concept of education for justice, as she explained that she had “never heard the term ‘education for justice’ before the Casa program.” For Karen Lopez, “The Casa program singlehandedly introduced me to an education for justice.” She goes on to explain that by witnessing such widespread atrocities experienced by the Salvadorans, her “heart and mind had no choice but to foster a knowledge of justice issues” and this “was the first step in using education to advocate for those who suffer from systemic injustice.” For nearly all of the participants, the Casa program either introduced or deepened their understanding of education for justice. For most, this concept became a calling to take action or as Ellie explained “[experiencing] injustice in a real way that pushed me to want to actually do something about [it].”
For most participants, this commitment to action on behalf of justice was fostered through their praxis experience. Molly’s explanation of how the Casa experience impacted her captures the sentiment of many respondents:

My experiences at my praxis site, in Colon, shaped my understanding of an education for justice on a very personal level. It’s one thing to study and learn about a situation from a book, the newspaper, or a presentation. But it’s a completely different scenario when you see, taste, smell, hear, and live the experiences, when the people are opening up to you, and when you begin to open up to them. The relationships that grew during my time in Colon deeply impacted my sense of what it means to study and live a life that works towards justice. Although it’s been more than two years since my time there and the feelings come and go in different ways now, the friends I made there are still a part of me. I see justice through the lens of my experiences with them. I feel as if I try to look at new situations more deeply now, in an effort to connect with the experiences of the people instead of only seeing from my own perspective and background.

The power of direct experience and the consequential emotional connection to the concept of justice was the most compelling finding of this section, as many students experienced a profound perspective transformation through their praxis site. This finding is illuminated by Jack Mezirow’s (1991) theory ‘transformation of meanings perspective’ (167). As I explained in Chapter Three:

Perspective transformation is the process of becoming critically aware of how and why our assumptions have come to constrain the way we perceive, understand, and feel about our world; changing these structures of habitual expectation to make possible a more inclusive, discriminating, and integrative perspective; and finally, making choices or otherwise acting upon these new understandings (Mezirow 1991: 167).

This “perspective transformation” is initiated with “disorienting dilemma.” He proposes phases of transformation that may include as many as ten steps, starting with the disorienting dilemma, and moving through self-examination (perhaps with accompanying feelings of guilt or shame), critical assessment, planning a course of action and eventually a “reintegrating of one’s life on the basis of conditions dictated by one’s own perspective” (Mezirow 1991: 169; Orlando 2003). This theory has been particularly insightful in exploring the core meanings of direct experience in students’ praxis work in El Salvador during the Casa.
For most within the Casa program their disorienting dilemma was witnessing the profound poverty that so many faced at their praxis sites. Julia, for example, explained that, “The Casa program brought me face to face with the poor and those who suffer from injustice”. Through this experience she was challenged to “make the connection between my privileged life and the suffering of the poor”. Through her friendships with the people in Mariona she “was able to understand more fully the impact that globalization and American foreign policy have on their daily lives”, which pushed her to recognize the “incredible gifts that [she had] been given” and ultimately fostered a sense of “responsibility” for social change. Ellie faced a similar disorienting dilemma in witnessing injustice, as she explained that, “Nothing I read in a textbook or saw on a powerpoint slide…could prepare me for the injustices I actually faced in the school system of El Salvador”. Personally witnessing these injustices caused her great angst, but motivated her to live as an agent of justice: “It wasn’t until I saw and felt the injustice that I was able to realize the importance of the education for justice that I was getting at [Santa Clara University] and knew I wanted my life to be dedicated to preventing these injustices from taking place”.

Throughout this section I have highlighted both the intellectual and the emotional impact of the Jesuit educational model on students. Many, like Julia, had “been exposed to social justice in an academic setting years before attending the Casa program,” but did not feel the stirring emotional drive to seek justice. Julia later explains that, “witnessing an example of an unjust society” drove her to seek “ways to transform it into a more just society.” A concept that united almost all of the students’ responses was an emphasis on the emotional link they made with Salvadorans on the margins of society through their praxis experience.

As I highlighted in Chapter Four, nearly all of the participants expressed a community oriented and distributive understanding of justice, which was remarkably similar to the CST operational definition of the term, social justice, presented in Chapter Two. A number of key themes and patterns emerged
when asking students about their vision of a just society, including: community, common good, social justice, distribution of power, distribution of resources, capacities. One uniting theme in the responses was an explanation of justice as requiring that the needs of the entire community be met. Based on their responses and the operational definition of social justice presented in Chapter Two, the findings suggested that most students had a vision of justice that most clearly resembled justice as social justice.

5.3 Findings: Men and Women for Others

The idea of men and women for others is another core component of Jesuit education. As highlighted in Figure 2, the Jesuit pedagogy emphasizes direct experience with situations of injustice to foster an emotional connection to seeking social change. The quote cited earlier from Moreno (1990) astutely captures how an emotional (heart) connection to situations of suffering produces solidarity, which leads to action on behalf of justice:

> Solidarity with others leads to being identified with them so that their pain, their passion, become one’s own (com-passion), and they pain one to the point of being unbearable: they have to be relieved, something must be done to change the situation of suffering. That leads to action, to doing something that relieves the suffering of the other, which is also one’s own suffering (104).

> In explaining the development of a will to action, Moreno argues that direct contact with injustice leads to a sense of solidarity which creates a sense of “being identified with them so that their pain, their passion, become one’s own (com-passion), and they pain to the point of being unbearable” to a point that “something must be done to change the situation of suffering” (ibid). This deep sense of solidarity compels one to action. Thus, in the Jesuit educational tradition, being a man or women for others is being in solidarity with those facing injustices.

About 21 respondents affirmed that the Casa program had either shaped or deepened their understanding of what it meant be live out the values of men
and women for others. Robyn, for example, developed a new understanding of what men and women for others meant in experiencing the flourishing of solidarity, as she explained, “It might not be the typical idea of doing service for others, but it was in the simple interactions that showed me how connected I am to others and showed me what ‘solidarity’ really means.” Most experienced a deepening of a previously held understanding of the concept, like Ellie, who explained that the “Casa experience did not change my idea of a man or woman for others, but definitely enforced it for me.” For most the deepening of their understanding of men and women for others came through the direct experience of living in solidarity with Salvadorans through their praxis sites.

The praxis component was the most influential aspect of the Casa program as it was the vehicle for developing solidarity, the profound empathy expressed by Moreno (1990). Megan succinctly captured the emergence of solidarity through her experience as she explained how the praxis site provided “a tangible way of shaping notions of what it means to be a woman for others.” To her, “The opportunity to reflect and think critically about unjust systems is essential, but even more important, perhaps, is physically placing ourselves in those unjust systems and building relationships with people that suffer the most from our failing structures.” She concludes, “I am grateful to Casa for the opportunity to tangibly be a women for others, rather than just talking about it in a classroom, far from the reality of the poor.”

The influence of direct experience with the struggles of others in shaping students’ perspectives and fostering a call to live in solidarity as men and women for others was an important unifying concept in this section. Similar to my discussion of Mezirow’s perspective transformation theory in the previous section, many respondents experienced a transformation of their perspectives in relation to the concept of men and women for others. For Casa students the disorienting dilemma was direct experience with the struggles of those marginalized by poverty. Respondents expressed a deep sense of
solidarity in which they internalized the struggles of the relationships they had made at their praxis sites.

Kathy succinctly articulated her feeling of solidarity:

My Casa experience influenced this idea a lot and can be summed by the Lilla Watson quotation that says, ‘If you have come here to help me, you are wasting your time. If you have come because your liberation is bound with mine, then let us work together.’ My Casa experience was so powerful because of the ways I found myself connected to people in such a different context and culture from my own. To be a woman or man ‘for and with others’ now holds more weight to me and also means a woman or man whose liberation is bound with others’ liberation.

In facing the disorienting dilemma of the intense tribulations of those at the praxis sites many respondents developed an understanding of men and women for others as a deep solidarity, which manifested as a call to action to join in the struggles of the Salvadorans for their liberation was “bound with mine” (Kathy). Like Moreno’s (1990) quote at the beginning of this section, many respondents had internalized the struggles of others to a point where “they have to be relieved, something must be done to change the situation of suffering. That leads to action, to doing something that relieves the suffering of the other, which is also one’s own suffering” (104).

5.4 Findings: Global Citizenship

What emerged from my exploration of the concepts of education for justice and men and women for others was the commitment of respondents to working on behalf of their community, which developed both through their classroom experience and particularly through direct experience in their praxis communities. Mostly through the development of relationships, respondents expressed a broadening of their sense of community or what I have defined as broadening their sense of solidarity. This broadening was a key to understanding the idea of global citizenship emphasized in the Casa mission. As I explained in the Literature Review, the Casa program has embraced an emphasis on developing global citizens.
An important finding in this section was the broadening of the scale of community for many students through their praxis sites – a movement from a limited notion of community often related to national identify to a sense of global identity. For most, the catalyst to an expanded idea of community was a realization of commonality and recognition of interconnectedness. Lisa explained this as, “Simply living and falling in love with another country and another people” and through this she experienced “how interconnected we are and how much we affect each others lives.”

For most, this intimate experience with the interconnectedness of humanity through their praxis sites led to a diminution of the significance of nation-state borders. As I mentioned in Chapter Four, this was illustrated by Hannah, who explained that, “Being a global citizen would mean ignoring the lines drawn by political borders of one’s own country and instead seeing everyone as belonging to the same group.” Lisa shared this perspective, as global citizenship to her was solidarity with marginalized populations “wherever they may be” and that “borders do not determine our loyalties.”

The understanding of global citizenship expressed by many respondents seemed to be a product of the location of the Casa program. By being in another country, students were challenged to recognize the commonality of those from another country. In this experience, respondents in my research expressed a re-evaluation of their own boundaries of community and a broadening of community to a global scale.

5.5 Findings: Vocational Choices

To explore the influence of the Casa program on fostering a commitment to action on behalf of the promotion of justice, I identified vocational choice as a clear means of how students live out the values identified. A remarkable finding was that nearly every respondent identified their Casa experience and the Jesuit values espoused by the Casa program (education for justice, men and women for others, and global citizenship) as
profundely influential in shaping their vocational choices. For McKenzie Leigh, for example, the Casa experience “helped [her] to recognize that [she] does desire to work to address the needs of [her] community.” She believed that through her work in Jesuit Volunteer Corps she was advancing social justice. She sees herself as working for the human right of health care by working in a rural hospital in Oregon “trying to find health care coverage for the uninsured that enter our doors.” Julia found similar inspiration to volunteer through Jesuit Volunteer Corps International, as the Casa experience inspired her to live in solidarity with people in Peru. Ellie she saw herself as living out the value of an education for justice, “I believe that actions speak louder than words and I try to promote a just society in all of my actions. Currently I am one of four coordinators for a volunteer organization known as SCCAP (Santa Clara Community Action Program) aimed at promoting justice through our volunteerism, activism and advocacy.” For Ellie, this vocational choice was a means for living out the values of the Jesuit educational model and seeking social justice.

Overall, it was remarkable that almost all of the students saw their vocation as a means to moving society towards a more just world. For the few that are not currently see themselves as promoting justice in their vocational choice, they expressed a deep yearning to find a means to do so. The high percentage of students committed to seeking social justice does, I believe, reveal a self-selection weakness in my research. It is likely that students who did not feel they were actively promoting social justice would have opted out of my research. I will discuss this point more below.

Like the previous sections, respondents identified the praxis experience as being most influential in shaping their vocational choices. Katie for example, discussed how “[she] became passionate about the idea of greater change, systems change, community organizing and macro work” through her praxis experience in Las Delicias. Ultimately, this passion led her to “serve community through relationship building as a Community Organizer at a domestic violence agency in a White/Latino neighborhood.” Kathy found
similar inspiration at her praxis placement, as she “had previously been interested in social work, but [her] praxis site influenced [her] to feel more strongly towards this pursuit.” She also shared that, “More generally, the Casa experience as a whole inspired [her] to really want to find a vocation that will give [her] the opportunity to connection with other who are struggling.”

5.6 Study Limitations

By only drawing on 24 students out of a total of over 160 total graduates since the beginning of the program, I face the obvious research barrier of generalizability. Thus, I lack the necessary external validity to make far-reaching generalizations about the impact of the Casa program. Also, because I was only able to focus on student perceptions I am not able to make strong claims about the impact of the Casa program itself. Based on the scope of my findings, I do not know what other factors influenced participants’ understanding of the Casa goals or their own vocational aspirations. If I had conducted longitudinal research interviewing students before and after their Casa experience, I could have presented valid findings on the impact of the Casa program. Such a study is clearly an effective avenue for future research in order to evaluate the Casa program. Further, my personal experience with the Jesuit educational model during my undergraduate studies at Seattle University has created the possibility for biases to impact my findings.

Aware of these issues, I sought to develop internal validity and minimize the impact of biases through three different mechanisms. First, I utilized was triangulation to incorporate multiple sources of data. I subsequently used crosschecking of the data to “confirm emerging findings” (Merriam 1998: 204). Second, I further sought to establish a chain of evidence through the wealth of data provided through my utilization of multiple data sources. Third, I sought to clearly explain my potential biases, which helped key informants point out potential weaknesses in my conclusions. Cognizant of my limitations, however, my research has revealed important trends and
patterns elements of the Casa experience that were particularly influential for Casa participants.

5.7 Summary

Certainly not everyone needs to have an immersion experience in El Salvador to find her or his way. Our bias at the Casa, however, is that the poor, those who struggle to survive and suffer unjustly, have a great deal to teach us about ourselves and our world. Encountering the realities of the poor is challenging at many levels. When provided with the optimal amount of support, however, these experiences can effectively foster students’ development, enabling them to find that which gives life deep meaning. Doing so enables them to participate in creating a more peaceful and just world, one where all people, especially the poor, can live with dignity (Yonkers-Talz 2004: 184).

The quote provides an illuminating description of my key findings. Through my examination of the responses of the 24 former Casa participants I interviewed, I have found compelling evidence that direct experience through their praxis placement in El Salvador had a profound impact on their commitment to seeking social justice. Most participants expressed that their personal will to action was a product of their emotional reaction to directly witnessing injustice and a product of the profound solidarity they gained through living in the Salvadoran campo.

My research was developed around my thematic research question: Is the Casa’s educational model a form of peace education, and to what extent does this model contribute to the formation of agents of social justice (positive peace)? As I argued at the start of this chapter, I have clearly established that the Jesuit educational model of the Casa program, based on its goal of promoting social justice, is a form of peace education.

Much of my research has focused on exploring the outcomes of the Casa’s Jesuit educational model to understand the extent to which students perceive the Casa experience as having shaped their understanding of the ideals of the program and how those perceptions have contributed, if at all, to a commitment of living as agents of social justice. What has emerged from my research is that personal encounters with the realities of intense poverty and
injustice profoundly impacted nearly every student. The experience of witnessing ‘heart breaking’, to paraphrase Rachel’s response, injustice helped participants foster a sense of solidarity and a commitment to seek a transformation of such conditions. What ultimately emerged was as illumination of Korth’s (2003) explanation of the Jesuit pedagogy that combines intellectual understanding (mind) with an emotional connection to injustice (heart), which for most respondents created a deep yearning for action (will to action).

For many, the praxis experience stirred a will to action:

Again, the praxis site experience was very transformative. I saw the need for development in Las Delicias and wanted to become a part of that. The Casa program does a great job at asking the question “...And now what?” In other words, it provides you with such a powerful experience that opens your eyes and pushes you to use that knowledge for constructive change (David).

For David one means of seeking constructive change was by living out his vocational choice of working in international development. Most expressed a similar reaction to their Casa experience, which corroborates the process represented in Figure 1. For David the Jesuit pedagogy (box 2.1), and especially the direct experience aspect, moved him to seek a means to promote justice (box 2.2), which for David was through his vocational choice of international development, with the ultimate goal of seeking to create a more just and peaceful world (box 2.3).

Clearly, my data, based on the lack of external validity discussed in Chapter Three, is not able to suggest a causal pattern, nor conclusively say that the Casa experience caused students to live a life committed to promoting social justice. The goal of this descriptive case study has been to develop a thick description of how students perceive the impact of the phenomenon of the Casa experience. By sharing respondents’ personal narratives of their experiences, I have uncovered a revealing pattern of the power of direct experience with injustice in fostering a will to action.
This is an important pattern because it provides insights to other Jesuit universities and Jesuit university programs and to the wider field of peace education. For Jesuit universities it demonstrates the impact of experience based education and suggests wider use of praxis experiences as a means to foster a commitment for the “promotion of justice” (Arrupe 1972).

In relation to pedagogies of peace education, it also highlights the potential of experience based praxis components in fostering a will to action. As I discussed in Chapter Two, throughout Alger’s work on peace education he has emphasized the normative nature of peace education and the need to inspire a vision of a peaceful world and the commitment to pursuing that vision. As I discussed in Chapter Two, Alger (1996) argues that a comprehensive view of peace is essential in peace education, “Because of the emphasis on extreme conflict and violence by the media, and because the academic study of international relations tends to emphasize the same phenomena, young people tend to assume that a world with widespread violence is inevitable” (40). To counter this dire view on the conditions of society, Alger argues that peace education needs to provide hope that change is possible and to inspire a commitment to “quest” towards realizing such change (ibid). To create such a vision and a will to action, Alger’s argues that three pedagogical mechanisms are necessary:

(1) [A] very intensive study of the present state of human relations with a broad perspective. (2) It also requires systematic thinking about strategies for change based on knowledge about the past successes and failures of these strategies. And (3) it constantly challenges students to clarify and revise their preferred future (ibid: 41).

These mechanisms primarily focus on the intellectual exploration of the theme of peace. My research, however, suggests that he is missing a crucial component of effective peace education. My research has demonstrated the transformative and inspirational power of direct experience with injustice through praxis based education, which suggests that an emotion connection to structural violence (social injustice) and the development of solidarity have been the most influential components of stirring students to action. Based on
these findings, it seems necessary to expand Alger’s model of peace education to include an experiential component to foster a will to action and hopefully begin to move society towards King’s vision of “a substantive and positive peace, in which all men will respect the dignity and worth of human personality” (1964).
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Participant Intake Survey

Please take a moment to answer these questions. Please limit your answers to one to two sentences.

1) What is your name?

2) Are you a male or a female? (Mark with X)
   
   Male ___
   Female ___

3) How would you identify yourself? (Mark with X)
   
   Caucasian ___  Hispanic ___
   African American ___  Mixed ___
   Native American ___  Other ___

4) How would you describe you religious or spiritual beliefs?

5) What university did you attend, and what year did you graduate?

6) What was your major (s) and minor (s) if applicable?

7) Did you change majors while enrolled in undergraduate studies?

8) What semester and what year did you attend the Casa de la Solidaridad program?

9) What classes did you enroll in during the program?

10) Where was your praxis site?

11) What was your role at the praxis site?
Appendix C – Casa Impact Questionnaire  
(Data available by request to author)

Casa de la Solidaridad Impact Questionnaire

NOTE: I anticipate anywhere from one sentence to one to two paragraph responses depending on the question; however, do not feel constrained in your answers. Please use any amount of space needed to answer the questions.

Introductory Questions

1) Please state your name and choose a pseudonym for reference in the thesis or write “researcher’s choice” if you would like the research to choose your pseudonym.

2) Why did you decide to attend a Jesuit school?

3) Why did you choose to participate in the Casa program?

Education for justice

4) What was your understanding of an education for justice before the Casa program?

5) Did the Casa program change or deepen your understanding of what an education for justice means? If so, can you explain in what ways it influence your understanding?

6) Can you share particular encounters, exchanges or classes during your time in the Casa program that shaped your understanding of the meaning of an education for justice?

7) More specifically, did your experience in the Casa program shape vision of a just society? If so, in what ways did it influence your idea of a just society?

8) Can you please share your vision of a just society?

9) Do you feel you are currently promoting that vision of a just society? (Please choose (a) or (b) for your response)
   
   a. If so, can you share a few ways in which you see yourself promoting a just society?
   
   b. If not, can you explain why not?

Men and Women for Others

10) What does it mean to be a man or woman for others to you?

   a. Did your casa experience influence that idea?
11) Can you share particular encounters, exchanges or classes during your time in the Casa program that shaped your understanding of being a man or women for others?

12) Do you feel you are living as a man or woman for others? (Please choose (a) or (b) for your response)
   a. If so, can you share some ways in which see yourself as being a man or woman for others?
   b. If not, can you explain why not?

**Vocational Choices**

13) Did the Casa program influence your vocational aspirations?
   a. If so, can you share experiences, classes or moments that particularly influenced your vocational aspirations?

14) What is your current vocation?

15) Has your current vocation choice been influenced by the Jesuit mission, and if so, in what ways?

---

**Follow Up Questions Via Email appended to Research Questionnaire** –

1) Do you feel you are a global citizen?

2) If so, can you explain what being a global citizen means to you?

3) Can you share particular encounters, exchanges or classes during your time in the Casa program that shaped your understanding of being a global citizen?

4) Can you share ways in which you see yourself acting as a global citizen?